

Some humanitarian agency participants noted the need to exercise caution in extending the use of the “humanitarian” label to cover a military mission with significant political ramifications. The lines distinguishing the military and humanitarian agencies can become blurred, exposing the humanitarian workers to very real physical danger. Seminar participants agreed that military missions, and the success or failure thereof, should be defined in terms of clearly understood military goals in a political context, rather than humanitarian objectives. In the case of ensuring security in refugee camps, this may be related to preventing direct external armed attacks, raids by rebel groups, or separating out combatants.

Upon reaching a common understanding of the capabilities and limitations of the organizations represented, seminar participants were better able to understand the problems and challenges faced by these actors. Participants concluded that in order to bridge the gap in operational cultures and perspectives, and in order to achieve a more integrated approach to camp security, better coordination and information sharing on both an inter-agency and a bilateral basis would be required. In this context, it was noted that coherent measures can only be effective if they are based on a common understanding of the context and problems which they intend to address, and of the mandates and roles of the various actors involved. Most participants observed that such measures would require an integrated, multi-disciplinary approach to refugee camp security at all levels.

Seminar participants observed the need to be more pro-active when addressing insecurity in refugee camps as a means of contributing to regional and international security. In this context, participants identified activities that international security

forces could undertake in support of such objectives. From a purely political perspective, it was acknowledged that any decision to deploy international military forces would depend a great deal on generating sufficient political will among troop contributing countries. While such activities would be primarily geared toward buttressing host capacities, concerns about state sovereignty may also need to be addressed.

From a military perspective, representatives stressed that the deployment of international military forces to insecure refugee camp environments would likely be an exceptional measure or a measure of last resort, and would need to focus on their value-added, as other organizations or institutions, such as the police or private security firms, may be better placed to fulfil some (or all) of these roles. At the same time, it was noted that in some instances, the presence on the ground of military forces could act as a deterrent, and may possibly increase the level of accountability of local forces and thereby enhance civilian protection. Seminar participants clearly distinguished between the types of threats encountered in and around refugee camp environments, emphasizing the value-added of the military would be on external threats to refugee camps, while police were better placed to deal with those threats experienced internally.

Ultimately, participants suggested that the operationalization of international military engagement to insecure camp environments will be tempered by certain key military principles, such as the need for a **clear and enforceable mandate**, as well as certain essential operational considerations, including the **size, training and equipment of the force** (or individuals) to be deployed, a defined **concept of operations** and **clear rules of engagement**. Deployment of military forces would be further guided by **political interests** (strategic interest, media