

**Pakistan's answers to the
Guiding questions for the open call for contributions for
Review of all forms of peace operations**

Q1: What are the main challenges confronting peace operations today and what challenges are expected to be faced by peace operations in the future?

Answer: United Nations peace operations today confront a rapidly evolving and complex global landscape. From protracted intra-state conflicts to regional spillovers and transnational threats, the demands placed on peace operations have expanded. **Geopolitical frictions** increasingly hinder coherent decision-making at the Security Council, resulting in lack of authorizations of new missions, ambiguous and ambitious mandates, and uneven political support. The **resource constraints and financial crisis** present a grave threat to peace operations. At the same time, the existing missions are often tasked with **ambitious mandates without corresponding resources**, leaving peacekeepers to operate under increasingly constrained conditions. Lack of progress for political pressures/political solutions is also a major challenge confronting peace operations.

2. The security environment has also become more fragmented. Armed groups today are frequently decentralized, with no clear command structures or political agendas. The **proliferation of non-state actors**, often interwoven with organized criminal networks, and the growing use of **information warfare and digital disinformation** further complicate the operational landscape. These factors strain the ability of peace operations to maintain impartiality and build trust with local populations.

3. A growing number of peacekeeping contexts now involve **asymmetric threats** from terrorist groups, organized criminal networks, and transnational actors who challenge the conventional parameters of peacekeeping under Chapter VI or VII mandates. These threats are compounded by lack of unified political support by the Security Council, as geopolitical rivalries hinder timely and unified decisions. In parallel, the **weaponization of new technologies** and use of IEDs and drones have created new problems for the safety and security of the peacekeepers.

4. Looking ahead, peace operations will need to contend with a far more unpredictable and volatile environment. The weaponization of emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence, surveillance tools, and cyber capabilities, will present

both operational risks and rules of engagement dilemmas. The struggle over access to and **exploitation of critical natural resources**, often taking place in fragile or contested regions, presents another challenge for the peacekeeping. These trends are likely to be exacerbated by worsening geopolitical rivalries and increasingly assertive actions by malign state and non-state actors who seek to undermine UN missions, discredit their legitimacy, or manipulate them for personal gains. In such an environment, the resilience, impartiality, and adaptability of traditional peacekeeping will remain vital to protecting vulnerable populations and containing instability.

Q2: How could United Nations peace operations adapt in response to current and future challenges (e.g. in terms of political and substantive work, mandates, operational and administrative requirements, and capacities)?

Answer: To remain effective in today's rapidly evolving conflict landscape, United Nations peace operations must adapt with a careful balance: **preserving their core principles** and traditional strengths, while evolving operationally to address new threats and demands. Pakistan believes that peacekeeping must not be redefined so extensively that it loses the very characteristics that have made it a trusted and stabilizing presence for over seven decades. The fundamental principles of consent, impartiality, and use of force as authorized by the Security Council must remain the normative and operational anchor of all UN peace operations.

2. Further, **the primacy of politics** must guide every peace operation. Missions do not substitute political processes, but serve to enable them. Peacekeeping missions provide essential space, protection, and credibility to pursue political solutions. Even in the absence of a full-fledged peace process, peacekeeping operations play a vital role in protecting civilians, monitoring ceasefires, facilitating humanitarian access, and deterring further escalation. By providing a secure and impartial presence, they help preserve the space for political solutions to eventually take root. Political processes should accompany peacekeeping missions. But peacekeeping missions must also be deployed to prevent escalation of the conflict and atrocity crimes against civilians – the protection of civilian principle was incorporated after learning hard lessons from Rwanda and Srebrenica. Those lessons should not be forgotten.

3. While preserving what is important, adaptation of peace operations is necessary. We make following suggestions:

- i. First, **mandates must be realistic, prioritized, and context-specific.** Overburdening missions with expansive and sometimes contradictory responsibilities weakens their focus and credibility. Mandates should be grounded and tailored in line with local conditions.
- ii. Second, the **safety and security of peacekeepers** must be paramount. The increasing threats posed by IEDs, surveillance drones, cyberattacks, and other weaponized technologies demand enhanced focus on the safety and security of peacekeepers. This includes timely intelligence, mobility, and protective equipment to match evolving risks. Operational and administrative capacities must also be strengthened to address and counter modern threats. Peacekeeping missions today require improved mobility, intelligence capabilities, situational awareness tools, and digital resilience. The weaponization of technology and the rise of disinformation campaigns necessitate not only technical upgrades but also investment in community engagement, public information, and strategic communications. Pakistan urges greater investment in these areas, while also cautioning against over-reliance on technology at the expense of human interaction and trust-building with communities.
- iii. Third, **adaptation must be inclusive.** Troop- and police-contributing countries bring a wealth of experience from the field, and yet their perspectives are often underrepresented in mandate formulation, mission planning, and performance assessment. Pakistan strongly advocates for more structured and institutionalized engagement with T/PCCs, including during mission reviews, budget discussions, and transitions. Inclusive adaptation is not only a matter of fairness, but a practical necessity for more grounded and implementable mandates.
- iv. Fourth, **transitions** from peacekeeping to post-conflict settings must be responsibly managed. Too often, missions are withdrawn prematurely, reversing hard-won gains and creating dangerous vacuums. A conditions-based approach to drawdown, informed by local assessments and linked to peacebuilding support, is essential. Where required, peacebuilding should be integrated early into mission design — not added as an afterthought.
- v. Lastly, administrative reforms must support **operational agility.** Procurement processes, human resources frameworks, and mission support structures need to be more field-responsive and less centralized. Strengthening the UN's rapid

deployment capabilities, enhancing logistical resilience, and ensuring timely reimbursement to T/PCCs will improve both performance and morale.

4. In short, adaptation must not mean abandoning peacekeeping's traditional foundations. Rather, it must empower missions to operate with greater precision, agility, and support, while staying true to the values that have earned peacekeepers the trust of communities around the world.

Q3: What could United Nations peace operations be expected and mandated to do in the future? Under what conditions are United Nations peace operations least likely to be effective in achieving their objectives?

Answer: In the future, United Nations peace operations should focus on delivering well-defined, achievable tasks aligned with their established strengths. Peacekeeping should not be expected to solve all aspects of a conflict, but rather to create the enabling environment for political processes to take hold. Specifically, among other context specific mandates, peace operations should: (i) safeguard political space and reduce immediate threats to peace and security; (ii) protect civilians where mandated and feasible; and (iii) support the implementation of peace and ceasefire agreements.

2. Missions are least likely to succeed when they are assigned overly broad mandates, particularly those detached from political or operational realities on the ground. The misalignment between expectations and capabilities not only impairs delivery but also erodes credibility. Overloaded mandates also divert missions from their core stabilizing functions and make coordination with host states and communities more difficult.
3. Peace operations succeed when they are guided by a focused mandate, supported by sustained political backing - especially from the Security Council - and led by competent and experienced leadership. Transparent criteria for the selection of mission leadership and senior staff are essential to ensure accountability and operational coherence.
4. Peace operations work best when they are deployed with a clear purpose, in support of achievable objectives, and with the necessary political and operational tools to carry them out. Ensuring these conditions will be essential to maintaining their relevance in a more volatile and unpredictable future.

Q4: What could be the role of partnerships, with regional organizations, international financial institutions, or other actors, in future United Nations peace operations? What are the opportunities and challenges presented by partnerships, and what principles should underpin them?

Answer: Partnerships with regional and sub-regional organizations will be an essential element of effective and responsive UN peace operations in the future. Given the growing complexity and regionalization of many conflicts, regional actors such as African Union, European Union, Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and others - are often well-placed to support or complement UN efforts through their contextual knowledge, proximity, and political leverage. However, such partnerships must be grounded in the principles of the UN Charter, and designed to reinforce - not replace - the legitimacy, impartiality, and political oversight that are the hallmark of UN peace operations.

2. Security Council Resolution 2719 is a landmark step in strengthening UN-AU cooperation. It provides a framework for African Union-led peace operations to be supported with UN-assessed contributions under Security Council mandates. Pakistan supports the effective implementation of this resolution and sees value in developing the operational readiness and logistical capabilities of African regional forces for such deployments. This should be pursued in a way that builds local capacity, improves regional response mechanisms, and complements - rather than competes with - the role of traditional UN peacekeeping.

3. In this regard, major Troop- and Police-Contributing Countries, including Pakistan, can play a constructive role in supporting regional capacity-building initiatives through training, logistics, and planning support - particularly under UN coordination. The goal must be to create a more effective and integrated global peacekeeping architecture, while preserving the central role of the UN and its tested mechanisms for oversight, performance, and accountability.

4. At the same time, unstructured or ad hoc partnerships may risk fragmentation, duplication of efforts, or political confusion on the ground. It is therefore essential that all partnerships remain anchored in a **clear normative framework, underpinned by**

legality, predictability of roles, and mutual accountability. The United Nations must retain its leadership in peace operations, and partnerships should be carefully calibrated to uphold this role.

5. In sum, Pakistan supports deeper and more structured partnerships - particularly with regional organizations - as long as they uphold UN Charter principles, complement multilateral efforts, and contribute to the collective goal of maintaining international peace and security.

Q5: Please share any additional observations that may benefit the Review.

Answer: Looking ahead, the credibility and future relevance of United Nations peace operations will depend not only on how they are mandated or resourced, but also on whether they are equipped to respond to the evolving global peace and security landscape. The growing use of disinformation, weaponized technologies, artificial intelligence, and cyber tools by armed actors presents challenges that peace operations must be prepared to confront. This requires investments in strategic foresight, digital situational awareness, and context-sensitive training across all mission components.

2. The question of relevance must be addressed not by retreating from peacekeeping, but by investing in its renewal. While financial constraints are real, peacekeeping remains one of the most cost-efficient tools available to the international community for maintaining peace and security. The reluctance to deploy new missions where conditions demand international presence risks creating avoidable humanitarian and security vacuums.

3. Pakistan reiterates the importance of inclusive decision-making. T/PCCs must be meaningfully consulted not only at the operational level but also at the strategic and policy-making stages. The governance of peace operations must reflect the principle that peacekeeping is a collective enterprise. Yet, over time, decision-making on mandates, deployments, and mission adjustments has become increasingly centralized among Security Council with major donors playing important background role in Secretariat and mission leaderships, often leaving Troop- and Police-Contributing Countries without a meaningful role. This de facto division between those who fund and those who serve on the ground risks undermining the spirit of shared responsibility. Pakistan believes that the credibility, effectiveness, and fairness of peacekeeping can only be

sustained if all stakeholders - especially those who bear the operational and human costs - are fully involved in shaping mandates, evaluating performance, and designing reform. Inclusion of field-based perspectives improves mandate design, enhances credibility, and ensures that peacekeeping evolves with the support and ownership of those who implement it.

Part II:

Questions for Member States that are hosting United Nations peace operations or have hosted them in the past

Q6: From your national perspective, having hosted one or more United Nations peace operations, what are the most critical considerations and conditions for success?

Answer: In addition to being a longstanding troop and police contributing country, Pakistan is host to one of the first UN peacekeeping missions, the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP), which is mandated by the Security Council since 1949 to observe the ceasefire along the Line of Control in the disputed Jammu & Kashmir.

2. As both a major troop-contributing country and a host state, Pakistan brings a comprehensive perspective on peacekeeping. Our national experience highlights that the success of peace operations depends on their **credibility, consistency, and ability to function even in politically contested environments.**

3. One of the most important considerations is that peace operations must have a clear mandate, grounded in Security Council decisions, and be allowed to perform their assigned functions without obstruction. **Even where political conditions are complex, and host-state cooperation may vary, missions can retain significant value by acting as stabilizing presences and reducing the risk of escalation.** The presence of a UN mission in a monitoring or observer capacity often contributes to preventive diplomacy and helps create space for broader peace efforts.

4. Our experience has also shown that peace operations need adequate resources, modern equipment, and continuous unhindered access to fulfill their mandates effectively - especially when engaged in critical functions like monitoring ceasefires or

reporting violations. Freedom of movement and access are essential operational conditions that must be ensured for the credibility and functionality of any mission.

5. Moreover, the success of a mission is enhanced when the international community - particularly the Security Council - shows sustained political commitment to addressing the root causes of the conflicts.

6. It is important to recognize that the relevance of a peace operation is further enhanced by the complexity of its operating environment. UN presence mandated by the Security Council provides value by deterring the parties to the conflict, fostering transparency, and keeping open the possibility of engagement between parties. This reaffirms the broader principle that UN peacekeeping is not only about managing peace, but also about maintaining international legitimacy and preventing the escalation of unresolved disputes.

Q7: Based on your country's experience, what lessons learned should inform future United Nations peace operations?

Answer: Pakistan's experience as a host country underscores that nimble missions with focused mandates can provide a stabilizing presence and play a vital role in conflict prevention and restraint. Several lessons emerge that are broadly applicable to future peacekeeping missions.

- i. **Focused and clear mandates** are more effective in contested or politically sensitive settings. Narrow roles such as ceasefire monitoring, reporting, and confidence-building measures often prove more feasible than expansive mandates in complex Missions.
- ii. **Host-state cooperation is central to effective mission performance and sustainability.** In cases where missions are mandated by the Security Council to serve broader international peace and security objectives—particularly in protracted or disputed contexts—full cooperation by parties becomes ever more important as it is also part of their responsibility. The Security Council bears the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, and missions operating under its authority must be allowed to function with neutrality, access, and protection.

- iii. **Political neutrality enhances credibility.** Peace operations must be perceived as impartial to maintain trust among parties. At the same time, host states must refrain from politicizing missions or selectively cooperating with them.
- iv. **Long-term deployments-** even with limited authority - can reduce risks of escalation and foster restraint between conflicting parties. Preventive presence, when backed by political support, can act as a deterrent and signal continued international commitment.
- v. **Balanced access must be ensured.** Peace operations must not be constrained by the selective cooperation of one party. International oversight and support may be required to ensure operational symmetry and integrity.
- vi. **Security of UN personnel** is non-negotiable. Even in high-tension contexts, host states must uphold their responsibility to protect UN staff and provide freedom of movement in line with agreed mandates.
- vii. **Symbolism matters.** In unresolved disputes or frozen conflicts, the presence of a UN mission - however limited - can help maintain visibility, promote transparency, and keep open avenues for dialogue and diplomacy.

Q8: What positive and/or negative examples can you share in terms of how current or past United Nations peace operations have implemented their mandates in, or related to, your country/context?

Answer: Pakistan draws several overarching lessons from the varied experiences of UN peace operations worldwide, illustrating both successes and pitfalls that inform how future missions can be more effective and resilient. **The key is that every mission is unique and mission design should be done on case-to-case basis.** A one-size-fit-all approach should be avoided. In our case we have learnt that some lessons may be true for some missions but they may not work in the context of UNMOGIP and vice versa.

1. Successes Anchored in Clear Mission Design and Local Engagement

- i. **Mozambique (ONUMOZ)** demonstrated how stability, disarmament, and democratic transition could be achieved through a mission structured with clear, phased objectives, flexible implementation, and thorough consultation with local parties.

- ii. **East Timor (UNTAET)** reflects how a UN mission can administer interim governance, oversee institution-building, and facilitate successful independence when granted a clear mandate, inclusive political and civil engagement, and international backing.
- iii. **Central America (Guatemala's MINUGUA, El Salvador's ONUSAL)** exemplified effective post-conflict peacebuilding through verification and reconciliation, spurring confidence in public institutions and supporting long-term peace.

2. Challenges Undermining Mission Success

- i. **Rwanda (UNAMIR)** tragically showed that inadequate mandates, delayed reinforcement, and lack of political will result in catastrophic failure - even when early warnings are evident. Similarly, the genocide in Srebrenica and failure of peacekeeping mission there have important lessons. The mandates of Protection of Civilians emerged out of these tragedies. However, we now see a backsliding on the lessons learnt from these tragedies and limited resources are often cited for lack of action.
- ii. **Somalia (UNOSOM II)** revealed how complex mandates, mission overreach and deep entanglement in conflict dynamics can lead to backlash, violence, human rights violations, and ultimate mission failure.
- iii. In **eastern DRC (MONUSCO)** the premature withdrawal from South Kivu left significant protection gaps for civilians. M23 took over the area and DRC government changed its position on withdrawal of MONUSCO from North Kivu, highlighting the importance of planned transitions done for right reasons.
- iv. In **Mali**, the mission was considered in-effective because of the deteriorating security and political situation eroding confidence in the mission's ability to maintain peace - and private militias filled the gap. Highlighting risks posed by private militia and mercenaries and gap between host country expectation versus reality.

Key Lessons for Future Peace Operations

- i. **Strategic Focus & Realism:** Design missions with well/clearly defined, realistic mandates matched to local conditions.
- ii. **Host-State Trust & Autonomy:** Secure meaningful host-state cooperation—as seen in Mozambique and East Timor—but recognize that UN Council mandates may remain necessary in politically complex cases.
- iii. **Early, Preventive Deployment:** Even minimal international presence can deter escalation and foster stability.
- iv. **Adequate Support and Clear Exit Planning:** Missions must be backed by sustained political will, sufficient resources, and cohesive exit strategies linked to resolution of conflicts.
- v. **Flexible, Contextual Adaptation:** Missions must evolve with conflict dynamics while resisting mission creep or overextension.
- vi. **Accountability and Humanitarian Safeguards:** Risks of human rights violations or operational failures—as in Somalia and Rwanda—must be mitigated through clear accountability and robust rules of engagement.

Part III

Questions for current and former Troop- and Police-Contributing Countries

Q9: What factors shaped your country's decision to become a T/PCC to United Nations peace operations? What factors and considerations will determine whether your country will remain an active T/PCCs in future United Nations peace operations?

Answer: Pakistan's decision to serve as a Troop- and Police-Contributing Country (T/PCC) flows from its unwavering commitment to the United Nations Charter and to the principles of multilateralism. This commitment was articulated early on by Pakistan's founding leadership and has been consistently upheld through our active engagement with the United Nations for over seven decades. Our contributions to peacekeeping reflect a core belief in the value of international cooperation to promote peace, development, and security for all.

2. Support for United Nations peacekeeping remains a central pillar of Pakistan's foreign policy and a vital expression of its support for the collective security framework established by the United Nations. Pakistan regards peacekeeping as one of the UN's most effective and visible success stories - a testament to what multilateralism can achieve when supported with political will and professionalism.

3. A key enabling factor behind Pakistan's sustained contributions is the professionalism, discipline, and operational excellence of our armed forces. Pakistani peacekeepers have consistently distinguished themselves through courage, empathy, and impartial service in diverse and often high-risk environments around the world. Our deployments have been motivated not by strategic interests, but by a principled desire to serve humanity and contribute to international peace and stability.

4. Looking ahead, Pakistan's continued engagement as a T/PCC will be guided by several factors: the integrity of the peacekeeping model based on the three core principles (consent, impartiality, and non-use of force except in self-defense or defense of the mandate); meaningful participation of T/PCCs in decision-making; merit based selection of peacekeepers and adequate investment in the safety, training, and equipment

of peacekeepers. The sustainability and credibility of peacekeeping depend on recognizing the value that T/PCCs bring—not only in terms of personnel, but in operational experience, local engagement, and on-the-ground insights that are critical to mission success.

5. Pakistan stands ready to continue playing its part in supporting the UN's peacekeeping efforts—as long as those efforts are firmly anchored in Charter principles, driven by genuine political purpose, and implemented with equity, professionalism, and accountability.

Q10: How would you assess the degree to which your views as a T/PCC were, or are, taken into consideration with regard to the mandates of United Nations peace operations and their implementation?

Answer: As one of the longest-serving and most consistent Troop- and Police-Contributing Countries (T/PCCs), Pakistan brings decades of operational experience to the table. Yet, like many other major T/PCCs, we have long observed a disconnect between the contributions made on the ground and the influence afforded in strategic and mandate-related decisions. Too often, T/PCCs are informed of mandates after they are finalized, rather than being genuinely consulted during their formulation and various stages such as mandate formulation, mission planning, rules of engagement, and leadership appointments.

2. While initiatives—such as the triangular consultations among the Security Council, the Secretariat, and T/PCCs—have aimed to enhance engagement, these mechanisms remain largely procedural and need to evolve into platforms for meaningful dialogue. The current configuration has unfortunately led to a growing perception that peacekeeping has been bifurcated between those who fund and those who serve—between "mandate drafters" and "mandate implementers." This artificial division is counterproductive to the collective nature of UN peacekeeping.

3. T/PCCs are not merely providers of personnel; they are partners in the success of peace operations. Their views should be systematically included at all stages—mandate design, mission planning, performance evaluation, and transitions. Consultations must go beyond token representation and allow T/PCCs to share lessons learned, raise operational concerns, and contribute to realistic, context-specific mandates.

4. Pakistan believes that the legitimacy, credibility, and effectiveness of peace operations would be significantly enhanced by adopting a more inclusive and consultative approach. Only when those who implement the mandates are genuinely part of the decision-making process can the full potential of UN peacekeeping be realized.

Q11: From your perspective as a T/PCC, what are the most pressing challenges confronting the United Nations peace operations that you are involved in?

Answer: From Pakistan's perspective as a major Troop- and Police-Contributing Country (T/PCC), the challenges confronting United Nations peace operations today are both operational and political — reflecting a more fragmented global environment and increasingly complex threat landscape.

2. Foremost among these is the **rising threat to peacekeepers in high-risk environments**, where volatile security conditions, asymmetric warfare, and the weaponization of emerging technologies — including drones and IEDs — have drastically increased risks. The **safety and security of UN peacekeepers** must remain a top priority, especially as many missions operate with outdated equipment, insufficient intelligence capacities, and limited force protection measures. Specialized training, enhanced protective technologies, and robust host-state guarantees are essential to mitigate these risks.

3. Secondly, **peacekeeping mandates have become overly ambitious and at times politicized**, expanding beyond achievable limits and often lacking clear sequencing or prioritization. These expansive mandates are sometimes detached from the realities on the ground and risk overstressing mission capacities. They may also undermine mission credibility when political solutions are not forthcoming. Peacekeeping should not be burdened with tasks better suited to other UN entities or imposed without adequate political backing and resource commitments.

4. Third, the **persistent lack of consultation and representation of T/PCCs** in key strategic decisions continues to undermine mission planning and effectiveness. Despite contributing the majority of personnel and operating at the frontlines, T/PCCs like Pakistan are often excluded from meaningful participation in mandate formulation, rules of engagement, and senior leadership appointments. This imbalance of responsibility

and authority weakens both accountability and ownership in the peacekeeping enterprise.

5. Fourth, the **politicization of peace operations and lack of viable political processes** have created a disconnect between mandates and ground realities. While Pakistan supports the pursuit of political solutions, it is concerned by the growing tendency to question the relevance of peacekeeping in the absence of an active political track. Experience shows that peacekeeping can help create the stability and space necessary for political processes to evolve.

6. Finally, **evolving conflict dynamics have exposed growing capacity gaps** in peace operations. There is a pressing need for **specialized pre-deployment and in-mission training**, not just in conventional peacekeeping tactics, but in dealing with asymmetric threats, protection of civilians, and civil-military engagement. Additionally, missions require **technology upgrades** to enhance situational awareness and mobility. Greater **integration with humanitarian and development actors** is also needed, especially in contexts of protracted instability, to support long-term peacebuilding and resilience.

7. Pakistan believes that addressing these interlinked challenges requires political resolve, adequate financing, adherence to UN principles, and a rebalanced peacekeeping partnership that fully includes the views and capacities of T/PCCs.

Q12: Based on your experience deploying peacekeepers, what capabilities and support would be needed for deployments in the future?

Answer: Drawing on decades of operational experience, Pakistan believes that future peacekeeping deployments must be guided by realism, readiness, and relevance. As the nature of conflicts evolves, so too must the capabilities and support systems underpinning UN peace operations.

2. First, the **merit-based selection of troops** remains the foundation of effective deployments. Troop quality, professionalism, and preparedness are essential to both credibility and mission success. Pakistan ensures that only the best-trained personnel, with proven discipline and commitment to UN values, are deployed.

3. Second, Future gender parity strategy should aim to systematically increase the participation, retention, and leadership of women in peacekeeping operations through a

comprehensive, institutionalized approach. This includes setting clear national targets aligned with UN gender parity strategy, reforming recruitment and training systems to encourage greater female participation in police and military roles. Pakistan is creating enabling environment for women back home and in mission areas. Moreover, Pakistan advocates that gender parity strategy should promote women's inclusion in decision-making and command roles, strengthen partnerships with UN agencies & regional actors to support female deployments, and establish monitoring mechanisms to track progress with a view to address systemic barriers. By prioritizing both quantitative and qualitative aspects of gender inclusion, Pakistan will enhance its contributions to UN peacekeeping while advancing broader goals of gender equality and operational effectiveness.

4. Third, the **advance provision of modern technology and equipment** is critical. Missions must be equipped with surveillance tools, secure communications, mobility assets, and counter-IED capabilities to operate effectively in high-threat and complex terrains. **Technology support must be tailored to counter asymmetric threats**, including those posed by non-state actors and the weaponization of drones and cyber tools.

5. Fourth, **training must be enhanced across the peacekeeping lifecycle**. This includes robust pre-deployment training, in-mission scenario-based refreshers, and modules focused on civil-military coordination, human rights, and local cultural understanding. Specialized skillsets — such as engineering, medical, EOD, gender protection, and forensic analysis — should be institutionalized across missions.

6. Fifth, the UN must prioritize **rapid deployment readiness** through standing arrangements, pre-positioned equipment, and strategic lift capabilities. Delays in deployment often result in missed opportunities to prevent escalation and secure political space.

7. Sixth, **troop welfare and psychological resilience** are vital. Missions must include proper medical support, stress management mechanisms, and systems for family contact. Post-deployment reintegration and mental health support must also be prioritized.

8. Seventh, Pakistan emphasizes the need for **stronger strategic and political coordination**. Peacekeepers cannot succeed in a vacuum. Political solutions must guide operations, and Security Council unity must back mandates with credibility and

consistency. Coordination with humanitarian and development actors can also enhance coherence without blurring mandates.

9. In sum, future deployments must be driven by professional excellence, adaptive capabilities, and integrated planning. With proper support and inclusive planning, peacekeeping can remain one of the UN's most valuable tools for maintaining international peace and security.