

Deployable Mission Headquarters. A number of technical working groups were established to refine plans and proposals to improve logistics, administration, financing, sustainability and strategic lift.⁴¹

The United Nations Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, otherwise known as the Committee of 34, also continued to meet each spring to consider new requirements and forward related recommendations to the wider membership through the General Assembly. Over the past decade, the Committee expanded beyond the traditional troop contributors to include representation from a core of approximately 110 member states. Although the Committee hardly represents a vanguard of new thinking on peacekeeping, it provides an important consultative forum for discussing proposals and generating the base of consensus necessary to implement changes.⁴² Rapid deployment featured prominently in their recent reports with strong endorsements of both standby arrangements and the rapid deployment mission headquarters.⁴³

Limitations of the FORD

The FORD is now dormant. Political controversy and official neglect diminished the momentum of the 'Friends', the Special Committee on Peacekeeping and, to a lesser extent, the Secretariat.⁴⁴ The 'Friends' have yet to decide whether they will re-convene. They did not meet in 1998 or 1999. A promising, albeit contentious process stalled. Despite having secured a relatively broad base of international support, it is apparent that the consultative process of the 'Friends' could have been more thorough. Several representatives of the non-aligned movement, including a few of the larger troop-contributing member states, were annoyed at having been excluded. In October 1996, for example, Pakistani ambassador Ahmad Kamal said that he "supported the concept of a rapid deployment headquarters team but was concerned at the action of a self-appointed group of 'Friends of Rapid Reaction' operating without legitimacy, and having half-baked ideas developed without broad consultations with the countries most concerned".⁴⁵ In turn, the Friends' agenda would be delayed as some members of the non-aligned movement (NAM) challenged specific arrangements. As the NAM included 132 member states, they had the potential to limit progress on several related reforms. Within the Special Committee on Peacekeeping dissension arose over equitable representation in the RDMHQ and the wider use of gratis personnel within DPKO. Some member