



**THE DEVELOPING ROLE OF NATO AND KFOR'S
CONTRIBUTION TO PEACEBUILDING IN KOSOVO
APRIL 2010**

[The following report describes the role and contributions of KFOR in building sustainable peace in five selected municipalities in Kosovo. The research begins by describing the evolution of peacekeeping since the Cold War, progresses to the NATO intervention in Kosovo, and then identifies KFOR activities, projects, civil-military cooperation, and the perceptions of locals from various community backgrounds to determine the impact that KFOR has had with regards to transforming the relationships of conflict parties and promoting mechanisms for nonviolent resolution of conflict. The paper concludes with general observations and recommendations.]

CSSP would like to acknowledge the time and effort John D. Etchemendy has spent in Kosovo in researching and writing this report. CSSP would like to thank him and his interviewees for their readiness and cooperation.



Executive Summary

CSSProject for Integrative Mediation has been working in Kosovo since 2005. Its focus has been improving inter-community relations in conflict areas using the methodology of *Integrative Mediation* initially developed from ten years of work with the Office of the International Mediator in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Though its work has been conducted throughout the Balkans, in Kosovo the majority of efforts have been focused in the municipalities of Obiliq/Obilić, Rahovec/Orahovac, Ferizaj/Uroševac, and Štrpce/Shtërpçë. In addition, meetings and consultations were held in several other municipalities with NGO and municipal leaders. Throughout its work CSSP has come into contact with Kosovo Force (KFOR) and heard about its initiatives. Given that all actors in a conflict or post-conflict context have the potential to contribute to creating more peaceful societies, this paper researches the role that KFOR has played in the process where CSSP has been working, especially as the body of information and research on this topic has been limited and largely out of date.

Given that KFOR recently announced a reduction in forces and new strategic plan for the smaller force, the opportunity was provided to research deeper at what has been done and the impact that it has had on divided communities. To understand KFOR “peace support operation” strategies the research started by looking at the evolution of peacekeeping and military strategies which has shaped the mission in Kosovo. One major conclusion from this work is that, while the approaches differed throughout the multi-national forces, the overall force had adopted strategies formed since the end of the Cold War which were committed to preventing a re-emergence of cultural and national tensions. By conducting independent projects, delivering humanitarian aid, and contributing resources to projects in the fields of humanitarian aid, society development and construction/reconstruction, all 36 KFOR contingents had indeed entered the gray area formerly dividing humanitarian actors and traditional peacekeeping forces.

To determine the role KFOR has played in the municipalities where we work, KFOR’s mission, objectives, and appropriate units were reviewed along with traditional and non-traditional activities. This research was supplemented and verified with interviews with local leaders. To analyze the data and form conclusions core principles of peacebuilding theory and published KFOR objectives were used as standards. Guiding the research were the following questions:

1. To what extent did these activities address the “sources of violence”?¹
2. To what extent did these activities address the “structural violence”?²
3. Did these activities encourage or build capacity in inter-community dialogue and problem-solving?
4. Did these activities create a network of collaborative and supportive relationships?
5. Did these activities influence attitudes and behavior, and promote tolerance?
6. Did actions support and promote local institutions that respect the values mentioned above?

A second major conclusion was that a refocusing of all Civil-Military Operations (CA, CIMIC, LMT and PsyOps) efforts was needed. By emphasizing peacebuilding concepts, KFOR can make more significant contributions to its own force-protection, force-reduction and stability goals while transferring responsibility to local structures and civilian organizations. Recommendations address issues of dependency on confidence, capacity-building for military actors and barriers to communication in civil-military cooperation.

¹ “Sources of Violence” describe attitudes, feelings and beliefs. Examples include hatred, fear, mistrust, intolerance, racism and sexism.

² “Structural Violence” is a term used to describe pain that is “felt” by a party with regards to a specific context, system, or structure. In Kosovo, examples may include pain felt from real or perceived discrimination, segregation, denial of equal rights or treatment, disproportionate employment, or injustices ignored by the “others” in positions of authority.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

Contents

Executive Summary	i
Contents.....	ii
Acronyms	iv
The Post Cold War Context.....	1
The Evolution of Peacekeeping.....	3
Kosovo Force (KFOR)	5
KFOR Activities in Selected Municipalities.....	8
KFOR in Obiliq/Obilić: From Peacekeeping to Developmental Issues and Risks of a new Dependency ..	9
Municipality Description	9
Security and Stability	9
Displacement and Returns	10
Activities.....	11
Impact	11
KFOR in Rahovec/Orahovac: Supporting Municipal Structures and Risks with Untrained Mediators...	12
Municipality Description	12
Security and Stability	13
Displacement and Returns	13
Activities.....	13
Impact	14
KFOR in Ferizaj/Uroševac: Advocacy for all Communities and the Danger of Being Perceived as a Service Provider.....	15
Municipality Description	15
Security and Stability	16
Displacement and Returns	16
Activities.....	17
Impact	18
KFOR in Gjilan/Gnjilane: Encouraging Communities to Interact and KFOR's Lack of Responding to Incidents.....	19
Municipality Description	19
Security and Stability	20
Displacement and Returns	20
Activities.....	21
Impact	21



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

KFOR in Štrpce/Shtërpçë: Dealing with Future Conflicts before They Escalate	22
Municipality Description	22
Security and Stability	22
Displacement and Returns	23
Activities.....	23
Impact	24
Conclusion and Recommendations.....	25
Dependency Issues	25
Military Actors Engaging in Conflict Resolution Activities.....	26
The Dangers of Military Actors Providing Direct Aid.....	26
Barriers to Communication.....	27
Adapting PsyOps Campaigns.....	27
Taking a Proactive and Offensive Peacebuilding Stance	28
Integrative Mediation.....	29



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

Acronyms

AOR	Area of Responsibility
ARC	American Refugee Committee
BiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
CA	Civil Affairs
CIMIC	Civil-Military Cooperation
CMO	Civil Military Operation
COA	Course of Action
CSAT	Community Safety Action Team
DDR	Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration
DE	Desired Effects
DP	Decisive Points
ECLO	European Commission Liaison Office
ECMI	European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo
EU	European Union
EULEX	European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo
F/U	Ferizaj/Uroševac
FRY	Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
G/G	Gjilan/Gnjilane
GFAP	General Framework Agreement for Peace
ICITAP	International Criminal Investigations Training and Assistance Program (US State Dept.)
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDP	Internally Displaced Person(s)
IFOR	NATO Implementation Force
IO	International Organization(s)
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JCC	Joint Civil Commissions
JEC	Joint Effects Command
KFOR HQ	Kosovo Force Headquarters
KFOR	Kosovo Force
KLA	Kosovo Liberation Army – <i>Albanian Language: Ushtria Çlirimtare e Kosovës (UÇK)</i>
KP	Kosovo Police
KSF	Kosovo Security Force - formerly known as the Kosovo Protection Force (KPF)
LMO	Liaison Monitoring Officers
LMT	Liaison Monitoring Team(s)
LOE	Lines of Effort
LO	Liaison Officer(s)
LOO	Lines of Operation
LOT	Liaison Observation Team(s)
LSC	Local Safety Council(s)
MIA	Minister/Ministry of Internal Affairs
MCO	Municipal Communities' Office
MSC	Municipal Community Safety Council(s)
MP	Military Police
MNB	Multi-National Brigades
MNBG-N	Multi-National Battle Group (North)
MNBG-C	Multi-National Battle Group (Central)
MNBG-E	Multi-National Battle Group (East)
MNBG-S	Multi-National Battle Group (South)
MNBG-S	Multi-National Battle Group (West)
MNTF	Multi-National Task Force



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

MSC	Municipal Safety Council(s)
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
O/O	Obiliq/Obilić
OHR	Office of the High Representative
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PAO	Public Affairs Office
PSO	Peace Support Operations
PsyOps	Psychological Operations
RAE	Roma, Ashkali, Egyptian (Community/People)
R/O	Rahovec/Orahovac
RIF	Reduction in Forces
S/S	Štrpce/Shtërpçë
SFOR	NATO Stabilization Force
SOC	Serbian Orthodox Church
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

The Post Cold War Context

Over the last twenty-one years the end of Cold War bipolarity and international fears of global nuclear warfare have receded. During this time, the world has witnessed waves of democratization, increasing globalization of information and economic power, and frequent efforts at establishing internationally recognized standards for security, justice, human rights and gender equality. Individual nations and international alliances have made declarations, brokered and signed peace treaties, and taken action with the broad goal of establishing “peace.” Actions taken by nations have included attempts to prevent and intervene in conflicts through the use of diplomacy; mediation and negotiation; condemnations and coercion; diplomatic, economic, and military sanctions; and the use of military force.

The post-Cold War era however has also witnessed an apparent shift from inter-state conflicts to intra-state conflicts.³ The nature of intra-state conflicts present new challenges as, unlike in inter-state conflicts, seemingly intractable problems related to sub-national community, religious, and cultural identity cannot be resolved through conquest, defeat, or surrender. The last two decades have demonstrated that intra-state conflicts, when divided along community lines, have the potential to result in increasingly intense violence and often result in war crimes and genocide. Furthermore, the deeply-rooted identities involved are reinforced and passed down through generations through a combination of individual experiences and descriptions of historical injustices and triumphs by family-members and charismatic leaders.⁴ When combined with issues including the lack of democratic governance, oppression, legacies of unresolved conflicts, disputed borders, underdevelopment, poor education and restricted access to resources – outside nation goals of establishing and maintaining peace become considerably more challenging.

Adaptation to the conflicts of the last two decades has been characterized by changes in conflict analysis, approaches and reactions to contemporary conflicts and policy has been continually redefined. Academic concepts and terminology most often credited to the fields of peacebuilding, conflict resolution, and conflict transformation have been adopted by governments and governmental organizations around the world and are now being applied to policy, diplomacy, and in the application of military intervention. In this regard, the formal recognition of preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding in United Nations (UN) Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali’s “An Agenda for Peace” (1992) and its subsequent “Supplement to An Agenda for Peace” (1995) are instrumental.⁵

Though Secretary General Boutros-Ghali claimed in “An Agenda for Peace” that “the concept of peace is easy to grasp...,” it may be argued that there is significant oversimplification of the term “peace” as it is often used to describe only the absence of violence and/or hostility. A more comprehensive explanation, which is central to describing the evolution of the use and methods employed by the military in this paper, is posed by Johan Galtung. He extends the concept by describing the mere absence of violent conflict as “negative peace” whereas “positive peace” represents a range of collaborative and supportive relationships which ensures sustainability through the creation of a culture of nonviolence.⁶ This expansion lends itself well to Boutros-Ghali’s 1992 contribution to the UN Security Council, the concept of post-conflict “peacebuilding.”

Peacebuilding is an overarching concept that includes conflict transformation, reconciliation, development, and leadership and describes the processes involved in resolving violent conflict and

³ The “apparent” shift to intra-state conflict since the end of the Cold War is heavily debated as many academics believe that the instances of community conflict may not have actually increased – as they were formerly masked by proxy wars fought during the Cold War.

⁴ Dr. Vamik D. Volkan is a widely respected psychologist who used the terms “chosen traumas” and “chosen glories” to describe the transgenerational transmission of historical references to defeats and successes against an enemy which serve to reinforce a group’s threatened group or community identity. Activation often causes dramatic and destructive consequences.

⁵ “An Agenda for Peace” may be viewed at: <http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agpeace.html>; “The Supplement to An Agenda for Peace” at: www.un.org/Docs/SG/agsupp.html.

⁶ Johan Galtung, “Peace by peaceful means: peace and conflict, development and civilization”, page 32. Sage Publications, 1996.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

establishing positive, sustainable peace. Core concepts of peacebuilding theory include the re-integration of former combatants, security sector reform, strengthening rule of law, improving respect for human rights, providing technical assistance for democratic development, and the formalization of conflict resolution and reconciliation techniques. In his explanation of peacebuilding, Boutros-Ghali underscores the importance of efforts which contribute to economic and social development and enhance confidence. He went on to describe ideas of joint initiatives which supported the construction of a new environment with access to unrestricted movement, cultural exchange, joint youth and educational projects, reducing hostile perceptions through educational exchange and curriculum reform – “all essential to forestall a re-emergence of cultural and national tensions to prevent recurrences of violence”.⁷

This new vision for peacekeeping operations, and the redefined roles that a military force could play, were not easy to implement. The paradigm shift presented commanders and politicians with a variety of problems which included changing military culture and tactics while protecting soldiers from harm as they performed their duties. The very basis of traditional military strategy and training had to be adapted from the use of force and coercion to achieve political, strategic and/or defensive goals.⁸ Early missions exemplified the difficulties of this transition and level of political fallout that could occur with each military and civilian casualty. Partly due to political indecisiveness and restrictions in the authorization to use force to intervene, the newly redefined “wider” and “multi-dimensional” strategies of the 1990s resulted in major challenges for the UN in Somalia, Rwanda and Bosnia, often with negative consequences.⁹

One positive outcome was however the increasing levels of cooperation and understanding between military and humanitarian actors in post-conflict peacebuilding efforts. While Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) was not a new concept, the lessons learned from the UN and NATO mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) between 1992 and 1995 emphasized the need for greater commitment to CIMIC activities during peacekeeping deployments. Beyond rhetoric, CIMIC activities in BiH proved that providing support for humanitarian activities ensured that forces could be withdrawn more rapidly, and furthered the understanding that the link between development, justice, and security was critical to achieving military objectives and force protection.¹⁰ While political stability and sustainable peace in BiH remains elusive, the NATO mission to BiH may be considered successful in that it established the conditions necessary for humanitarian and military actors.

More so than in BiH, the NATO-led international force, Kosovo Force (KFOR), has relied on this model. In Kosovo, KFOR has demonstrated a commitment to increasing levels of cooperation among military and humanitarian actors, as-well-as to building sustainable peace through support and cooperation with local communities, their political and religious leadership, and local structures.¹¹ Building on the “hearts and minds” campaigns of the 1970s and 1980s, and the “force protection” strategies of the 1990s, KFOR initiatives have demonstrated the potential role that military actors can play in building sustainable peace.¹²

Additionally, the current reduction in forces (RIF) in Kosovo and newly announced “Deterrent Presence Plan,” offers a unique opportunity to critically examine what has been done as the force realizes the full

⁷ Boutros Boutros-Ghali, N General, “An Agenda for Peace”, retrieved February 2010, cited previously.

⁸ Deployments after 1998 were redefined under new forms of military doctrine that were commonly labeled ‘multidimensional strategies,’ ‘second-generation peacekeeping operations,’ ‘wider peacekeeping’ or ‘second-generation multinational forces.’ Use of these terms are most recognizable in the evolution of military strategies, operations and tactics that fall under the rubric of “Peace Support Operations” (PSO).

⁹ The Rwandan genocide in July of 1994 left 800,000 dead in while the UN Peacekeeping force was ordered not to intervene. A year later, the Bosnian Muslim town of Srebrenica, designated as the first ever civilian safe area under UN Security Council Resolution 819, was attacked by Serbian forces, despite the UN Peacekeeping deployment there, leaving 8,000 dead.

¹⁰ The term “Force Protection” is used to describe preventive measures taken to mitigate hostile actions against military personnel, resources, facilities, and information.

¹¹ Interview with Major Josef Liebming, Austrian Army, HQ KFOR, Joint Effects Coordination (JEC) cell, 12 March 2010.

¹² “Hearts and Minds” campaigns refer to methods to win the support of a population. Tactics employed include, but are not limited to, building trust through the provision of medical and food aid, community assistance and development programs, and military security and support to economic and political reform programs.



CSSProject for

Integrative Mediation

transfer of its responsibility to local and international civilian structures.¹³ The insight provided by the following research offers an outsider perspective of the actions and effects that military stability operations have in the region and helps to inform future initiatives, research and/or civil-military collaboration. This research is also relevant to understanding how even broader and more creative strategies can positively impact future NATO, and NATO contributing country, responses in other complex humanitarian crises.

The Evolution of Peacekeeping

As bipolar geopolitical tensions between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and the United States (US) and its allies diminished at the end of the Cold War, the political and strategic motivations for supporting proxy wars, destabilizing regions, and establishing global alliances lessened.¹⁴ The international community refocused on intervening in intra-state conflicts with the goal of averting humanitarian crisis and/or helping to resolve seemingly intractable wars across the globe.¹⁵ Though this shift, especially among the UN and NATO countries, marked a period of increased dedication to international humanitarianism, the transition proved challenging. Political rivalries frequently paralyzed the UN Security Council and UN peacekeeping goals were limited to attempts to maintain ceasefires and stabilize situations on the ground so that efforts could be made at the political level to resolve the conflict by peaceful means. In the early 1990s it became apparent that “traditional” UN peacekeeping missions consisting of lightly armed troops tasked with supporting of ceasefires and limited peace agreements through monitoring, reporting and building confidence were not making significant progress towards creating the conditions for the type of lasting peace called for by the Charter of the UN.

In mid-1992, the realization that UN peacekeeping missions were unable to fulfill their ongoing peacekeeping objectives led to UN Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali's "An Agenda for Peace" which provided recommendations for improving preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding. The document “represented an unprecedented recommitment, at the highest political level, to the Purposes and Principles of the Charter” and stated that peacekeeping was more complex than previously thought.¹⁶ It also stated that the “deepest” causes of conflict were economic despair, social injustice and political oppression and requested that preventive deployments be authorized to respond to inter-state disputes and conflicts.

As a result, the strategies employed by UN peacekeeping forces changed dramatically and field operations evolved at the conceptual and operational level to form complex “multi-dimensional” strategies that began to consider the roots and drivers of conflict. This breakthrough translated to the UN peacekeeping missions underway as they refocused priorities by connecting humanitarian issues to problems of peace and security. The use of “wider” peacekeeping measures expanded the work of the

¹³ According to the JEC, the new “Deterrent Presence” marks one step in the reduction in forces (RIF) that will be followed in the future with a “Minimal presence”. Interview with Colonel Josef Liebminger, Austrian Army, HQ KFOR, Joint Effects Coordination (JEC), 12 March, 2010.

¹⁴ “During the cold war, the use of force by the major powers was tied clearly to their political and ideological competition; deterrence of major conflicts between them served the most fundamental national interest, survival. Vital interests revolved around preventing the other side from gaining undue influences in important places such as the Persian Gulf”. Snow, Dr. Donald M. (1993) “Peacekeeping, Peacemaking and Peace-Enforcement: The U.S. Role in the New International Order”, This paper was originally presented at the U.S. Army War College Fourth Annual Strategy Conference held February 24-25, 1993, retrieved February 2010, obtained from www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=348. The 1947 Truman Doctrine served as a foundation for much of the actions during the Cold War, it “asserted that the USA was to support foreign nations who desired to acquire or maintain political freedom as defined by the USA. The doctrine’s accompanying strategy was containment and postulated that to contain the USSR, the USA needed to apply ‘counter pressure’ wherever in the world the USSR applied pressure. Nonetheless, as was characteristic for the Cold War Era, the USA was primarily engaged by providing secondary warring support to governments or rebel movements that rejected communism”. Uppsala Conflict Data Program Retrieved February 2010, UCDP Database: www.ucdp.uu.se/database, Uppsala University ©2008, Department of Peace and Conflict Research.

¹⁵ From the close of the Cold War in May 1988 to the present day, there have been forty-nine conflicts and crisis where the United Nations (UN) has intervened with some level of peacekeeping operation. Of these interventions, the vast majority have been in response to internal, community conflicts. Additionally, there are three ongoing peacekeeping missions which were deployed prior to the end of the Cold War. United Nations Peacekeeping, retrieved February 2010, obtained from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/list.shtml>.

¹⁶ Boutros Boutros-Ghali, UN Secretary General, “An Agenda for Peace”, retrieved February 2010, cited previously.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

UN troops to include disarmament and demobilizing troops and civilians, stationing of reactionary troops as deterrents, training military and police forces, providing humanitarian relief, monitoring human rights, creating “safe zones” for non-combatants, coordinating with civilian humanitarian organizations and overseeing elections.

The evolution of UN peacekeeping was not limited to the UN however and a July 1990 meeting of the North Atlantic Council resulted in the "Alliance's New Strategic Concept" which emphasized a “shift” from monitoring to more active engagement in supporting complex peace operations.¹⁷ Conflicts in the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) highlighted the evolving use and practices of both the UN and NATO in Peace Support Operations (PSO) and witnessed troops deployed in broader, multi-dimensional peacekeeping, peace enforcement, conflict prevention, peacebuilding, humanitarian and crisis response roles in BiH (1993/1995), Kosovo (1999), and Macedonia (2001).¹⁸

NATO's first non-traditional peacekeeping role developed from supporting the UN embargo in 1992 to relieving the UN peacekeeping force in BiH in 1995. The NATO Implementation Force (IFOR) and its successor, the NATO Stabilization Force (SFOR), were tasked with supporting the Dayton Accords and to implement the General Framework Agreement for Peace (GFAP). The NATO deployments were significant for a number of reasons, which included being the first NATO peacekeeping operation, first military action, and the first “out-of-area” deployment. It was also the first time that NATO had conducted a joint operation with non-NATO countries, including Russia.¹⁹ Another first was that the peacekeeping mission was expanded to promote “a climate in which the peace process could continue to move forward; and, to provide selective support within its means and capabilities to civilian organizations involved in this process.”²⁰

This support came in various forms. At the highest levels, and to facilitate cooperation with civilian efforts, CIMIC officers were stationed as “liaisons” in large International Organizations (IO). Liaison tasks included coordinating military strategy, actions, and resources with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), Office of the High Representative (OHR), Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), World Bank, European Union (EU), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and others who were responsible for implementing the majority of civil actions outlined in the GFAP.²¹ At the local level, CIMIC Centers were set-up to implement civil reconstruction and improvement plans, and Liaison Observation Teams (LOTs) were deployed in the field to monitor local developments.²² SFOR also showed their support for the new systems by participating in the OHR's Joint Civil Commissions (JCCs) which facilitated civil actions throughout BiH.

The relationships forged with non-governmental and international organizations and the adjustments that were made to accommodate the humanitarian, economic, and civil reconstruction support duties in BiH were new for NATO and many of its coalition partners. The unprecedented role in achieving the objectives of the GFAP has been largely credited to the coalition's Civil Affairs (CA), CIMIC, and other

¹⁷ The New Strategic Concept documented organizational changes “from one of neutral observer of immediate post-conflict scenarios to one of involvement in conflicts that have not yet run their course. The report also notes that the United Nations has not altered its corporate culture or its ability to address new challenges. It calls for changes, including realistic and clear peacekeeping mandates, robust rules of engagement for military forces, unity of effort, a clear and unified chain of command, and a shift in policy from monitoring to more active engagement in restructuring the complete public security system. It also contains numerous recommendations concerning the United Nations' ability to conceive, plan, mount and logistically support complex peace operations”. “The Alliance's New Strategic Concept”, retrieved February 2010, cited previously.

¹⁸ “Crisis Management”, retrieved February 2010, obtained from www.nato.int/issues/crisis_management/index.html.

¹⁹ These missions marked a change in NATO's past deployments as they were the first assignments outside of NATO's “defensive” mandate of responding to conflicts within its member states. “NATO Review: Lessons Learned”, Vol. 49 - No. 2 Summer 2001 p. 12-15, retrieved February 2010, obtained from www.nato.int/docu/review/2001/0102-03.htm.

²⁰ “Peace support operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, retrieved February 2010 from, www.nato.int/issues/sfor/index.html#aim

²¹ Ibid.

²² SFOR Fact Sheet, “Liaison and Observation Teams of SFOR”, published September 2004, retrieved February 2010, obtained from <http://www.nato.int/sfor/factsheet/lot/t040909a.htm>.



CSSProject for

Integrative Mediation

Civil-Military Operations (CMO).²³ In particular, CIMIC operations in BiH demonstrated that the alliance could adapt from a post-Cold War “go-to-war” military into one which could support the needs of complex peace operations. In 1999, the UN and NATO peacekeeping missions in BiH were utilized as models for the mission in Kosovo.

Kosovo Force (KFOR)

The NATO intervention into the former autonomous province of Kosovo in the FRY followed on the heels of a promising but failed peace agreement drafted by NATO.²⁴ The result was the March 1999 NATO bombing campaign in the FRY which lasted three months with the goal of “Serbs out, peacekeepers in, refugees back”.²⁵ On the ground, the NATO bombing intensified and the crisis with Serbia resulted in massive displacement of civilians, destruction of infrastructure in both Kosovo and Serbia, and produced a significant number of civilian casualties.²⁶ These factors, combined with arguments over the legality of the intervention, politicized the action and polarized the international community.²⁷

On 9 June 1999, the Governments of the FRY and the Republic of Serbia signed the Military Technical Agreement (MTA) with KFOR and officially ended the Kosovo War.²⁸ In addition to declaring an 11 day withdrawal of FRY forces, the agreement also authorized the deployment of international civil and security forces.²⁹ The following day, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1244 and officially placed Kosovo under interim UN administration, authorized KFOR, and outlined commitments to establishing provisional institutions of local self-government, return of all refugees and displaced persons, and the demilitarization of the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA).³⁰ On 12 June 1999 the NATO KFOR entered Kosovo with no resistance as a PSO with the mandate of deterring renewed hostility and threats against Kosovo, establishing and ensuring a secure environment, public safety and order, demilitarizing the KLA, supporting the international humanitarian effort, and coordinating with the international civil presence.³¹

Building on the SFOR model, initial KFOR activities were significantly humanitarian in nature and the force recognized the value of utilizing wider peacekeeping strategies to achieve the mission. KFOR started by employing a decentralized command structure capable of responding to local and municipal

²³ “Civil-Military Cooperation: Vital to peace implementation in Bosnia”, Colonel William R. Phillips, WEBEDITION, Vol. 46 - No. 1, Spring 1998, pp. 22-25, retrieved March 2010, obtained from the official NATO web site, <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1998/9801-07.htm>.

²⁴ The first phase of negotiations during the Rambouillet talks in February 1999 led to agreements of substantial autonomy for Kosovo, mechanisms for free and fair elections to democratic institutions, for the governance of Kosovo, for the protection of human rights and the rights of members of national communities, and for the establishment of an unbiased judicial system. Agreements were also made regarding an international civilian and military presence in Kosovo. Despite this, former FRY demands for a UN presence, rather than NATO presence, were met with pressure from US diplomats and resulted in the former FRY refusing to sign. In turn, the failure to reach agreement led to justification for the NATO bombing. Various sources. See: “Rambouillet talks ‘designed to fail,’” Barnaby Mason, BBC News Online: World: Europe, 19 March, 2000, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/low/europe/682877.stm> Also see: Rambouillet Agreement, Interim Agreement for Peace and Self-Government in Kosovo, retrieved February 2010 from www.state.gov/www/regions/eur/ksvo_rambouillet_text.html.

²⁵ Quote attributed to official NATO spokesperson in 1999. Various sources. No name attributed.

²⁶ The UN reported that 850,000 People (primarily K-Albanians) had been displaced by April 1999. Estimates of civilian casualties from the bombings vary. Serbia claimed that the attacks produced between 1,200 and 5,700 casualties while NATO acknowledged a maximum of 1,500. Human Rights Watch estimates the number close to 500.

²⁷ The NATO bombing campaign in Kosovo took place without the backing of the United Nations Security Council and represented a direct violation of Articles 2 (4), 24 and 53 of the United Nations Charter. NATO’s position was that the action was justified because Kosovo represented an “international humanitarian emergency”. Other criticism of the bombing campaign includes the charge that the bombing was an attack on non-NATO country which was not directly threatening any NATO member – a further violation of the “Atlantic Charter”. www.un.org/News/Press/docs/1999/19990326.sc6659.html.

²⁸ The MTA is also referred to as the Kumanovo Treaty.

²⁹ Military Technical Agreement, published 9 June 1999, Updated: 2 August 1999, retrieved March 2010 from www.nato.int/kosovo/docu/a990609a.htm.

³⁰ See: UN Security Council Resolution 1244, S/RES/1244 (1999), 10 June 1999, retrieved February 2010 from <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/172/89/PDF/N9917289.pdf?OpenElement>.

³¹ “NATO’s role in Kosovo”, retrieved February 2010 from www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_48818.htm#objectives.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

problems efficiently.³² The five separate multinational brigades (MNB) each falling under the direct command of a lead country divided the country and the MNBs were given the latitude to respond creatively to the unique problems in their areas of responsibility (AORs).³³ The MNBs were not completely independent however and overall brigade-level coordination of the force was delegated to the KFOR Headquarters (KFOR HQ).³⁴

Early KFOR tasks included assisting with the return and relocation of displaced persons and refugees, infrastructure reconstruction and demining, providing medical assistance, security, policing and border control, protecting historical and cultural sites, and Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR). Over a decade later, responsibility for most of these programs is being transferred to local institutions. Additionally, KFOR continues to take direct action to support the civilian institutions focused on law and order, municipal services, the judicial and penal system, and to a limited extent, the electoral process.³⁵ As in BiH, KFOR has attempted to coordinate the majority of these tasks with IOs, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and local authorities and structures using CIMIC tools such as Liaison Monitoring Officers (LMOs) assigned to specific posts in organizations and Liaison Monitoring Teams (LMTs) to “feel the pulse” in the field. KFOR also utilizes Psychological Operations (PsyOps) campaigns with the aim of influencing “attitudes and behavior in order to break the spiral of violence and promote tolerance between the different community groups,” and contribute to force protection.^{36,37} CIMIC and CA personnel are commanded by the battalion G9 officers located in each individual MNBG, while LOs and LMTs fall under and the direct command of KFOR HQ.³⁸ Overall coordination, command, and strategy for these functions, and those of KFOR PsyOps campaigns is handled by the JEC/J9 located at KFOR HQ in MNBG-C, Pristina.³⁹

While the decentralized command structure and use of liaisons has clear benefits with regards to being able to respond quickly, the cohesiveness and consistency of KFOR in non-traditional roles has been questioned by civilian and military actors.⁴⁰ Recent evidence of this dysfunction was highlighted in a “KFOR CIMIC White Paper” issued by the JEC in October 2009.⁴¹ The paper revises CIMIC Standard

³² For up-to-date AORs, contributing forces, and troop strength see: Appendix A, “Troop Placemap” for current map depicting contributing countries, troop strength, AORs, and location of five municipalities researched for this report.

³³ KFOR contingents were originally grouped into four regionally-based multinational brigades. In 2005 NATO restructured KFOR by replacing the existing multinational brigades with five task forces. The changes allowed for greater flexibility and removed restrictions on the cross-boundary movement of units based in different sectors of Kosovo. The move to “task force” also placed more emphasis on intelligence-led operations and involved working closely with the local police and population to gather information. Recent restructuring under the “Deterrent Presence” plan, announced by the COMKFOR on 5 February 2010, renamed the “task forces” to “mission-tailored” Multinational Battle Group (MNBG) structures which transitions the forces to a “Deterrent Presence Force”. Sources: “KFOR Restructuring”, and “KFOR Troops (Placemat)”, “How did it evolve?”. Retrieved February 2010 from www.nato.int/issues/kfor/evolution.html.

³⁴ Of note is that the decision to coordinate all KFOR AORs at the KOR HQ, under NATO command, came as a surprise to the Russian contingent who reacted by seizing the Pristina airport. The controversy heightened tensions between the multinational forces and though a deal was struck which allowed Russian forces to operate as a unit of KFOR but not under the NATO command structure, the highly publicized issues served as a major disruption at a critical period in the initial operations. For more, see: “Confrontation over Pristina airport”, BBC News, 9 March 2000, BBC News Online: World: Europe, 19 March, 2000, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/671495.stm>.

³⁵ “NATO’s role in Kosovo”, retrieved February 2010 from www.nato.int/issues/kfor/evolution.html.

³⁶ “KFOR 1998 - The beginnings of a humanitarian catastrophe”, “PSYOPS forces support”, retrieved February 2010, Available at the official German Army Website, KFOR, Mission, Psychological Operations, www.opinfo.bundeswehr.de/.

³⁷ Using billboard signs, television commercials, bus advertisements, and high profile KFOR public engagements, KFOR PsyOps campaigns appear to primarily focus on goals of contributing to force protection and promoting a positive public image of KFOR. Themes of “peace and tolerance” have also been utilized to a lesser extent.

³⁸ Interview with Major Josef Liebming, Austrian Army, HQ KFOR, Joint Effects Coordination (JEC) cell, 12 March 2010.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ Questions of cohesiveness and consistency are in large part attributed to differences in military priorities, interpretation of roles, command structures, training, language and cultures of each of the contributing country to the peacekeeping force. Political views also play a significant role in interactions between forces and civilians in Kosovo. Various references can be found which detail this criticism. Also see: “Civil-Military Cooperation in Peace Operations: The Case of Kosovo”, Thomas R. Mockaitis, published October 2004, retrieved February 2010, from www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB583.pdf.

⁴¹ INS 1-2009: KFOR CIMIC White Paper, issued by JEC/J9, last updated: 23 10 200, NATO/KFOR UNCLASSIFIED, HQ KFOR: Internal Instructions. Received electronically by request, Feb 2010, from the JEC at HQ KFOR.



CSSProject for

Integrative Mediation

Operating Procedures (SOP) and CIMIC Course of Action (COA) based on the new *Deterrence and Minimum Presence* strategies. The document highlights the need for more comprehensive planning of projects and states that CIMIC in Kosovo has been widely recognized as “nothing [else] but projects” with no connection to KFOR tasks, operational planning, Lines of Operation (LOO), Decisive Points (DP) and Desired Effects (DE).⁴² It also acknowledges that the “roles, mandates, tasks and responsibilities of KFOR and civilian actors in Kosovo might have been blurred.”⁴³ Further concerns raised by the directive identify the need to reduce local dependency on KFOR, to cease tasks which expand KFOR’s mission, and to respect the competencies and advantages of civil agencies doing humanitarian work. The paper also emphasizes that “civilian actors are responsible for the development work, humanitarian projects and humanitarian assistance” and “all possible KFOR actions must complement, not overlap or duplicate the roles of civilian agencies.”⁴⁴

The complexity and challenges that military actors face when engaging in non-traditional military roles lie as much in coordination, planning and action as they do in understanding and addressing the structural and organizational-cultural differences between military and humanitarian actors. The criticisms detailed in the 2009 KFOR CIMIC White Paper fail to note that the “blurring” of “roles, mandates, tasks and responsibilities” are likely a symptom of the inherent tensions in the relationship between military and humanitarian actors which have resulted in commanders simply choosing to “do the job themselves.” CIMIC officers, LMTs, and Liaison Officers (LOs) often do not have the authority to share information as they are bound by a strict set of “traditional” military guidelines which view information as a weapon which must be safeguarded. When information regarding community conflicts or areas of concern is passed on to humanitarian actors, the information must go through the decentralized multi-national chain of command, which subjects it to various adaptations and translations, before it is shared with large IOs at the highest levels and must be passed down again before reaching the affected communities.

Despite these criticisms, the overall KFOR mission can be viewed as a relative success.⁴⁵ In terms of determining the role of KFOR in peacebuilding, and measuring the impact that it has had on the greater peacebuilding community, its most important contribution has been in effectively establishing a safe and secure environment for humanitarian actors. IOs and NGOs currently have the ability to travel and implement projects, even in the most divided communities in the north of Kosovo.⁴⁶ In addition to this traditional role, since 1999 all 36 contributing nations of KFOR have conducted projects and contributed resources to thousands of projects in the field of humanitarian aid, society development and construction/reconstruction aimed at improving the “social life” for all communities Kosovo-wide.⁴⁷ The general respect among all community communities for KFOR is evidence that while the projects undertaken may be criticized, KFOR has been relatively successful in achieving goals through the application of non-traditional military tactics and made a significant contribution to building sustainable peace in the region.

⁴² Lines of Operation (LOO), Decisive Points (DP) and desired Effects are used guide the multinational force in Kosovo and set the parameters of KFOR operations.

⁴³ INS 1-2009: KFOR CIMIC White Paper, issued by JEC/J9, last updated: 23 10 200, NATO/KFOR UNCLASSIFIED, HQ KFOR: Internal Instructions. Received electronically by request, Feb 2010, from the JEC at HQ KFOR.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ Kosovo has witnessed significant improvements in security, stability and inter-community relations. One significant incident occurred however in March 2004 when violence between K-Albanians and K-Serbs resulted in KFOR troops being attacked and their response being heavily criticized. The community violence claimed 28 lives and left 600 injured -including 61 peacekeepers and 55 police officers. 110 houses and 16 churches were destroyed, 3,600 people were made homeless, and the displacement of 150,000–250,000 K-Serbs and K-Roma were reported. Tensions throughout Kosovo and Serbia rose significantly as Serbian media reports of genocide, persistent discrimination, intimidation and harassment led to comparisons of Serb communities in Kosovo to WWII concentration camps resulted in large-scale angry protests in Belgrade. Among the K-Albanian community rumors of Belgrade’s orchestration of the riots persist. Various sources.

⁴⁶ The northern region of Kosovo has been central to the conflict in Kosovo for geographic, community, and political reasons. The municipality of Mitrovica borders Serbia, has the largest population of Serbians in Kosovo, and has maintained direct ties to Serbia until today. Most Serbians living in the municipality were not displaced and Serbian authority, extended from Belgrade, continues to govern the majority of the region.

⁴⁷ “CIMIC Organisation in KFOR”, retrieved February 2010 from www.nato.int/kfor/cimic/cimic_org/index.html.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

KFOR Activities in Selected Municipalities

The following sections describe KFOR's role and peacebuilding contributions in the municipalities of Obiliq/Obilić, Rahovec/Orahovac, Ferizaj/Uroševac, Gjilan/Gnjilane, and Štrpce/ Shtërpçë. Research was conducted using publicly accessible information about KFOR, interviews with local municipal leaders, residents of different community communities, and interviews/correspondence with KFOR officers.⁴⁸ In an effort to fully describe KFOR's role, each municipality researched was broken into five sections. Content descriptions of these sections are provided below:

Section one: Municipality Description

This section provides a brief description of the municipality including brief information about population, communities, major developmental issues, and the physical KFOR presence.

Section two: Security and Stability

A brief description of the general security and stability context in each municipality and KFOR's current contribution is given. Since 1999, KFOR's role in security and stability has gradually transitioned to "third responder" behind the Kosovo Police (KP) and the European Union Rule of Law Mission (EULEX) in Kosovo. Despite this transfer of authority, the continued KFOR presence at the municipal level provides significant support to the local population and remains a core task of KFOR.

In an effort to determine the continuing KFOR contribution to security and stability concerns and its support of local structures with the potential to relieve inter-community spoilers, one community security meeting was chosen from the three which exist in Kosovo. The mid-level Community Safety Action Team (CSAT) was selected as it focuses on bringing together well trained representatives from towns and villages in each municipality - unlike the higher level Municipal Safety Councils (MSCs) with two representatives from each municipality or Local Safety Councils (LSCs) which focus on village-level security issues.

Section three: Displacements and Returns

Describes the role of KFOR in the displacement and returns process of internally and externally displaced persons in the municipalities researched. This section includes KFOR's involvement in the planning, execution, level of civil-military cooperation, and monitoring of the process.

Section four: Activities

Covers specific peacebuilding and development activities that occur outside of more traditional peacekeeping roles. This section combines published KFOR CIMIC project information with information provided by representatives from KFOR and the perspectives, opinions, and observations of local community members from different minority groups within the municipalities researched.

Section five: Impact

This section contains additional information, gathered independently or from interviews, that does not fit neatly into other categories. Common themes for this section include information and perceptions of KFOR contributions to peacebuilding, specific concerns, and transfer of responsibility.

⁴⁸ Interviews were conducted between February and March of 2010. Local sources were told that their names would not be cited.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

KFOR in Obiliq/Obilić: From Peacekeeping to Developmental Issues and Risks of a new Dependency

Municipality Description

Obiliq/Obilić (O/O) is a municipality in central Kosovo that is home to 19 villages and has a total population of approximately 30,000 inhabitants. A recent OSCE municipal profile estimates that 83% of the population are K-Albanian, 11% K-Serbs, 2% K-Roma, 1% K-Ashkali, and <1% K-Bosniaks.⁴⁹ According to the municipal communities' office (MCO), unemployment is the biggest social problem in the municipality with rates exceeding 70% for K-Albanians and over 95% among the other communities. In addition, violent displacements of K-Serbs in 1999 and 2004 have significantly impacted the demographics and inter-community relations of the municipality.⁵⁰

O/O falls within the Multinational Battle Group Central (MNBG-C) AOR. MNBG-C is currently led by Finland and provides security support, CA, CIMIC, and LMT functions in the municipality. This multinational brigade currently consists of 1,169 troops from Finland, Czech Republic, Italy, Sweden, and Slovakia. The MNBG-C AOR also covers the municipalities of Pejë/Peć, Prishtinë/Priština, Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje, Glogoc/Glogovac, Lipjan/Lipljan, and Shtime/Štimlje.⁵¹ MNBG-C also patrols the north-eastern border with Serbia. In the municipality of O/O, Slovak and Finnish KFOR troops from MNBG-C have primary responsibility.⁵²

According to local sources, these troops are highly visible throughout the municipality and enjoy good relationships with all communities. Though KFOR's role in the municipality is primarily the provision of direct security through patrols and in support of local policing efforts, units were also reported to be active in non-traditional roles at the municipal level. LMTs often speak with village elders, local school children, and people on the street. In addition a CIMIC office has been opened to facilitate communication, and KFOR LMTs attend weekly municipal meetings on returns, security, and development in the municipal building. During these meetings KFOR representatives pass on local concerns and development issues to municipal leaders, IOs and NGOs.

Security and Stability

There have been no inter-community incidents in the municipality of O/O since 2004 and while issues of stability and security are serious concerns in the municipality, local structures are capable of fulfilling their roles without KFOR assistance.⁵³ Despite this, ECMI reports that displacements in 1999 and 2004 have divided communities along community lines, many displaced persons are unable to return due to their houses being occupied.⁵⁴ According to interviews conducted with different communities, despite a greatly

⁴⁹ OSCE Mission in Kosovo Municipal Profile for Obiliq/Obilić, published September 2009, retrieved: March 2010 from www.osce.org/documents/mik/2009/09/1195_en.pdf.

⁵⁰ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Obiliq/Obilić, published 2009, retrieved March 2010 from www.ecmi-map.com/map/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=54&Itemid=83.

⁵¹ "KFOR Troops (Placemat)" to view up-to-date MNB information and AORs. Last Updated: 26 Feb. 2010, retrieved February 2010 from www.nato.int/kfor/structur/nations/placemap/kfor_placemat.pdf. Also See [Appendix A](#), "Troop Placemap" for current map depicting contributing countries, troop strength, AORs, and location of five municipalities researched for this report.

⁵² Interviews conducted 3–26 March 2010 with four community leaders (K-Albanian, K-Ashkali, K-Serb, and K-Roma) in the municipality of Obiliq/Obilić. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁵³ Informal telephone interview conducted 26 March 2010 with an official of the Obiliq/Obilić CSAT program. Name withheld as interview was conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁵⁴ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo, Safety and Freedom of Movement in Obiliq/Obilić, published 2009, retrieved March 2010, cited previously.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

improved security situation and independently operating police department, confidence in the capabilities of the municipal police force is limited. One source specifically described KP as being “unreliable” and another as “unable to function without the support and supervision of KFOR.”

Local sources interviewed related the KFOR contribution to safety and security directly to the easy access to KFOR and the willingness of KFOR officials to listen to personal and community concerns. As in other municipal meetings, the majority of local sources described that KFOR frequently relayed their concerns to municipal officials in security meetings.⁵⁵ In O/O, the CSAT serves as the primary security forum and is mandated by an administrative instruction.⁵⁶ CSAT meets monthly to discuss and address a variety of community problems including inter-community relationships, issues of mutual importance, crime, violence in schools, and drug abuse in the municipality. The forum brings together municipal leaders, high-ranking police commanders and representatives from the OSCE, ICITAP, UNHCR, and civil society.⁵⁷ Participants are trained in community policing and partnerships, consensus-building, effective teamwork, resource identification and leverage, and problem analysis and problem-solving.⁵⁸ Though KFOR attends nearly all O/O CSAT meetings, they must make an official request to attend. An official source within the program reported that KFOR’s role was limited to monitoring the meetings and that they rarely made contributions to discussions.⁵⁹

Displacement and Returns

According to the UNHCR statistics provided by the European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI) in 2009, there are currently 8,615 displaced persons from the municipality of O/O.⁶⁰ The OSCE also reports that while some displaced persons began returning after 1999, the March 2004 riots may be credited with disrupting the returns process and increasing the total number of displaced people.⁶¹ The formerly multi-community town of O/O serves as an example of this division as the population today is almost completely K-Albanian. Additionally, property abandoned by those fleeing in 1999 and 2004 was often occupied or destroyed and remains a major barrier to reconciliation.⁶² The incidents of 2004 also intensified community division as inter-communal relations were severely damaged when K-Serbian, K-Roma, and K-Ashkali houses and a Serbian Orthodox church were burned.⁶³

UNHCR estimates of returns and relocations in the municipality since 1999 are over 1,300 returnees. Additionally upsetting the returns process is a poor municipal economy, high unemployment, and the

⁵⁵ Interviews conducted 3–26 March 2010 with four community leaders (K-Albanian, K-Ashkali, K-Serb, and K-Roma) in the municipality of Obiliq/Obilić. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁵⁶ Informal telephone interview conducted 26 March 2010 with an official of the Obiliq/Obilić CSAT program. Name withheld as interview was conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁵⁷ Community Safety Action Teams (CSATs) Brochure. “Making Communities Safer”. OSCE Mission in Kosovo’s Community Safety Development Section.

⁵⁸ All training is conducted at the Kosovo Centre for Public Safety Education and Development in Vushtrri/Vučitrn. Community Safety Action Teams (CSATs) Brochure. “Making Communities Safer”. OSCE Mission in Kosovo’s Community Safety Development Section.

⁵⁹ Informal telephone interview conducted 26 March 2010 with an official of the Obiliq/Obilić CSAT program. Name withheld as interview was conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁶⁰ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Obiliq/Obilić, published 2009, retrieved March 2010 from www.ecmi-map.com/map/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=54&Itemid=83.

⁶¹ OSCE Mission in Kosovo Municipal Profile for Obiliq/Obilić, published September 2009, retrieved: March 2010 from www.osce.org/documents/mik/2009/09/1195_en.pdf.

⁶² European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Obiliq/Obilić, published 2009, retrieved March 2010 from www.ecmi-map.com/map/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=54&Itemid=83.

⁶³ The St. Elias Orthodox church in the town of Vuçitrn/Vushtrri, just north of Obiliq/Obilić, was burned by a reported group of 200-300 K-Albanians on March 18, 2004. The crowd set fire to the church and the adjacent structures and knocked down tombstones in the graveyard located beside the church. The crowd then reportedly moved to a nearby K-Ashkali neighborhood and burned it. A Moroccan KFOR unit which had been positioned to protect the site failed to provide any protection and allegedly left. “ERRC: Ethnic Cleansing of “Gypsies” in Kosovo”, published March 31, 2004, retrieved March 2010, available at: www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=345.



CSSP Project for

Integrative Mediation

issue of occupied housing.⁶⁴ According to local sources, KFOR's role in the returns process has been limited to providing direct security, facilitating "look and see" visits for prospective returnees, "go and pray" visits, visiting with returnees to discuss security issues and concerns, and attending municipal meetings on the returns process.⁶⁵ Recent interviews with KFOR commanders have revealed that these roles have been performed only at the request of UNHCR and municipal bodies, and that the KP and EULEX have assumed the majority of these duties.⁶⁶

Activities

Though MNBG-C CIMIC and LMT officers were unable to comment on past operations, local sources interviewed reported that they were unaware of KFOR providing direct aid or being involved with independent or cooperative development work in recent years in O/O.⁶⁷ That being said, the K-Ashkali community of Plementina/Plementinë did receive two 500 liter water tanks from KFOR in 2008.⁶⁸ Additionally, two schools in the municipality, one K-Serb and one K-Ashkali, were reportedly provided with computers and printers. Another KFOR initiative described by all locals interviewed was the issuance of small business grants awarded by the CIMIC office.

Impact

KFOR efforts in the municipality of O/O demonstrate clear attempts to adapt traditional peacekeeping operations to address developmental issues. Most notably, MNBG-C attempts to strengthen the use and availability of municipal structures by minorities and their support for small businesses used to address greater economic issues demonstrate the flexibility of the force. As in other communities, the physical KFOR presence in local municipal structures and meetings, such as the CSAT, has produced an air of credibility and may be considered a progressive approach to building sustainable peace at the local level.

O/O interviewees from all communities' background expressed that KFOR's most significant contribution to building peace was their ability to move through each community sharing information and expressing interest and concern for local issues. While on the surface this perceived "service" provides minority communities with a voice and demonstrates a need to consider all communities, it may also reinforce a psychological dependency on KFOR. As communities rely on KFOR to "pass on their message" or ask "if all communities have been heard on an issue," there is the potential risk of generating mistrust with regards to the local structures being willing and able to effectively address minority concerns without KFOR's direct supervision.

Also of concern in the municipality was the perception of preferential treatment of one minority community group over another. One interviewee clearly felt frustration and anger when asked about his experiences with direct aid provided by KFOR to his community. He described that one computer and printer was donated to a school in his community while a computer lab with 16 computers was donated to another. He also described that his community had only been awarded one small business grant while others had received more. Though the sample size was limited to only one civil society or municipal "leader" from each community, this experience mirrors CSSP experiences over the years and highlight the challenges of assuming both development and security.

⁶⁴ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Obiliq/Obilić, published 2009, retrieved March 2010 from www.ecmi-map.com/map/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=54&Itemid=83.

⁶⁵ Interviews conducted 3–26 March 2010 with four community leaders (K-Albanian, K-Ashkali, K-Serb, and K-Roma) in the municipality of Obiliq/Obilić. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁶⁶ Interview with Major Josef Liebming, Austrian Army, HQ KFOR, Joint Effects Coordination (JEC) cell, 12 March 2010.

⁶⁷ Interviews conducted 3–26 March 2010 with four community leaders (K-Albanian, K-Ashkali, K-Serb, and K-Roma) in the municipality of Obiliq/Obilić. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁶⁸ "CIMIC Projects", last updated: 11 November 2008. Retrieved March 2010 from www.nato.int/KFOR/cimic/projects/index.htm.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

KFOR in Rahovec/Orahovac: Supporting Municipal Structures and Risks with Untrained Mediators

Municipality Description

Rahovec/Orahovac (R/O) is a municipality located in the south western part of Kosovo which is home to 35 villages and has a total population of approximately 73,700 inhabitants. A recent OSCE municipal profile estimates that 97% of the population are K-Albanian, <2% K-Serb, and <1% K-RAE and Bosniaks combined.⁶⁹ The municipalities have to small K-Serbian enclaves.⁷⁰ According to the MCO, major municipal issues include high unemployment rates, a poor economy and migration of residents from the area due to these issues. There is also a lack of freedom of movement reported among the K-Serbian community. There are however some signs of inter-community progress which include increasing levels of minority representation in municipal institutions.⁷¹

The municipality of R/O falls under the Multinational Battle Group South (MNBG-S) AOR. MNBG-S is a 2,680 troop contingent currently led by Germany and supported by Turkey, Austria, and Switzerland.⁷² The AOR also includes the municipalities of Malishevë/Mališevo, Suharekë/Suva Reka, Prizren, and Dragash/Dragaš. MNBG-S borders Albania to the south-west and Macedonia to the south-east. Austrian KFOR troops have primary responsibility for the municipality of R/O and complete six-month rotations.⁷³ They patrol the municipality by vehicle and foot, protect cultural and religious heritage sites, and support the police as the “third responder” behind KP and EULEX.⁷⁴ According to local sources, Austrian MNBG-S troops remain highly visible throughout the municipality and enjoy reasonably good relationships with all communities despite reducing the frequency of patrols.⁷⁵ The unit has increased its efforts of building relationships over the last five years. When asked, local interviewees provided examples of relationship-building as LMTs frequently visited villages and provided some direct aid supplies gathered by the Austrian Red Cross. They also mentioned that MNBG-S has been actively engaging in, and even facilitating, inter-community dialogue between members of the Zoqishtë/Zočište Monastery and the local community.⁷⁶ Dialogue will continue between the monks, the Serbian Orthodox Church (SOC), the KP and the surrounding communities.⁷⁷

⁶⁹ OSCE Mission in Kosovo: Municipal profile of Rahovec/Orahovac, published September 2009. Retrieved February 2010 from www.osce.org/documents/mik/2008/04/1196_en.pdf.

⁷⁰ Though there is some interaction between communities in the “economic sphere”, the K-Serb population in Velika Hoca are isolated and there was limited freedom of movement reported in 2009. European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Rahovec/Orahovac, published 2009, retrieved March 2010 from www.ecmi-map.com/map/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=56&Itemid=84&lang=en.

⁷¹ The OSCE reports that two K-Serb police officers were serving in the northern sections of the municipality and the one K-Serb per shift in the town of Rahovec/Orahovac. OSCE Mission in Kosovo: Municipal profile of Rahovec/Orahovac, published September 2009. Retrieved February 2010, cited previously.

⁷² “KFOR Troops (Placemat)”. Retrieved February 2010, cited previously. See [Appendix A](#).

⁷³ Interview with Major Josef Liebminger, Austrian Army, HQ KFOR, Joint Effects Coordination (JEC) cell, 12 March 2010.

⁷⁴ Interviews conducted 9–29 March 2010 with one community leader (K-Serb), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and two civil society workers (K-Albanian and K-Ashkali) in the municipality of Rahovec/Orahovac. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁷⁵ One interviewee was not supportive of MNBG-S presence and activities. Though the party refused to go into detail, the position seemed to center on KFOR assuming authority that should rest with the municipal authorities. The party repeatedly insisted that the K-Serb community did not need KFOR in this municipality—at this point in time. *Ibid*.

⁷⁶ The Zoqishtë/Zočište Monastery, located 5 kilometers south-east of Rahovec/Orahovac, was “looted and torched by members of the KLA in 1999”. K-Serb monks returned in 2004 and have been protected by Austrian KFOR. Recent developments surrounding the facility include KFOR intervening in a dispute when K-Albanian locals were offended by a Serbian flag over the church, disputes concerning the repair of the roof on the church, and a dispute over security for the facility which is being transferred from KFOR to the Kosovo Police (KP). Sources: Interview conducted 9 March 2010 with Rahovec/Orahovac native. Also see: “Kosovo Police Wants to Take over Security of Zociste Monastery”, *Balkan Travelers.com*, retrieved March 2010 from www.balkantravellers.com/en/read/article/1669.

⁷⁷ Interview with Major Josef Liebminger, Austrian Army, HQ KFOR, Joint Effects Coordination (JEC) cell, 12 March 2010.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

Security and Stability

The municipality of R/O is relatively stable and no inter-community incidents were reported over the last year.⁷⁸ According to K-Serbs, K-Albanian, and K-Gorani interviews, the situation has dramatically improved over the last few years.⁷⁹ Improving conditions have allowed KFOR to remove their observation post from Hoçë e Madhe/Velika Hoča, a K-Serbian enclave close to R/O town center in 2009.⁸⁰ KFOR has also scaled down foot and vehicle patrols in the municipality.⁸¹ KFOR continues to provide security for Zoqishtë/Zočište Monastery and are planning the possible transfer of authority to the KP.⁸²

One belief held among those interviewed is that the increasing effectiveness and reputation of the KP in the municipality has been a factor in the improved levels of security and stability in the municipality.^{83,84} Another consideration concerning improvements in the real and perceived stability in the municipality may be attributed to the physical segregation of communities and general lack of freedom of movement experienced by K-Serbian minority group – rather than improvements in relationships.⁸⁵

Displacement and Returns

According to UNHCR there are currently only 30 K-Serbs displaced persons from the municipality of R/O and no returns have been recorded. This is likely due to the occupation of abandoned property, perception of limited security, limited freedom of movement for minorities, a poor economic situation and high unemployment rate. This also explains the response of an interviewee who described the role of KFOR in the returns process in the municipality as “minimal.” All interviewees did report that KFOR participate in various municipal meetings – including those on return.⁸⁶

Activities

Most local sources reported that Austrian troops of MNBG-S are in daily contact with minority communities in R/O.⁸⁷ When asked about KFOR development projects they mentioned that there is an “LMT house” but could not offer any examples of initiatives. One source mentioned that the soldiers had

⁷⁸ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Rahovec/Orahovac, published 2009, retrieved March 2010, cited previously.

⁷⁹ Interviews conducted 9–29 March 2010 with one community leader (K-Serb), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and two civil society workers (K-Albanian and K-Ashkali) in the municipality of Rahovec/Orahovac. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁸⁰ Interview with Major Josef Liebminger, Austrian Army, HQ KFOR, Joint Effects Coordination (JEC) cell, 12 March 2010.

⁸¹ Interviews conducted 9–29 March 2010 with one community leader (K-Serb), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and two civil society workers (K-Albanian and K-Ashkali) in the municipality of Rahovec/Orahovac. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁸² Interview with Major Josef Liebminger, Austrian Army, HQ KFOR, Joint Effects Coordination (JEC) cell, 12 March 2010.

⁸³ The KP in Rahovec/Orahovac has become increasingly multi-community and “effective”. Additionally, the Police Chief, a K-Albanian, is reported to be widely respected among the K-Serb community for personally blocking an K-Albanian mob from attacking a K-Serb neighborhood during the riots of March 2004. Interviews conducted 9–29 March 2010 with one community leader (K-Serb), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and two civil society workers (K-Albanian and K-Ashkali) in the municipality of Rahovec/Orahovac. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁸⁴ Of note: In one interview conducted, the municipal police were described as unprofessional and unreliable. The interviewee noted that they do not have the training or willingness necessary to conduct proper investigations. In contrast, all interviewees regarded the KFOR troops, and specifically the MPs, as being quite the opposite. *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Rahovec/Orahovac, published 2009, retrieved March 2010, cited previously.

⁸⁶ Rahovec/Orahovac KFOR LMTs, LMT house and G9 officers were contacted but unable to comment on any specific actions in the municipality.

⁸⁷ One K-Serb source reported that he had never witnessed or heard about LMTs engaging the public, or his community, in the town of Rahovec.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

previously distributed Austrian Red Cross items collected in Austria and shipped to the task force.⁸⁸ Another mentioned that MNBG-S had been actively engaging in inter-community dialogue between members of the Zoqishtë/Zočište Monastery and the local community.⁸⁹

According to the most recently published CIMIC Projects Report for MNBG-S, no projects have been completed or planned for R/O.⁹⁰ However, projects in other municipalities in the MNBG-S AOR in the past year included: construction of a gravel road in cooperation with the municipality of Prizren, construction of a sanitary building for a school in Peqan/Peçane, classroom renovations and furniture in Dragash/Dragaš, reconstruction of a school in Bukosh/Bukoš, and construction of a new school in Gelancë/Geljance. Planned projects include: a distribution location for milk producers, installation of a sewage system in Duhël/Dulje, and reconstruction of a bridge east of Prizren.

KFOR has also supported the R/O CSAT created in 2004 by ICITAP and the OSCE.⁹¹ Current members are all K-Albanian and include the KP, businessmen, teachers, doctors, pupils, and clergymen selected by the CSAT commanding staff. The Kosovo Security Force (KSF) does not attend and would be welcome according to a local member who also noted that its predecessor did. On request, KFOR provides transcription services for the meetings and offers guidance. The meetings have not been held as regularly though and one source related this to an increase in expenses since the OSCE stopped providing transport and food, and since the program was “taken over” by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) Department of Community Affairs, which has not made contact with the members yet. Additionally, the legitimacy of the program has been challenged by the Kosovo Parliament as the Constitution only foresees MSCs and LSCs which KFOR also attends.

Impact

As in other municipalities researched, KFOR’s role in R/O has expanded from the provision of security to supporting municipal structures. It is also clear that KFOR’s presence continues to deter outbreaks of direct inter-community violence – as in the case of the Zoqishtë/Zočište Monastery. When reviewing past and proposed projects, it appears that KFOR is also attempting to address key developmental issues in their AOR including: education, employment, and infrastructure – though this could not be directly confirmed by KFOR in the municipality. Additionally, based on published CIMIC Projects Report for MNBG-S, development projects have employed tactics such as “matching contributions” and inter-community committees. It is also unclear if these development committees, or the newly established R/O MSC, have been trained in problem-solving and dialogue, similar to the CSAT training received, though operations have been passed to local hands.

Of particular concern are untrained officers attempting to continue to mediate disputes and facilitate dialogue between the Zoqishtë/Zočište Monastery and the local community over the transition of security to the KP. The apparent abandonment of the CSAT program and its trained members by the Kosovo Parliament, its lack of participants from all community backgrounds, lack of participation by the KSF, and its questionable sustainability are cause for concern.

⁸⁸ Interviews conducted 9–29 March 2010 with one community leader (K-Serb), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and two civil society workers (K-Albanian and K-Ashkali) in the municipality of Rahovec/Orahovac. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* Also see: “Kosovo Police Wants to Take over Security of Zoqishtë/Zočište Monastery”, Balkan Travelers.com, retrieved March 2010 from www.balkantravellers.com/en/read/article/1669.

⁹⁰ “CIMIC Projects”, last updated: 11 November 2008. Retrieved March 2010 from www.nato.int/KFOR/cimic/projects/index.htm.

⁹¹ Interviews conducted 9–29 March 2010 with one community leader (K-Serb), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and two civil society workers (K-Albanian and K-Ashkali) in the municipality of Rahovec/Orahovac. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

KFOR in Ferizaj/Uroševac: Advocacy for all Communities and the Danger of Being Perceived as a Service Provider

Municipality Description

The southern Kosovo municipality of Ferizaj/Uroševac (F/U) is home to 48 villages and a town of the same name. The total population is approximately 170,000 people spread over 345 km². A recent OSCE municipal profile estimates that 94% of the population is currently K-Albanian while other communities in the municipality include 2.3% K-Ashkali, 0.1% K-Roma, 0.1% K-Gorani, and <0.04% K-Bosniaks, K-Serbs, K-Egyptians, and K-Turks.⁹² The municipality has a variety of developmental and economic issues which affect the KFOR tasks of establishing a stable and secure environment and the return of displaced persons. According to the MCO, the most serious development problems facing the municipality are unemployment, poor infrastructure and lack of education.⁹³

The municipality of F/U falls under the AOR of Multinational Battle Group East (MNBG-E) which is a multinational contingent consisting of 2,120 troops commanded by the US and includes contributors from Greece, Poland, Ukraine, Armenia, and Romania.⁹⁴ Lately, Turkey is also contributing to the LMTs in the municipality.⁹⁵ The US troops have recently lengthened troop deployments in their AOR to one year and soldiers do a three-month intensive training in Hohenfels, Germany prior to departure. The MNBG-E AOR also includes the municipalities of Štrpce/Shtërpçë, Gjilan/Gnjilane, Kaçanik/Kaçanik, Viti/Vitina, Novo Brdo/Novobërdë, and Kamenicë/ Kamenica.⁹⁶ MNBG-E borders Serbia on the east and north and Macedonia to the south. Authority for the command and control of the Macedonian border is currently being transferred to the KP.⁹⁷

US and Greek KFOR are highly visible in the municipality and enjoy relatively good relationships with all communities.⁹⁸ Municipal and community leaders interviewed also report that KFOR LMTs actively attend municipal meetings on returns, security, and development and frequently meet with the mayor.⁹⁹ At the community level, KFOR visits and observes the communities. LMTs ask about security concerns, education, and discuss construction, employment, and electricity with those reported as not paying their bills. According to one source, KFOR makes an effort to speak with women and children in the

⁹² OSCE Mission in Kosovo: Municipal profile of Ferizaj/Uroševac, published September 2009. Retrieved February 2010 from www.osce.org/search/?displayMode=3&lsi=1&q=Ferizaj%2FUroševac.

⁹³ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Ferizaj/Uroševac, published 2009, retrieved March 2010 from www.ecmi-map.com/map/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=68&Itemid=91&lang=en.

⁹⁴ "KFOR Troops (Placemat)". Retrieved February 2010, cited previously. See [Appendix A](#).

⁹⁵ Interview with Lt. Colonel Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

⁹⁶ "KFOR Troops (Placemat)". Retrieved February 2010, cited previously. See [Appendix A](#).

⁹⁷ "US troops transfer powers to Kosovo Police on borderline with Macedonia", published 29 March 2010, retrieved February 2010, Media Monitoring Office Broadcast Report, OSCE Mission in Kosovo. Received via email.

⁹⁸ According to most sources, KFOR is highly regarded in all communities and there is frequent interaction between troops and communities. In one interview with a minority leader in the municipality, he expressed respect for KFOR but claimed that there had been little to no interaction with KFOR for the past 5 years. Interviews conducted 1–29 March 2010 with four community leaders (K-Albanian, K-Serb, K-Roma and K-Ashkali) and one senior member of the CSAT (K-Albanian) in F/U. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

⁹⁹ One high-level municipal source mentioned that the LMTs had recently rotated out and that he was hopeful that the replacement LMTs would be as helpful and involved. Interviews conducted 1–29 March 2010 with four community leaders (K-Albanian, K-Serb, K-Roma and K-Ashkali) and one senior member of the CSAT (K-Albanian) in F/U. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

communities and maintains a public office in the municipality to deal with security, peace and humanitarian aid.

Security and Stability

Since 1999, the majority of policing tasks have transitioned from US and Greek KFOR to the F/U police and KP.¹⁰⁰ Other than Greek KFOR guarding select K-Serbian villages and historical sites, KFOR has now fully taken on the role of “third responder” in the municipality.¹⁰¹ According to the local sources interviewed in F/U, the police are capable of handling all calls and incidents in the municipality – though KFOR’s presence and the availability of support was useful in deterring violence and police discrimination.¹⁰² Additionally, there have been no community motivated incidents reported in the last year and the LMTs meet with the MCO and Municipal Assembly on a weekly basis.¹⁰³

MNBG-E was also reported to be very responsive to structures such as the F/U CSAT formed in 2007. A CSAT leader interviewed reported that KFOR rarely attended the meetings, but the five CSAT groups consisting of 7-8 members have recently received KFOR support for a member initiative by providing brochures and lectures for youth on traffic safety.¹⁰⁴ However the interviewee described that the CSAT groups did not know how to contact the LMTs and expressed interest in KFOR participation in the meetings. The participants of F/U CSAT groups are primarily K-Albanians, but there are three active K-Serbian members and one K-Roma. The groups include local teachers, pensioners, and representatives from the KSF. Members receive training in community policing and partnerships, consensus-building, effective teamwork, resource identification and leverage, and problem analysis and problem-solving at the Kosovo Centre for Public Safety Education and Development in Vushtrri/Vučitrn.¹⁰⁵ Leadership for the F/U teams was selected from the top performers during training and there are currently two local participants certified as trainers.¹⁰⁶

Displacement and Returns

The 1999 conflict displaced a significant portion of the K-Serbs and K-Bosniaks living in the municipality.¹⁰⁷ The March 2004 riots also resulted in the displacement of a small number of K-Serbs who were protected and housed for a short time by Greek KFOR.¹⁰⁸ UNHCR has reported a total of 283 K-

¹⁰⁰ Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

¹⁰¹ “Civil-Military Cooperation in Peace Operations: The Case of Kosovo”, Thomas R. Mockaitis, published October 2004, retrieved February 2010, available at the official website of the United States Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute (SSI), cited previously. Members of Greek and U.S. KFOR have been credited with protected Holy Tsar Uros Church during the March 2004 riots when they locked themselves inside the church to defend it. Protestors outside threw fire bombs on the walls but were unable to chase the troops away or destroy the structure. Various sources. See: “Roof on Holy Tsar Uros Church in Urosevac repaired”, KIM Info Newsletter, published 14 November 2006 from www.kosovo.net/news/archive/2006/November_14/3.html.

¹⁰² Local sources all reported needing KFOR to be present despite having a fully capable police force. One minority representative also added that discrimination by the F/U police would be an issue if KFOR wasn’t around to investigate claims of this type. Interviews conducted 1–29 March 2010 with four community leaders (K-Albanian, K-Serb, K-Roma and K-Ashkali) and one senior member of the CSAT (K-Albanian) in F/U. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* Also see: European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Ferizaj/Uroševac, published 2009, retrieved March 2010, cited previously.

¹⁰⁴ “Julie at ICITAP made contact and set up a meeting with KFOR”. Interviews conducted 9–29 March 2010 with one community leader (K-Serb), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and two civil society workers (K-Albanian and K-Ashkali) in R/O. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹⁰⁵ Community Safety Action Teams (CSATs) Brochure. “Making Communities Safer”. OSCE Mission in Kosovo’s Community Safety Development Section.

¹⁰⁶ Interviews conducted 9–29 March 2010 with one community leader (K-Serb), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and two civil society workers (K-Albanian and K-Ashkali) in R/O. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹⁰⁷ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Ferizaj/Uroševac, published 2009, retrieved March 2010, cited previously.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* Also see: “Roof on Holy Tsar Uros Church in Urosevac repaired”, KIM Info Newsletter, published 14 November 2006, retrieved March 2010 from www.kosovo.net/news/archive/2006/November_14/3.html.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

Serb and 169 K-Egyptian returns to the municipality since 1999, though most reportedly left again after a short stay. Reports indicate that the primary reasons contributing to the exit of returns include the lack of employment opportunities and the poor economic state of the municipality, but research has identified threats, thefts, and perceptions of discrimination also play a role.¹⁰⁹

Though KFOR was specifically mandated to assist with the returns process, KFOR's role in providing security for displaced persons visits has been reduced from previous years as the KP takes over responsibility.¹¹⁰ This was supported by local sources who reported that all returns services in the municipality were handled by UNHCR, American Refugee Committee (ARC), Mercy Corps, and Care International but that KFOR frequently visits returnees to offer informational and physical support. In previous years, one K-Serb interviewed reported that KFOR further facilitated the process by providing tools, transporting furnishings for returnees, clearing property of debris and conducting demining, and even providing heavy equipment services when necessary.¹¹¹

Activities

To date, military-humanitarian activities in MNBG-E have occurred primarily at the national contingent level.¹¹² This corresponds to interviews conducted with F/U residents who mentioned that Greek KFOR assistance often comes in the form of "humanitarian aid" donated by their church and distributed to those in need. According to the K-Serb interviewed, Greek KFOR is currently providing daily meals to three villages in the municipality.¹¹³ Alternately, locals credited US troops with providing aid in the form of technical assistance in health care and education and the provision heavy equipment unavailable to the municipality.¹¹⁴ The MCO also reported that the US contingent in MNBG-E had previously assisted the municipality with multiple infrastructure projects over the last ten years which included the building of roads, sewage systems, and electricity networks throughout the municipality.

According to the most recent CIMIC projects report published online by MNBG-E, the units have been active in their AOR and there are multiple infrastructure, assistance and development projects listed.¹¹⁵ While there have been infrastructure projects in previous years, the majority of the projects undertaken by the US contingent currently focus on education and health issues throughout the MNBG-E AOR.¹¹⁶ With regards to supporting public health, the US contingent provides a mobile medical service to communities as-well-as surgical and Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) trainings to multi-community local groups.

¹⁰⁹ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Ferizaj/Uroševac, published 2009, retrieved March 2010, cited previously.

¹¹⁰ According to various sources, KFOR previously provided heavy escorts for 'look-see' visits by potential K-Serb returnees and security for K-Serb villages and historical/cultural sites in F/U. Recent interviews with KFOR commanders in MNBG-E have informed that these missions were done at the request of UNHCR and the KP has taken over primary responsibility in recent years. Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Anderson, MNBG-E G9 Commander, and Colonial Phillip Butch, PsyOps Commander, US Army, 21 October 2009.

¹¹¹ Interviews conducted 1–29 March 2010 with three community leaders (K-Albanian, K-Roma and K-Ashkali) and one senior member of the CSAT (K-Albanian) in F/U. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹¹² Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Anderson, MNBG-E G9 Commander, and Colonial Phillip Butch, PsyOps Commander, US Army, 21 October 2009.

¹¹³ Interviews conducted 1–29 March 2010 with three community leaders (K-Albanian, K-Roma and K-Ashkali) and one senior member of the CSAT (K-Albanian) in F/U. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹¹⁴ Despite locals making a distinction between Greek and US forms of aid, provision of direct aid was discovered in interviews with US KFOR commanders. US KFOR has donated excess property including a fire engine and SUV to local communities. Interviews conducted 1–29 March 2010 with three community leaders (K-Albanian, K-Roma and K-Ashkali) and one senior member of the CSAT (K-Albanian) in F/U. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity. Also: Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

¹¹⁵ "CIMIC Projects", last updated: 11 November 2008. Retrieved March 2010 from www.nato.int/KFOR/cimic/projects/index.htm.

¹¹⁶ Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.



CSSS Project for
Integrative Mediation

These initiatives serve local needs, build local capacities, meet unit field-training requirements for the force, and contribute to force protection strategies.¹¹⁷

Educational initiatives also serve these functions. These programs make the connection between education and development though the Lines of Effort (LOE) and interest appear also to lie in the availability of funding.¹¹⁸ Recent US KFOR educational projects include multi-community teaching seminars put on throughout MNBG-E every sixty days, “adoption” of schools by troops who voluntarily serve as English teachers, and various school construction/renovation projects.^{119,120} Though no specific mention of these projects in the municipality of F/U were made by US KFOR representatives or local sources, a Youth Center with members from five local high schools was created by the MNBG-E Aviation unit in F/U and is currently being adopted by a local NGO.¹²¹ Local sources also described KFOR soldiers participating in “game projects with pupils” organized with UNHCR and OSCE.¹²²

Impact

The multi-national KFOR contingents in F/U have made significant contributions to the establishment of “negative peace” and development throughout the municipality. The physical KFOR support provided to the KSF, local police and law enforcement structures has also contributed to perceptions of competence reported among locals interviewed. This success is most noticeable in the considerable transfer of responsibility to the KP and improvements in freedom of movement among all communities. KFOR has developed a reputation in F/U as a fair and neutral municipal actor which is not only capable, but willing to advocate for all communities. This reputation needs to be projected onto local structures for them to flourish, however, as some local sources lack confidence.¹²³

Additionally, MNBG-E’s approaches to development and humanitarian aid have earned them popularity and respect in F/U, but lack in significant contributions to peacebuilding. Infrastructure projects, food and equipment donations certainly relieve overburdened and underfunded municipal structures as do the provision of medical trainings, teacher workshops, English teaching, and establishment of a mono-community youth centers. These projects and programs are admirable and effectively win population support for the force, but do not appear to contain components that encourage inter-community dialogue or cooperation on deeper levels than simply attending training or receiving a donation. Furthermore, they negatively project the force as a provider.

¹¹⁷ Also see: “Camp Bondsteel’s doctor teaches triage techniques in Ferizaj/Urosevac”, updated: 15-Feb-2010, retrieved March 2010 from www.nato.int/kfor/docu/inside/2010/02/i100215i.htm.

¹¹⁸ US KFOR troops do not have a budget specifically allocated for CIMIC or development activities. They do however have Liaison Officers posted in the US Embassy and USAID who put in project proposals and requests for funding. The “Oasis” Foundation/Program provides the majority of support for educational initiatives for US KFOR in the field. Interview with Lt. Colonel Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid*. Also see: “South Carolina aviators teach English with a ‘twang’” and “North Dakota Guardsman shaping young minds in Kosovo”, published 2010, retrieved on March 2010 from www.ng.mil/news/archives/2010/03/030110-SOUTH.aspx and www.ng.mil/news/archives/2009/12/121709-Minds.aspx?src=rss.

¹²⁰ “CIMIC Projects”, last updated: 11 November 2008. Retrieved March 2010 from www.nato.int/kfor/cimic/projects/index.htm.

¹²¹ The center currently provides recreational and entertainment facilities for K-Albanian youth in F/U. The program is however open to all communities. Transition to NGO hands is believed to ensure sustainability for the program. Interview with Lt. Colonel Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

¹²² Interviews conducted 9–29 March 2010 with one community leader (K-Serb), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and two civil society workers (K-Albanian and K-Ashkali) in R/O (Should this be F/U?). Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹²³ Though most sources interviewed stated that the KP are capable, one interviewee stated that the KP were unpopular in his community and discriminated against them. Interviews conducted 9–29 March 2010 with one community leader (K-Serb), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and two civil society workers (K-Albanian and K-Ashkali) in R/O. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.



CSSProject for

Integrative Mediation

One program which has been implemented throughout MNBG-E and makes a contribution to sustainable peace has been summer “camp-outs” organized jointly by KFOR and KP on Camp Bondsteel.¹²⁴ The summer program challenges multi-community youth participants to jointly solve challenges and various other team-building exercises. Past programs have demonstrated that the children enjoy the interaction – though sources reported that the parents often do not communicate. This appears to highlight a future opportunity for peacebuilding however. The parents have common-ground in their children’s participation and could potentially be encouraged to participate in an event which could lead to dialogue concerning the importance of inter-community interactions among their children.

KFOR in Gjilan/Gnjilane: Encouraging Communities to Interact and KFOR’s Lack of Responding to Incidents

Municipality Description

Gjilan/Gnjilane (G/G) is the name of a municipality in eastern Kosovo that has a total area of 515 km² and consists of a town and 63 villages. The total population of approximately 30,000 inhabitants may be broken down into community populations estimated to be 53% K-Albanian, 41% K-Serbs, and 4% K-Turks and 1% K-Roma.¹²⁵ The municipality has a variety of development and economic issues which include unemployment, poor infrastructure and low levels of education. Similar to most municipalities in Kosovo, community division intensified after 1999 and the majority of villages in G/G are currently mono-community K-Albanian.¹²⁶

The municipality of G/G falls under the AOR of MNBG-E which is commanded by the US. As in F/U, the US troops have recently lengthened troop deployments in their AOR to one year and soldiers do a three-month intensive training in Hohenfels, Germany prior to departure.¹²⁷ The current multi-national contingent consists of 2,120 troops from the US, Greece, Poland, Ukraine, Armenia, and Romania.¹²⁸ As mentioned before, Turkey is also contributing to the LMTs in the municipality. MNBG-E also includes the municipalities of Štrpce/Shtërpçë, Ferizaj/Uroševac, Kaçanik/Kaçanik, Viti/Vitina, Novo Brdo/Novobërdë, and Kamenicë/Kamenica. MNBG-E borders Serbia on the east and north and Macedonia to the south. As mentioned in the previous section, recent progress in stability and KP functionality is currently allowing MNBG-E to transfer Macedonian border responsibilities to the KP.¹²⁹ Local sources report that US KFOR combat troops have been less visible, while LMTs visit communities throughout the municipality daily and enjoy extremely good relationships with all communities.¹³⁰ To support access to municipal leadership and the general public, US KFOR has also established an office inside the G/G municipal building and attends all municipal meetings, community events, and visits minority offices every other day. This has allowed strong relationships to be forged with local leaders.¹³¹

¹²⁴ This program also extends to the municipalities of Gjilan/Gnjilane and Štrpce/Shtërpçë. Interview with Lt. Colonel Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

¹²⁵ OSCE Mission in Kosovo: Municipal profile of Gjilan/Gnjilane, published September 2009. Retrieved February 2010 from www.osce.org/documents/mik/2009/09/1184_en.pdf.

¹²⁶ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Gjilan/Gnjilane, published 2009, retrieved March 2010 from www.ecmi-map.com/map/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=43&Itemid=73&lang=en.

¹²⁷ Interview with Lt. Colonel Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

¹²⁸ “KFOR Troops (Placemat)”. Retrieved February 2010, cited previously. See [Appendix A](#).

¹²⁹ “US troops transfer powers to Kosovo Police on borderline with Macedonia”, published 29 March 2010, retrieved February 2010, Media Monitoring Office Broadcast Report, OSCE Mission in Kosovo. Received via email.

¹³⁰ One noteworthy comment was that KFOR is more popular among the K-Serb community than others in the municipality. Interviews conducted 9–30 March 2010 with one municipal leader (K-Turkish), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and one civil society worker (K-Serb) in G/G. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹³¹ *Ibid.* This source also described that KFOR often insists that representatives from all communities are invited to functions which they attend.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

Security and Stability

In G/G, MNBG-E's primary mission has been to maintain a safe and secure environment, ensure freedom of movement, and has evolved to serving as the "third responder" behind the KP and EULEX.¹³² According to UNHRC, all citizens currently move freely in town and in most areas throughout the municipality.¹³³ Additionally, ECMI has reported that there have been no community motivated incidents reported in the last year.¹³⁴ The improvements in general security and stability were also evident in recent comments made by the US commander of MNBG-E who stated that the positive changes in the two largest municipalities in his AOR, G/G and F/U, are evident as the security situation had improved to the point where there is currently, "no need for KFOR assistance of any kind."¹³⁵

According to the OSCE, the municipality has a fully functional and multi-community police force consisting of 223 male and female officers and the municipality is credited for being one of the first municipalities to introduce community-mixed patrols.¹³⁶ All local sources interviewed claim that the police are capable of handling all calls and incidents in the municipality – though they also commented that if KFOR withdrew today the KP would be unable to ensure the level of security currently being enjoyed. Furthermore, KFOR LMTs and KP attend and contribute to weekly MCO and MSC security meetings.¹³⁷ KFOR has also indirectly contributed to the local multi-community CSATs by providing materials based on their experiences with community policing, provided political influence when requested, and promise to provide physical support upon request.¹³⁸

Displacement and Returns

According to UNHCR, the 1999 conflict resulted in the displacement of approximately 1,178 K-Serbs and 115 members of the K-RAE community throughout the municipality of G/G.¹³⁹ KFOR's role in the returns process is primarily logistical and provided at the request of UNHCR.¹⁴⁰ In the past, KFOR provided support for "look and see" visits, "go and pray" visits, transportation and moving assistance.¹⁴¹ As the KP have taken over the majority of these functions and freedom of movement has been improved, KFOR's role in providing security for displaced persons visits has been significantly reduced.¹⁴² Local sources also reported that MNBG-E LMTs visit families who have returned to the municipality.

¹³² Interview with Major Josef Liebminger, Austrian Army, HQ KFOR, Joint Effects Coordination (JEC) cell, 12 March 2010.

¹³³ OSCE Mission in Kosovo: Municipal profile of Gjilan/Gnjilane, published September 2009. Retrieved February 2010, available at the official OSCE website, cited previously.

¹³⁴ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Gjilan/Gnjilane, published 2009, retrieved March 2010, cited previously.

¹³⁵ "KFOR commander tells local media 'positive changes' are coming", Official National Guard Website. Published 27 Jan. 2010 by: North Dakota National Guard. Retrieved March 2010 from www.ng.mil/news/archives/2010/01/012710-KFOR.aspx.

¹³⁶ OSCE Mission in Kosovo: Municipal profile of Gjilan/Gnjilane, published September 2009. Retrieved February 2010, available at the official OSCE website, cited previously.

¹³⁷ KFOR's highly-trained and specialized units were also mentioned to be assets that the KP is unable to provide. Interviews conducted 9–30 March 2010 with one municipal leader (K-Turkish), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and one civil society worker (K-Serb) in G/G. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹³⁸ Interviews conducted 9–30 March 2010 with one municipal leader (K-Turkish), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and one civil society worker (K-Serb) in G/G. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹³⁹ UNHCR Report on Internal Displacement. Updated Oct 2009. OCM Pristina. Retrieved Mar 2010 from [www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/\(httpDocuments\)/7CD492E663EF7BA9C125766A002EE7BC/\\$file/Statistical+overview+October+09.pdf](http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/(httpDocuments)/7CD492E663EF7BA9C125766A002EE7BC/$file/Statistical+overview+October+09.pdf).

¹⁴⁰ Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

¹⁴¹ Interviews conducted 9–30 March 2010 with one municipal community leader (K-Turkish), one member of the Kosovo Police and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and one civil society worker (K-Serb) in G/G. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹⁴² According to various sources, KFOR previously provided heavy escorts for 'look-see' visits by potential K-Serb returnees and security for K-Serb villages and historical/cultural sites in F/U. Recent interviews with KFOR commanders in MNBG-E have informed that these missions were done at the request of UNHCR and the KP has taken over primary responsibility in recent years. Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Anderson, MNBG-E G9 Commander, and Colonial Phillip Butch, PsyOps Commander, US Army, 21 October 2009.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

Activities

According to MNBG-E and local sources, the contingent has been active in the municipality. In addition to the mobile health care services and the provision security and municipal support; a number of unique CIMIC projects, LMT interactions, and direct aid examples were discovered in and near G/G.¹⁴³ Recent examples of projects include the response of KFOR to health concerns at a school in nearby Novo Brdo/Novobërdë posed by contaminated flooding of a school basement which resulted in the unit providing preventative landscaping.¹⁴⁴ In G/G, KFOR worked in cooperation with USAID, the US Embassy and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) to build and equip a 200,000 € community concert center with offices in Parteš/Partesh four years ago. Additionally, a local source described that US KFOR had provided her community with heaters, generators and food though she didn't know if this aid was funded by KFOR or only delivered by them.¹⁴⁵

Interactions were cited by all sources as major contributions. One source described KFOR “advisors” who provided information with regards to the court system in Kosovo, the advice often came in the form of telling people where they could go to address their issues and options available to them.¹⁴⁶ Additionally, all local sources described LMT relationships where daily interactions moved beyond discussing security concerns as LMTs make efforts to encourage different communities to come together in public settings to discuss community concerns. Interviewees also described that KFOR built relationships between the communities by inviting them to meetings with other communities and encouraging them to participate in joint community activities such as clean-up projects. LMTs in G/G sit in traditional public meeting places, such as grocery stores, and are widely perceived as treating all communities as equals – though one source also commented that KFOR was “liked more by K-Serbs than K-Albanians”. Interviewees also reported that the LMTs carry their concerns to IOs and municipal structures.¹⁴⁷

Impact

The AOR of MNBG-E, including the municipality of G/G, was one of the most diverse communities in Kosovo prior to the war and the area suffered less damage during the war.¹⁴⁸ While this history certainly contributes to the apparent stability and lends itself to improvements in inter-community relations, US KFOR efforts have also clearly made a positive impact. They have interacted with the public in a transparent manner, encouraged different communities to interact on issues and concerns, strengthened local capacities and made attempts to relieve suffering.

However, one recent incident discovered during interviews with MNBG-E does appear to represent a missed peacebuilding opportunity. On the surface the incident may not appear to be a KFOR responsibility, but it offers an example of proactively using a high-profile incident to build stability through inter-community dialogue and reconciliation. Approximately one month ago LMTs discovered that a grave was robbed a day after the person was buried. This was the first K-Serb to be buried in G/G since 1999,

¹⁴³ Though none were publicized in the online CIMIC projects reports. “CIMIC Projects”, last updated: 11 November 2008. Retrieved March 2010 from www.nato.int/KFOR/cimic/projects/index.htm.

¹⁴⁴ US KFOR also responded to a municipal garbage issue by funding a six-month contract which provided the municipality with 100 dumpsters and pick-up services in Novo Brdo/Novobërdë. Interview with Lt. Colonel Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

¹⁴⁵ USAID is currently funding the operation of the facility and community English classes which are taking place there. Interviews conducted 9–30 March 2010 with one municipal community leader (K-Turkish), one member of the KP and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and one civil society worker (K-Serb) in G/G. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹⁴⁶ Interviews conducted 9–30 March 2010 with one municipal leader (K-Turkish), one member of the KP and a member of CSAT (K-Albanian), and one civil society worker (K-Serb) in G/G. Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid*. The answer was expanded by describing that K-Serbs often go to KFOR rather than the predominately K-Albanian municipal structures with their concerns and issues.

¹⁴⁸ “Civil-Military Cooperation in Peace Operations: The Case of Kosovo”, Thomas R. Mockaitis, published October 2004, retrieved February 2010, available at the official website of the United States Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute (SSI), cited previously.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

and the theft, while being handled by KP and EULEX police, had led to a heightening of community tension. Rather than discussing a proactive response to the incident, identifying the common-ground regarding the sanctity of burial among both communities, and encouraging K-Albanian leaders to publically denounce the incident or meet with the mourners, KFOR simply left the investigations to the KP and “monitored” the incident in the event that they would need to respond.¹⁴⁹

KFOR in Štrpce/Shtërpçë: Dealing with Future Conflicts before They Escalate

Municipality Description

Štrpce/Shtërpçë (S/S) is the name of a town and municipality in south eastern Kosovo. The municipality has a K-Serbian majority and consists of a town and 16 villages. The total population is estimated to be 13,600 inhabitants and can be broken down into community populations of 67% K-Serbs, 33% K-Albanian, and <0.3% K-Roma. The municipality has a variety of development and economic issues which include high unemployment rates, contaminated water supplies, a poor electrical network, and frequent power cuts.¹⁵⁰ S/S villages are predominately mono-community and there have been several minor inter-community incidents reported over the last few years though the municipality is currently regarded as “stable but problematic” or “stable but fragile” by locals.¹⁵¹ Additionally, K-Serbian population participation in the most recent municipal elections may signal that the parallel political structures are weakening.¹⁵² According to local sources interviewed, restrictions on freedom of movement previously experienced by the K-Serbian community also appear to be improving.¹⁵³

The municipality falls under the AOR of MNBG-E which is commanded by the US. The current multi-national contingent consists of 2,120 troops from the US, Greece, Poland, Ukraine, Armenia, and Romania.¹⁵⁴ However, in S/S the KFOR activities are primarily conducted by the Ukrainian and US contingents.¹⁵⁵ MNBG-E also includes the municipalities of Gjilan/Gnjilane, Ferizaj/Uroševac, Kačanik/Kaçanik, Viti/Vitina, Novo Brdo/Novobërdë, and Kamenicë/Kamenica. MNBG-E borders Serbia on the east and north and Macedonia to the south. According to local sources, both the Ukrainian and US KFOR are highly visible and enjoy excellent relationships in all communities. At the local level, LMTs visit and interact with the communities daily. There is also a LMT house in the municipality and LMTs from both countries regularly attend municipal-level meetings, community events, and visit minority offices. KFOR has also established relationships with local religious leaders and IOs working in the municipality.

Security and Stability

As in the other municipalities researched, MNBG-E’s primary mission in S/S is to maintain a safe and secure environment, ensure freedom of movement, and serve as the “third responder” behind the KP and

¹⁴⁹ The K-Albanian night watchman was suspected to be involved. The current “solution” appears to be the pouring of a concrete slab over future burials. Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

¹⁵⁰ OSCE Mission in Kosovo: Municipal profile of Štrpce/Shtërpçë, published September 2009. Retrieved February 2010 from www.osce.org/documents/mik/2009/09/1203_en.pdf.

¹⁵¹ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Štrpce/Shtërpçë, published 2009, retrieved March 2010 from www.ecmi-map.com/map/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=38&Itemid=97&lang=en.

¹⁵² See: “Kosovo election divides Serbs”, Mark Lowen, BBC News Online: World: Europe, 14 November 2009, retrieved January 2010 from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8359761.stm>.

¹⁵³ Interviews conducted 10–30 March 2010 with one municipal community leader (K-Albanian), one member of a K-Serb parallel structure (K-Serb), and one municipal official who is also a member of CSAT (K-Albanian). Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹⁵⁴ “KFOR Troops (Placemat)”. Retrieved February 2010, cited previously. See [Appendix A](#).

¹⁵⁵ Interviews conducted 10–30 March 2010 with one municipal community leader (K-Albanian), one member of a K-Serb parallel structure (K-Serb), and one municipal official who is also a member of CSAT (K-Albanian). Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.



CSS Project for
Integrative Mediation

EULEX.¹⁵⁶ In the last year, KFOR has made significant progress towards achieving the full transfer of law enforcement and security responsibilities. According to local sources, the security and stability situation has significantly improved and locals currently move freely throughout the municipality – “even at night.” Additionally, locals interviewed expressed that the municipal police were currently capable of handling all calls without the assistance of the police. According to the OSCE, the municipality has a fully functional multi-community police force consisting of 56 officers. This was confirmed by local contacts, however one was adamant that the KP needed more training to overcome biases and place more emphasis in the law.¹⁵⁷ This is in stark contrast to reports from previous years which claimed that KFOR patrols, and particularly those of the “more-neutral” Ukrainian forces, were necessary to maintain order in the municipality.¹⁵⁸

While KFOR in the municipality participates in MCO meetings, the MSC and LSCs have yet to be created. Additionally, KFOR monitors but does not participate in S/S CSAT meetings which have been plagued by low attendance, loss of trained members, and inaction. Participants that do attend come from a variety of community backgrounds and represent the KP, schools, students, villages and local NGOs.

Displacement and Returns

According to a Serbian Red Cross statistic provided in the most recent UNHCR Municipal Profile for S/S there are an estimated 700-1000 K-Serbian IDPs living in the municipality.¹⁵⁹ Further UNHCR estimates of returns to the municipality include 26 K-Serbs and 443 K-Albanians since 1999. Local sources within the municipality reported that KFOR’s role in returns process is primarily logistical and is undertaken by request and in cooperation with UNHCR and local authorities. When requested, KFOR provides “look and see” visits, “go and pray” visits, transportation and moving assistance, and monitors families who have returned to the municipality.¹⁶⁰ One local source described US and Ukrainian KFOR providing beds, employment, and food to IDPs.

Activities

Though the KFOR CIMIC projects report published online by MNBG-E does not specifically mention any development, construction/reconstruction, or humanitarian aid projects in the municipality of S/S, a number of initiative were described by local interviews.¹⁶¹ The K-Serb interviewed for this research described seeing US KFOR on-site at every infrastructure project in the community but said that he was unsure if KFOR was implementing or supporting the projects. Additionally, all interviewees confirmed that KFOR participated in meetings between the municipal structures and cooperated with IOs/NGOs working in the municipality. According to all local sources, LMTs also frequently carry community concerns to municipal structures and IOs/NGOs.

Examples of small-scale direct aid were noted as one interview described KFOR LMTs donating 50 school bags for children “from their own pockets,” and another describing provision of school materials and food and clothes. Larger scale examples included, helicopters being used to transport sick residents to the US base for treatment, helping to clear roads and free communities after a heavy snowfall, construction of a landslide barrier wall on the main road, general road maintenance, and organizing a contractor to make repairs on a local bridge. KFOR also helped local community leaders pressure a

¹⁵⁶ Interview with Major Josef Liebminger, Austrian Army, HQ KFOR, Joint Effects Coordination (JEC) cell, 12 March 2010.

¹⁵⁷ Interviews conducted 10–30 March 2010 with one municipal community leader (K-Albanian), one member of a K-Serb parallel structure (K-Serb), and one municipal official who is also a member of CSAT (K-Albanian). Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹⁵⁸ European Centre for Minority Issues in Kosovo (ECMI), Municipal Profile for Štrpce/Shtërpçë, published 2009, retrieved March 2010, cited previously.

¹⁵⁹ OSCE Mission in Kosovo: Municipal profile of Štrpce/Shtërpçë, published September 2009. Retrieved February 2010 from www.osce.org/documents/mik/2009/09/1203_en.pdf.

¹⁶⁰ Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Anderson, MNBG-E G9 Commander, and Colonial Phillip Butch, PsyOps Commander, US Army, 21 October 2009.

¹⁶¹ “CIMIC Projects”, last updated: 11-Nov-2008. Retrieved March 2010 from www.nato.int/KFOR/cimic/projects/index.htm.



contractor into starting construction on a school in Brod. At least one recent request was denied however.¹⁶²

When asked about KFOR's role in helping to resolve community or inter-community disputes and addressing community concerns, local sources unanimously agreed that KFOR frequently assisted in both of these capacities. One source described KFOR bringing specific issues in his community regarding the availability of water, electricity and education to the attention of the municipal structures and IOs on different occasions. An additional two examples were provided that described KFOR LMTs acting as informal mediators in a community dispute over water and once in a local school dispute between children. Additionally, one local source described US KFOR bringing children onto Camp Bondsteel to initiate inter-community communication, though it was unclear if this is a reference to the summer "camp-out" program mentioned previously. A similar initiative aimed at bringing two community different student councils together failed recently after the youth showed interest in the program but the parents obstructed it.

Impact

Though achieving long-term stability in this municipality has moved much slower than in others researched, the stalemate which has divided S/S and prolonged and exacerbated economic and development issues appears to be revealing a "point of ripeness" for future initiatives. The recent electoral progress in the municipality, formation of local municipal structures, and interest for increased inter-community programs showed by all sources interviewed confirms this progress.¹⁶³ Of particular concern is that the recent "universal" CIMIC criticisms and directive to cease development projects/initiatives is based on other, more progressive municipalities, and will cripple trust-building and peacebuilding opportunities just surfacing in this municipality.¹⁶⁴

One missed peacebuilding opportunity was also discovered while compiling research on KFOR projects in S/S. US KFOR recently received a request to repair the roof on a K-Serbian school in the municipality.¹⁶⁵ They put in a request for funding, were approved, advertised the tender and selected the lowest-bidder – a K-Albanian. The K-Serbian school principal allowed the work to proceed and CIMIC officers confirmed delivery of supplies and photographed the completed work. Approximately a week later the school principal contacted the CIMIC officers to complain that the work was faulty. CIMIC officers investigated and the roof had been damaged after their completion pictures had been taken. A CA team then informed the school principal that the contract would be paid and the work considered complete. The concern is that the school staff and students presumably feel frustrated with the K-Albanian for doing a poor job and the contractor is equally frustrated that not only was his work done properly, but it was now destroyed. The result is that all parties involved share their frustration with their own, divided, communities and the matter serves as an example of why they should not trust the "other." In this case, an opportunity exists to highlight how communities can work together, through dialogue and mediation, to find an acceptable solution. Actions of this type also demonstrate constructive examples for dealing with future conflicts – before they escalate.

¹⁶² *Ibid.* A request was made to KFOR to provide a truck to assist with sewage problem and no response has been given or action taken. This corresponds with comments made by MNBG-E commanders regarding requests. "We do not fulfill every request...", "we often need to determine if requests are based on self-need or self-want vs. community-need". Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Keller, MNBG-E G9 Commander and Major Sean Lund, MNBG-E Deputy G9 Commander, US Army, 24 March 2010.

¹⁶³ When asked what else could be done by KFOR to build peace, all sources mentioned that more projects and activities that brought communities together would be welcomed. Interviews conducted 10–30 March 2010 with one municipal community leader (K-Albanian), one member of a K-Serb parallel structure (K-Serb), and one municipal official who is also a member of CSAT (K-Albanian). Names withheld as interviews were conducted under agreement of anonymity.

¹⁶⁴ INS 1-2009: KFOR CIMIC White Paper, issued by JEC/J9, last updated: 23 10 200, NATO/KFOR UNCLASSIFIED, HQ KFOR: Internal Instructions. Received electronically by request, Feb 2010, from the JEC at HQ KFOR.

¹⁶⁵ Interview with Lt. Colonial Brian Anderson, MNBG-E G9 Commander, and Colonial Phillip Butch, PsyOps Commander, US Army, 21 October 2009.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

Conclusion and Recommendations

In determining the role that KFOR has played in the peacebuilding process it is important to consider that the line between traditional and expanded approaches to peacekeeping is not static. As exemplified by the March 2004 riots, the mere absence of violent conflict and presence of “neutral” peacekeepers does not ensure that sustainable peace can take root. With that being said, the NATO peacekeeping force in Kosovo has had a clear impact on the improvements in the security situation since 1999. And while many of the “multi-dimensional” strategies and widened military roles that have been applied in Kosovo have not always resulted in successful, efficient, consistent initiatives or cooperative efforts, KFOR has rather effectively produced an environment where inhabitants from all communities feel increasingly safe and humanitarian actors can move freely.

Through decentralized commands being able to focus on problems unique to their AORs, CIMIC officers have had the latitude to creatively address local issues, build local capacities and respond to local needs. Additionally, LOs stationed in IOs have coordinated resources and facilitated cooperation and LMTs have successfully established and maintained constructive relationships with local and municipal structures. Since 1999, these combined mechanisms have used the respect earned to significantly contribute to the establishment of collaborative and supportive relationships at the municipal level, support and promote local structures that represent all sides, and facilitate minimal levels of dialogue. KFOR’s commitment to their expanded peacekeeping role has demonstrated that non-traditional military strategies can indeed be an effective peacebuilding tool. However, the full potential of these types of efforts have not been realized yet. The research conducted for this report indicates that an adaptive, well-trained, well-coordinated, and cooperative military force can help bridge community divides, but approaches need to focus on more proactive peacebuilding efforts and training.

As KFOR currently restructures and reduces forces under the “Deterrent Presence” and “Minimal Presence” plans, the issues and suggestions documented by this report should be used to inform and adapt KFOR strategies. The major criticisms raised in this report are:

- Local dependency on KFOR reduces confidence in the KP and municipal structures.
- Military actors are engaging in activities outside of their competencies and training.
- Consequences resulting from the provision of direct aid without development training.
- Existence of barriers to communication which hinder civil-military cooperation.
- PsyOps campaigns are too narrowly defined.
- Lack of a proactive and offensive peacebuilding stance.

Dependency Issues

KFOR’s non-traditional peacekeeping actions on the ground have resulted in a significant level of psychological dependency on the international peacekeeping force. While on the surface this dependency may seem natural in a post-conflict setting, interviews conducted during the course of this research indicate that while the KP and KSF are widely believed to be capable, KFOR’s highly visible presence and good reputation distracts the public from the progress that has been made by these structures and reduces the overall confidence in them.¹⁶⁶ As many interviewees mentioned the professionalism, capabilities and neutrality of KFOR as the very reason why they are required. Attempts to pass on these

¹⁶⁶ Interviews reflect a resounding fear that with the continued reduction in international forces, municipal structures will crumble as corrupt and community biased authorities will spark renewed violence.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

valued “soft” and “hard” skill sets to local structures provide opportunities for sustainability that should be exploited. More attention and resources should be focused on addressing issues of corruption, levels of professionalism, and expanding KP training programs to focus on soft skills as KFOR draws down. Additionally, passing on the same CIMIC and LMT mechanisms which have earned the trust and respect which KFOR now enjoys in local communities seems to be a logical step in building the same capacities in the KP. The transition period may include training multi-community KP forces in CIMIC and LMT principles, embedding them with KFOR for a period, and creating similar structures within their national commands. The trust built by the KP will encourage the same in municipal structures.

Military Actors Engaging in Conflict Resolution Activities

Though KFOR’s reputation as a neutral third party has been earned, another significant concern is military actors engaging in conflict resolution activities that are outside of their competencies and training.¹⁶⁷ Even if well trained and certified, LMTs and MNBG commanders who have engaged in unofficial “shuttle diplomacy,” facilitating dialogue, and conducting negotiations and mediations of local community disputes have risked inflaming the disputes by politicizing the issues and making them seem as if the military *had* to intervene.¹⁶⁸ In-theater inter-community dialogue and mediation training for military actors who have face to face engagements with the public is one step that should be taken. However, inter-community dispute settle requires significantly more training and experience than peacekeepers are given. Politicization and increasing the publicity of the issue should be primary concerns and extend to enlisting the services of high profile IOs, which are often viewed as being politically aligned.

In Kosovo, a number of intervention options for intra-personal, community and inter-community disputes present themselves. Firstly, Kosovo currently has a variety of local and international NGOs working in these fields that can provide immediate support and professional services. MNBG, CA, CIMIC and LMT officers who maintain relationships in their AORs should have the authorization to contact and/or request these services. Additionally, there is a Kosovo Law on Mediation and a Mediation Commission headed by the Ministry of Justice. While not fully functioning, European Commission Liaison Office (ECLO), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and a wide variety of other IOs and NGOs are currently working to ensure its success. These structures will provide future support. By formally passing community issues, concerns, and disputes that could be applicable to this structure, KFOR would be encouraging and supporting the progress of this structure. Finally, there are regional certified mediators that can be contacted. Professional mediators and mediation NGOs can be found throughout Kosovo, Serbia, BiH, Montenegro, Albania, Croatia, Macedonia, and Slovenia with minimal effort. Some are even members of functioning Mediation Commissions in their own countries.¹⁶⁹

The Dangers of Military Actors Providing Direct Aid

Another action that should be restricted is the seemingly harmless act of providing direct aid to underdeveloped communities. While effective for “winning the hearts and minds” in the short-term, the unintended consequences resulting from “well intentioned” humanitarian aid distribution negatively impacts longer-term force objectives. Research identified one particular incident in O/O which provides a

¹⁶⁷ In interviews conducted during the course of this research, interviewees cited various examples of military actors facilitating inter-community dialogue and mediation. Additionally, this research identified opportunities where inter-community dialogue and mediation could have served to reduce inter-community tensions and produced sustainable indigenous solutions, but issues were not shared with the appropriate actors.

¹⁶⁸ The term “shuttle diplomacy” refers to actions of an outside party serving as an intermediary between principals in a dispute. The term is characterized by the absence of direct principal-to-principal contact.

¹⁶⁹ The South Eastern European Mediation Forum (SEEMF) is a regional network of mediators that supports and advocates the development of mediation as a conflict resolution tool in South Eastern Europe – the former Republic of Yugoslavia and Albania. www.seemf.eu.



CSSP Project for

Integrative Mediation

simple example of KFOR direct aid breeding resentment among communities and towards the force, and has the potential to reinforce community tensions.¹⁷⁰ In addition to these negative effects, a precedent has been set which now makes the force a “provider.” Concerns extend beyond what a “provider” can or cannot give or the implications that these actions have on local dependence, general stability and force protection (i.e. locals get agitated and react over unequal distribution or cessation of supplies). An additional unintentional impact of direct aid often reveals itself in longer-term socio-economic issues produced. This revelation is not limited to KFOR and the direct aid practices of civilian humanitarian agencies and organizations have been radically evolving with regards to this understanding for at least two decades. KFOR should consider working through or with local development NGOs in Kosovo to assess potential donations.

Barriers to Communication

In conducting research for this project, barriers to communication were very present. In direct contradiction to KFOR desires of transferring responsibility, reducing force levels, and KFOR’s insistence that CIMIC officers, LMTs, and the information that they collect are not part of the Military Intelligence (MI) structures, requests for information on CIMIC and LMT activities and projects related to peacebuilding and development were repeatedly crippled by the classification of information, strict hierarchal military structures and multi-national bureaucracy.¹⁷¹ Additionally, while the website provided a considerable amount of the background information for this report, documents regarding the subject were often out of date and poorly organized. Further aggravating the communications process were incorrect phone numbers, and rotating commands, and a Public Affairs Office (PAO), currently the only direct point of contact listed on the official KFOR website, that was unable to provide current names or numbers for Civil Affairs, CIMIC commands, LOs, or LMTs.

Better communication and up-to-date online information are critical to achieving force reduction goals and leveraging KFOR’s greatest contribution to building sustainable peace – their informational resources. KFOR has resources beyond that of any IO or NGO. LMTs enjoy unrestricted access at the grassroots and municipal levels and have built relationships which could allow them to be proactive in achieving mutually desired effects. LMTs are aware of local conflicts and issues which are well documented and filed, but not shared. Information sharing practices must be adapted for the common goal of achieving regional stability and sustainable peace to be achieved. LMTs and the JEC have the ability and resources to proactively alert IOs and NGOs to issues, but according to the research conducted, do not have the authority. Continuance of the classification of non-sensitive information, restrictions in the ability of LMTs to proactively share information, and inaccessibility of personnel contact information undermines KFOR’s ability to achieve its objectives, tasks, and desires to maintain supportive relationships with civilian humanitarian actors. Building trust starts with demonstrating the willingness to share.

Adapting PsyOps Campaigns

The development of trust and respect which provide a foundation for the “hearts and minds” campaigns of the 1970s are still relevant in the current decade of expanded peacekeeping roles. PsyOps campaigns also play a key role. Traditional PsyOps is used to create or reinforce behavior favorable to objectives. While in the case of Kosovo, themes of “peace and tolerance” have been utilized and certainly offer some

¹⁷⁰ In an interview conducted with a minority community member in Obiliq/Obilić on 3 March 2010, the interviewee cited frustration with the unequal donations/distribution of computer equipment to two different minority communities. For more see: “Activities” and “Impact” on page 10-11. Other comments regarding preferential treatment of one community group over another were also noted throughout.

¹⁷¹ Numerous attempts were made to request meetings and information with regards to CIMIC and LMT field activities in the municipalities covered by this report. In nearly every case those requests were denied. One very informative, but non-specific, interview was completed with a high ranking officer from the JEC at KFOR HQ and future meetings at the local level have been authorized with JEC coordination and supervision.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

contribution to achieving the mutual desired effects of military and humanitarian actors these themes do not contribute to the transfer of responsibility or support confidence building in local structures.

Additionally, the majority of the PsyOps campaigns appear to focus on goals of contributing to force protection and promoting a positive public image of KFOR. The billboard signs, television commercials, bus advertisements, and high profile KFOR public engagements have the potential to promote the accomplishments of those who are tasked with relieving the force, mechanisms which promote intercultural interaction and attempts to promote a culture of equality and nonviolence.

Taking a Proactive and Offensive Peacebuilding Stance

KFOR's overall contributions to peacebuilding have been commendable, but are overshadowed by a shallow focus on achieving short-term objectives and gaining popularity among people in Kosovo. As the "Deterrent Presence" and "Minimal presence" plans begin to take shape in the coming years, a renewed focus on improving levels of civil-military cooperation, and supporting Kosovo structures which promote cultural exchange, mutual respect, and conflict resolution and reconciliation mechanisms are the only way that KFOR can successfully transfer their responsibilities and ensure sustainable peace. As KFOR works to redefine its CIMIC vision and field practices it is critical for the force to consider the contributions that can be made through even greater commitment to the theories of peacebuilding. Reductions in personnel and discontinuation of CIMIC "projects" can represent challenges in the municipalities that can be leveraged by putting greater emphasis on the sharing of information, carefully designed programs that encourage communities to interact and solve their own problems, proactively contacting local and international humanitarian organizations when needs are identified, training local authorities to conduct their own CIMIC and LMT activities, and refocusing of efforts promoting KFOR to the promotion of the Kosovo institutions which are replacing them.

The continuance of gathering information through local sources to prepare reactive top-down strategies must be replaced with proactive and offensive attempts to address local issues and concerns documented by LMTs and CIMIC officers.



CSSProject for
Integrative Mediation

Integrative Mediation

Bringing Local Leaders Together

CSSP – Verein für Integrative Mediation e.V. (CSSP) is a registered non-profit association based in Berlin, Germany. It was founded on 16 June 2006 in Berlin and has ten founding members. Its purpose is to improve inter-community communication and cooperation, and the implementation of peace initiatives to resolve local conflicts through Integrative Mediation. It also promotes efforts to support the development of democratic processes as a tool to overcome conflicts. The organization is fully funded on a yearly basis by the German Foreign Ministry and the Bundestag through the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe and has its offices in Berlin and Kosovo. Parts of its activities are also sponsored by the Austrian Development Agency (ADA)

The origin of CSSP lies in the implementation of the lessons learned from ten years of work of the International Mediator in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1995 – 2004), Dr. Christian Schwarz-Schilling. As International Mediator he placed a particular emphasis on increasing dialogue. Through review, critique and the evolution of his extensive experience as a mediator, the methodology of Integrative Mediation was developed. It brings together several elements of conflict resolution at the local level in a comprehensive approach. Integrative Mediation is the core of CSSP.

CSSP seeks to empower local individuals through tailored mediation processes. This includes providing local individuals with professional training in mediation, negotiation and problem solving techniques and skills, as well as offering expertise and assistance in resolving their conflicts. At the same time CSSP tries to strengthen professional mediation in its target areas to increase capacity and provide credible alternatives to conflict. The CSSP team firmly believes in and strives for building peace from the bottom up and strengthening a community's capacity to overcome its internal disagreements and to create a fertile ground for democratic (political, economic, and social) development.

The comprehensive approach to mediation includes various levels of responsibility, multiple actors, and a variety of techniques, drawing on classical mediation and developing holistic and decentralized processes. It combines five different core elements: Mediation, Consultation, Professional Training, Advocacy, and Research & Analysis. The elements are combined in various forms and situations to develop a holistic and individual process.

CSSP assists local actors to develop initiatives and to implement confidence-building measures which apply to their specific needs and circumstances. Overall Integrative Mediation endeavours to bring the general and hierarchical process of conflict resolution down to the local level by focusing on joint meetings, dialogue, confidence-building and experience sharing.

CSSP does not seek to replace or remove ownership of the peace process. Instead, Integrative Mediation complements the work of those already in the field. The main aim is to leave decisions and solutions in the hands of local actors.

For further information contact:

John D. Etchemendy (Author)

CSSProject for Integrative Mediation, e.V.
Schiffbauerdamm 15
10117 Berlin
Germany

researcher@cssproject.org
www.cssproject.org
tel: +49 30 4000 6510
fax: +49 30 4000 6521