

## FRANCE

# REVIEW OF THE HOSTILE ACTION FACTOR

## 1. ISSUE PAPER THEME: Major equipment and Self-Sustainment

## 2. SUMMARY

The method of calculation for the reimbursement of equipment deployed in the mission area includes add-on factors that are calculated based on three mission factors, therefore generating a potential variation in the reimbursement level. The memorandum of understanding of each troop contributing country should reflect more accurately the change in the security situation on the ground through a more adapted and reactive update of the hostile action factor.

## 3. BACKGROUND

The COE Manual (Chapter 2-VIII) defines the mission factors as follows:

*“Mission factors are intended to compensate [contributing countries] for specific conditions prevailing in the area of responsibility that cause unusual wear and tear, shorter life of equipment, increased maintenance costs and/or risk of damage to and loss of the equipment. They notably include a hostile action or forced abandonment factor.”*

Moreover, Chapter 2-IX of the Manual indicates that *“the main purpose of inspections is to verify that the terms and conditions of the memorandum of understanding have been met, and to take corrective action when required.”*

Finally, Chapter 7 of the Manual provides decision sheets to calculate the add-on factor to be applied to each of these factors, and specifies:

*“These [add-on] factors may be determined by the technical survey team and [are] reviewed during different phases of the mission. The factors are subject to change depending on changes to the mission mandate and the prevailing conditions in the mission area and should be reviewed at least once every three years. Whenever a review is conducted, due consideration should be given to the suitability of assigning different mission factors for specific geographical areas within a mission or consolidating geographical areas for which different mission factors were previously assigned. The United Nations or troop/police contributors can request a review of the mission factors whenever the conditions in the mission have changed sufficiently to warrant a review. Different mission factors may be calculated and applied to different geographical areas within a mission area, if recommended.”*

The issue with updating the mission factors is therefore focused on the hostile action factor, as the

environmental change in a theatre of operations is first and foremost related to the change in its security situation, and therefore to the intensity of the threat. Whether it is positive or negative, the change in the security situation is likely to take place rapidly (within weeks) and differently (according to the location), which is not automatically reflected in the add-on factor applicable in each memorandum of understanding.

As an example, the current framework of the COE Manual enables to take only partially into account the volatility of the hostile action factor.

Security conditions have to be reviewed “*at least every three years or at the request of the United Nations or troop contributing countries*”: a three-year periodicity seems to be too long, regarding the rapid change in the security situation in certain theatres of operations.

The review of the COE Manual may opportunely include the possibility to review earlier the hostile action factor when the rapid change in the security situation justifies it. The new wording would open the way to a better compensation for security realities.

## **4. DETAILED PROPOSAL**

The COE Manual may be modified as follows:

- Chapter 7 paragraph 2: *“The mission factors may be determined by the technical survey team and are reviewed during different phases of the mission. They are subject to change depending on changes to the mission mandate and the prevailing conditions in the mission area and have to be reviewed at least every three years. If the rapid change in the security situation justifies it, the head of the mission or the troop contributing countries may request an earlier review of the hostile action or forced abandonment factor. However, the review of this factor will take place only one year after the previous review. Whenever a review is conducted, due consideration should be given to the suitability of assigning different mission factors for specific geographical areas within a mission or consolidating geographical areas for which different mission factors were previously assigned.”*