



## IGAD – Paper Tiger facing Gigantic Tasks

Ulf Terlinden

Berlin, February 2004

*The “Intergovernmental Authority on Development” (IGAD) has been operating as a revitalized regional organization in the Horn of Africa since 1996. Its member states are Ethiopia, Djibouti, Kenya, Uganda, Sudan, Somalia, and, since 1993, Eritrea. IGAD is not a typical regional organization. It lacks vital characteristics like a progressing political integration worth mentioning, institutionalization of an executive authority with regional competences, establishment of its own legislative and judicative institutions, a legally binding foundation, and a clear vision of its future development. In addition, the creation of an economic area with a common internal market is not intended. However, IGAD has established itself as a crucial political forum in the Horn of Africa providing a framework for the most essential peace-building efforts of the region.*

### **1. Development, structure, and background of the regional organization**

#### **1.1 From IGADD to IGAD**

In 1986, the precursor of today’s IGAD, the “Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development” (IGADD), was founded. Its six member states, complemented by Eritrea in 1993, initially aimed at the creation of an early warning mechanism for humanitarian emergencies. Early detection of recurring droughts, and timely alarming and mobilization of the international community were the primary supportive tasks of IGADD.

The organization was predominantly concerned with matters of drought, desertification, and food security. With this mandate, however, IGADD rather led a shadowy existence until, in 1995, on the initiative of the Kenyan President Moi, a “revitalization process” started and changed the mandate profoundly.

From 1996, the reformed IGAD dedicated itself to a broad spectrum of subjects: by promoting food security, joint development strategies, sustainable environment management, regional infrastructure development, cooperation in science, peace, security, inter-regional trade, and improving communication and

infrastructure, the aim was to deepen regional cooperation and economic integration. However, the strongest motivation for the revitalization of IGAD was the need to find regional strategies for the resolution of the numerous inter- and intra-state conflicts. This was of vital interest for Kenya as a host country of huge groups of refugees from Somalia and Sudan. Apart from this, President Moi, in his role as a neutral, statesman-like mediator, was clever enough to use the IGAD process to make his country and himself internationally presentable again after the withdrawal of IMF and World Bank. The Sudanese government, on the other hand, participated in the IGAD peace process, obviously expecting to benefit from the support of those former rebel movements they had assisted in taking over power in Eritrea and Ethiopia. This, however, turned out to be an erroneous expectation.

The IGAD revitalization was also accompanied by the expectation of raising considerable funds for regional infrastructure projects through such joint activities. Although this hope has not yet materialized, it made sure at the time, that all states of the region wanted to participate even if IGAD as such, like in Uganda, was not considered important.

Together with peace keeping and infrastructure, emphasis was put on food security.

## **1.2 IGAD Profile**

IGAD is not based on a treaty of the member states under international law but only on an agreement of the participating governments, reached in March 1996. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government is the supreme organ and ultimate decision-making power of IGAD, meeting once a year. It allocates the revolving IGAD

chairmanship and determines the political guidelines for the sub-organs and the IGAD Secretariat by consensus, with special attention to conflict management.

One level below, the Council of Foreign Ministers and another IGAD-designated ministry respectively works under supervision of the Assembly. Ambassadors of the member states accredited to the IGAD headquarters in Djibouti advise the Secretariat on the realization of its work plan approved by the Council of Ministers. It is worth mentioning that the ministers and ambassadors can take decisions by two third majorities.

Apart from these defined bodies, IGAD establishes ad-hoc committees on demand to deal with special issues like the present conflict management in Somalia.

The Secretariat is the executive body for the decisions of the Assembly and the Council. It is headed by the IGAD Executive Secretary, presently Dr Attalla Hamad Bashir from Sudan. The Secretariat supports the promotion of regional cooperation on behalf of the member states. It has three divisions, one each in the areas of political and humanitarian affairs, economic cooperation, and agriculture and environment. Furthermore, there is a "Women's Desk" (funded by UNIFEM), the department for fund raising, and a documentation centre.

Considering the Secretariat's limited capacity of twenty-four employees and a budget of approximately three million US Dollars per year, the thematic mandate of the regional organization is extremely broad. Large projects, like satellite-supported early assessment of food production and environmental trends, regional cereal trade, and household energy consumption are on-going. If used at all, most of the intended cooperation areas, however, have only generated small projects like

the project for the improvement of disaster management. Many of the project descriptions rather summarize sporadic activities or outline pending petitions, for example, the pilot programme on reintegration and rehabilitation of returnees and internally displaced persons, or the pilot programme on the removal of landmines.

Among all IGAD activities, three initiatives seem to be of primary interest: the peace process „projects“ for Sudan and Somalia, and the Conflict Early Warning and Early Response Mechanism (CEWARN project). The establishment of secretariats for each project in Nairobi and Addis Ababa, and the set-up of an exclusive IGAD peace fund for mediation in Sudan and Somalia, underlines the significance of these projects. The important role of IGAD in this area demonstrates that the political dimension of the regional organization by far exceeds its “technical“ relevance in supporting and implementing development processes. Therefore, Section 2 will cover Sudan, Somalia, and CEWARN in greater detail.

The eye-catching dominance of conflict management reflects, to some extent, the motivational background of the IGAD reform: the member states honoured only this field of cooperation with an exclusive Article (18A) in the foundation agreement. However, this Article is not more than a declaration of intent for a collective security policy and peaceful, sub-regional conflict resolution. The dominance of conflict resolution activities in the IGAD practice also results from its failure in other fields. Especially the improvement of economic cooperation in the region is lacking in results. Following a 2002 report, there are not even data on it. On the institutional level, IGAD represents the region as one pillar of the African Economic

Community to the African Union (AU). On the other hand, the recently initiated negotiations on an economic partnership agreement with the EU are not held in the IGAD but in the COMESA format (REPA-Eastern and Southern Africa Group).

### **1.3 Deficits**

One reason for existing deficits is the Secretariat's inefficient acquisition of donor funds. Great efforts have only been made for infrastructure projects. In 1996, already, the heads of government adopted a list of eight projects with a total of roughly half a billion US Dollars, however, not a single one has been implemented yet.

Essential reasons for the donor community's hesitation are ineffective project implementation by the Secretariat, weak management, and limited skills of staff seconded by the member states. These factors combine with a partial lack of commitment to reform. Under such circumstances, it is even difficult for the technical consultants, delegated by GTZ and European Commission, to produce measurable improvements in the organizational structure. A model for restructuring the Secretariat, meanwhile developed with support of a business consultancy, will be presented to the IGAD ministerial summit in March 2004.

Striking deficits are also apparent in the relation between Secretariat and member states. Most IGAD projects are disconnected from the level of the member states, which neither participate in the development and implementation nor in the services of these projects. In addition, the member states have hardly responded to the insufficient capacity of the IGAD Secretariat with efforts of their own aiming at improvement. Quite on the contrary. Activities in the mid nineties

to improve the capacity of the national "Focal Points" by means of technical assistance came to nothing: equipment provided was misappropriated, trained personnel transferred, and the tasks of the Focal Points neglected. Furthermore, harmonization of policies in the defined fields of cooperation is neither really wanted nor politically promoted.

The low priority attributed to IGAD by the member states is also reflected in the defaulting payment of dues. At the Khartoum Summit in 2000, the IGAD Executive Secretary pointed out that, theoretically, pursuant to the sanctions regarding defaulting payment of dues stipulated in Article 14 of the agreement, the right to vote would have to be immediately suspended for all member states, except Eritrea. At least, this situation has partially improved in the meantime.

#### **1.4 Social Dimension**

Since the 8th IGAD Summit in 2000, the formation of a social dimension of the IGAD process as a complement to IGAD's own structures and bodies has been pushed ahead. As a first step, the IGAD Business Forum was established. It has already met twice with participation of Chambers of Commerce and enterprises. Next step, in July 2003, was the founding assembly of the IGAD Civil Society Forum, designated to improve cooperation as well among NGOs located in the region as among NGOs and IGAD. Both fora are not embodied in the IGAD founding treaty.

At present, the creation of an inter-parliamentary union (IGAD Parliamentary Unit) in the IGAD region represents the third and most important component in its start-up period. The initiative originating in Djibouti has been fully backed mainly by Ethiopia and Sudan. The founding

protocol, elaborated by a group of lawyers with the assistance of the Secretariat, has been presented to the Speakers of the member states' parliaments for approval. The IGAD Parliamentary Unit will be composed of 28 Members of Parliament, with four members per country to be nominated by the national Speakers. The latter will probably form the supreme body of the assembly, whose precise functions and competences are not yet known. Primary goal is strengthening inter-parliamentary cooperation, not least to improve common parliamentary practice. The institution will not have legislative quality, yet, it may foster the founding and structuring of a regional legal community in the long run.

The inauguration of the assembly is expected for spring 2004. Addis Abeba was chosen as the preliminary seat of the assembly in May 2003. The final decision on the seat is a sensitive issue, since the seat of the Union is likely to become seat of a potential future IGAD Parliament. Ethiopia shows particular interest to host this parliament because it is also competing for the seat of the African Union Parliament.

#### **1.5 International Partners**

Since 1997, IGAD has been striving for the establishment of formal relations with its international donors and supportive governments. In joint action with the IGAD Secretariat, the former "Friends of IGAD" were organised in the "Joint IGAD Partners Forum" (JIPF), presently embracing Italy (co-chair), Belgium, Denmark, Germany, France, Greece, Great Britain, Ireland, Japan, Canada, the Netherlands, Norway, Austria, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, the USA, the European Commission, UNDP and the World Bank as members.

The JIPF serves both as political forum for consultation, with sub-committees on Sudan and Somalia, and for integrating donors in the development process of the regional organization. JIPF's functioning is not yet satisfactory. The international partners find it extremely difficult to define common political positions. By any means, most of the partner governments are not accompanying this process with due commitment, and delegate their participation in JIPF meetings from the minister to the ambassador (to Addis Abeba) level. This criticism targets the German foreign policy in the first place. Till Summer 2003, the German Embassy in Yemen has been responsible for IGAD for a long time but permanently delegated its participation to the Addis Abeba Embassy which then joined the JIPF meetings without a mandate of its own. In addition, Germany did not show strong diplomatic commitment in the peace process of Sudan and Somalia.

IGAD itself is not satisfied with the performance of JIPF because the partner governments do not provide funds to the expected extent. The biggest financial supporters of IGAD are the EU (up-to-date approx. 24 mio Euro), USAID (up-to-date 3,5 mio USD), and Italy (approx. 3-4 mio USD). The German project on IGAD's consultative support had an input of approx. 10 mio. Euro since 1990. At present, approximately 800,000 Euro are made available per year. In addition, 1,3 mio Euro were raised from Germany's Anti-Terror package and humanitarian aid (in 2002).

## 1.6 Perspectives

In 2002, a new IGAD strategy has been initiated according to which the organization will focus on four strategic outputs in the future:

- a) Political dialogue, development and integration;
- b) Compilation and dissemination of development related information;
- c) Capacity building;
- d) Support of research and technology development.

With this step, the strategy draws the consequences of the far-reaching failure of IGAD as a project implementing organization. From now on, policy-related subjects shall have supreme priority. Most of the infrastructure projects are referred back to the responsibility of the member states and IGAD shall only play a supportive role.

At the IGAD Summit of the Heads of Government and State in Kampala in October 2003, a five-year implementation plan was adopted together with the strategy, formulating ambitious goals foremost regarding fund raising activities and volume: until 2008, the annual regional funds shall be increased to 4,5 mio US Dollars per year, generated in the region. IGAD would like to have this amount complemented by donor funds amounting to additional 9 mio US Dollars per year.

Parallel to this planning process, generated mainly by the Secretariat, the same summit adopted the "Future Vision for Integration and Regional Security", designed in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sudan. This document envisages ambitious institution building, incl. an IGAD Bank, a Regional Parliament, a Court of Justice, a Central Bank, a Human Rights Centre, and a Centre for Gender Studies. One further goal is the realization of freedom of movement and trade.

These intentions seem to be unrealistic, especially against the evolutionary background of the "Vision" and with regard to the absence of

concrete plans for its implementation. If the vision document is not destined to vanish instantly in oblivion, it may provoke new discussions about a stronger institutionalization of IGAD and a consolidation of cooperation. By no means, however, does it imply the planned or real development of IGAD in the near future. Instead, with a high degree of probability, the initiated focussing process described in the above mentioned IGAD strategy, will determine the essential development lines of the regional organization.

### **1.7 Background: IGAD as Organization of “hostile brothers“**

The primary reason for the poor institutionalization and the limited success of IGAD resides in the initial situation of political integration processes in the Horn of Africa, marked by fragile inter-state relations, violent intra-state conflicts, major military conflicts, recurring massive humanitarian crises, sparse basis of resources, and traditionally less-than-cooperative policy approaches. First, this implies the existence of fundamental antagonisms of member states' interests, which should be settled before and during integration. Second, the region is characterized by the fact, that it is extremely difficult to anticipate political developments. Today's allies may turn into sworn enemies tomorrow. Such an unpredictable environment simply does not provide a foundation for the installation of binding, progressing integration. Looking around in the region, the challenges for the regional organization become apparent.

When IGADD was founded in 1986, Ethiopia entered the fourth decade of the Eritrean war of independence. President Museveni had just taken

over power in Kampala in the wake of the Ugandan civil war, the situation in Somalia was marked by increasing internal violence and disintegration of the state, and the war between SPLA and the government in Sudan was rekindled three years before with disastrous impacts for the population in Southern Sudan.

Although the fall of the Mengistu dictatorship and the collapse of the Barre regime in Somalia profoundly changed the political landscape in 1991, such obstacles for integration and development were still in existence at the time of IGADs revitalization in 1996. The attempt at establishing a UN Protectorate to improve the humanitarian situation in disintegrated Somalia had just failed. Eritrea and Uganda, as early as in 1994, had interrupted their diplomatic relations to Sudan after accusing the government of supporting hostile militia forces. Subsequently, Sudan's attempt on the life of the Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak during his visit to Ethiopia in 1995 also destroyed the relations between Addis Abeba and Khartoum.

Hardly two years had lapsed since the IGAD governments had committed themselves to peaceful sub-regional conflict resolution in the founding protocol, when the brutal border war between the IGAD members Ethiopia and Eritrea broke out, much to the surprise of most states of the region. The war between May 1998 and June 2000 claimed almost 100,000 lives, and some 1, 2 mio people were expelled. The regional organization faced this situation in utter helplessness, torn by the conflict between former “hope bearers“ of the region, without availing of a supreme mechanism for non-military conflict resolution. The war was ended in 2000 after OAU mediation, especially by its Algerian chair, and through massive US pressure. Furthermore, 4,200 Blue

Helmets and military observers of the United Nations Mission to Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) were deployed in a security zone along the border. Yet, the resolution of the border conflict, especially the demarcation of the border defined by a commission, is still pending as Ethiopia refuses cooperation. Apart from meetings of military leaders at the Military Coordination Committee of UNMEE, complete silence reigns between the two governments.

This is also the case because, far beyond the border issue, the conflict also resided in unresolved ambitions of predominance. While the Eritrean leadership's own image was still shaped by the victory over Mengistu and the then military supremacy of its own EPLF over the Ethiopian TPLF, Ethiopia derives its claim for regional supremacy from its geographical position, size, and history, not only but also vis-à-vis Eritrea. This background fosters the fear, that the government in Addis Abeba could push for its desired change of regime in Asmara. At present, Ethiopia is host to political meetings of the Eritrean opposition. Eritrea, on its part, had broken with all its neighbours at the time of the war. With the help of dubious Somali warlords, it supplied weapons to the Oromo Liberation Front and other groups fighting the Ethiopian government. In addition, Asmara hosts the alliance of the Sudanese opposition (including the SPLA).

The Ethiopian-Eritrean war was paralleled by a further shift in the intra-regional relations. Surprisingly, Ethiopia and the internationally isolated Sudan got friendly again, in part furthered through their political opening up in the aftermath of September 11. The bilateral relations between the two states are nowadays among the best in the region. Ethiopia's use of the harbour of Port Sudan, coming along

with investments in the cross-border road network, and with agreements on Sudanese oil supplies to Ethiopia seem to point to a longer-term liaison. In January 2004, Ethiopia, Sudan, and Yemen signed the founding charter of the "Sana'a Cooperation Forum", created, among other aspects, to fight international terrorism and to establish a free trade zone as early as 2004. Eritrea interprets this forum an "axis of belligerence" against itself.

Uganda and Sudan have improved their relations such, that Khartoum has granted the Ugandan army the right to fight the "Lord's Resistance Army", the rebels of North Uganda, operating inside Southern Sudan. Yet persistent rumours have it that the Sudanese government continued or continues to support the LRA.

After more than a decade without state and government, Somalia seems to be stuck in an endless loop of hopeless peace negotiations. For some time, the peace process also triggered a political dispute between Djibouti and Ethiopia, which supported different factions and had contrasting visions for Somalia. Their common interest in Ethiopia's use of the Djibouti harbour, the most important trade relation of the region, however, remained unaffected.

It is the apparently forthcoming peace accord between SPLA and the Khartoum government that bears a small glimmer of hope for overcoming major military conflicts in the region; a hope overshadowed by a new rebellion in the Darfur region of West Sudan.

## **2. The Role of IGAD in Conflict Management**

## 2.1 Somalia

For the past 13 years, Somalia has lived without a central government. After the most significant clan militia of the country had agreed on a coordinated strategy, the dictator Siad Barre was expelled from Mogadishu in 1991. The Somali state collapsed in no time, not least, because the militia alliance did not find a common denominator on the political level beyond the overthrow of Siad Barre. The country disintegrated into numerous individual parcels, controlled and sometimes contested by clan militia and their leaders, the many warlords. The attempt to counteract this brutal lawlessness through a military intervention by a US-headed state alliance followed by a trusteeship supported by UN-Mission UNOSOM II, ended in a fiasco after June 1993 as a consequence of the misguided policy of the international actors; as a result, the UN-troops were finally withdrawn in March 1995.

In the shadow of this war, administrative and governmental structures were established in some areas, enabling a relatively peaceful living together of the citizens. Such structures function quite well in secessionist Somaliland, the former British part of Somalia. Yet, in disregard of its enormous achievements in the provision of peace and stability, the young republic has not been awarded international recognition, until today. In 1998, a fairly functioning "Autonomous Region of Puntland" was founded in the North East, which has however been troubled with internal power struggles. Fragile attempts of establishing administrative structures were also undertaken in the Bay and Bakool region, in Hiran (Beledweyne) and in Jubba.

However, the termination of the civil war, ongoing mainly in the South of the

country, and the formation of a new government for Somalia, proved to be highly complex. International mediation efforts for the formation of a national transition government for Somalia were hampered by the so-called "Forum-Shopping", for a long time. Due to regional rivalries, especially between Egypt and Ethiopia, numerous competing mediation talks were held, none of which brought together all the relevant parties.

In the mid nineties, IGAD and OAU furnished their mediation mandates to Ethiopia, Somalia's former opponent in the 1977/78 Ogaden war. However, the failure of the Sodere Conference, held in 1997, at the latest, proved this approach wrong. Ethiopia increasingly played the blurred multiple part of a mediator, regional power, and spoiler. The militarily potent neighbouring state supports political forces in Somaliland, and the Somali Reconciliation and Reconstruction Council (SRRC) in the South, represented by Colonel Abdullahi Yussuf (Puntland), Hussein Aideed, the Rahanweyn Resistance Army, and General Morgan, who became ill-famed as "Slaughterer of Hargeisa". In addition, Ethiopia deployed its troops to the Somali border area, to fight the Islamic "Al-Ittihad", which allegedly has connections to al-Qaida and claims responsibility for assaults on Ethiopian territory.

In 1999, during its IGAD-term of office, Djibouti initiated an international concerted action. In the framework of IGAD, a high-level meeting was held in Arta (Djibouti), supported by Egypt, Libya, Eritrea, and the Gulf States, among others. Participants were hundreds of traditional elders, and some political leaders, like former government politicians of the Barre Era, yet only a few warlords attended. The Transitional National Government (TNG), formed there and headed by



President Abdiquassim Salad, was supported by the Islamic clergy and particularly by parts of the business world. The latter run their import and export business through middlemen in Djibouti, which explains the considerably tight relationship between the TNG and Djibouti.

The TNG received international recognition from OAU, IGAD, the Arab League, and the political staff of the UN. This turned out to be overhasty, since TNG's sphere of influence is still not extending beyond parts of Mogadishu and small plots of territory belonging to allied factions. At the same time, the TNG was repeatedly accused, that some of its government members had already held significant posts in the Siad Barre-Era or had close relations to militant Islamic movements. Ethiopia soon opposed the TNG openly. Addis Abeba had always observed the Arta process with scepticism, yet focused most of its diplomatic capacities on the war against Eritrea between 1998 and 2000. Ethiopia's role became obvious in 2001/2002, when it provided military support to Colonel Abdullahi Yusuf in Puntland, to expel his TNG favoured rival Jama Ali Jama from the region.

From this time, at the latest, the Arta process was considered a failure. The TNG had consumed the Arab start-up funding without reaching considerable internal recognition and influence. Seemingly imminent US military action against alleged terrorist training camps in Somalia, and the interruption of trans-national money transfers through the al-Barakaat-Bank by the Americans, were other contributing factors. In this tense atmosphere, at the Khartoum Summit in January 2002, the IGAD Heads of State and Government commissioned the then Kenyan President Arap Moi, to start a joint initiative with Ethiopia and Djibouti in order to bring the warlords of SRRC,

and thus, Ethiopia's political allies, back on board.

In October 2002, a peace conference started in Eldoret, West Kenya, on a very promising note. All the relevant conflict parties, except the "Republic of Somaliland", were present. In contrast to Arta, where elders and representatives of civil society dominated, almost all the warlords, and thus the "real rulers" of Somalia, gathered around the table in Kenya. In a declaration dated October 27, 2002, the leaders of the armed factions agreed on the cessation of hostilities. In the following period, however, problems gained the upper hand. First, repeated fierce fighting in Somalia ridiculed the warlords' pretended will to negotiate peace. Second, in the course of negotiations, the warlords as the "Political Leaders' Committee" unduly claimed more and more competences at the expense of civil groups and traditional elders. Third, it took the negotiating team too much time to establish unambiguous criteria for the selection of delegates and the negotiating procedure. By the end of 2002, the process almost ran aground on many procedural questions.

After the change of government in Kenya, the negotiations were revitalized in January 2003, when Bethuel Kiplagat, a renowned diplomat and former church representative, became chief mediator. The meeting place was transferred from Eldoret to Mbagathi, near Nairobi. Protracted negotiations finally resulted in a procedure to admit the delegates along the lines of an already agreed clan formula. On July 5, 2003, it seemed that a final agreement on the charter for the formation of a new government had been found. Over 20 leaders of military factions, who had signed the ceasefire agreement in October 2002, were to nominate 351 members of parliament. Those, in turn, would elect

the new president who would then appoint the prime minister. The key role of the warlords in the planned nomination of delegates expressly underlines that the original Arta idea of a bottom-up process had been abandoned almost completely.

Kiplagat, however, called it a “historical breakthrough”. Unfortunately, it did not last long. The day after, already, the TNG President, Abdiquassim, declared the agreement null and void. In his reasoning, Abdiquassim explicitly opposed the recognition of existing administrative structures on the regional level (hence, mainly in Somaliland), which, in his opinion, could lead to the formation of small states and the disintegration of Somalia. One of his motives may have been the close end of his “period in office”, after a three year period ending in August 2003. The TNG President simply ignored the expiration of its mandate and remained in office. He even appointed a new prime minister (following an internal rift), and took part in the IGAD Summit in October.

The conference in Mbagathi meanwhile remained deadlocked. The TNG as well as several warlords (Muse Sudi Yalahow (USC/SSA), Barre Aden Shire (JVA), Osman Ato (USC/SNA), Mohammed Ibrahim Habsade (RRA)) have stayed away from the talks since summer 2003, with one brief interruption, even repeatedly threatening to organize their own peace conference in Somalia. Representing only a relatively small portion of the “Leaders Committee”, their absence still undermines the alleged inclusive nature of the process. In addition, IGAD depends on the approval of TNG, which came into being under its patronage, unless the regional organization wants to hold summits with two recognized Somali governments in the future.

For months, attempts were made to influence the TNG. The delegates remaining in Mbagathi revised the already adopted charter, considering some of Abdiquassim's points of criticism. However, he still rejected the Charter. In January 2004, a repeatedly postponed in-camera meeting finally took place in Kenya, intended to re-integrate all the Somali “leaders” in the negotiation process. The retreat concluded with the signing of an amendment to the Charter. The new document reduces the number of future parliamentarians to 275 and requires approval by both the Transitional National Assembly (born out of the Arta process) and the Mbagathi conference. It remains to be seen whether the results of this latest attempt will be sustainable. While IGAD threatens all future absentees and dissenters not to be considered “Somali Leaders” any more, re-emerging quarrels over the procedure to select the parliamentarians and the disowning of the amendment document by a great number of warlords early February forecast further setbacks for the peace process.

For now, it seems that IGAD has successfully re-integrated all its “Frontline” states in the facilitation committee. In August 2003, Djibouti withdrew after the TNG had left. The IGAD Summit in October agreed on the involvement of all member states (except Somalia) in the committee, enabling Djibouti to return. Furthermore, the Ugandan President Museveni announced his intention, to make Somalia a focal issue of his IGAD chairmanship beginning in October 2003. In the future, IGAD is going to seek increased support of the AU, hoping for military observers and the deployment of a peace keeping mission after the formation of a new government.

All in all, there is little reason for optimism. On balance, after 15 months of continuous talks in Kenya, IGAD has only reached an ineffective “ceasefire” and a charter that still needs to stand a reality test. IGAD’s former hope bearer, the TNG “letter box government”, for some time even turned into a further core element of the negotiation dilemma. The TNG president de facto vetoed the formation of the government for months. It can only be hoped that this situation will be overcome now that Abdiquassim declared his willingness to step down in the course of the implementation of the charter.

Beyond this, the mediation process faces further profound, unsolved problems. The most difficult task is to assemble all powerful stakeholders around the same table and, at the same time, to integrate actors of civil society furnished with capabilities of control and transparency. In Somalia, this means, above all, to strike a balance between the warlords (i.e. the real profiteers of the war), and legitimate actors of society such as clan leaders, traditional elders, religious leaders, intellectuals, and representatives of grassroots organizations. The creation of an effective government oriented towards the commonweal also requires that Somalia’s economy of violence and the prevailing warlordism will gradually be overcome.

If such balance of the actors cannot be established, which is most likely since the formation of the “Political Leaders’ Committee”, another “Caretaker Government” is luring, serving as a facade for warlords converted into businessmen and politicians, still indulging in their economic interests, and happy about the influx of fresh development aid resources. By force of arms, they would ensure a permanent

say for themselves in “government business”.

Within the framework of the negotiations, IGAD cannot resolve this task. Despite all diplomatic skills, Kiplagat and the Secretariat are not equipped with the necessary leverage against the warlords. In contrast, Ethiopia and the remaining TNG supporters do have these means but do not want to use them against the military factions. Against the background of their incompatible interests, these external actors support their respective clients with financial and military means or even belong to their economic networks. The only way out of this dilemma would be pressure exerted from outside the region. The West fears potential terror cells indeed, but apart from more vigilance it has not yet dedicated adequate priority to the peace process in Somalia. First and foremost, the United States are not willing to take appropriate influence on Ethiopia, its closest regional ally. Meanwhile, the government in Addis Abeba finds it easier to come to terms with a group of manageable warlords in the absence of a Somali government than with a reanimated Somalia, which might give new impetus to the secessionist aspirations of Somalis living in Ethiopia’s East.

The fact that the negotiations, right from the start, focused on the establishment of a new central government for the whole of Somalia precluded any chances for the participation of the government of Somaliland. Due to the deep divisions caused by the civil war, and the heartfelt desire for independence, this is no option. Somaliland’s implicit exclusion from the peace process must not be ignored, in view of the fact that the territorial conflict between Somaliland and Puntland, the most important peace zones of former Somalia,

escalated dramatically during the Mbagathi Conference.

The example of Somalia reveals that not only IGAD but the international community in its entirety lacks concepts for state formation processes in states disintegrated for a longer term. Unsettled key issues like self-determination, consolidation and integration of existing local and regional entities, as well as the shape and legitimacy of developing power and government structures, are all too often circumvented with hollow compromise phrases.

## 2.2 Sudan

With some interruptions, Sudan has been war-stricken for almost half a century. The political core issue is the question of self-determination of the predominantly Christian-animist South versus the Islam-dominated North. This is closely related to other contentions such as the claim to power of competing elites, the general controversy on a secular versus Islamic state philosophy for Sudan, the economic and war-type economic penetration of the South, and most recently, the potential exploitation of large oil resources.

The war, ended with the Addis Abeba Peace Treaty in 1972, flared up again in 1983 and claimed more than two million lives until today. The "Sudan People's Liberation Movement" (SPLM) as the predominant rebel organization, especially with its military wing, the SPLA, follows the aim of self-determination. It has remained open for any solution from far-reaching autonomy to secession. In 1995, it joined hands with parts of the opposition in the North to form the National Democratic Alliance (NDA), united in its rejection of Omar Hassan El-Bashir's government, which came into power by a coup d'Etat in 1989. At the same time, the government formed alliances with Southern militia and

groupings (mainly in the Upper Nile province), which had split away from SPLM. The forces gathered in the "Southern Sudan Defence Force" (SSDF), and the "South Sudan Liberation Movement" (SSLM), also grounded on ethnic identities (mainly Nuers), which would get into a minority position versus the Dinka dominated SPLM in an independent "New (South) Sudan".

Since 1989, there have been repeated peace talks with a variety of mediators and involving actors on different levels. The "Declaration of Principles", adopted after IGAD mediation in 1994, marked the most crucial cross-road of the nineties. The Declaration states that sustainable peace cannot be achieved by military means. The population of South Sudan is granted the right to decide on its future by means of a referendum. However, a single-state solution is given priority under the premise that the following conditions can be realized: social pluralism, legally substantiated, political and social equality, far-reaching self-determination of the Sudanese peoples, separation of state and religion, appropriate sharing of common assets (especially state earnings), as well as human rights and an independent legal system. However, the principles of this document were repeatedly undermined by the Sudanese government, which adopted the Declaration in 1997 only. In combination with the SPLM's poorly developed desire for peace, the given situation did not offer IGAD any chance to reach a breakthrough with its numerous attempts on mediation.

The deadlock of on-going static warfare was only broken up by the far-reaching global change after the attacks of September 11, 2001, and the beginning of the "War against Terror". Suddenly, Sudan gained top priority on the agenda of US Foreign

and Security Policy. The USA had already demonstrated their willingness to undertake military action when, in 1998, reacting to assaults at their embassies in Tanzania and Kenya with cruise missile attacks on a Sudanese medical factory for alleged production of weapons of mass destruction. The El-Bashir government, subjected to American economic sanctions since 1997, responded with diplomatic wisdom to the attacks on New York and Washington, immediately and clearly condemning them as terror acts. The state, isolated before, then received unexpected recognition and a more friendly, if ambivalent, attention in the establishment of the United States' international Anti-Terror Alliance.

Only five days before September 11, President Bush had appointed the republican Senator John C. Danforth Special Envoy to Sudan. He verified the desire for peace of the conflict parties through four "confidence tests", leading to a local ceasefire in the Nuba Mountains and other humanitarian concessions, from January 2002 on. In October 2002, the US diplomacy exerted massive pressure on the Sudanese government, most of all through the so-called "Sudan Peace Act". It provides President Bush with 100 mio US\$ per year, for the period of 2003-05, to prepare the areas not controlled by the Sudanese government for peace. On the other side, the highly indebted Sudanese government is menaced by a denial of further loans, additional economic sanctions, and reduction of diplomatic relations, if President Bush does not certify its good will for negotiation every six months.

In the first half of 2002, the US initiative was consolidated and brought back under the IGAD roof. The IGAD Secretariat in Djibouti is not directly involved in the negotiation process. IGAD only provides the general

framework. The Sudan Peace Secretariat in Nairobi was established as a "decentralized structure of IGAD", after the organization had furnished Kenya with the negotiation mandate. The negotiations are chaired by the retired Kenyan General Lazaro Sumbeiywo, who acts as IGAD's seconded special envoy. His mission, mainly dedicated to the support of communication between the two parties, is financed through the IGAD peace fund. Until 2002, donor funds amounting to about 1,1 mio US Dollar have been raised for the Sudan peace process.

In July 2002, after several weeks of negotiation, the so-called "Machakos Protocol" was signed in Kenya. It provides for a referendum on South Sudan's self-determination after a six month initial and a six year transition phase. Only then shall the decision be taken whether the south becomes independent or Sudan remains one single state. In compensation for this concession, the SPLM accepted an Islamic administration for the North. An independent commission shall monitor the implementation of the peace agreement during both phases and support the building of institutions making it attractive enough for the people in South Sudan to stay in a united Sudan.

The negotiations initiated in Machakos, despite repeated standstills, are characterized by a series of remarkable breakthroughs. Immediately after the signing of the protocol, fierce fighting started between the SPLA and militia loyal to the government. In October 2002, however, an agreement on the cessation of hostilities was signed, considerably strengthening the position of the verification and monitoring team. From May 2003 on, with the intention to speed up negotiations, the Kenyan mediator applied a "holistic approach",

meaning that the different issues are no longer negotiated separately but in packages. In July, the Sudanese president wished the mediator literally "to hell" for his compromise proposals and sought a shift of the mediation competence from IGAD to the AU or the Arab League. Finally, the personal ambitions of the Sudanese Vice-President Taha favoured the resumption of talks in September 2003, but now on highest level. Since then, Taha and the SPLM leader John Garang have been facing each other personally in Kenya. At the end of September, a further breakthrough was achieved through the agreement on security arrangements for the interim period. It is planned that SPLA and government forces remain in existence separately, withdrawing to the South and North respectively, while "joint/integrated forces" of 39,000 soldiers are established. These units, whose precise structure is still open, shall be deployed in the South, the Nuba Mountains, in Southern Blue Nile, and Khartoum (3,000 men). Finally, on January 7, 2004, the parties signed an agreement on the distribution of state revenues, especially from booming oil exports, and on currencies. A joint commission shall make sure, that the central government in Khartoum and the regional government to be established in the South, share the state revenues to 50 percent each.

However, in February 2004, at least three core issues remain open: 1) No agreement has yet been found on the division of power during the transition phase. It is only likely, that John Garang will act as Vice-President under El-Bashir. 2) No agreement on the future status of the so-called "marginalised areas", the Abyei regions, the Nuba Mountains, and the Southern Blue Nile Province, along the internal border could be signed so far. There seems to be consensus that the before mentioned areas shall be

autonomous in the transition phase but it is a highly controversial question whether all the three regions shall have the right to participate in the planned referendum in six-and-a-half years. The SPLM further demands that Abyei, totally ignored in September's security agreement, shall be allocated to the South. 3) Despite the principal ruling by the Machakos Protocol, it remains unclear which law shall be adopted in the national capital. While the government wants to apply Shari'a jurisdiction like in the Northern areas, the SPLM insists that at least the predominantly Christian parts of the capital shall be exempted from such jurisdiction.

In addition, all of the agreements signed so far are characterized by huge gaps and loopholes. Addressing these deficits after the formal signing of the framework agreement will involve further delay and potential for breakdown.

Moreover, since spring 2003, a disregarded conflict has profoundly escalated in parallel to the peace talks. In the Darfur Province, in West Sudan, the "Sudan Liberation Army" and other new rebel groups have been fighting fiercely against government troops and militia loyal to the government, displacing more than 600,000 people. In contrast to its stated will to achieve peace in Machakos, the Sudanese government exclusively follows a strategy of military repression in this case. Chad, already hosting 100,000 Sudanese refugees, repeatedly failed in its mediation efforts. Now, the United Nations endeavour to see the mediation continued. Khartoum unverifiably accuses Eritrea of supporting the SLA with training and weapons, thus adding another regional element to the conflict.

Meanwhile, there are growing fears that the Sudanese government could be interested in extending the

interruption of the peace talks, which was originally agreed in January 2004 to allow the Northern participants to participate in the Islamic Hadj. Khartoum is suspected of wanting to crush the rebellion in Darfur before the signing of a final peace agreement and the onset of the rainy season.

When taking stock, the achievements of the Kenyan mediation process by far exceed all other agreements since 1972 already. Meanwhile, the successful conclusion of negotiations is widely expected, even so, the timeline had to be adapted several times in the past. At present, April 2004 is the often mentioned date.

The overall impression of IGAD's role is ambivalent: on the one hand, despite several competing mediation attempts such as the "Egyptian-Sudanese Peace Initiative (JLEI)", the regional organization has provided the by and large undisputed negotiation framework for the Sudan conflict since the mid-nineties. Following the 1994 Declaration of Principles, it has successfully maintained a political process, laying the foundation for increased efforts since 2001. On the other hand, there was a lack of leverage: the parties' willingness to negotiate correlated with their military successes and failures. For years, real commitment to peace negotiations could not be observed. Hence without doubt only the enormous American pressure on Khartoum allowed for real progress. Although negotiations were returned under the IGAD roof after the Danforth Initiative, the US, as part of the informal group of international "observers" (together with Great Britain, Italy, and Norway), remain the driving force. Starting from a regionally managed procedure, the mediation efforts have turned into an externally driven process in which IGAD's role has shrunk to (quite successful) good offices. The – still commendable –

achievement of the organization therefore was to provide a proper forum for the US efforts when the time arrived.

The residual role of the regional organization in the Machakos Process must also be critically reviewed. Since the establishment of the Peace Secretariat in Nairobi, the Secretariat in Djibouti runs the risk of being marginalised from the process. The Sudan Secretariat is dominated by Kenya's "national" mediation mandate – not least through joint action with the Kenyan diplomacy. Nairobi as the venue of the meetings of the JIPF Special Committee on Sudan further contributed to the falling behind of the IGAD Secretariat.

Moreover, the mediators increasingly lose grip on the negotiation process since the leading politicians have started direct talks among each other without Sumbeiywos' direct involvement. This, however, must be appreciated in terms of an enhanced "ownership" of the process.

Despite the expected successful conclusion of negotiations, there are major doubts regarding sustainability and implementation. This has always been the greatest weakness in all peace agreements throughout Sudan's history.

First, the lack of inclusivity in many respects must be taken into account:

1. In the present negotiations, neither the militia loyal to government, yet independent, nor the Southern factions, independent of SPLA, are included. The negotiating parties are now going to divide power and state revenues amongst themselves, leaving the others out. The exclusion of the militia leaves the government with means to torpedo the peace process without being held responsible. These groups, are also a source of

potential interference as long as they are not involved in the negotiations. Finally, there is a high risk that the rivalries in the South escalate after a peace settlement between Khartoum and SPLM.

2. The total detachment of the Darfur conflict bears the danger, that the end of the rebellion in the South will be accompanied by the beginning of a new one in the West. For the very reason that Darfur is neglected and all non-SPLM factions are excluded, SLA may become a serious "spoiler" of the peace process.
3. Both the government of the North and the SPLA rule in the South are not democratically legitimized. The political leaders negotiate without having mandates of their respective societies. In other words: the Sudanese people are not involved in "their" own peace process and remain completely excluded from the principal definition of the post-war order.
4. If Sudan shall become a constitutional state it is indispensable to include the North Sudanese opposition in the peace process. So far, they have only been onlookers. The secular oriented Northern opposition will hardly agree to the "solidification" of Shari'a by the Machakos process. Even in the South, the process is internally safe-guarded through democratic participation. In recent years, the SPLM has considerably increased its political control through developing a civil administrative system. On top, the Machakos Protocol quasi-guarantees it a six year power monopoly in the South that could be abused by it in the conflicts between the dominant Dinka and ethnic minorities. Media reports already speak of the fear of an

alleged "Dinka dictatorship" to come. In this respect, the negotiation design, too, could prove counterproductive in the medium-term: course and content of the talks are less-than-transparent, and social actors like women initiatives, local NGOs, the very active churches and grass-roots groups are totally excluded.

Second, the most sensitive question, the final state structure, remains shelved for a long time. Even if a "single-state solution" is given supreme priority in the Declaration of Principles, the Machakos Protocol leaves the option of secession after the six year transition phase open. An independent South can only be considered a credible option if different designs of an "amicable divorce" are thoroughly discussed prior to the referendum, which has not happened until today. A "road map" has been drawn without knowing where the journey goes. It is also striking that there is no concept for the urgently required transformation of politics and society in Sudan. The danger is, for the second time, that the negotiations initiate little more than a ceasefire of several years whereby the government in Khartoum primarily wants to reach a time out.

Third, the concerns are further enhanced by the fact that the negotiations were not based on free will. If the interest in peace in Sudan, predominantly the American, does not prevail and the pressure dies down, the collapse of an externally forced agreement could become foreseeable.

### **2.3 CEWARN**

The ratification of the CEWARN Protocol in January 2002 laid the foundation for the establishment of a "Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism" for the IGAD region. It intends the timely gathering,



processing, and distribution of conflict information in the complex institutional network of the member states, CEWARN and IGAD. The structure shall provide decision-makers with relevant regional information in acute crises as well.

In September 2003, the office of the CEWARN-Unit opened as a technical arm of the IGAD Secretariat (Political and Humanitarian Affairs Division) in Addis Abeba. It forms the interface between the so-called "Conflict Early Warning and Early Response Units" (CEWERUs) of the member states, and the Foreign Ministries' "Committee of Permanent Secretaries", acting as supreme organ and link to the political IGAD committees. In terms of "early action", the committee shall determine strategies for the handling of escalating conflicts. Thus, for the first time, a mechanism has been institutionalized, which translates the mandate for crisis prevention as stipulated in Article 7 of the IGAD agreement into operational practice and goes beyond the scope of ad-hoc committees.

Meanwhile, the Protocol has come into force upon ratification through a qualified number of IGAD states. However, the CEWARN structure is not yet fully operational. For a start, the three staff members of the Addis Abeba Unit are trained, working structures developed, cooperation partners identified, and early warning indicators are determined. The CEWERUs must be established or developed from existing national structures. This indicates the broad capacity building dimension of the CEWARN project. The cross-border monitoring units have been established in July 2003 and report their findings from their respective territories on a weekly basis.

The thematic provisions of the "Operating Guidelines" (Clause 7) put the preliminary focus of CEWARN on

conflicts in pastoral areas and along national borders. The Protocol does not explicitly prohibit the use of the mechanism for internal conflicts, but implicitly, at least, the Heads of State and Government anchored down such restriction. The Ugandan-Sudanese-Kenyan "Karamajong-Cluster", and the triangle of Somalia, Ethiopia, and Kenya have been selected for the pilot phase in the next years. Thus, for a start, the CEWERUs will only be installed in Kenya, Uganda, and Ethiopia.<sup>1</sup>

By focusing on conflicts in predominantly pastoral border regions, CEWARN indeed addresses a type of conflict whose institutional handling has been poor because of weak state structures, and because of its cross-border dimension going beyond the scope of single-state structures. Yet these specific conflicts only represent a small segment of the multi-faceted, highly integrated conflict system in the Horn of Africa. It remains to be seen if the narrow focus enables effective early warning and sustainable handling of conflicts that have strong linkages beyond the border regions.

A remarkable novelty of this approach is the (intended) involvement of groups of civil society and science in the steering committees of the CEWERUs. Selection and factual involvement of these representatives still depend exclusively on the member states, and so does the management of the CEWARN structure; but at least, for the first time, a framework for joint efforts of conflict solution of state and society has been institutionalized. Yet there is room for doubt, whether the proposals for conflict resolution of the steering committees, predominantly composed of civilians, will prevail over

---

<sup>1</sup> The relevant parts of Sudan are SPLA controlled. In Somalia, state structures are completely absent. This rules out the establishment of CEWERUs.

the “Joint Border Commissions”, which are rather ineffective and dominated by military logic.

In general, the Protocol leaves many details of implementation to the discretion of the member states; thus, their political will finally decides on success or failure of the mechanism. The CEWARN-Unit and the CEWERUs have the right to evaluate all publicly available sources, but if they want to gain access to official information they rely on the cooperation of the states. CEWARN can neither refer to an embodied information duty of the states nor claim the right to inspect records. These conditions strongly limit CEWARN’s room for action, especially in the face of wide-spread secretiveness on all administrative levels in most IGAD countries.

Moreover, the translation of Early Warning into Early Action (beyond local agreements, at least) is the exclusive responsibility of the “Committee of Permanent Secretaries” – in other words: the political representatives of the member states. The Protocol also remains vague with regard to precise measures of “Early Action“ or “Action“ in general. The in many ways necessary adaptation of national legislation is only “suggested“.

It is too early to judge the functioning of the CEWARN structure. From today’s perspective, the Addis Abeba Unit – exclusively financed by German and American contributions – will soon be overstrained because of its inadequate capacity. Even its status is still unclear and in need of correction. For example, the Unit is not authorized to publish information without approval of the Djibouti Secretariat, at present.

### **3. Conclusions**

#### **3.1 Summary**

Success and limitations of regional integration in the Horn of Africa become most visible in conflict management, IGAD’s central field of action. The organization’s work can be distinguished in two categories characterized by consensus resp. probable dissent, yet also reflecting the capacities of the IGAD-Secretariat: CEWARN and a series of minor projects on small weapons, landmines, capacity building, etc. are realized in close connection to the Djibouti Secretariat, the organization centre. For the peace process in Somalia and Sudan, where harsh and sometimes antagonistic interests of member states are at stake, external autonomous and ad-hoc mechanisms have been mandated. This, and subsequent poor integration increasingly weaken the Secretariat.

However, both categories are still lacking strong, binding mechanisms. The organization lacks the leverage to achieve progress in conflict solution out of its own strength. The areas (in all thematic fields) closely attached to the Secretariat are characterized by constant dependence on the member states’ cooperation and dedication, which is not always very pronounced. A stronger integration would especially require a re-definition of the relationship between the Secretariat and the member states.

In the major conflicts in Sudan and Somalia, external pressure is decisive for potential success of IGAD mediation efforts. IGAD itself can only use the weak means of mediation; especially potential “spoilers“ and war profiteers not interested in peace cannot be addressed with these means, which becomes most obvious in the considerable deficits in the Somalia mediation.

IGAD’s limitations come drastically to the fore in its handling of the Ethiopian-Eritrean war. The inter-state conflict

between the two member states even escaped the ad-hoc handling by IGAD. One of the obstacles in the organization's handling of the conflict rooted in the fact that the responsible Director for Political Affairs was Ethiopian while the Executive Secretary was Eritrean. The conflict, with a token of regret, was transferred to the OAU. This move ridiculed the intended (yet not institutionalized) mechanism for peaceful, sub-regional conflict solution stipulated in the IGAD Founding Treaty.

Similarly, IGAD's total neglect of the conflict in Northern Uganda underlines the limits of the organization's conflict resolution potential. Below the scale of the Sudanese civil war and beyond the narrow scope of the CEWARN mechanism, internal conflicts involving armed opposition groups remain the exclusive domain of the respective national governments.

All in all, IGAD rather has the character of an "umbrella organization" for peace initiatives (with small projects attached) than that of a regional organization tailored to binding integration. From this perspective, however, IGAD has rendered remarkable performance, eliminating at least some spoiling factors in the conflict management of the region: efforts were bundled and made more transparent under the umbrella of the regional organization. The mediation procedure, which has been "mandated away" still offers much range of manoeuvre for the peace-hindering political lobbyism of the nation states; the IGAD dialogue forum, however, subjects them to continuous joint observation oriented towards progress in the peace processes.

It is remarkable that the Peace and Security Council of the AU has meanwhile appointed IGAD to coordinate the states in East Africa and the Indian Ocean, as well as Rwanda,

in their efforts to establish an East African AU Stand-by-Brigade. However, until now, there remains a huge gap between these ambitions and IGAD's political reality.

### **3.2 Critical Outlook**

Even leaving aside the integration obstacles originating from the major military conflicts in Sudan and Somalia, and more so between Eritrea and Ethiopia, leeway for consolidation of regional cooperation and integration seems rather small. This is founded on the ground that IGAD, in contrast to other regional organizations like SADC and ECOWAS, lacks a dominant member keen to drive integration against the background of its claims to and opportunities for hegemony. Ethiopia's politics vis-à-vis Eritrea, Djibouti, and Somalia shows traits of hegemony; the regional ambitions of this central country with the largest population of the IGAD region also become apparent in its outstanding commitment within AU and NEPAD, and its reinforced cooperation with Sudan and (recently) Yemen (Sana'a Forum). However, Ethiopia does not have the economic foundation to act as centre of regional integration driven by hegemony, despite its considerable diplomatic and military capacities.

The heterogeneous nature of the region complicates its integration within the IGAD framework even more. This is especially indicated by the many cases of – inclusive and exclusive – double membership of IGAD states: Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania form the East African Community (EAC); it has been revitalized speedily in recent years and follows a relatively clear vision of political and economic integration. In contrast to all the other IGAD states, Sudan, Djibouti, and Somalia, are members of the Arab League, which Eritrea also wanted to join. These structures allow the IGAD

states an “opting out“ on different levels – IGAD becomes one of many options “to catch up” internationally. Ethiopia is the only country with no real alternative to IGAD; it has no access to the sea and is therefore strongly interested in reliable links to its neighbours which further enhances its wish for IGAD to develop around Ethiopia as the centre.

This is comprehensible all the more as the present situation offers Egypt, Ethiopia’s regional rival, many opportunities to exert competing influence. Through the instance of the Arab League and by means of various bilateral relations, Egypt’s foreign policy succeeds, time and again, to thwart Ethiopia’s interests in the Nile issue and the Somali peace process and thus acts as a “spoiler“ of IGAD’s integration efforts. In December 2003, Sudan, Egypt, and Ethiopia adopted an agreement on common use of the Nile water. It is expected that the cooperation based on this agreement will ease Ethiopian-Egyptian relations and further improve the ties between Sudan and Ethiopia.

On the economic scene, COMESA appears as a competing organization of integration. It stretches far beyond the IGAD sphere into Eastern and Southern Africa. COMESA makes more active efforts of economic integration than IGAD although the AU recognized IGAD as a pillar of the African Economic Community. Moreover, in contrast to IGAD, COMESA has a common Court of Justice, which, however, is in charge of market law only.

In the face of these heterogeneous and multiple memberships, it remains to be seen what consequences the call for a consolidation of memberships in the regional organizations, made by the Chairman of the AU, Konaré, will have.

In addition, apart from the realm of peace creation, IGAD is short of a

common normative foundation which would find expression, for example, in embodied principals of Human Rights. This is also reflected by the fact that any intended formation of sub-regional democratic structures is hampered by the member states’ lack of effective democratic institutions as a foundation. For instance, with regard to the discussion on the creation of an IGAD Parliament, following the preliminary stage of the IGAD Parliamentary Unit, it must be realized that only Kenya and Uganda are already seriously applying democratic procedures in functioning parliaments.

Finally, and in contrast to other African regional organizations, IGAD has a particularly strong donor orientation. This implies problems for both parties involved: the donors must fear the creation of such structures since they are menaced by inefficiency and poor sustainability for lack of *ownership*. IGAD, on the other hand, runs the risk of becoming a plaything or cloak for alien interests, as illustrated by the strong – so far quite fruitful – US commitment under the IGAD roof in the Sudan conflict.

Despite IGAD’s revitalization process and its resulting developments, the organization is still far from being an institution capable of fostering political integration in a meaningful manner like other regional organizations. However, it has become a firm and indispensable factor as a regional forum on “the smallest common denominator“.

A sustainable peace accord for Sudan, adopted under its patronage, could open new perspectives for the entire region including efforts to further and consolidate integration.

**Relevant Internet Pages:**

<http://www.igad.org/>

[http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/IGAD.html](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/IGAD.html)

**The Author:**

Ulf Terlinden is researcher at the department for „Political and Cultural Change“ of the Centre for Development Research (ZEF) in Bonn.

**Contact:**

Dr Volker Vinnai, Phone: +49-30-26 935-919  
[Volker.Vinnai@fes.de](mailto:Volker.Vinnai@fes.de)  
Roswitha Kiewitt, Phone: +49-30-26 935-914  
[Roswitha.Kiewitt@fes.de](mailto:Roswitha.Kiewitt@fes.de)

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung  
Referat Entwicklungspolitik -Afrika  
Hiroshimastr. 17  
D-10785 Berlin  
Germany  
Fax: +49-30-26 935-959



**List of Abbreviations**

AU	African Union
CEWARN	Conflict Early Warning and Early Response Mechanism
CEWERUs	Conflict Early Warning and Early Response Units
COMESA	Common Market of Eastern and Southern Africa
EPLF	Eritrean People's Liberation Front
EU	European Union
GTZ	German Society for Technical Cooperation
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IGADD	Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development
JIPF	Joint IGAD's Partners Forum
JVA	Juba Valley Alliance
NDA	National Democratic Alliance
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
OAU	Union of African States
RRA	Rahanweyn Resistance Army
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SLA	Sudan Liberation Army
SPLM/A	Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army
SRRC	Somali Reconciliation and Reconstruction Council
SSDF	Southern Sudan Defence Force
SSLM	South Sudan Liberation Movement
TNG	Transitional National Government
TPLF	Tigray People's Liberation Front
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNMEE	United Nations Mission to Ethiopia and Eritrea
UNOSOM II	United Nations Operation in Somalia II
USC/SNA	United Somali Congress/Somali National Alliance
USC/SSA	United Somali Congress/Somali Salvation Alliance