



Libya: An Assessment of Twelve Years of International Mediation

By Youssef Mohammad Sawani¹

¹ Senior non-resident fellow at ICDI and professor of politics and international relations at the University of Tripoli, Libya. The report was peer-reviewed and benefited from additional comments and inputs from the ICDI team.

July 7th 2022

© 2022 International Centre for Dialogue Initiatives (ICDI)
All rights reserved worldwide

Photocopies and reproductions of excerpts are allowed with proper credits.

All queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to International Centre for Dialogue Initiatives, e-mail: icdi@dialogueinitiatives.org

Links contained in this publication are provided for the convenience of the reader and are correct at the time of issue. ICDI takes no responsibility for the continued accuracy of that information or for the content of any external website. References have, wherever possible, been verified.

Website: <https://dialogueinitiatives.org/>

Executive Summary

It is a long and winding road towards peace and stability in Libya. Despite some relative positive developments following the Libyan Political Dialogue Forum, a durable peace still eludes the Libyan people and the international community. Today, Libya is faced by an uncertain future, a political morass, and severe economic hardships, with risks of renewed military escalation due to the political deadlock following the expiration of the Libyan Political Dialogue Forum roadmap and the failure of the electoral process.

The endurance of violence, though at a low-intensity level, as demonstrated by regular militia skirmishes now and then, coupled with the continued presence of foreign fighters and mercenaries, makes peace fragile and exposed to further upheavals. Substantial work on the political, economic and military tracks remains pending, including the resolution of complex issues such as the future of militias, security, and the thorny issues of the electoral process and a permanent constitution.

Despite the efforts exerted by the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) to move the constitutional process forward during the latest high-level meeting on Libya's constitutional track in Geneva last June (28-29 June 2022), major disagreements persist on a number of issues, mainly on the eligibility requirements for the candidates in the first presidential elections post-2011. True, the several rounds of consultations in Cairo and in Geneva yielded significant progress, yet this falls short of the requirements to hold comprehensive and inclusive national elections, as most Libyans wish for.

The fact is that since the fall of the Gaddafi regime, Libya has failed to transit to stability and democracy as both the uprising and the ensuing conflict divided Libyans into essential categories of 'winners' and 'losers'. The UN and a number of international actors have attempted to bring resolution to the crisis through various mediation efforts but the role of foreign powers, including some of the permanent member states of the UN Security Council (UNSC), has not always been constructive. Disagreement and competing interests between these UNSC member states have negatively impacted the trajectory of the conflict, impeding the efforts by the UN at finding a durable settlement of the conflict. Competing foreign interests more often than not have prevented consensus both at the national and international levels. Despite some positive results in the political process, the crisis continues unabated, and no final inclusive and lasting settlement looms on the horizon, with little serious attention paid to key issues such as national dialogue, transitional justice, security sector reform, and reconciliation.

The UN has been involved in mediation in the Libyan conflict through its special mission in Libya, UNSMIL. However, each head of the mission – Special Representatives of the Secretary General (SRSGs) Ian Martin, Tarik Mitri, Bernardino Leon, Martin Kobler, Ghassan Salame, Acting SRSG Stephanie Williams, and Ján Kubiš – opted for different approaches. A comparison between these efforts suggests that there have been inherent flaws in the design of the process and inconsistencies of strategy and approach.

In addition to the lack of a unified strategy in the UN-led political process, there have also been concern within large segments of Libyan society that the impartiality and neutrality of the UN were compromised at times, in a process that lacked transparency, according to our interviewees. Participants were kept in the dark ahead of the political dialogue and had no access to the dialogue agenda, its minutes or the results. Coupled with the negative effect of contending regional and international actors, the UN process was destined not to succeed in many respects.

This report reveals that, in the eyes of a majority of Libyans, the work of UNSMIL suffered many weaknesses and scored quite low on most criteria considered necessary for success. As there were no clear transparent criteria for selecting the participants in the national dialogue processes, deficiencies of inclusion and ownership reduced accountability and allowed for politicising of the whole process by the participants. Moreover, there were hardly any voices representing civil society as their limited participation was more of a token attempt at inclusivity.

Women's participation did not constitute any meaningful representation. Failing to address the issues related to women and civil society further reduced inclusivity, undermined public ownership and ignored the conditions that continue to generate conflict and violence. Lack of inclusivity and ownership also meant that implementation was left to desire, and it became essentially haphazard and circumstantial.

The Libyan Political Agreement (LPA), being the major achievement of UNSMIL and the framework that defines its work and determines current Libyan state institutions, has, despite all the support it had from UNSMIL and the international community, failed to achieve its objectives. In fact, the LPA created a context in which Libyans became even more divided than before while new issues of contestation were added. The process failed to become a transformative national dialogue that induces changes in public attitudes, making them hospitable to the ideas that render the change possible, desired and sustainable, and thus the conflict becomes actually more entrenched.

This report shows that for any dialogue to achieve a sustainable resolution to the Libyan crisis, it must be transformative and adaptive. This goal may be achieved with clearer and more solid commitment to ending foreign interference and the designing of a broader and more inclusive national dialogue that puts reconciliation at the very forefront. Any attempt to resolve the Libyan conflict must be based on an appropriate understanding of the socio-economic and historical contexts that help the parties genuinely commit to implementation of agreements.

Any effort that ignores this requirement will result in a superficial agreement that could backfire. There is a need to widen participation and uphold Libyan ownership as well as limiting foreign interference. Instead of continuing to rely on foreign actors, peace in Libya will require Libyan stakeholders joining together to develop a peace and reconciliation agreement through a Libyan-led process in which they themselves frame the contested issues as shared problems. This would pave the way for commitment and guarantees implementation based on mutual, not exclusive, benefits. Such an agreement would then no longer be a mere tool for power-sharing that privileges some factions.

Instead of continuing to rely on foreign actors, peace in Libya will require Libyan stakeholders joining together to develop a peace and reconciliation agreement through a Libyan-led process in which they themselves frame the contested issues as shared problems.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Unsuccessful Nationally Organised Dialogues
3. The Preparatory Commission for the National Dialogue (NDPC)
4. International Dialogue Initiatives for Libya
5. Libyan Dialogues Led by the UN and Foreign Countries
 - a. Analysis of Dialogues and Agreements
 - b. The Libyan Political Agreement: Inherent Factors for Failure
6. Ghassan Salamé Rescue Action Plan: No Consensus is Possible
 - a. The Consultation Phase of the Libyan National Conference, April–July 2018
7. Special Envoys and SRSGs: Different Approaches
 - a. Abdelelah al-Khatib, UN Special Envoy to Libya, March–August 2011
 - b. Ian Martin, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, September 2011 – October 2012
 - c. Tarek Mitri, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, September 2012 – August 2014
 - d. Bernardino León, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, September 2014 – November 2015
 - e. Martin Kobler, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, November 2015 – June 2017
 - f. Ghassan Salamé, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, August 2017 – March 2020
 - g. Acting SRSG Stephanie T. Williams, 2 July 2018 – 18 January 2021
 - h. Ján Kubiš, UNSG Special Envoy on Libya and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL), 18 January 2021 – 23 November 2021
8. Too Many Cooks Spoil the Broth: Foreign Interventions in the Libyan Crisis
9. The Inconsistency of the UN Approach: Deficiencies in Design, Structure and Process
 - a. Inclusion and Local Ownership
 - b. Weak Implementation Modalities
 - c. Accountability and Legitimacy
 - d. UN Impartiality Questioned
10. Conclusion

11. Policy Recommendations
 - a. The Libyan Parties
 - b. The United Nations
 - c. The International Community
 - d. Neighbouring Countries

12. Annex
 - a. List of Interviews
 - b. List of References
 - c. List of Abbreviations

1) Introduction

In less than three months, the Presidential Council (PC) and the Government of National Unity (GNU) would have spent almost two years in office. UNSG, on 2 September 2022, appointed Abdoulaye Bathily of Senegal as the Special Representative for Libya and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL). However, the hopes for peace raised by this development seem even far elusive as durable settlement of the Libyan crisis is yet to be reached. While hopes of achieving tangible results are mounting, many obstacles remain unaddressed.

The high hopes raised by the Berlin Conference were dashed when the elections could not be held as planned on 24 December 2021 as per the agreed roadmap. What is more, the sudden resignation of yet another special envoy, Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) Ján Kubiš, shortly before the due date of the controversial parliamentary and presidential elections, is an additional indication that the UN-led political process in Libya is in dire straits. Following SRSG Kubiš' resignation, U.N. Secretary-General António Guterres appointed American diplomat Stephanie Williams, who had previously led talks that resulted in the October 2020 cease-fire deal in Libya, to be his special adviser and to support the holding of the Libyan elections.

Before this, several rounds of consultations in Cairo and in Geneva yielded significant progress. Yet this falls short of the requirements to hold comprehensive and inclusive national elections. In June 2022, Special Advisor of the Secretary-General (SASG) Williams convened a high-level meeting on Libya's constitutional track in Geneva to push the constitutional process forward. During this meeting, the presidents of the Libyan House of Representatives and High Council of State reviewed the outstanding provisions of the 2017 Libyan Draft Constitution, taking into account the agreement reached during the Cairo talks earlier. The two chambers agreed on a number of long-standing issues, inter alia, the designation of the headquarters and distribution of seats for the two chambers of the legislative authority; division of responsibilities among the president, prime minister, cabinet and local government; the specific form of decentralization, including the delineation of the number of governorates and their powers; a revenue allocation mechanism for the different levels of government; and increased representation for cultural components. Yet, major disagreements persist on some key issues, mainly on the eligibility requirements for the candidates in the first presidential elections post-2011. What is more, the UN Security Council, riven by schisms, has been struggling for years to maintain a fragile UN-led political process in Libya, which has been plagued by protracted violent conflict, institutional collapse, and political strife since the U.S.-led NATO intervention in 2011, which resulted in the downfall of Muammar al-Qaddafi's regime. The on-going war between Russia and Ukraine, with the indirect involvement of a number of NATO countries is yet another factor, which may well complicate further the prospects for a resolution of the Libyan crisis.

The Libyan conflict seems to have defied all attempts at mediation, be it through political or peace processes carried out by local, intercommunal, national or international arbitrators, including the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL). This report discusses analytically these different attempts at resolving the conflict through peaceful means and evaluates them according to criteria such as ownership, inclusion, impartiality and legitimacy.

Each of these components is explored conceptually and empirically, based on the views expressed by many Libyan participants interviewed for the purpose of this research.² The lessons drawn, therefore, have significant relevance for the design of national dialogue processes that international mediators, including UNSMIL, may attempt in the future. To conclude, the report will attempt to make some policy recommendations.

2) Unsuccessful Nationally Organised Dialogues

Libya's transition has seen little attention paid to national dialogue, transitional justice and reconciliation.³ Though there were several attempts at 'dialogue', they rested upon traditional reconciliation mechanisms that seldom tackled the real issues, lacked conceptual clarity and were confined to isolated issues of the transition. More importantly, the results of these processes were not replicated at the national level.

Early dialogue attempts actually became mere platforms for revolutionary rhetoric. Even when initiatives were the undertaking of the transitional authorities, such as the National Transitional Council (NTC), they lacked the political will and the resources required for successful and effective implementation. Some of these early dialogues were politically charged with ideological rhetoric, which marred them with bias that fuelled scepticism and wider criticism. This led to failure amidst an increasing deterioration of security in the country. This, in turn, led to further widening divisions, and thus the conflict became more of a cause for concern for international actors, who began seriously entertaining the idea of a UN-sponsored dialogue. (Van Lier, 2017, pp. 20–21)

The discussion below focuses on one major initiative, the Preparatory Commission for the National Dialogue (NDPC), which was set up in August 2013. With support and technical advice from UNSMIL, the NDPC sought to engage major political parties, civil society organisations, regions and ethnic groups.

3) The Preparatory Commission for the National Dialogue⁴

In 2013, sensing the urgency of the situation, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Libya (SRSG) and Head of the UN Mission in Libya, Tariq Mitri, highlighted the need for an inclusive national dialogue process to build consensus among the contending parties in Libya. Therefore, a Preparatory Commission for the National Dialogue (NDPC) was created.⁵ According to SRSG Mitri, the NDPC "was not welcomed by many Libyans. Some associated it politically with the interests of Prime Minister Ali Zaidan, while others insisted that it was the prerogative of the General National Congress (GNC) to appoint such a group and that it should work under its authority". As a consequence, it was not an effective national

² This research is based on a critical review of the literature and the analysis of the statements and declarations related to the Libyan conflict. Interviews with a number of UNSMIL chiefs and Libyan actors of different orientations who took part in UN-led mediation efforts provide the primary sources as far as the evaluation of this process is concerned.

³ Libya's transition and ongoing peace talks are based on the Constitutional Declaration of 2013 (available at: www.peaceagreements.org/view/728/) and the Libyan Political Agreement (LPA) of 2015 (available at: www.peaceagreements.org/view/1370/).

⁴ The background information in this section is based on interviews with Fadeel Lameen, Head of NDPC, and ex-SRSG Tariq Mitri, in addition to documents and reports from the NDPC.

⁵ (NDPC Chairman, Fadeel Lameen, interview)

dialogue; the process lacked inclusivity and furthermore was accused of being under UN control. UNSMIL advised that a politically inclusive, consultative group be formed: “But the deficit in representativeness was not offset, and despite many preparatory consultative meetings, it was not possible for the NDPC to progress towards convening national dialogue.”⁶

“But the deficit in representativeness was not offset, and despite many preparatory consultative meetings, it was not possible for the NDPC to progress towards convening national dialogue.”

The NDPC faced a serious challenge inherent in designing such processes. Though this initiative attempted to be inclusive and representative, its essential drawback pertained to its power mandate and decision-making powers. Being an initiative of a government at loggerheads with its own parliament, the independence and legitimacy of this initiative were questioned. This also implied it lacked autonomy and acceptable ratification by existing institutions. In particular, the NDPC lacked a connection to any roadmap commonly adopted, reducing its achievements to a programme of visits which included a number of cities.⁷ The Chair of the NDPC, Fadeel Lameen, attributes the failure of the NDPC to the competition between Libya’s actors for politically narrow interests. Lameen, however, defends the work of the NDPC and its efforts to facilitate a true Libyan national dialogue. He blames Libyan actors for laying obstacles in the path of peace rather than committing to the NDPC process. In the end, the NDPC found itself unable to compete with the UN-sponsored process and the NDPC activities were halted by its chair. Fadeel Lameen thereafter continued as a political dialogue participant. According to him, the NDPC never formally dissolved; it de facto disintegrated.⁸

4) International Dialogue Initiatives for Libya

As several observers pointed out, Libya went through several unsuccessful transitional phases, with several interim or transitional governments which proved incapable to resolve the fundamental issues or table a shared vision for state-building, peace consolidation and development. This is due mainly to the fact that these governments were more often than not the result of political wrestling and power sharing rather than an inclusive dialogue-based consensus. As such, these quick fixes established power structures embodied by governments which were more partisan and interest-based, rather than serving the country as a whole. Absent the principle of dialogue and consensus, the country went into a vicious circle of chaos and protracted violence. For its part, the international community has been trying to support Libyans to reach a consensus on the divisive issues through the convening of meetings and negotiations both in Libya and abroad, and through supporting the work carried out by the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL). Yet, so far, and despite some relative successes now and then, these efforts have faced tremendous challenges and proven vain in putting an end to the protracted conflict and in effective state-building. What is more, the lack

⁶ (T. Mitri, Interview)

⁷ (Van Lier, pp. 25-27)

⁸ (Fadeel Lameen, Interview)

of close coordination between members of the international community has compounded the internal competitive nature of the Libyan parties and, at times, even added more divisions to existing cleavages within the Libyan context.

In 2014, a new turn was reflected in the political divide in Libya that became more acute as the country witnessed a new cycle of civil war.⁹ The need for mediation efforts was highlighted by top-ranking diplomatic efforts and high-powered diplomacy. Realising the risks, the new UNSMIL head, SRSB Bernardino León, opted for a new strategy of political dialogue in which UNSMIL's primary concern was reaching consensus around a united Libyan government. The focus became that of convening a dialogue that accommodated both formal and informal actors and institutions. UNSMIL selected a number of participants for what it called the 'Libyan Political Dialogue' and embarked on a dialogue process that eventually resulted in the Libyan Political Agreement (LPA). This agreement remains the main framework for existing institutions and the dialogue itself. Moreover, a number of countries, including France, Italy, the UAE, Egypt, Morocco, Algeria, Russia and Germany, attempted to mediate the Libyan conflict at different levels of engagement.

UNSMIL selected a number of participants for what it called the 'Libyan Political Dialogue' and embarked on a dialogue process that eventually resulted in the Libyan Political Agreement (LPA).

5) Libyan Dialogues Led by the UN and Foreign Countries

The UN and international mediation dialogue efforts included a pre-negotiation agreement made on 2 July 2015, resulting from what has come to be known as the Libyan Political Dialogue, in addition to a number of other initiatives.¹⁰ All efforts involved Libyan actors and resulted in some kind of agreement or declaration. UNSMIL, led by the Acting SRSB Stephanie Williams, worked towards achieving a ceasefire, resuming dialogue amongst Libyan factions and uniting state institutions. Williams' aim was to resume the talks based on the results of and agreements made at the Berlin Conference in January 2020.

UNSMIL convened a number of meetings focusing on the six critical issues identified at the Berlin Conference. These issues grouped in six baskets were included in the Conclusions of the Berlin Summit, namely the cessation of hostilities and permanent ceasefire, implementation of the arms embargo, security sector reform, return to the political process, economic reform and upholding international humanitarian and human rights law. Following the Berlin Conference, UNSMIL laid out an action plan to be implemented before, during, and after the Berlin Summit, working on the basis of simultaneous advancement of each basket. UNSMIL thus focused concomitantly on operationalizing the political track, the economic and financial track, the security and military track, the arms embargo, the promotion and respect for international human rights, humanitarian law and the creation of an environment conducive for

⁹ Views differ widely as to whether Libya's civil war started in 2011 or later in 2014. Those arguing for the first view indicate that it had been a civil war that included Libyans supportive of either Gaddafi or the rebels. Those who argue it only started in 2014 consider that the divisions following the elections of 2014 and the ensuing fighting mark the beginning of the civil war. I use the term 'civil war' as a general condition that has dominated most of Libya's affairs since 2011.

¹⁰ See Annex

humanitarian actors. This UNSMIL-led process also provided options for where Member States can provide support for and engage in concert with the United Nations.

Critical issues identified at the Berlin Conference, namely the cessation of hostilities and permanent ceasefire, implementation of the arms embargo, security sector reform, return to the political process, economic reform and upholding international humanitarian and human rights law.

Several meetings were held in Morocco and Geneva, in addition to a number of meetings and discussions in other capitals with the declared objective of including more actors in the dialogue process to amend the Libyan Political Agreement, signed in Skhirat in Morocco on 17 December 2015, and assuring its implementation.¹¹ In 2020, Libyan delegations signed an agreement on a mechanism for appointments to sovereign positions in Bouznika, Morocco (2-6 October 2020). The two rounds of inter-Libyan dialogue, held in Bouznika between the delegations of the High Council of State and the Libyan House of Representatives, were aimed at fostering trust between the two rival institutions and constituted yet another positive step to be capitalized upon in the process of peacebuilding. These initiatives were also preceded by other international efforts such as the aforementioned Skhirat agreement on 17 December 2015, and the Berlin Conference on 19 January 2020. It is worth mentioning also the UN-led consultation meeting which was convened 7 - 9 September 2020 in Montreux, Switzerland. Moreover, the United Nations Support Mission in Libya organized a series of face-to-face meetings of the Libyan Political Dialogue Forum in Tunisia in November 2020, including a series of virtual sessions.

a) Analysis of Dialogues and Agreements

In this section, an analysis of the Libyan dialogues and agreements is made based on the aforementioned Berlin Conference criteria. However, the focus is on the Libyan Political Agreement as it remains the main inclusive agreement and serves as the general framework of other dialogues.¹² The discussion benefits from the feedback received from many interviewees who participated in the dialogues. Some of them took part in most, if not all, dialogues, while some were actually signatories to the Libyan Political Dialogue and the Libyan Political Agreement, or were leading actors and figures in their context.

b) The Libyan Political Agreement: Inherent Factors for Failure

Add a box:

The Libyan Political Agreement (LPA) signed in Skhirat, Morocco intended to settle the dispute between two competing legitimacies; that of the House of Representatives (HoR) and

¹¹ In the Moroccan city of Skhirat and agreement was reached in a form of a roadmap that brought a Presidency Council and caretaker government, Government of National Accord. Skhirat was thus an attempt to accommodate the House of Representatives, HoR, the defunct General National Congress, GNC, and their allies. Such conceived political order was also supposed to reintegrate militias.

LPA text available at: <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/sites/default/files/Libyan%20Political%20Agreement%20-%20ENG%20.pdf>

¹² Robert Forster, 'A Gender Analysis of Peace Agreements and Transitional Documents in Libya', 2011–2018

its associated government, based in the eastern cities of Tobruk, then in al-Bayda, which was opposed to the General National Congress (GNC) and its government in Tripoli. As stipulated in the LPA, a number of institutions were established. A Presidency Council, an executive power based in the capital Tripoli as of March 2016 in charge of forming a unity government, and an advisory High State Council, composed of former GNC members. The HoR saw its legitimacy confirmed and prolonged as the only parliament, mandated to endorse the unity government, which it never did. All told, the institutional arrangements established by the LPA were concocted hastily and contained the seeds of discord from the outset, which contributed eventually to more chaos and strife, as supporters and foes resorted to competing legal interpretations and technical details to favor their positions and weaken that of their adversaries. The fundamental objective of the LPA was to avoid military confrontation and the total collapse of Libya,

An essential element in the Libyan Political Agreement (LPA) has been its interim nature. However, analysis of the responses received from interviewees indicates that Libyan actors made certain calculations by which they considered the arrangements to have the potential for endurance. Therefore, they viewed all interim arrangements resulting from any agreement, especially the LPA, as concessions they would make that would become disadvantages to them in the future. Much of the issue relates to the fact that the UNSMIL head at the time, SRSB Bernadino León, on several occasions made substantial content changes to the draft agreement. The LPA text was negotiated further, but interviewees confirm that SRSB León discarded the fourth draft of the agreement even though Libyan participants had approved it. With the sixth draft, UNSMIL faced more obstacles.

Both the 2014 elected Libyan House of Representatives (HoR) and the 2012 elected General National Congress (GNC) rejected the UNSMIL proposals, including the Presidential Council (PC) and the Government of National Accord (GNA) composition and selection process. Instead of responding to these concerns, SRSB León chose to ignore them, considering any further talks and amendments a betrayal of the Libyan people's aspirations as well as UN mediation. He warned that the only option for the parties would be to respond either 'yes' or 'no'.¹³

Both the 2014 elected Libyan House of Representatives (HoR) and the 2012 elected General National Congress (GNC) rejected the UNSMIL proposals, including the Presidential Council (PC) and the Government of National Accord (GNA) composition and selection process.

This, according to senior House of Representatives negotiators interviewed for the purpose of this research, led to an increase in the level of mistrust they had in SRSB León as a mediator. This was the view of two senior House of Representatives members and negotiators, Abobakr Boera and Abdulsalam Nasia, who led the HoR teams at various stages of negotiations. (Boera, interview; Nasia, interview) The House of Representatives rejected the proposal, citing

¹³ SRSB León's press conference late night Monday 21 September 2015 in Skhirat, Morocco, available at <https://reliefweb.int/report/libya/leon-final-text-libyan-political-agreement-ready-candidates-government-after-eid>

underrepresentation of eastern Libya, while the General National Congress condemned the talks, considering the entire process a reflection of foreign interference, and called for an inter-Libyan dialogue on Libyan soil. (Franco, pp. 46–47)

A number of interviewees indicate that one major flaw in the LPA relates to the fact that UNSMIL did not actually seek or maintain a direct, honest, serious and inclusive exchange of views, and, as such, the process was not perceived as a genuine Libyan-owned dialogue. This resonates with other critics' concerns that the Libyan parties did not actively exchange their views and did not take part in the drafting process which UNSMIL both sponsored and led. According to House of Representatives member Abobakr Boera, who was elected by the HoR to represent it at the Skhirat talks, there had been agreement on the fourth draft of the LPA, but UNSMIL changed it, imposing an increase in the number of members of the Presidential Council from three to nine. He indicates that this was against the spirit of the discussion and came as SRSB León¹⁴ ignored the need to take into consideration Libya's three regions. This issue would later become the focus of subsequent talks to amend the LPA.

The interviewees indicate that, even at this stage, SRSB León had drawn up his own list of candidates and included them in the final communique. House of Representatives member Boera confirms that the Presidential Council members were selected with total disregard for the lists of candidates that the House of Representatives and the General National Congress had provided based on previous agreement. The names selected were entirely different, suggesting that SRSB León decided the composition of the Presidential Council in a discreet manner not related to the negotiations. (Boera, interview) This, the interviewees said, was considered a contradiction of the dialogue objective and a blatant violation of Libya's sovereignty and Libyans' ownership of the process, and as an interference in the new government's affairs.

Moreover, Boera explains that while both the House of Representative and the General National Congress elected their delegations, UNSMIL restructured the participants' list, adding unelected members and other individuals without any cogent explanation. More surprising was UNSMIL's exclusion of Boera himself from the final session. Boera's version of events is evident from the fact that the names of the signatories who initialised the LPA fourth draft in July 2015 were different from those signing the final text of the LPA in December 2015. (Boera, interview) SRSB León's attitude and his tactic of imposing his own views and proposals, especially in the selection of Presidential Council and Government of National Accord members, created confusion and greatly diminished the credibility of the entire process. As evident from leaked emails of León's, the numerous changes he introduced to the draft were considered a tactic for placating the side he was accused of supporting, thus compromising his position, and eventually the UN's stand as an impartial, honest broker.

¹⁴ Mr Bernardino León was contacted several times for an interview as this research was being conducted. He never responded to the several interview requests.

SRSO León's attitude and his tactic of imposing his own views and proposals, especially in the selection of Presidential Council and Government of National Accord members, created confusion and greatly diminished the credibility of the entire process.

As the stalemate continued, a new SRSO, Martin Kobler, was appointed. His immediate concern was to find a way out of the deadlock and convince the General National Congress to endorse the Libyan Political Agreement. He convened a new set of talks in Tunis on 10–11 December 2015 to deliberate the key points of disagreement. SRSO Kobler and the international community pushed for a ratification of the LPA, citing the danger posed by Daesh, arguing, therefore, that the LPA should not be renegotiated. One major faction, the General National Congress, was split between the hardliners rejecting the entire process, and the majority accepting the LPA. UNSMIL continued with its timetable, setting a target date for the final signatures. This rushed and pressured approach echoed the technocratic manner of this UN-led process, which gave priority to adhering to a technical process, at the expense of realising the most important objective of achieving a transformative dialogue. (Franco, p. 53) SRSO Kobler admitted that the Libyan factions “began to perceive the power sharing arrangements through the interests of one group over the other”.¹⁵

In this way, the LPA did not have a smooth path as issues remained unresolved, particularly those related to the Government of National Accord (GNA) and the incorporation of the LPA itself into the Constitutional Declaration. SRSO Kobler attempted to secure some grassroots support by holding a workshop in Malta in January 2017 to create what he called a roadmap for national reconciliation. He was hopeful that through such a dialogue he would levy pressure on the main Libyan actors. But this turned out to be hopeless. Kobler was frustrated, and in April 2017, recognising the failure of the process, he exhorted, “it is time to go back to politics, it is time to address the core issues, and it is time to go back to the spirit of Skhirat”.¹⁶ Nevertheless, this turned out to be his last failed attempt as he subsequently decided to resign. (Franco, p. 55)

SRSO Kobler was frustrated, and in April 2017, recognising the failure of the process, he exhorted, “it is time to go back to politics, it is time to address the core issues, and it is time to go back to the spirit of Skhirat.”

6) Ghassan Salamé Rescue Action Plan: No Consensus is Possible

The first step taken by Kobler's successor, SRSO Ghassan Salamé, was to talk to wider circles of Libyans, and he came to the conclusion that “the Libyan people need and want a process which is inclusive... with clearly defined stages and objectives... a process that they themselves own and lead”.¹⁷ According to SRSO Salamé, getting UNSMIL back to working from inside Libya was necessary so that direct contact with Libyans and understanding the issues involved were possible, thus he moved UNSMIL and its staff back to Tripoli. He

¹⁵ UNSMIL, Martin Kobler's Statement to the Security Council, 19 April 2017, <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/martin-koblers-statement-security-council>

¹⁶ UNSMIL, Martin Kobler's Statement to the Security Council, 19 April 2017, <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/martin-koblers-statement-security-council>

¹⁷ UNSMIL, Remarks of SRSO Salamé at the High-Level Event on Libya, New York, 20 September 2017, <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/remarks-srsg-salam%C3%A9-high-level-event-libya>

indicated that his decision to bring UNSMIL back to Tripoli was met with resistance from the UN bureaucracy, but his determination was decisive (Salamé, interview). Direct interaction with Libyans on the ground revealed that the UN was not present and almost non-existent while it was held responsible for the crisis in Libya (Salamé, interview). His encounter with Libyan actors and the direct exchanges and discussions he held with the Libya public, intellectuals, academics and experts led him to realize that the frameworks and approaches the UN previously followed in Libya were not relevant to the Libyan case. He became convinced that the divide in Libya was not ideological, tribal or regional but that it was due to the unequal distribution of the national wealth. What Libya needed most was state building rather than international aid (Salamé, interview).

According to SRSg Salamé, getting UNSMIL back to working from inside Libya was necessary so that direct contact with Libyans and understanding the issues involved were possible.

Realising the deadlock the Libyan Political Agreement was facing, SRSg Salamé started his mission enthusiastically, working for mutual accord between the House of Representatives and the High Council of State (HCS) for almost one year. Soon he realised that the LPA was the problem, declaring that “in its current state it is not adequate”.¹⁸ Given the obstacles, he abandoned the objective of reaching consensus on the amendments, which he now considered “a distraction”. He advanced a different formula in his Action Plan with a proposal for holding an inclusive national conference that would adopt a national charter providing guidelines or governing principles for the transition. (Salamé, interview) This method could have responded to many of the challenges and fixed shortcomings in the UNSMIL approach. However, SRSg Salamé’s Action Plan was ambitious in its objectives and its timeline of 12 months for implementation. It was even too ambitious as it assumed that the national consultation process would be inclusive and lead to a consensus on the fundamental principles of the constitution, resembling a new vision or social contract. It also included ideas about engaging armed groups, addressing urgent economic issues and promoting local and national reconciliation.¹⁹

a) The Consultation Phase of the Libyan National Conference, April–July 2018

SRSg Salamé’s plan for the national conference was aborted when fighting erupted just days before the conference was to convene. It suffered the same fate as the process led by SRSg Mitri in 2014, which was abandoned when fighting broke out, leading to the most destructive cycle of the civil war post-Gaddafi.²⁰ SRSg Salamé expresses dismay with the international community and the role of the UNSC. He criticizes both for being responsible for lack of real progress to resolve the crisis. Salamé indicated that the goal of organising a national conference was torpedoed by the military operation of the Libyan National Army (LNA) to take Tripoli

¹⁸ UNSMIL, Remarks of SRSg Salamé at the High-Level Event on Libya, New York, 20 September 2017, <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/remarks-srsg-salam%C3%A9-high-level-event-libya>

¹⁹ UNSMIL, Remarks of SRSg Salamé at the High-Level Event on Libya, New York, 20 September 2017, <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/remarks-srsg-salam%C3%A9-high-level-event-libya>

²⁰ Tarek Mitri, 2015. *Arduous Paths: Two Years in and for Libya*. Riad El-Rayyes Books, Beirut, Lebanon. (Arabic Text)

by force but more importantly by the support of such operation received from more than half of the UNSC members (Salam, interview).

SRSB Salamé's plan for the national conference was aborted when fighting erupted just days before the conference was to convene. It suffered the same fate as the process led by SRSB Mitri in 2014, which was abandoned when fighting broke out, leading to the most destructive cycle of the civil war post-Gaddafi.

Therefore, the national conference was only realised in the form of a number of smaller dialogues or town-hall type discussions run by the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HD). The National Conference planned in Ghadames in April 2019 was not possible to convene as the crisis continued, culminating in the launch of the Libyan National Army (LNA) military operation to take over Tripoli. (Watanabe, 2019; Salame, interview)

At the request of UNSMIL, the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue organised what it considered to be an inclusive, structured discussion including, among others, Libyans from the diaspora. The HD confirmed the participation of 7,000 Libyans, with 2,000 online submissions and the participation of 130,000 people through social media.²¹ However, the whole process was less effective than previously assumed. Interviewees who took part in or monitored the dialogues indicate that there was no real large-scale process for including more representative stakeholders or engaging the whole polity. According to a number of participants, these rounds of dialogues were a mere showcase to support the 'real' negotiations that were ongoing backstage. UNSMIL seemed to have wanted to avoid falling into the trap of working between the fulfilment of UN norms for inclusivity through a broader participation and the real dilemma of delivering an agreement. The result was, as interviewees testify, that the HD dialogues were merely a pro forma inclusion, not a catalyst for genuine inclusion. They did not enable genuine inclusive deliberations or dialogue.

7) Special Envoys and SRSBs: Different Approaches

UN mediation in the Libyan conflict has seen the appointment of a number of SRSBs, each opting for a different approach. A comparison between these suggests that a unified strategy was lacking. In the discussion below, an analysis of the approach adopted by each SRSB is attempted. The objective is to demonstrate how each approach affected the dialogue process and its outcomes. Furthermore, the analysis will assess how these have framed UN mediation and determined its role.

a) Abdelelah al-Khatib, UN Special Envoy to Libya, March–August 2011

On 7 March 2011, before the conflict turned into civil war, the UN appointed Abdelelah al-Khatib to find a peaceful solution to the crisis in Libya. His mission, however, was ill-fated since the UN Security Council (UNSC), while appointing him, also referred the situation in

²¹ United Nations Support Mission in Libya, and Center for Humanitarian Dialogue. 2018. The Libyan National Conference Process: Final Report. Geneva and Tunis: November. Available at: https://unsmil.unmissions.org/sites/default/files/ncp_report_jan_2019_en.pdf

Libya to the International Criminal Court (ICC) and approved Security Council Resolutions 1970 and 1973, opening the door for the NATO military campaign in Libya.

The Security Council was divided, but the views of those member states which supported regime change eventually prevailed. Therefore, Special Envoy al-Khatib's early entry, before widespread violence, was not useful as the NATO intervention made it clear that the real objective was regime change, not peacemaking through mediation and diplomacy. In fact, al-Khatib was physically constrained and unable to undertake his mission to such an extent that he had to ask for permission from NATO to fly to Libya. On one occasion, NATO shelled Tripoli while al-Khatib was getting ready to meet key regime figures, possibly depriving him of the opportunity of meeting Gaddafi himself. Technical assistance from the UN was limited too, and this eventually undermined his mission. In fact, his mission lacked support and was greatly undermined by the lack of impartiality of certain key members of the UNSC.

Special Envoy al-Khatib's early entry, before widespread violence, was not useful as the NATO intervention made it clear that the real objective was regime change, not peacemaking through mediation and diplomacy.

No matter how impartial al-Khatib was perceived to be, through making efforts to reach out to all parties, the international community and he in reality were at odds and ended up working against each other, while the absence of any Libyan ownership remained a major weakness. The multiplicity of mediation initiatives introduced by countries such as Turkey, the Western countries' 'Contact Group for Libya', and international organisations such as the African Union (AU) and the League of Arab States (LAS) created a cacophonous atmosphere with the various initiatives undermining each other. This made al-Khatib less informed and a victim of cross-purposes. His mandate was rather short as it ended on 20 August 2011, when the Gaddafi regime fell. (Mancini and Vericat, pp.6–8)

b) Ian Martin, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, September 2011 – October 2012

SRSR Ian Martin's task was to set up the UN Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) in the spirit of the so-called 'light footprint', which aimed for a limited UN presence in Libya. UNSMIL, whose mandate was mainly advisory, focused its activities on areas related to supporting the democratic transition, public security, human rights, transitional justice, and the rule of law. SRSR Martin tried reaching out to Libyan stakeholders, but with the Libyan transitional authorities deeply divided, he found no real leadership to engage with. In the end, the UN made the ill-advised decision to hastily go for elections before addressing these issues, which eventually became more pressing, and this finally proved catastrophic. Launching the electoral process, before laying the foundations of the State and initiating institutional building, in a country which had no tradition of political participation nor effective and accountable institutions over decades, proved fatal to the Libyan transition. Libya quickly descended into more polarisation and conflict. (Mancini and Vericat, pp. 6–8)

“Launching the electoral process, before laying the foundations of the State and initiating institutional building, in a country which had no tradition of political participation nor effective and accountable institutions over decades, proved fatal to the Libyan transition.”

c) Tarek Mitri, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, September 2012 – August 2014

From the outset, SRSR Tarek Mitri’s focus was to act as a facilitator. However, the rushed elections and the advance of exclusionary attitudes and practices complicated his mission and deprived this approach of its merits. He explains, “it was obvious that the temptation for vengeance was stronger than the desire for reconciliation. The call for reparation, in its material sense, was more pronounced than the aspiration to justice”. Mitri’s focus became that of “options for the management of the institutional transition”. (Mitri, interview)

“[I]t was obvious that the temptation for vengeance was stronger than the desire for reconciliation. The call for reparation, in its material sense, was more pronounced than the aspiration to justice.”

The national dialogue he believed in and was keen on supporting was doomed to failure, as it also did not prevent exclusionary practices as exemplified in the Political Isolation Law.²² UNSMIL during SRSR Mitri’s tenure played an advisory role through the provision of technical support, which meant that the Libyan parties, especially those in positions of power, were able to challenge UNSMIL’s efforts; they resisted any change in their position and continued to have access to leverage. Therefore, the dialogue initiative was at their mercy and no effective dialogue was possible. Important Libyan figures and groups also accused UNSMIL of partiality. (Franco, pp. 86–87)

d) Bernardino León²³, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, September 2014 – November 2015

SRSR Bernadino León’s tenure was controversial. In stark contrast to SRSR Mitri, León moved beyond facilitation, making his priority the structuring of the Libyan Political Agreement, the drafting process of which he closely monitored and controlled. Participants in the dialogue processes alleged that there was evidence of undue interference in the negotiations, in contravention of his role as an impartial UN mediator. Just a few months after taking office, he announced that he would be leaving his post as head of UNSMIL.

Confronted with the House of Representatives’ rejection of the Libyan Political Agreement, SRSR León threatened that unless it approved his proposed LPA, members of the House of Representatives and any other Libyan actor were likely to be sanctioned by the international

²² On 8 May 2013 the GNC passed a lustration law, Law No. (13) of 2013 on administrative and political isolation. It led to barring all middle- and high-ranking state officials on the pretension that they were former regime elements. The text of this law is available at: https://security-legislation.ly/sites/default/files/lois/315-Law%20No.%20%2813%29%20of%202013_EN.pdf

²³ As stated earlier, several emailed requests for an interview were sent to Mr LEÓN in vain. All these requests remained unanswered.

community. He said that “if the agreement is adopted or supported by the House of Representatives they will, of course, maintain their legitimacy as members of the HoR”. In a press conference, SRSR León stated, “*I think in this case they (HoR) can expect the recognition of the international community at the same time ... if the way chosen – I’m not going to talk now specifically about the HoR but about any Libyan party proposing unilateral solutions outside the national consensus – my impression is that this will not be recognized by the international community.*”²⁴ This led to even more reservations and eventually the failure of the LPA to achieve its objectives.

Though he initially succeeded in overcoming the distrust that marked the relationship between the House of Representatives and the General National Congress, this was not enough to resolve the conflict. His understanding of the conflict and its dynamics was obscured by his consideration of their contestation to be the major divide, thus excluding major actors. Moreover, his mediation faced rather an unsurmountable obstacle as he eventually lost the trust of the parties, who considered him biased, with a hidden agenda. He was perceived as involved in a conflict of interest and lost the most important trait for a mediator: credibility.

He was perceived as involved in a conflict of interest and lost the most important trait for a mediator: credibility.

In November 2015, the press published leaked emails alleging that León had been offered a high-salaried job in a country from the region involved in the Libyan crisis, which he reportedly accepted while he was still a UN official.²⁵ SRSR León denied any conflict of interest, stating that his emails were manipulated and that he had made it clear he wanted to leave his UN role before he accepted this job offer. Yet, whatever the truth may be, the damage was done and doubt was cast on the proposals by the GNC, pointing to evidence of SRSR León’s perceived lack of neutrality and impartiality. (Franco, pp. 48–49, 88)

In an even less credible and impartial move, SRSR León was alleged to have named the candidates for the Presidential Council and determined their roles in the Government of National Accord. This, although it went ahead later, was a blatant interference in the GNA’s affairs, and any common understanding he may have previously cultivated among Libyans just evaporated. (Franco, p. 89)

e) Martin Kobler²⁶, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, November 2015 – June 2017

²⁴ UNSMIL, ‘Excerpts from SRSR for Libya Bernardino León’s Press Conference Held in Tunis, Tunisia, Wednesday 21 October 2015’, <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/leon-we-will-press-ahead-and-no-chance-allow-hardliners-hijack-political-process>

²⁵ un-libya-envoy-accepts-1000-a-day-job-from-backer-of-one-side-in-civil-war <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/04/un-libya-envoy-accepts-1000-a-day-job-from-backer-of-one-side-in-civil-war>

²⁶ Despite many attempts at contacting Mr Martin Kobler, it was not possible to establish contact with him.

SRSK Kobler was fearful that the whole process would collapse altogether and was keen on keeping the momentum and accelerating it through a tighter timeline. He exploited local Libyan dynamics and contestations by furthering the interests of the Libyan parties who saw the Libyan Political Agreement as their counter-offensive against any intra-Libyan dialogue that their opponents were considering as an alternative to the LPA. Apart from the negative impact this approach had on the conflict, the attitude of SRSK Kobler meant a rush towards an agreement that not only failed to include all stakeholders but also was a reflection of political opportunism, as indicated by a number of our interviewees, including some of the participants in the LPA process and its signatories.

Despite the euphoria surrounding the signing of the LPA and the momentum it created, SRSK Kobler was not able to find acceptable solutions to the many contentious issues, especially a security roadmap and the formation of a unity government that the House of Representatives rejected, leading thus to a situation where the whole process lacked implementation. In response, Kobler launched what he called ‘A Roadmap to Peace’ with the aim of advancing implementation of the LPA. His time was spent taking shuttle trips and presiding over many meetings geared towards finding agreements on amendments to the LPA. But his efforts were in vain. (Franco, p. 88)

Despite the euphoria surrounding the signing of the LPA and the momentum it created, SRSK Kobler was not able to find acceptable solutions to the many contentious issues, especially a security roadmap and the formation of a unity government that the House of Representatives rejected, leading thus to a situation where the whole process lacked implementation.

SRSK Kobler was keen to highlight that a divided Libya needed peace in unity. He equated this with fulfilling his demand for “a rapid endorsement of the Libyan Political Agreement”, indicating that those in disagreement would be left behind, using the metaphorical expression “the train has left the station”.²⁷ SRSK Kobler’s role and work display two contradictory results. He was able to implement the LPA by securing the signatures of a number of figures from both sides of the divide. However, the LPA military and security provisions were not acceptable to a substantial House of Representatives majority, resulting in them rejecting the whole LPA. There were also objections to establishing a Presidential Council of nine members in a clear contravention to the three-member council that had been agreed in draft four of the LPA. The General National Council’s objection to the LPA was made on the grounds that it was made while it was boycotting the talks.²⁸

The signing of the LPA was undertaken by delegates who had not been mandated to do so by either the House of Representatives or the General National Council. The GNC hard-line presidency and its allies discredited the process altogether. SRSK Kobler’s bad relations with a key Libyan actor, Khalifa Haftar, greatly compromised his position as a broker. Haftar

²⁷ UNSMIL, ‘SRSK Martin Kobler: Libyan Political Agreement Is the Only Way Forward for Peace in Unity’, <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/srsg-martin-kobler-libyan-political-agreement-only-way-forward-peace-unity>

²⁸ For more details see ‘Crisis Group, The Libyan Political Agreement: Time for a Reset’, <https://www.crisisgroup.org/middle-east-north-africa/north-africa/libya/libyan-political-agreement-time-reset>

actually refused to meet SRSK Kobler, and his Libyan National Army prevented an UNSMIL jet from landing in eastern Libya. Unable to overcome these difficulties and the trust gap, SRSK Kobler was accused of partiality, or even conspiracy. His mission was denied access to western Libya and he was declared *persona non grata* throughout Libya. (Franco, pp. 58, 90)

f) Ghassan Salamé, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, August 2017– March 2020

While SRSK Salamé’s Action Plan was perceived as more inclusive, the inclusion of a wider array of Libyan actors remains questionable. SRSK Salamé was unable to realise this in practice. The Action Plan was ambitious in its objectives, as was its timeline of 12 months for implementation. It was even more ambitious as it assumed that the national consultation process would be inclusive and lead to a consensus on the fundamental principles of the constitution, resembling a social contract. The main element of the Action Plan was to hold a national conference in Ghadames in April 2019, but it ended up only in the form of town-hall-type discussions run by the NGO, the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HD), as mentioned above.²⁹

The Action Plan was ambitious in its objectives, as was its timeline of 12 months for implementation. It was even more ambitious as it assumed that the national consultation process would be inclusive and lead to a consensus on the fundamental principles of the constitution, resembling a social contract.

Interviewees cast doubt on the importance or usefulness of the HD dialogue. They questioned the validity of such a large-scale process for including more people and whether they really do represent or engage all the stakeholders and reflect their views. According to a number of participants, these rounds of dialogues were actually less effective than their organisers documented in their report.³⁰ They accuse UNSMIL of using the dialogues as a mere showcase to legitimise the ‘real’ negotiations that were ongoing backstage. UNSMIL also seems to have fallen into the trap of working between the fulfilment of the UN norms for a broader participation and the real dilemma, reflected in the pressure of delivering an agreement.³¹ The result was, as interviewees testify, that the HD dialogues were more like a pro forma inclusion, not a catalyst for genuine inclusion.

SRSK Salamé tried to perform the dual roles of the facilitator and the mediator simultaneously. However, his plan never materialised, as explained above. He ended up frustrated and decided to resign. Speaking to the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, Salamé said he had felt “irrelevant” and “stabbed in the back by most of the Security Council members”. He spoke openly about the major world powers supporting a particular Libyan side, which led to the battle for Tripoli in April 2019. He painfully states that the real problem was at the level of the

²⁹ The task was assigned to a Swiss-based non-profit private diplomacy foundation, the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, otherwise known as the Henry Dunant Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HD) that assists in mediation between conflicting parties to prevent or end armed conflicts.

³⁰ The Libyan National Conference Process: Final Report. Geneva and Tunis: November. Available at: https://unsmil.unmissions.org/sites/default/files/ncp_report_jan_2019_en.pdf

³¹ The UN has a set of norms for its mediation work. These include: impartiality, inclusivity, national ownership, inclusion of civil society, the empowerment and participation of women, justice and reconciliation, and human rights.

UNSC, where more than half of its members actually supported the Libyan National Army military operation while the UN was supposed to support the Government of National Accord (GNA) (Salamé, interview). This view is also shared by Stephanie Williams who explains how she was "never under any illusion about the ambiguity – to say the least - of the “international community” -- that there were countries that said one thing publicly while privately pursuing a contrary policy in full violation of the UN arms embargo' '(Williams, Interview). The Libyan National Army attempt to take Tripoli led to a battle that erupted just a few weeks before the convening of the UNSMIL-sponsored Libyan National Conference, thus further undermining SRSR Salamé’s mediation efforts in Libya.³² Moreover, both the security track (5+5 talks) and the economic track proved cumbersome and failed to realise any real success. SRSR Salamé, faced with tremendous odds, saw his continuous attempts to design and implement security and economic arrangements flounder, and eventually vanished as soon as fighting erupted in April 2019. He decided to resign from his position. (Franco, p. 90)

[T]he real problem was at the level of the UNSC, where more than half of its members actually supported the Libyan National Army military operation while the UN was supposed to support the Government of National Accord.

Interviewees indicate that his approach reflected a lack of consistency and a coherent strategy. Though SRSR Salamé was able to, initially at least, rekindle the UN political process, the change of approach and inconsistency of strategy meant that the Action Plan caused even more divisions and made any reform of the LPA almost impossible. Each faction saw in this an indication of the weakness and expediency of the UN and sought to renegotiate their position for more gains, thus making a consensus even harder to reach.

g) Acting SRSR Stephanie T. Williams, 2 July 2018 – 18 January 2021

Acting SRSR Williams served as Deputy Special Representative (Political) in UNSMIL for just under three years. When SRSR Salamé resigned, she was appointed Acting SRSR until a successor was appointed. Stephanie Williams saw the Libyan conflict as "an internationalized civil war" but she believed that there was an "over-emphasis on the role of foreign powers in what is essentially a domestic Libyan conflict over access to resources and differences over how these resources should be distributed". Therefore, following the Libyan National Army (LNA) attack on Tripoli in April 2019 and the inability of the UN Security Council to restore consensus on Libya, she pursued the Berlin process involving both the P-5 and the countries directly interfering in the country. The hope was to restore at a " minimum the international consensus on the need to end the conflict and enable a return to the political process under the international umbrella. This was embodied in the formal Berlin Conference conclusions and UNSC Resolution 2510." (Stephanie Williams, interview)

The hope was to restore at a " minimum the international consensus on the need to end the conflict and enable a return to the political process under the international

³² HD, 'Ghassan Salamé on the failures of the international community to stop wars', <https://www.hdcentre.org/podcasts/ghassan-salam-on-the-failures-of-the-international-community-to-stop-wars/> ; also available at: <https://www.dailysabah.com/politics/former-un-libya-envoy-salame-accuses-security-council-of-hypocrisy/news>

umbrella. This was embodied in the formal Berlin Conference conclusions and UNSC Resolution 2510."

Acting SRSR Williams' approach rested upon three principles.: "the first shared principle was that the best means by which to alleviate and contain foreign intervention in Libya was to put the United Nations firmly in the driver's seat and to reject any attempt, by any power (great or small) to replace the UN in this role. The second principle was to have the UN mission protect and promote the Libyan national interest against the wishes, interests, and policies pursued by these foreign players. The third principle was to give voice to and place the interest of the average Libyan above that of the predatory Libyan ruling class – military, political, and the kleptocrats (categories which are by no means mutually exclusive) -- who would endlessly and shamelessly collude to prevent elections or any change in their status quo." (Williams, interview) Arguing that her role was "that of listening to the parties, finding areas of convergence, bridging gaps and brokering a pragmatic resolution", Williams concentrated on knowing "the Libyan participants, spent considerable time with them, understood the richness of their perspectives." (Williams, interview) Thus, her main focus was to achieve a ceasefire and bring the two major sides, the Libyan National Army/House of Representatives and the Government of National Accord/High Council of State, to the negotiating table. Her plan rested upon agreements made at the Berlin Conference and its different baskets. After extensive and extended shuttle diplomacy, she managed to bring the HoR and the HCS to talks to decide on the implementation of a reformed Libyan Political Agreement.

Acting SRSR Williams managed to set up what became known as the Libyan Political Dialogue Forum (LPDF). According to UNSMIL, the aim of LPDF was "... holding of national elections in the shortest possible timeframe in order to restore Libya's sovereignty and the democratic legitimacy of Libyan institutions".³³ This new body produced a document outlining a number of amendments to the LPA, including the division of the executive authority into a three-member presidential council and a prime minister leading a government independent of the Presidential Council and tasked with leading the transitional phase to prepare for parliamentary and presidential elections on 24 December 2021.

According to UNSMIL, the aim of LPDF was "holding of national elections in the shortest possible timeframe in order to restore Libya's sovereignty and the democratic legitimacy of Libyan institutions."

The 75 members of the LPDF held several meetings, starting with a virtual meeting on 26 October 2020, with subsequent in-person meetings in Tunis and Geneva. A unified governance framework was agreed upon and a new Presidential Council and a Government of National Unity (GNU), were selected by the LPDF, tasked with unifying institutions and making the necessary arrangements to facilitate the elections and national reconciliation.

³³ <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/acting-special-representative-secretary-general-libya-stephanie-williams-announces-launch-libyan> ; Libya ceasefire: UN relaunched inclusive political forum, amid growing 'sense of hope' | UN News

While UNSMIL used the LPDF as a tool for mediating a resolution of the conflict, it also used it as a stick to levy pressure on the democratically elected HoR and other stakeholders.³⁴ UNSMIL created the LPDF and hand-picked its members to ensure particular stakeholders and powerbrokers as well as foreign powers were represented.

Apart from corruption allegations surrounding the LPDF and its selection of the executive, Libyans, including armed groups that fought in the most recent civil war, consider the forum, with few exceptions, a platform for opportunistic, greedy politicians with little legitimacy or influence. The largest group of the LPDF's members came from the House of Representatives and High Council of State and reflected their ongoing rivalry. Because of this, UNSMIL actually implanted the same ills and woes into the LPDF by including members of these two bodies known for standing in the way of any political solution that would cost them their privileges. Though both Salame and Williams (Salame, interview; Williams, interview) agree on the merits of the selection and credit LPDF with success, the following developments attested to its failure to agree on a constitutional framework for elections despite pressure from UNSMIL and popular demand. UNSMIL resorted to threatening that unless the HoR and HCS took action, the issue would be decided upon by the LPDF. This meant that UNSMIL, instead of respecting real Libyan ownership and inclusion, set up a politically selected group and granted its members the opportunity to make themselves the ultimate decision-makers should the HoR fail to confirm their roadmap or the GNU they selected, paving the way for the LPDF to replace the HoR.

Apart from the political implications of making the LPDF and its members influence the GNU as part of political bargains amidst allegations of corruption, such strategy by UNSMIL further casts doubts on the legitimacy of the whole process that would actually become self-serving and vulnerable to hijacking by certain interests of actors determined to control the transition. The GNU, and indeed the whole LPDF process, was not based upon forging a political consensus but rather on majority voting among its members. The recent moves, the overlapping domains, and the sometimes-conflicting statements made by both the PC head and the GNU PM indicate their lack of a clear-cut shared view or strategy for the future. This highlights the negative impact of the power-sharing mechanism UNSMIL adopted and reflects the risks associated with the exclusionary methods of UNSMIL, as discussed in this paper. However, Williams disputes the notion that the LPDF did not succeed in advancing the political process. According to her, "the first and second meetings witnessed great progress – approval of the Roadmap to end the long transition, designation of a date for national elections (during the Tunis meeting in November 2020) and the selection of a government of national unity (during the February 2021 meeting in Geneva)". However, she blames the failure on disrespect of the Roadmap by the UN nor the two chambers. She explains that "the Roadmap explicitly laid out a sixty-day deadline to produce the constitutional basis and electoral framework for elections. When the deadline was ignored and the LPDF was neglected, the status quo parties and the political dinosaurs took comfort and started to dig in. There was a fundamental misreading of Libyan political dynamics." (Williams, interview)

h) Ján Kubiš, UNSG Special Envoy on Libya and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL), 18 January 2021 – 23 November 2021

³⁴ Interview with SRSB Salame.

After considerable delay, the UNSC eventually agreed to the appointment of Slovak diplomat Ján Kubiš³⁵ as UNSG Special Envoy on Libya and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL). This heralded not only the end of Acting SRSG Williams' term but also a change in the leadership structure within UNSMIL. Accordingly, UNSMIL is no longer led by a UNSGSR, but by a non-Libya-based Special Envoy. There is now an Assistant Secretary-General and Mission Coordinator, Raisedon Zenenga, and an Assistant Secretary-General, Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator for Libya, Georgette Gagnon. Therefore, UNSMIL will need more time to be able to understand Libya's political process. New members need to establish working relationships with a variety of Libyan stakeholders and major influential figures, which requires more time and may cause misunderstandings and delay their ability to advance the Mission's work. The work of UNSMIL under Kubiš' leadership was to continue with the previous plan. Therefore, Kubiš' focused on engaging Libyan and foreign actors in pushing forward the same LPDF roadmap. In the end, it was not capable of facing the current challenges with its full capacities.

On 10 March 2021, the House of Representatives approved the Government of National Unity, with almost all lawmakers present voting in favour and international commendation. The GNU assumed its responsibilities and took oath before the House of Representatives on 15 March. Rival governments of the Government of National Accord of Prime Minister Serraj and east-based Prime Minister al-Thani handed over power to the Government of National Unity on 16 and 23 March, respectively. UNSC resolution 2570 on the 16 April 2021 endorsed the LPDF plan and the GNU as an interim government tasked with preparing the scene for elections.

Regardless of the accusations of partiality that many Libyan actors direct at UNSMIL and its process, as highlighted in the responses of those interviewed for the purpose of this research, the few weeks following the assumption of office by the GNU attest to the negative impact of the perceived exclusionary methods of UNSMIL by a majority of Libyans. The dominant view is that the GNU only echoes power-sharing and foreign interests. Therefore, rather than helping Libyans form a real unity government, the GNU becomes hostage to such interests and militias, making it unable to act as recent violent events in Tripoli unfolded. The fact that the GNU has prioritised visiting foreign countries may well be a strong sign of its lack of national legitimacy. This also implies that divisions remain, and political and armed factions may also be reinvigorated. Many analysts argue that the early positive reception by both LNA/Haftar and militias in the west of the country is actually based on their ability to remain the main interlocutors who have the most influence and roles and are ready to dictate their own terms to the GNU. (Badi and Lacher)

On the ground, Libyans remain frustrated, facing huge challenges including cash and power shortages, widespread cases of Covid-19 and declining standards of living. Public opinion, however, appears to welcome the LPDF results and the GNU. While UNSMIL and the international community still appear to perceive Libyans as passive actors, bypassing them by dealing with the GNU even before it received the confidence vote from the HoR and by continuing to accept the LPDF as the main decision-maker determining the country's political scene. The GNU, and the whole LPDF process, still lacks real substance and may well not be able to withstand the dynamics of the conflict that have proven the fragility of the previously

³⁵ For the purpose of this report, a request for an interview was addressed to UNSG Special Envoy Ján Kubiš, but he declined due to his busy schedule.

UNSMIL-sponsored LPA. The endurance of violence, as demonstrated by recent militia clashes in Tripoli and the continued presence of foreign fighters and mercenaries, makes any claimed progress shaky and exposed to further political antagonisms and fragmentations. Huge political, economic and military tracks still await resolution, including the future of militias, security, and the thorny issue of the constitutional and legal basis for elections.

The endurance of violence, as demonstrated by recent militia clashes in Tripoli and the continued presence of foreign fighters and mercenaries, makes any claimed progress shaky and exposed to further political antagonisms and fragmentations. Huge political, economic and military tracks still await resolution, including the future of militias, security, and the thorny issue of the constitutional and legal basis for elections.

On 16 December 2020, the United Nations Secretary-General announced the appointment of Raisedon Zenenga as Mission Coordinator of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL). This appointment helped fill the gap in UNSMIL leadership after the resignation of Ján Kubiš but seemed a formality as UNSMIL's mediation work remained almost absent. The appointment of a new SRSG to succeed Ján Kubiš was only made on 2 September 2022, with the appointment of Abdoulaye Bathily of Senegal as the Special Representative for Libya and Head of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL). Mr Bathily has spent the first few weeks since his arrival in Tripoli to conduct a number of visits to a number of countries with interest in Libya. He has also met with a number of Libyan actors in an attempt to resume UNSMIL mediation but while the challenges appear to be mounting, it is early to make any conclusions.

8) Too Many Cooks Spoil the Broth: Foreign Interventions in the Libyan Crisis

As many observers and key stakeholders explain, the role and mediation efforts of UNSMIL faced obstacles from foreign countries with their competing agendas. The UN Special Representatives have had to deal with a number of special envoys appointed by several countries, including from UN Security Council P5 members. These envoys, according to the source, were interfering with the work of UNSMIL, advancing their own proposals and engaging with different Libyan parties to the conflict, making any coordinated effort impossible and eventually putting the UNSMIL process in jeopardy. This was stated by former SRSG Mitri in his book *Rugged Paths: Two Years in and for Libya*³⁶ and further confirmed by SRSG Salamé when he stated that “too many cooks spoil the broth”.³⁷ In our interviews with Salame and Williams, both indicated how foreign interference played a negative role in Libya and expressed dismay at the failure of the international community to exert a united effort to resolve the conflict (Salam, interview; Williams, interview).

³⁶ Unofficial translation of the original Arabic title: مسالك وعرة: سنتان في ليبيا ومن أجلها Massalek Wa'era: Sanatan fi Libya wa Min Ajleha. Ed. Riad Al-Rayyes Books. 2015, Beirut.

³⁷ <https://en.minbarlibya.org/2017/09/14/salame-too-many-cooks-spoil-the-broth/>

As many observers and key stakeholders explain, the role and mediation efforts of UNSMIL faced obstacles from foreign countries with their competing agendas.

All interviewees, albeit for different reasons, hold the view that foreign actors attempted to influence the dialogue and its outcomes in favour of their own agendas and to assure the best interests of their respective Libyan allies. According to Abdulsalam Nasia, Head of the House of Representatives Dialogue Committee, the international actors were not serious in finding a solution. (Nasia, interview) The foreign actors and their initiatives, as well as the behaviour of their diplomats, including their special envoys for Libya, were partial and quite often against the spirit of mediation. The Libyan stakeholders interviewed for this report indicate that, against the spirit of mediation, diplomats from a number of countries had actually attempted to influence the process, but not necessarily always in favour of their Libya allies. Each Libyan side considered this support as a sign that they could rely on a certain foreign country's sympathy for their position. In the process, most views reflected those of foreign allies, rather than focusing on resolving the conflict and establishing peace and reconciliation.

Citing the specific example of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Boera considered the role of some foreign countries to have been negative in influencing the dialogue. The process was at times rendered, as interviewees indicate, a reflection of the strategic interests of foreign governments. (Boera, interview) A similar criticism, although lighter in tone, was voiced by House of Representatives Vice Chairperson Emhemmed Shoieb, who was elected by the HoR to head its delegation to Skhirat and who signed the LPA on behalf of the HoR. He indicates that foreign countries attempted to influence the dialogue and some foreign officials actually played the role of parallel mediators! (Shoieb, interview) The same view is also held by Musa Faraj Zowi, High Council of State member and head of its Dialogue Committee, who confirmed foreign interference to serve particular agendas or interests. He named Egypt and France as having attempted to influence the dialogue but also considered Turkey, Qatar and Saudi Arabia to have interfered, although to a lesser degree. (Zowi, interview)

The process was at times rendered, as interviewees indicate, a reflection of the strategic interests of foreign governments.

According to former General National Congress Vice-Chair Giuma Attiga, a number of foreign countries sought to influence the dialogue explicitly and implicitly, to subvert it to their respective interests. (Attiga, interview) France, the USA, and the United Kingdom were fearful that failure to endorse the Libyan Political Agreement would allow countries in support of the Libyan National Army/House of Representatives to exploit the situation and increase their unilateral actions, thus creating more conditions less conducive to peace and reconciliation. This has resulted in the severe undermining of the national ownership aspect of the process in question.

A civil activist, Bojaila Saifnaser, who took part in the dialogue sessions in Algiers in 2015, reveals that foreign powers were levying pressure during the dialogue to help advance their views and empower their Libyan allies. He indicates that SRSGL León told a number of Libyan

participants that diplomats from the USA and the UK were pressuring him to move in the direction best serving their Libyan allies. (Saifnaser, interview) During a dialogue session in Geneva in February 2020, SRSR Ghassan Salamé was also reported to have complained of the persistence of negative interventions of some countries that sought to derail the whole process, including the agreements reached at the Berlin Conference and UNSC Resolution 2510 that endorsed them. (Abdullah Othman Abdullah, interview) Speaking three years earlier, at a high-level event on Libya in New York on 20 September 2017, Salamé warned that there was “a real risk that a proliferation of initiatives will rob the Libyans of their chance”.³⁸

SRSR Mitri explained that “the interplay between internal political contradictions and external interference set narrow limits for what could be achieved”. Special envoys of a number of countries and regional organisations claimed to work under the UN leadership and coordinate their efforts when this was not the case. The multiplicity of envoys led to confusion. The UN tried to facilitate dialogue among the envoys. This was an impossible task. Each had an agenda. Libyans were given different and conflicting messages and some of them used its contact with one envoy against the other. There were cases where they held the UN responsible for what this or that envoy had said or done. Worse still, specific countries said one thing in the Security Council, to their ambassadors in Tripoli another thing, and to their special envoys a third one.” (Mitri, interview) Some Western countries “pursued the all too familiar policy of double standards, and apart from the mandate given to the UN, chose to work under its banner in the instances when suitable, and to act unilaterally when such approach suited their priorities...”. (Mitri, 2015, p. 50)

Special envoys of a number of countries and regional organisations claimed to work under the UN leadership and coordinate their efforts, when this was not the case. The multiplicity of envoys led to confusion.

Mitri complained of the attitude of many countries, including some UNSC members, when they “chose to turn away from engaging in the coordination sought by UNSMIL by setting up sectorial groups to work together. Instead of working together, they opted for competition against coordinated plans and a division of labour. Two big countries did not even find it embarrassing to compete with the UN”. (Mitri, 2015, p. 50) The same view was expressed by SRSR Kobler. Speaking to the Security Council, Kobler appealed to the international community to help Libya which “needs strong, united, consistent, robust and concrete support of the international community”. In a desperate tone, he explicitly demanded “action and commitment, not only papers, meetings and workshops. Partnership, not interference. Antibiotics, not aspirin”.³⁹

Speaking to the Security Council, Kobler appealed to the international community to help Libya which “needs strong, united, consistent, robust and concrete support of the international community.”

³⁸ UNSMIL, Remarks of SRSR Salamé at the High-Level Event on Libya, New York, 20 September 2017 <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/remarks-srsr-salam%C3%A9-high-level-event-libya>

³⁹ UNSMIL, Martin Kobler's Statement To The Security Council, 19 April 2017, <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/martin-koblers-statement-security-council>

While Abdulsalam Nasia considers the interference of regional organisations, especially the African Union (AU) and the League of Arab States (LAS), to have made matters more complex, this raises the methodological and analytical question of why the regional intergovernmental organisations such as the AU, LAS and the Arab Maghreb Union (AMU) were reduced to a protocol aspect of the dialogue and had no opportunity to influence it. The absence of any influential role for these organisations meant allowing the process to be hijacked or dominated by a number of states that claimed to have strategic interests.

According to Libya's prominent lawyer and member of the now-defunct February Commission, Azza Maghur, an important lesson to draw for neighbouring countries, including Arab countries, is to realise that the Libyan crisis poses a threat to all of them, despite what may seem immediate attainable advantages to some. They have different concerns, but they are all exposed to threats of terrorism and instability. There can be no security, democracy, economic prosperity, successful transition or stability in neighbouring countries unless they all work together to help resolve the Libyan conflict. These countries must also refrain from backing a particular Libyan faction against another and instead help to bring about a united national government in Libya. (Azza Maghur, interview) This echoes the views of Husni Bey, a Libyan business guru who participated in most UNSMIL meetings. Libya's challenge, according to Bey, is not just the inclusive dialogue that Libya needs, but a realisation, on the part of the UN and the international community, that the struggle is not tribal, political or ideological, but an issue related to consensual management of resources and the ending of corruption. (Bey, interview) Weakness, fragility and divisions on the Libyan side have enabled foreign actors to dictate to Libyans, instead of helping them. (Giuma Attiga, interview)

[A]n important lesson to draw for neighbouring countries, including Arab countries, is to realise that the Libyan crisis poses a threat to all of them, despite what may seem immediate attainable advantages to some. They have different concerns, but they are all exposed to threats of terrorism and instability.

9) The Inconsistency of the UN Approach: Deficiencies in Design, Structure and Process

UN mediation in Libya has had inherent flaws in the design of its process, and an inconsistency of strategy and approach. Coupled with the negative effect of contending regional and international actors, the UN process was doomed to suffer certain shortcomings.

a) Inclusion and Local Ownership

For any dialogue to be considered national and legitimate and to act as a transformative tool for the conflict, it has to create a sense of responsibility and engagement amongst the different factions. This is known in the literature as ownership of the process that determines the readiness or otherwise of the parties to take responsibility for the peace process and how it develops and whether its outcomes will be acceptable and legitimate. (Barnes, pp. 9–10) In the preparatory work leading to negotiating the Libyan Political Agreement, UNSMIL opted for selecting a group of Libyans to form what later came to be known as the 'Libyan Political

Dialogue’, without any obvious clearly defined criteria. This consisted of a group of individuals that SRS Leon and his team at UNSMIL selected on the assumption that they represented the different constituencies of Libyans. However, this selection was subject to wide criticism. The Libyan stakeholders interviewed indicate that there was no pre-dialogue discussion and no agenda approval, and the drafting committee did not include any Libyans.

For any dialogue to be considered national and legitimate and to act as a transformative tool for the conflict, it has to create a sense of responsibility and engagement amongst the different factions.

In an attempt to solicit consensus, UNSMIL made amendments to the proposed draft agreement and organised a series of consultations to bypass the obstacles. The main dialogue track convened a number of rounds in Geneva, while parallel tracks were held in Algeria (political parties and activists). A women’s track was added and held in Tunisia in 2015. At their inception, in 2014, these tracks included representatives of political parties, tribes, armed groups, civil society groups, and municipal and local councils. However, these remained limited to participants from the so-called February camp (winners of the 2011 civil war conflict). Moreover, the selection of participating political actors was based on the division created after the election of the House of Representatives and in the context of General National Congress boycotts.

The participation of women was almost negligible. (Na’as, interview) Only two women actually took part in the political track. Later, another woman, Fairouz Na’as, was included in the women’s side-track talks, but she is the First Deputy President and General Secretary of the National Front Party that is in alliance with the Islamists and shared with them the control of the defunct General National Congress and the High Council of State. This limited the inclusion of women, either appointed or representing a particular party or group’s interests, as it was likely to make them abide by the interests of the group that mandated their presence. They may, therefore, be less concerned with women’s issues at the table than with being a representative of their group. Azza Maghur, ex member of the 2013 Federal Commission, refused to attend a dialogue session facilitated by the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue in 2014 as a woman representative, as she considered it just cosmetic political tokenism, not a confirmation for inclusion. She boycotted another UNSMIL dialogue session in Geneva in February 2020 as she saw shortcomings, inadequate inclusivity and lack of Libyan ownership. (Maghur, interview)

The participation of women was almost negligible. Only two women actually took part in the political track.

There is also a general agreement amongst all Libyan interviewees that Libyan civil society organisations had no role whatsoever. According to a large segment of Libyans, the participation of civil society was actually a mere façade. Interviewees (those UNSMIL considered independent and members of civil society organizations) indicate that their track, despite its contributions, was considered less important and the output of their track was seldom

considered by UNSMIL or used as an input into the main political track. The interviewees indicate that the presence of some individuals representing the local and traditional actors, as well as civil society, at some dialogue sessions appeared to be largely ceremonial. The same applies to cultural groups which were excluded, despite the presence of some individuals from such communities in several of the dialogues. Many of these were actually just attending and were not there to speak on behalf of their own communities.

There is also a general agreement amongst all Libyan interviewees that Libyan civil society organisations had no role whatsoever.

Therefore, though reference to ‘Libyan ownership’ was always made, it was not fully realized. This is highlighted by Mohamed Alghoddi who coordinated the political team representing Saif Gaddafi at the Libyan Political Dialogue Forum. He attributes this to shortcomings in UNSMIL approach but also to foreign intervention (Mohamed Alghoddi, interview). Issam Al-Maoui, former Head of the Libyan Human Rights Council and a member of the February Commission, criticises organisers for controlling the dialogue and setting its agenda. (Issam Al-Maoui, interview) This, as Azza Maghur underlines, only confirmed that ownership was just part of UNSMIL jargon. (Azza Maghur, interview) Furthermore, “views which were not condoned by UNSMIL were simply cast aside by not including those who raised them in the process” as former planning minister Isa Twijir points out. He complains that he was excluded from further dialogues as he objected to UNSMIL practices during the dialogue session in Algiers. (Twijir, interview)

Interviewees credit SRSR Tariq Mitri for his serious attempt to achieve Libyan ownership and acknowledge his enthusiasm for reconciliation and dialogue. Reflecting on his own experience as SRSR in Libya, Mitri underlines that “dialogue cannot succeed unless it engages, in a durable manner, participants at local and national levels. The wider the participation, and the more diverse is the agenda, the better. It is essential to differentiate between negotiations and dialogue. The latter should not be reflective of power relations as the former often is”. (Mitri, interview) In his book, *Rugged Paths: Two Years In and For Libya*, Mitri elaborated his views and provided context for the failures in Libya and on how he insisted on Libyan ownership of any dialogue even if that meant not having any when the circumstances did not allow. He also indicated that not only was Libyan ownership impossible because of the deep differences amongst Libyans, but also because “some foreign diplomats, including two UNSC permanent members, were not really focused on national dialogue and reconciliation or did not consider it a priority”. (Mitri, 2015, p. 221)

[N]ot only was Libyan ownership impossible because of the deep differences amongst Libyans, but also because “some foreign diplomats, including two UNSC permanent members, were not really focused on national dialogue and reconciliation or did not consider it a priority.”

Contrary to this understanding, the participants chosen by UNSMIL were mostly lacking on both counts; that is, considering the primacy of national dialogue and reconciliation. Libya has

no formal structures for constituencies to choose their representatives, hence UNSMIL's claim that the Libyan Political Dialogue members are representative is ambivalent to say the least. With few exceptions, all interviewees indicate that Libyan ownership of the dialogue was not respected by or a main concern for UNSMIL. As Giuma Attiga, a former Vice-Chair of the General National Congress who took part in dialogue sessions held in Algiers in 2015, indicates, UNSMIL controlled the process from agenda-setting to the drafting of outcomes and the final communique. He raised objections to UNSMIL's drafting the recommendations and the final communique without the participation of the Libyans, but his concerns were not heeded, further undermining dialogue transparency. (Attiga, interview) For a number of interviewees who took part in the different tracks of the LPA process, Libyans had no role in setting the agenda. They were not open for discussion or approval. The LPA process was dominated by UNSMIL dictating the course of dialogue and its content, and eventually imposing its own draft agreement and selecting/determining the members of the Presidential Council / Government of National Accord. (Boera, interview; Musa Faraj, interview)

As we have seen in the discussion above, UNSMIL later realised the need to reduce the number of Presidential Council members, thus returning to the content of the fourth draft of the LPA, initialised in July 2015 and then endorsed as final by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon in the High-Level Meeting in New York on 25 September 2015. Despite the Secretary-General's call for not amending the initialised fourth draft of 8 October 2015, in less than two weeks UNSMIL changed the content of the draft, naming the Presidential Council, its members and their respective mandates. Moreover, UNSMIL selected some participants in the dialogue to the membership of the Presidential Council despite the fact that they had signed an undertaking, as did other participants, not to be part of any executive authority. (Boera, interview)

Libyan interviewees criticise the selective approach as an indication of bias towards particular political views and groups and an embodiment of early exclusionary practices. Attending three dialogues was enough to realise that there was some kind of previously determined criteria for inclusion and selection of participants at all levels of political institutions, social entities and civil society. This resulted in the failure of dialogues to be truly inclusive and representative, according to the political activist and journalist Sulieman Bayoudi. (Bayoudi, interview) This, as interviewees, especially those speaking on behalf of the old regime supporters, believe, reveals that the UN was not only partial or biased, but also sponsored and supported a 'winner takes all' approach that excluded major components of the Libyan people. (Naser Sa'id, interview; Hussein Sweidi, interview; As'ad Zheo, interview)

"UNSMIL has not been neutral and impartial" according to Saad Salame, a member of the Muslim Brotherhood who recently resigned his senior position in the Islamist Justice and Construction Party, and Fairouz Na'as, the First Deputy President and General Secretary of the National Front Party, that is in alliance with the Islamists and shared with them the control of the General National Congress. Its dialogue included individuals who have no real influence or constituency. (Saad Salame, interview; Fairouz Na'as, interview) However, the nationalist-oriented Sulieman Bayoudi suspects UNSMIL partiality for a different reason. He indicates that there seemed to be some kind of agenda amongst certain powerful countries to empower

Islamists at all levels, including their participation in dialogues. Therefore, in almost all dialogues and their sessions, Islamists' participation was noticeably higher than their actual power or popular support base. Forces speaking on behalf of or echoing neoliberalism also had an inflated presence, thus real inclusion and representation were lacking. (Sulieman Bayoudi, interview)

What has been lacking in UNSMIL-sponsored dialogues is real, effective and inclusive representation. One of the main reasons for the failure of the UNSMIL mediation role can rightly be attributed to these fatal shortcomings. As Azza Maghur indicates, the selection of participants illustrated at best arbitrariness, if not selectivity, and the lack of inclusiveness and representation of diverse Libyan stakeholders. She boycotted an UNSMIL dialogue session in Geneva in February 2020 as she clearly perceived several shortcomings and inadequate inclusivity. The independents' contingent, for example, was actually occupied by those from political institutions like the House of Representatives and the majority of High Council of State members, in addition to Government of National Accord ministers. The criteria for selecting the participants were at best inchoate and opaque. They were not clearly announced. One poignant example of this was a tweet by SRSR Salamé just before the Ghadames National Conference was planned, which was enough to ruin it. He wrote "*the names of participants are in my pocket*", reflecting the lack of transparency, inclusion and representation. (Maghur, interview)

What has been lacking in UNSMIL-sponsored dialogues is real, effective and inclusive representation. One of the main reasons for the failure of the UNSMIL mediation role can rightly be attributed to these fatal shortcomings.

The result was a Libyan Political Agreement that was a step towards consolidating a 'winner takes all' approach. As the narrative echoed in its preamble indicates, the Libyan Political Agreement hails the February victory over the previous regime, condemning it and its followers. One participant and a signatory to the LPA justifies the exclusion of the previous regime elements from the dialogue, in as much as it was meant to be a dialogue between the February elements that took part in the 2014 conflict. (Fadhel Lameen, interview) However, this may be seen as an attempt to exclude actors who may challenge the existing or newly emerging elites and regime leaders, who are determined to consolidate their own legitimacy and authority. The inclusion of Gaddafi supporters, or tribes presumed to be as such, was seen as a challenge to post-Gaddafi power structures. Such exclusion of larger segments of society paved the way for the empowerment of particular political, regional and ideological trends, supported by foreign powers. This was based on an assumption that the presence of Gaddafi supporters may present threats to some existing power holders even as it presents opportunities to others. This was echoed early on in statements made by Islamists and some political parties' leaders, insisting that the 2014 elections only empowered former regime supporters and that the resultant House of Representatives was theirs.

The Libyan Political Agreement process was also exclusive of some February elements known as Islamist hardliners. The Mufti Ghariani camp that included elements from the Libyan

Islamist Fighting Groups (LIFG) and General National Congress hardliners were not party to the final agreement despite having been party to its inception talks. They boycotted the process and became even more excluded when they resurrected the rump of the General National Congress in objection. The Libyan Political Agreement created yet another division paving the way for more conflict within the February camp, while the General National Congress set up its own Government of Salvation (GS) and other members of it decided to abandon it and instead set up the High Council of State, which became a main actor in the process and its main beneficiary. With the ‘Libyan National Army’ rejection of the Libyan Political Agreement, its process became captured by two dominant established power players or groups, representing the House of Representatives alliance and the High Council of State and its allies. Important issues in the dialogue were marginalised and other key players and actors that had a driving role in the conflict were excluded. This prevented important issues, like reclaiming the state, from being properly discussed and addressed, as businessman, writer and former advisor to Saif Gaddafi, Mohamed Abdulmotalib El Houni, affirms. (El Houni, interview)

This, therefore, impeded the inclusion of all stakeholders in a process that would have paved the way towards finding positive outcomes, shifting the dialogue from its unilateralism into interdependence of all Libyan factions and committing them to a shared future. This would also have grounded the dialogue and any resulting agreement in stability and shared ownership. Furthermore, while the negative and disturbing outcomes of the Libyan Political Agreement are seen in the events unfolding since 2017, the LPA and its resultant institutions, especially the Government of National Accord, suffer from a lack of legitimacy and confidence. The interviewees agree that these institutions are an epitome of a specific group capture and hence are not flexible enough to break with the past or establish the desired peace and reconciliation.

This, therefore, impeded the inclusion of all stakeholders in a process that would have paved the way towards finding positive outcomes, shifting the dialogue from its unilateralism into interdependence of all Libyan factions and committing them to a shared future. This would also have grounded the dialogue and any resulting agreement in stability and shared ownership.

This is related to the widely shared view that “national dialogue processes may be capable of engaging the ‘whole system’ by involving participants who, together, can serve as a microcosm of the whole” that can further lead to the desired shifts in current sociopolitical context. (Barnes, p. 10) Therefore, while interviewees underline the inclusion deficiency, they do not deny that actors from different political orientations were attending. But, as one interviewee explained, these were not chosen or elected by the constituencies they claimed to represent, nor were they chosen by UNSMIL specifically to represent such constituencies. (Mohamed Greera, interview) At the same time, while some major factions, like the federalists, were excluded, UNSMIL often quietly included many people or political parties that had no popular base. (Atif Miloud Hassia, interview) The same view is expressed by other interviewees. (Abdulmajeed Saifnaser, interview; Um al Ezz Farsi, interview; As’ad Zheo, interview) The negative implications are more vividly clear when it is noted that on many occasions, results or statements were different from what had been expected by the participant. (Mohamed Greera,

interview) Interviewees indicate that in many dialogues, Libyan ownership was not respected, and this resulted in final statements, issued by UNSMIL and others, which were not reflective of the actual discussions and often represented romantic or wishful thinking. (As'ad Zheo, interview)

b) Weak Implementation Modalities

Right from the start, UN mediation in Libya was not inclusive. The negotiations for the Libyan Political Agreement and the subsequent talks were essentially restricted to the 'victors' of the 2011 civil war. Some participants clearly associated UNSMIL with weakness and lack of appropriate mandate (Mohamed Alghoddi, interview). As interviewees from these elements indicate, when UNSMIL approached them for possible inclusion, it failed to understand the multiplicity of their composition and orientations. Thus, UNSMIL was unable to respond to their concerns and include them in the most productive way. As several interviewees indicate, not only were the so-called loyalists and supporters of the old regime excluded, but also major elements representing the Mufti Ghariani Islamists and General National Congress hardliners were left out or themselves boycotted the process. Influential militia leaders were also excluded and prevented from participating in what would eventually determine their status and future. This, as interviewees explain, undermined the dialogue aspect of the process and meant that the Government of National Accord and the security roadmap were a matter for continuous contention, rendering the entire process as a power-sharing deal restricted to what some analysts called the 'coalition of the willing'. All told, a good lesson to always keep in mind is that peace is made with enemies.

[N]ot only were the so-called loyalists and supporters of the old regime excluded, but also major elements representing the Mufti Ghariani Islamists and General National Congress hardliners were left out or themselves boycotted the process. Influential militia leaders were also excluded and prevented from participating in what would eventually determine their status and future.

Nuri Abbar, former head of the High National Election Committee, sees the weak implementation as an already latent factor in the exclusion of influential actors, particularly the armed groups, whilst they had the means to make implementation succeed or make it unattainable. (Nuri Abbar, interview) The exclusion of the militias that really mattered in making or breaking any security arrangements left critical aspects of the security roadmap neglected and created more spoilers. This was particularly the case with the Tribes Army (former regime supporters' militias) and the hard-line Islamists, as well as the die-hard revolutionaries. Other implementation challenges were not dealt with, as actors who wished to undermine the process were not challenged. (Fairouz Na'as, interview) Apart from risking further insecurity and armed conflict, this omission was exploited by Haftar/Libyan National Army to force the renegotiation of the Libyan Political Agreement to realise its objectives. This was clearly demonstrated in the military conflicts in the regions of Wershefanah and the south, and the later battles in and around Tripoli in 2017 and 2019. The interviewees, despite their different orientations, consider this exclusion to have deprived the Libyan Political Agreement

of the potential to become more effective. It actually created a context in which power distribution was confined to the limits imposed by particular actors, elites or militias that dominated the process. This led to the undesired consequence of making the LPA, as interviewees indicate, a fragile agreement that failed to address the real drivers of the conflict, leaving underlying causes essentially untouched.

The exclusion of the militias that really mattered in making or breaking any security arrangements left critical aspects of the security roadmap neglected and created more spoilers. This was particularly the case with the Tribes Army (former regime supporters' militias) and the hard-line Islamists, as well as the die-hard revolutionaries.

c) Accountability and Legitimacy

Confidential and discreet dialogues may be acceptable during the preparatory stage of initiating certain processes or to enable work while a conflict is intense or there is an impasse. Nevertheless, dialogues that take place behind closed doors and do not provide the wider public or communities with any information on the real issues at stake, an explanation of the real challenges or what compromises or trade-offs are required, are unlikely to attract popular support and eventually are doomed to fail. At the UNSMIL-led Skhirat talks in 2015, participants' names were not made public or even made available to the participants themselves before they met. Some sessions were held behind closed doors and no minutes of meetings were made available to participants. Secrecy and lack of transparency deprived the public of their right to know, especially considering that the dialogue and the contended issues were critical to their lives. Therefore, it was vital that they knew who was sincere in dialogue, who was opportunistic, who adopted a nationalist agenda and who was only determined to consolidate their own interests even if it meant wrecking any meaningful dialogue and discrediting them in the eyes of the wider public. What is more, maintaining transparency and keeping the wider public informed ensures participants remain publicly accountable. Libyans, including those attending the talks, were surprised by the names of those appointed to the Presidential Council and the Government of National Accord by SRSF León, most of whom were not previously known or had not been previously discussed. The signatories to the Libyan Political Agreement itself were not the actual people who negotiated the LPA, but included those who had not taken part. (Fairouz Na'as, interview)

[D]ialogues that take place behind closed doors and do not provide the wider public or communities with any information on the real issues at stake, an explanation of the real challenges or what compromises or trade-offs are required, are unlikely to attract popular support and eventually are doomed to fail.

Deficiencies of inclusion and ownership reduced credibility, legitimacy and accountability and led to the politicising of the whole process by the participants. A number of interviewees argue that most of the participants actually either came from Islamist backgrounds or were individuals with a history of animosity towards the previous regime and had antagonistic attitudes towards

its supporters. UNSMIL seemed more concerned with ‘ticking the boxes’ of what it assumed would reflect diversity. The participation of those representing a sizable proportion of the Libyan people, known as former regime supporters, rejectionist Islamists and die-hard revolutionaries, could have earned their trust. The fear that former regime elements, for example, may attempt to avert the change that took place in 2011 is unreasonable since being a part of the dialogue process is not an indication of influence or having a definitive role in decision-making.

Moreover, interviewees lament the exclusion of women and civil society voices at the initial stage of agenda-setting and the preparatory phase. Women’s participation was limited to a mere token and did not constitute meaningful representation. The most important dialogue leading to the LPA, for example, only included two women. Leaving the issues related to women and civil society unaddressed reduces inclusivity, weakens ownership and ignores the conditions that generate conflict and violence. Interviewees express the view that civil society, in particular, despite its weak and politicised nature in post-Gaddafi Libya, could have played a role in helping the process gain durability. It could have helped to develop civil society itself and to nurture civic and democratic culture. This is particularly important given that either contending Libyan factions are undemocratic or their democratic credentials are marred for a variety of reasons.

Moreover, interviewees lament the exclusion of women and civil society voices at the initial stage of agenda-setting and the preparatory phase. Women’s participation was limited to a mere token and did not constitute meaningful representation.

UNSMIL is yet to reconsider this issue. Rather, it continued in the same direction. As indicated in its appraisal of the convening of a meeting attended by a few Libyans in Montreux in Switzerland, under the auspices of the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (September 2020), UNSMIL claimed to launch the arrangements needed to resume the fully inclusive ‘Libyan Political Dialogue Forum’.⁴⁰ However, if the criteria for selection of participants are similar to the previous ones, or just an enlargement of the recent Montreux meeting, it is clear that UNSMIL’s approach continues to ignore the context and complex dynamics of the Libyan conflict. This inability or failure to adapt to the changing context of the conflict contrasts with a “paradigm of peacebuilding rooted in awareness that these processes are embedded within complex adaptive systems, where multiple forces are acting in unpredictable ways, generating surprising outcomes”. (Eoyang and Holladay 2013, cited in Barnes, p. 39)

This inability or failure to adapt to the changing context of the conflict contrasts with a “paradigm of peacebuilding rooted in awareness that these processes are embedded within complex adaptive systems, where multiple forces are acting in unpredictable ways, generating surprising outcomes.”

d) UN Impartiality Questioned

⁴⁰ <https://unsmil.unmissions.org/statement-hd-organised-libyan-consultative-meeting-7-9-september-2020-montreux-switzerland>

Abobakr Boera accuses UNSMIL of partiality, lack of transparency and bias. He identifies SRSG León as primarily responsible for this ultimately erroneous approach, while his two successors, SRSGs Kobler and Salamé, did not pay attention to rectifying the errors he created by abandoning the fourth draft of the LPA or the composition of the Presidential Council, but rather continued in the same direction. This is also echoed by Musa Zowi, who questions the neutrality of the mediators as UNSMIL had to accommodate the views of certain countries with particular interests. While, for example, valuing the constructive role of SRSG Tariq Mitri, he questions that any actor actually played the role of a mediator as it is generally understood. On at least one occasion, UNSMIL and its head ignored the consensus reached and, in practice and in effect, ruined the process by deciding to end the talks altogether. This raises doubts about UNSMIL's impartiality and transparency, in addition to the issue of the conflict of interest, as the case of León demonstrated. (Musa Zowi, interview)

On at least one occasion, UNSMIL and its head ignored the consensus reached and, in practice and in effect, ruined the process by deciding to end the talks altogether.

As explained above, our interviewees expressed concern that UN impartiality and neutrality were compromised in a process that lacked transparency. Participants were kept in the dark ahead of the dialogue and had no access to the dialogue agenda or its minutes or the results. Sulieman Bayoudi questions the impartiality and neutrality of UNSMIL and the SRSG Bernardino Leon, citing what took place just half an hour before the signing ceremony of the LPA on 17 December 2015 in Shkriat, Morocco, when it appeared that the Presidential Council member for the south had not been appointed. The members from south Libya, Fezzan, were called into a hall, and, after some chaos and loud noise, some emerged and said that they had only heard some people at the front shouting “accord, accord”, indicating that Abdulsalam Kajman had been chosen to be the member of the Presidential Council. However, when his name was read out in the main hall, there was real surprise among most of those attending, implying that the name was added to the Presidential Council in some kind of discreet agreement. (Bayoudi, interview)

[I]nterviewees expressed concern that UN impartiality and neutrality were compromised in a process that lacked transparency. Participants were kept in the dark ahead of the dialogue and had no access to the dialogue agenda or its minutes or the results.

Another interviewee, Naser Said, also accuses UNSMIL of partiality and bias and of forsaking neutrality. He cites the example of a dialogue meeting in Tunis on 6–7 March 2018 to resolve issues related to Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and Libyans in diaspora. According to Said, UNSMIL ignored the issues debated at the meeting and circulated a communique that made no mention of them and was ambiguous to say the least. The same applies to the town-hall-type national dialogue run by the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HD) in Cairo on 3 July 2018. The views of the participants were not fully represented and their proposals or demands were omitted from the HD report that was supposed to be impartial. The report of the

results was the product of the HD alone, as there was no Libyan participation or input into this report and, therefore, no ownership. (Naser Said, interview)

The attitudes of UNSMIL's leadership, particularly of SRSGs León and Kobler, were the subject of much criticism from a wide array of actors on the Libyan side. This negatively affected their roles but also put the impartiality of the UN itself and its legitimacy as an honest broker into question. As a consequence, the image of the UN was significantly damaged in Libya. Interviewees from all sides of the divide accused UNSMIL of favouring one particular side and of working to realise the interests of involved foreign countries. There were also elements within Libya who always accused the UN of being a mere tool in the hands of foreign powers that sought the destruction of Libya in the name of democracy.

Former SRSG León, in particular, was criticised, and his efforts were considerably hampered, as the General National Congress and its supporters saw him as imposing the will of the UAE by supporting the House of Representatives and the Libyan National Army faction. (Fairouz Na'as, interview; Sa'ad Saalme, interview) The General National Congress halted the talks and threatened to boycott them, which eventually happened. Moreover, when the Libyan Political Agreement was brokered and the UN recognised the Government of National Accord as the sole representative of Libya, the UN was accused of being partial and supportive of this government which eventually became party to the conflict. This created more obstacles to reaching the consensus required for the Libyan Political Agreement to be implemented. The accusations of partiality further weakened the position of the UN, and its special mission in Libya became embroiled even further in the conflict, leaving the UN with less and less ability to act.

This created more obstacles to reaching the consensus required for the Libyan Political Agreement to be implemented. The accusations of partiality further weakened the position of the UN, and its special mission in Libya became embroiled even further in the conflict, leaving the UN with less and less ability to act.

Former SRSG Mitri explains how striking a balance between impartiality and empathy proves difficult to maintain. He attributes this not to the inability or lack of objectivity of UNSMIL, but to the confusion Libyan factions suffered. According to Mitri, "there were times when empathy, and with it the attempt to interpret one party's position to its adversary was hastily confused with partiality. There were also occasions where my ability to explain, analyse motivations, discern inclinations and deconstruct double language, tended to be more of a burden than an enabling factor. On the one hand, I was appreciated for having developed relations of trust and understanding and for my independence from any specific Western country, while, on the other hand, my Arab identity was apparently perceived to be limiting the ability of being a true international civil servant." (Mitri, interview) Acting SRSG Williams (Williams, interview) believes that "impartiality and empathy are not mutually exclusive in the context of mediation". She explains that during her tenure, UNSMIL "stroved for neutrality. We were always empathetic to the plight of the Libyan people and sought to place their interests above the predatory ruling class and the international actors" (Williams, interview).

According to Mitri, “there were times when empathy, and with it the attempt to interpret one party’s position to its adversary was hastily confused with partiality.

Considering it a reflection of partiality and lack of transparency, a number of interviewees indicate that the Libyan Political Agreement was actually made behind closed doors without the significant contribution of most of the Libyan participants. The agreement and the final statement were drafted in advance, in their absence. One participant, Mohamed Abdulmotalib El Houni, who had attended two sessions in preparation for the Skhirat talks in Algiers in March and April 2015, criticises UNSMIL for not responding to the concerns of some participants. Another interviewee, Emhemmad Elbakai, head of Libya’s Aid and Development Fund, who took part in the dialogue process leading to the LPA, questions the impartiality and professionalism of UNSMIL, accusing it of a flagrant breach of these norms. He indicates that no words could ever justify why and how UNSMIL's head Bernardino Leon, despite the boycott of the General National Congress, empowered the head of its delegation Saleh Makhzoom, who signed the LPA, thus throwing into question the whole issue of ownership, inclusion and accountability.

10) Conclusion

This report shows that for any dialogue to succeed in realizing a sustainable resolution to the Libyan crisis, it has to be transformative and adaptive. This goal may be achieved with clearer and solid commitments to end foreign meddling and by designing a broader inclusive national dialogue that puts reconciliation at the forefront. The interviewees, despite their different political and social orientations, all agree that the Libyan Political Agreement process has actually deepened the crisis without being able to resolve anything and has led to extensive delays in the peace process in Libya, with more fault lines and divides occurring, even within each of the original two sides UNSMIL sought to reconcile. A truly genuine national dialogue is a constructed political process on its own. This implies that it has to achieve the meaningful result of moving the country and the society beyond conflict. This challenge was more acute as the LPA actually originated from the talks between a group of people UNSMIL hand-picked, even though most of them had no clear legal status; or rather a legal status bestowed upon them by the institutions they were supposed to represent giving them legitimacy was actually nullified as they acted against their mandate - as interviewees indicated. This was another testimony that the Libyan Political Agreement would not produce any sustainable political settlement and why the resultant institutions of the LPA were unable to gain consensus or legitimacy to serve as constituting bodies.

[F]or any dialogue to succeed in realizing a sustainable resolution to the Libyan crisis, it has to be transformative and adaptive. This goal may be achieved with clearer and solid commitments to end foreign meddling and by designing a broader inclusive national dialogue that puts reconciliation at the forefront.

The Libyan Political Agreement was not able to generate legitimacy either in the process or its outcomes. Talks were not open to the public and this undermined the LPA’s ability to be a tool

for making conflict resolution possible, at the grassroots or societal level, by shifting the existing polarised conflict. Consequently, the same dividing narratives that dominated the Libyan conflict, such as Islamists vs non-Islamists, revolution vs counter-revolution, Azlam⁴¹ vs revolutionaries and many others, are still prevalent. The LPA and its results have been exploited in these contending narratives and have been exploited in political propaganda. As the increase in hate speech and the propaganda war in the Libyan media, especially social media, indicates, the LPA created a context in which Libyans are even more divided than before while new issues of contestation are added. The process failed to evolve into a transformative national dialogue that includes a change in public attitudes and the creation of an environment where there is an openness to ideas that make change possible and cause it to be sought after. The public has to be willing to accept these new ideas and play a decisive role in helping them transform into a sustainable reality. This is not the case, however, and the conflict in Libya is becoming more entrenched.

The Libyan Political Agreement was not able to generate legitimacy either in the process or its outcomes. Talks were not open to the public and this undermined the LPA's ability to be a tool for making conflict resolution possible, at the grassroots or societal level, by shifting the existing polarised conflict.

Despite the recent jubilation regarding the formation of a new Presidential Council and General National Unity that resulted in the conclusion of the LPDF talks, disagreements are still standing in the way, and, as interviewees indicate, the UNSMIL process faces serious challenges and consensus is difficult to realise. The adoption by the LPDF of a majoritarian formula for voting on proposals has also proven problematic. While hopes of achieving tangible success are mounting, many obstacles remain in the way of consensus. Issues like the appointment to senior state roles, e.g. that of the Central Bank of Libya's (CBL) governor, the constitutional rules, federalism and the rights of regions, and the distribution of resources are the subjects about which agreement is difficult to reach. Moreover, foreign interventions, reconciliation, and the unification of the military forces remain the toughest obstacles. On the ground, armed militias continue to dominate and control capabilities and resources, with a major part of them opposing any dialogue and threatening war again.

While the interviews confirm what analysts have been positing, that is that the Libyan powerbrokers have been the main obstructers of the peace process and the realising of its objectives, they also identify foreign interference to have negatively affected the UN and other mediation activities. As a matter of fact, some interviewees completely attribute the Libyan crisis to foreign interests and interventions that have, ever since 2011, prevented peace and reconciliation.

⁴¹ Arabic word for supporters of the regime.

11. Policy Recommendations

The Libyan Parties

1. Libyan stakeholders should cease to rely on external actors and external solutions. They should take responsibility and start exploring collectively indigenous solutions to the protracted crisis and ways to diffuse the drivers of the conflict. Continuing to rely on external parties and external solutions will only deepen the existing divisions and prolong the conflict. External initiatives are often linked to external interests and are not necessarily in line with Libyan interests.
2. Libyans must reach an agreement on convening an inclusive National Dialogue that focuses primarily on achieving national reconciliation. This should be a Libyan-led process with specific timeframe, a clear agenda, and rules of procedure. Libyans should explore and learn from best practices and global and regional experiences to draw lessons, so that their national dialogue effectively contributes to achieving a sustainable solution to the Libyan crisis.
3. The Libyan parties must express determination to put an end to all types of external interference and not limit their concern with such interference to the presence of foreigners and mercenaries, regardless of their origins. Libyans need to agree on cancelling or freezing all security and defense agreements with foreign countries and entities whether signed by the Government of National Accord, the General Command of the Libyan National Army, or the House of the Representatives.
4. The Government of National Unity should make every possible effort to create the necessary conditions for holding free, fair, and transparent elections - including through securing the legal framework and the technical and security arrangements for the voting process to take place in accordance with the roadmap agreed for the “Preparatory Phase for a Comprehensive Solution.” The independence and protection of the High Commission on Elections must also be ensured to safeguard the fairness and credibility of the electoral process.
5. The Government of National Unity and the Presidential Council should take all necessary measures throughout their tenure to promote democratic principles and good governance. They must refrain from practices and announcements that make them appear merely agents of one of the parties to the conflict. Instead, the Government of National Unity and the Presidential Council should both focus on promoting peace and reconciliation and protecting Libya from further disintegration.
6. All parties must abandon the “winner takes all” approach. They should uphold instead the values of inclusiveness and reconciliation as the only viable solution to the Libyan crisis. The success of any national dialogue depends on the inclusion of a wide and representative array of the Libyan stakeholders. This may only be achieved through effective representation of different political trends, taking into account geographic and cultural diversity.

7. All parties must end hate speech to avoid polarization. Libyans need to transcend the divisive narratives that have prevailed so far. Divisiveness is particularly indicated by the escalation of hate speech, disinformation, and propaganda prevalent in the Libyan media, especially social media.

8. Military commanders, in various parts, of the country should commit to preventing further violence. This will require the expulsion of all foreign fighters, regardless of their nationalities, in preparation for an inclusive national dialogue and reconciliation.

The United Nations.

1. The Secretary-General of the United Nations should establish an independent review of the UN-led mediation efforts in Libya over the last twelve years to determine whether, for an effective process, they have been conducted in conformity with the UN standards. The review should include an assessment of the consent of the parties concerned; inclusiveness; national ownership, respect for international law; coherence; coordination; and complementarity of the mediation efforts and quality of peace agreements

2. The United Nations should support Libyan efforts to organize a National Dialogue and provide support for its facilitation. The United Nations should refrain from directly leading or dictating the terms of the political process. Instead, it should support Libyan initiatives and leave the leadership of the process to the Libyans themselves. It should be noted that many Libyans question the UN selection of the participants in the current political process, as this selection was not based on an inclusive national process that entitles those participants to a legitimate representation.

3. The United Nations should encourage Libyan political parties to increase the participation by Libyan women. So far, women representation in the political process has been low. Furthermore, women participating in the process on behalf of certain parties or groups have largely aligned themselves with narrow political interests of their groups and have demonstrated less interest in larger national issues. The United Nations must encourage an approach that ensures larger participation by women, youth, and civil society organizations to achieve inclusivity and broad national ownership of a National Dialogue.

4. Based on the Libyan experience, the United Nations should lead the effort to revisit the dominant normative assumptions which underpin the current practice of international mediation.

The International Community

1. Foreign actors should exert no pressure on Libyans to conduct hasty elections in the absence of the legal and security conditions necessary for their success. The international community has often pushed for holding elections in post-conflict settings despite the risks of failure and without due consideration of lessons learnt from experience in other conflict

situations. Quick fixes do not contribute to durable peace. Elections are not an end per se but rather a means to an end.

2. The international community should bring to an end the multiplicity of initiatives and proliferation of uncoordinated international mediation processes. Instead, local efforts to conduct a Libyan-led inclusive political process should be supported through a coordinated support plan.

3. All states must cease interference in Libyan internal affairs. This must include the immediate cessation of violations of the Security Council mandated arms embargo. All states should cease all illegitimate arms provisions to Libyan militias and warring factions. International parties must refrain from using the United Nations as a fig leaf to cover their private interests in Libya.

4. The key members of the Security Council must live up to their commitments and abide by the arms embargo resolution. It is no longer acceptable that Security Council members continue to provide arms to parties to the conflict in Libya. If their destructive support to various Libyan groups and factions is not ended any effort to establish peace will be meaningless.

Neighboring Countries (Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Chad, Niger, Sudan and Morocco)

1. Libya's neighboring countries must abandon the illusion that they can resolve the Libyan crisis through unilateral action. The multiplicity of their competitive and uncoordinated interference in Libya should cease.

2. Alternatively, neighboring countries should develop a mechanism for coordinated regional support to Libya, in concert with the Libyans. Such a mechanism would be designed to help Libyans advance their political process and limit the potential ramifications of the international rivalry over Libya on the region. It is in the interest of neighboring countries that the solution to the crisis is truly Libyan-owned, and free from extra-regional interference.

3. Neighboring countries should not treat Libya as a theatre to settle their decades old scores. Libya and Libyan stakeholders must be shielded from regional rivalries.

12) Annex

List of Interviews

- 1) Abbar, Nuri, former Head of the High National Election Committee and currently the Director of the National Center for Decision Consolidation of the Libyan Government, NDPC. Interviewed 23.8.2020
- 2) Alghoddi, Mohamed, Gaddafi era Minister of Transport and a member of LPDF as the Coordinator of the Political Team Representing Saif al- Islam Gaddafi. Interviewed 30.10.2021
- 3) Al-Maoui, Issam, former Head of the Libyan Human Rights Council, and a member of February Commission which proposed the amendment of the Interim Constitution and recommended early elections in 2014. Interviewed 28.8.2020
- 4) Attiga, Giuma, former GNC Vice-Chair and former director of the Gaddafi Human Rights Society. Interviewed 17.8.2020
- 5) Bey, Husni, a Libyan business guru. Interviewed 25.8.2020
- 6) Beyoudi, Sulieman, Political activist and journalist who took part in a number of UNSMIL sponsored events. Interviewed 12.8.2020
- 7) Boera, Abobakr, HoR member and senior negotiator during Skhirat talks. Interviewed 4.9.2020
- 8) El Houni, Mohamed Abdulmotalib, businessman, writer and former advisor to Saif Gaddafi. Interviewed 31.8.2020
- 9) Elbakai, Emhemmad, Head of Libya's Aid and Development Fund. Interviewed 18.8.2020
- 10) Farsi, Um al Ezz, Professor of Political Science, Benghazi University. Interviewed 24.8.2020
- 11) Greera, Mohamed, political activist. Interviewed 25.8.2020
- 12) Hassia, Atif Miloud, academic at Omar Mokhtar University, advisor of HoR. Interviewed 24.8.2020
- 13) Lameen, Fadeel, Head of NDPC and a member of the Libyan Political Dialogue that produced LPA and a signatory to it. He currently heads the Economic Development Board in Libya. Interviewed 30.8.2020
- 14) Maghur, Azza, a prominent lawyer and ex member of the 2013 February Commission that proposed the amendment of the Interim Constitution and recommended early elections in 2014. Interviewed 17.8.2020
- 15) Mitri, Tarek, ex SRSG and Head of UNSMIL. Interviewed 19.9.2020
- 16) Na'as, Fairouz, the First Deputy President and General Secretary of the National Front Party that is in alliance with the Islamists and shared with them the control of the defunct GNC and the HCS. Interviewed 28.8.2020
- 17) Nasia, Abdulsalam, HoR member and senior negotiator who led its team in negotiations with HCS. Interviewed 27.8.2020
- 18) Said, Naser, Editor-in-Chief of 'Libyan Stand' ('al -Mawqif al Libi'). Former regime loyalist figure and Spokesperson for the National Libyan Popular Movement. Interviewed 5.9.2020

- 19) Saifnaser, Abdulmajeed, former Head of the Supreme Security Commission in 2011, ex-Ambassador to Morocco and a leading Oulad Sulieman tribe figure. Interviewed 20.8.2020
- 20) Saifnaser, Bojaila, a civil activist and coordinator of a civil society group who attended the UNSMIL dialogue in Algeria. Interviewed 16.9.2020
- 21) Salame, Ghassan, SGSR and head of UNSMIL, Interviewed 26.10.2021
- 22) Salame, Saad, academic and leading figure in the Libyan Muslim Brotherhood and former Head of the Political Committee of the Supreme Authority of Justice and Construction Party. Interviewed 15.9.2020
- 23) Shoeib, Emhemmed, HoR member and leader of its delegation to Skhirat and a signatory to LPA. Interviewed 25.8.2020
- 24) Sweidi, Hussein, a leading figure of the former Gaddafi regime Revolutionary Committees Movement. Interviewed 12.9.2020
- 25) Twijir, Isa, former Planning Minister in Al Keib government of Libya (2013). Interviewed 27.8.2020
- 26) Williams, Stephanie, Acting SGSR, Interviewed 30.10.2021
- 27) Zheo, As'ad, a founder and former secretary-general of the Libyan National Gathering, an organisation for former regime elements who support dialogue and reconciliation. Interviewed 23.8.2020
- 28) Zowi, Musa Faraj, HCS member and Head of its Dialogue Committee. Interviewed 24.8.2020

List of References

- 1) Badi, Emadeddin & Wolfram Lacher, 'Agree to Disagree: Libya's New Unity Government', <https://carnegie-mec.org/sada/83839>
- 2) Barnes, Catherine, 2017, 'Dilemmas of Ownership, Inclusivity, Legitimacy and Power: Towards Transformative National Dialogue Processes', www.berghof-foundation.org/publications/national-dialogue-handbook
- 3) Eoyang, Glenda and Royce Holladay, 2013, *Adaptive Action: Leveraging Uncertainty in Your Organization*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- 4) Felix-Anselm van Lier, 2017, 'National Dialogue in Libya: The National Dialogue Preparatory Commission', https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_3026109_1/component/file_3028206/content
- 5) Forster, Robert, 2019, 'A Gender Analysis of Peace Agreements and Transitional Documents in Libya', 2011–2018, <https://www.politicalsettlements.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/PA-X-Spotlight-Libya-Digital.pdf>
- 6) Franco, Michela, 2018, 'The United Nations' Mediation Role in The Libyan Crisis After 2011', http://tesi.luiss.it/22786/1/632612_FRANCO_MICHELA_tesi%20Michela_Franco%20632612.pdf
- 7) Mancini, Francesco & Jose Vericat, 2016, 'Lost in Transition: UN Mediation in Libya, Syria, and Yemen', https://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/1611_Lost-in-Transition.pdf
- 8) Mitri, Tarek, 2015, *Arduous Paths: Two Years In and For Libya*, Riad El-Rayyes Books, Beirut, Lebanon. (Arabic Text)
- 9) Watanabe, Lisa, 2019, 'UN Mediation in Libya: Peace Still a Distant Prospect', <https://css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/CSSAnalyse246-EN.pdf>

Abbreviations

AU	African Union
AMU	Arab Maghreb Union
GNA	Government of National Accord
GNC	General National Congress
GS	Government of Salvation
HCS	High Council of State
HD	Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue
ICC	International Criminal Court
LAS	League of Arab States
LIFG	Libyan Islamist Fighting Groups
LNA	Libyan National Army
LPA	Libyan Political Agreement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDPC	Preparatory Commission for the National Dialogue
NTC	National Transition Council
PC	Presidential Council
SRS	Special Representative of the Secretary-General
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSMIL	United Nations Support Mission in Libya
USA	United States of America