STRATEGIC DOCTRINE • PROPOSED INSTITUTIONAL MODEL

MIDDLE EAST HUMAN SECURITY & PEACE COMMISSION

MEHSPC | Proposed Operational Charter and Human-Centred Stabilization Framework

VERSION 2.0 • 22 OCTOBER 2026 • ATLAS PROTOCOL • STR 05 / GEO 06 / OBS 07

DOCUMENT STATUS	INSTITUTIONAL SCOPE
Atlas proposal — not an established commission	Analytical and prospective charter; no claimed UN recognition, authority or standing mandate

Central proposition: durable stability is not created by an absence of violence alone. It requires civilian protection, verified access to essential services, credible local participation, coordinated decisions and accountable recovery.

Executive summary

The Middle East Human Security and Peace Commission (MEHSPC) is proposed as a complementary mechanism to improve the continuity, transparency and human-security focus of existing diplomatic and humanitarian processes. It is not a replacement for sovereign authorities, United Nations bodies, regional organizations, mediators or humanitarian agencies. Its creation would require voluntary institutional sponsorship, a negotiated mandate, agreed safeguards and sustainable financing.

The original April 2026 charter emphasized the governance gap between fragmented response and recurring escalation. This edition retains that mission while converting claims of current establishment, autonomous authority and binding powers into conditional design proposals. It proposes a staged pathway from feasibility review to voluntary pilot and—only if lawfully adopted—formal implementation.

1 Strategic premise and problem definition

Middle Eastern crises often transmit beyond national borders through displacement, trade, maritime passage, energy security and political polarization. Civilians experience the most persistent consequences: avoidable loss of life, disrupted health care, damaged critical infrastructure, uncertain water and food access, and prolonged insecurity. The relevant question is not which institution can claim overarching control, but how existing responsibilities can be linked without weakening sovereignty, humanitarian independence or legal accountability.

- Fragmented decision cycles can impede continuity between immediate protection and long-term recovery.
- Political constraints can delay action or undermine public trust.
- Humanitarian conditions and verified facts may be disconnected from strategic negotiations.
- Short pauses in violence do not automatically create durable safeguards.

2 Mission, objectives and institutional limits

Mission: create a voluntary, independently assessed framework through which participating actors can connect verified civilian needs with feasible de-escalation, protection and recovery decisions.

- Keep the protection of civilians and human dignity central to strategic assessment.
- Enable rapid common situational awareness based on attributed, independently tested evidence.
- Improve continuity between ceasefire facilitation, humanitarian access, infrastructure protection and recovery.
- Give communities and local actors meaningful participation, with clear safeguards for representativeness.
- Document implementation, uncertainty and non-compliance without claiming enforcement powers.

MEHSPC has no legal personality, membership, immunity, executive authority or treaty mandate by virtue of this document. Every such element would require competent authorization and formal agreement.

3 Operating principles

PRINCIPLE	REQUIRED PRACTICE
Human primacy	Civilian protection, essential services and non-discrimination guide priorities.
Impartiality	Evidence standards and participation rules apply consistently to every actor.
Sovereignty and law	No unilateral powers; all actions subject to applicable law and consent.
Independence	Conflict-of-interest controls, financial disclosure and no donor capture.
Evidence integrity	Multi-source verification; preserve provenance and uncertainty.
Local agency	Affected communities participate without being instrumentalized.
Transparency with protection	Public methodology, confidential handling of sensitive information.

4 Proposed institutional architecture

A compact independent panel is retained as a design option, not a prescribed universal authority. The original seven-member concept can be assessed for legitimacy and functional breadth, but must be evaluated against regional representation, gender balance, expertise, security and operational independence.

- Independent chair; legal and humanitarian expertise; security and infrastructure expertise; civil-society/community participation; relevant interfaith or cultural expertise where appropriate.
- Participating states, regional bodies, UN and humanitarian actors may join through defined terms of reference, never through implied automatic enrollment.
- A humanitarian and societal advisory forum would gather protected input from clinicians, civil-society organizations and affected populations.

- An independent secretariat, if created, would administer records and reporting but not acquire coercive authority.

5 Operational pathway and time horizons

PHASE	OBJECTIVE	ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUT
I / 0–90 days	Immediate civilian protection and reliable access	Needs baseline, verified access constraints, ceasefire-support options
II / 3–6 months	Stabilize critical systems and confidence measures	Infrastructure protection priorities, incident verification, safeguards
III / 6–24 months	Build durable recovery and accountable transition	Recovery scorecard, participation review, handover plans

These horizons are planning assumptions from the earlier charter, not mandatory deadlines or guarantees. They depend on access, security, the consent of parties and available resources.

6 Decision-making and mandates

A qualified-majority, no-veto voting model may support internal deliberation. However, it cannot override the decisions or legal powers of states, international organizations, courts or humanitarian actors. Commission conclusions would constitute recommendations unless a competent authority voluntarily adopts a specified procedure within its jurisdiction.

Recommendations should include: decision question, evidence grade, plausible alternatives, civilian impact, legal constraints, dissenting views, responsible institution and review date.

7 Verification, reporting and accountability

An independent evidence protocol should distinguish confirmed events, credible but uncorroborated reports, analytic judgments and unresolved claims. Public reporting must respect data protection, source security, humanitarian neutrality and the risk of exposing vulnerable persons.

- Publish a source and confidence methodology.
- Separate observations from inference and policy proposals.
- Require challenge and correction procedures.
- Refer alleged crimes or violations to competent mechanisms where legally appropriate; MEHSPC itself would not prosecute or impose sanctions.

8 Regional and international embedding

Potential pathways include voluntary sponsorship by regional governments or organizations; structured dialogue with relevant UN agencies and mediation channels; technical partnerships with humanitarian actors; and locally consented pilot mechanisms. UN General Assembly recognition is a possible political pathway, not a prerequisite already achieved, nor a source of automatic enforcement authority.

The design should operate alongside existing institutions rather than compete for ownership of peace processes. Applicable mandates, local participation and operational independence are essential admission criteria.

9 Financing, ethics and safeguards

An eventual financing model should use transparent, audited, multi-source support with donor concentration limits, conflict-of-interest declarations, procurement controls and a publicly accessible financial statement. Funding must not determine findings, mandate access or recipient selection.

Membership tenure, staggered appointments, recall safeguards and protections for independent judgment require legal design. No functional immunity can be assumed absent a valid legal instrument.

10 Risks, failure conditions and red-team questions

RISK	MITIGATION / DECISION GATE
Political capture	Independent appointments; transparent funding; conflict rules.
False legitimacy	Explicit proposal status until formal adoption.
Unsafe evidence collection	Minimization, consent, source protection, threat review.
Duplication of mandates	Institutional mapping; subsidiarity test.
Non-participation by key actors	Narrow pilot or pause; no fictional universal mandate.
Tokenized civilian participation	Representative selection, feedback and appeal channels.
Humanitarian access blocked	Record constraints; do not imply access guarantees.

11 Atlas Protocol integration

STR 05: crisis containment, infrastructure protection and escalation-management decision support. GEO 06: political actors, cross-border dynamics, negotiation pathways and regional legitimacy. OBS 07: verified monitoring, uncertainty management and evidence traceability. SPE 02 connects the human-security consequences at species level; CIV 03 addresses the institutional continuity and governance-design dimension.

Atlas Protocol Institute may research, assess, convene and support scenario-based decision-making, subject to engagement terms. It does not assume responsibility for military operations, humanitarian protection or legal enforcement.

12 Adoption roadmap and publication control

- Gate A — Doctrine review: legal, humanitarian and regional expert critique.
- Gate B — Mandate mapping: identify competent potential partners and existing mechanisms.
- Gate C — Consultation: confidential and protected engagement with affected communities and institutional stakeholders.
- Gate D — Pilot design: narrow objectives, voluntary participation, measurable outputs and exit criteria.
- Gate E — Adoption: only formal sponsors may approve governance, financing or operative authority.

Editorial status: REVISED PROPOSAL / INTERNAL REVIEW. This is a normative framework and not evidence that MEHSPC has been established, recognized or authorized. Public release requires factual, legal and partner review.

Strategic conclusion

Human security cannot remain a residual consideration after strategic agreements are drafted. The MEHSPC proposal asks whether civilian protection, verified conditions, institutional continuity and political decision-making can be built into one accountable process—without bypassing the sovereign and legal structures that make legitimate action possible.

PEOPLE BEFORE POWER. | STABILITY THROUGH STRUCTURE, EVIDENCE AND HUMAN DIGNITY.