



UNRWA Colonna Review: Neutrality Verification Collapse

Stratum II – Tier 1: analyses the Colonna Review as a structural artefact whose mandate architecture predetermines the evidentiary horizon and makes neutrality verification impossible.

UNRWA – STRUCTURAL DETERMINATION (STRATA SERIES)

Each Stratum isolates one structural mechanism shaping the Gaza governance environment.

All analyses follow the same forensic template: Executive Frame → Forensic Core → Exhibits → Decision Architecture → Final Diagnosis.

A. Executive Frame

UNRWA – Structural Determination Series

This analysis is Part II of a multi-part forensic series examining UNRWA's structural role, the collapse of neutrality verification, the UN–UNRWA system relationship, and the geopolitical exploitation by RUS/CHN.

This brief examines the **Independent Review of Mechanisms and Procedures to Ensure Adherence by UNRWA to the Humanitarian Principle of Neutrality** (“Colonna Review,” 20 April 2024) as a structural artefact rather than a political statement. The scope remains limited to:

1. **Stage 1:** Statements, constraints, and findings contained within the Review and its Technical Report. ^{2/13}
2. **Stage 2:** Public communications by the United Nations and donor governments after publication.
3. **Mechanistic synthesis:** how mandate architecture, environmental constraints, and communicative use generate a stable institutional configuration.

Sources consist exclusively of primary materials:

- **NWDC v4** architecture (H2-Spine · Narrative Parallelity · Formative Resources - see [Glossary](#))
- **UN Terms of Reference** (5 February 2024)
- **Independent Review Final Report** (20 April 2024)
- **Independent Review Technical Report** (20 April 2024)
- **Donor statements** issued publicly (Germany, Canada, EU)

Pagination is provided in dual form: *printed page number (PDF page number)*.

Glossary terms (H2-Spine, narrative parallelity, formative resources) appear as structural instruments only.

The full forensic analysis continues below, including Exhibits and Decision Architecture.

B. Forensic Core

1. MANDATE ARCHITECTURE

Section 7 of the Terms of Reference establishes the Review’s evidentiary boundary:

“The Review Group... will not itself investigate any such allegations nor make any findings of fact in respect of them.”¹

This prohibition excludes:

- fact-finding,
- investigation of alleged neutrality breaches,
- determination of actual neutrality,
- verification of allegations,
- chain-of-custody reconstruction.

Mechanism. The scope removes empirical neutrality verification from the Review.

Criterion. A review cannot establish neutrality when fact-finding is expressly excluded.

2. Methodological Execution

The Final Report restates the same limit:

“The review scope and findings do not include direct investigation of any such allegations.”²

The methodology focuses on:

- policy architecture,
- internal training and disciplinary systems, ^{4/13}
- administrative structures,
- interviews with staff.

It states that implementation is assessed “to the extent possible”³ within operational constraints.

Mechanism. A mechanism audit, not a factual inquiry.

Criterion. Assessment of procedures does not constitute verification of neutrality outcomes.

3. Environmental Constraints

The Review describes UNRWA’s operating environment as shaped by:

- territorial control by “de facto authorities”,⁴
- restrictions on access and safety for UN staff,⁵
- limits on oversight and independent verification capacity.⁶

Within NWDC terminology, these elements correspond to an **H2Spine** configuration: coercive control at the territorial layer and formative resource provision at the civilian layer.

Mechanism. Dual governance with external coercive authority controlling environmental variables.

Criterion. Verification capacity collapses when territorial authority is held by actors outside the organisation.

4. Narrative Parallellity

The Review positions itself as a mechanism-level audit.

However, donor and UN communications subsequently frame it as a reassurance signal restoring confidence.

Examples include:

- **Germany, 24 April 2024:** “Germany resumes cooperation with UNRWA... following the publication of the Independent Review.”⁷
- **Canada, 8 March 2024:** “The Review provides confidence in UNRWA’s processes...”⁸
- **EU, 23 April 2024:** “The Review confirms the robustness of UNRWA’s neutrality framework.”⁹

This divergence constitutes **narrative parallelity**: two coexisting meaning structures applied to the same document.

Mechanism. Procedural artefact repurposed as political reassurance.

Criterion. Divergent communicative frames signal functional decoupling between content and use.

5. Path-Locked Reform Demand

The Technical Report records fifty recommendations across:

- governance,
- investigative capacity,
- oversight,
- risk management.

Repeated references to structural limitations and environmental constraints appear throughout the diagnostic sections.¹⁰

Mechanism. Persistent reform cycle indicating structural, not episodic, vulnerability.

Criterion. Large-scale, cross-domain recommendations signal systemic insufficiency of existing mechanisms.

C. Exhibits

EXHIBIT 1 – MANDATE BOUNDARY

ELEMENT	DESCRIPTION	STRUCTURAL FUNCTION
Terms of Reference §7	Prohibits fact-finding	Removes empirical domain
Review Scope	Mechanisms, procedures	Restricts evidentiary field
Excluded Domain	Allegation investigation	Neutrality unverifiable

EXHIBIT 2 – ENVIRONMENTAL DEPENDENCIES

STAGE	ACTOR	OUTPUT	MECHANISM
Mandate	UN	Procedural framing	Pre-emptive signalling
Publication	Review Group	Mechanism audit	Diagnostic mapping
Post-publication	Donor states	Funding resumption	Procedural legitimisation

EXHIBIT 3 – COMMUNICATION SEQUENCE

ACTOR	CONSTRAINT	STRUCTURAL FUNCTION
UNRWA	Mandate-limited neutrality	Institutional insulation
Donor States	Funding conditionality	External leverage mechanism

ACTOR	CONSTRAINT	STRUCTURAL FUNCTION
Review Group	Procedural scope narrowing	Evidentiary restriction

D. Decision Architecture

1. VERIFICATION LIMITATION

Condition. Fact-finding is prohibited.

Consequence. The Review cannot generate empirical neutrality findings.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINT

Condition. Territorial control by de facto authorities restricts verification.

Consequence. Mechanisms do not counteract structural coercion.

3. COMMUNICATIVE TRANSFORMATION

Condition. Donor and UN communications treat a mechanism audit as reassurance.

Consequence. Narrative parallelity replaces evidentiary determination.

Together, the three conditions yield a stable configuration in which neutrality mechanisms exist and are internally maintained, yet empirical neutrality remains structurally unverifiable.

E. Evidence Diagnosis

1. PROCEDURAL LEGITIMATION → DE FACTO LEGITIMACY AUDIT

Mechanism.

A mechanism-level review is framed and received as if it were an evidentiary audit. A procedural artefact occupies the role of a fact-producing institution via Substitution Rule. Legitimacy is generated from

procedural form rather than empirical verification (H2-Spine consequence).

Criterion.

A Legitimacy Audit requires environmental access, actor access, investigatory authority, and the ability to render factual findings. None were present.

Diagnosis.

Procedural Legitimation supplants evidentiary auditing: the audit form is preserved while the evidentiary core is absent, producing the appearance of oversight without the material capacity to reconstruct or verify neutrality.

2. SUBSTITUTION OF PROCESS EVIDENCE FOR FACTUAL EVIDENCE

Mechanism.

Narrative Parallellity collapses: internally the Review is a mechanism audit; externally it is treated as substantive clearance. Role Substitution positions procedural compliance as a surrogate for empirical validation; Value Preservation retains the public meaning of “neutrality confirmed.”

Criterion.

Parallellity collapse occurs when the communicative layer diverges from operational reality and constructs institutional signals from the appearance of process rather than evidentiary content.

Diagnosis.

The public justification layer substitutes procedural compliance for factual verification, generating a communicative façade that masks the absence of empirical findings.

3. DECISION ARCHITECTURE OF AN INSTITUTIONAL HOSTAGE

Mechanism.

External Coercive Determination (territorial and security control by Hamas), Formative Resource Dependence (UNRWA’s essential services), and Oversight Reproduction (information constraints embedded in the same coercive environment). Oversight cannot operate autonomously from the actor shaping its risk environment.

Criterion.

A system is hostage when it cannot investigate or verify claims independently, cannot correct structural vulnerabilities, and external stakeholders accept non-evidentiary outputs as sufficient to maintain operations.

Diagnosis.

The oversight function reproduces the dependency it is meant to monitor: factual verification is structurally impossible, and neutrality assurance collapses into procedural affirmation inside a coercive environment.

4. SYSTEM-LEVEL LEGITIMACY TRANSFER (UN → UNRWA)**Mechanism.**

System-Level Authority Lending transfers UN system legitimacy to UNRWA via procedural framing; Narrative Integration repositions UNRWA inside the legitimate governance layer despite absent verification; H2-Spine Continuity preserves the humanitarian backbone through symbolic assurance rather than factual clearance.

Criterion.

Legitimacy Transfer occurs when higher-level institutional authority confers credibility on a subordinate actor through procedural rather than evidentiary channels.

Diagnosis.

The Review operates as a vector of system-level legitimacy transfer: UN institutional authority stabilises UNRWA's neutrality posture through procedural form while bypassing empirical verification.

F. Final Diagnosis

The Colonna Review's mandate prohibition, its documentation of operational dependence on Hamas, and the subsequent UN and donor communications that treat a mechanisms audit as factual clearance together form a procedural-legitimation chain through which system-

level UN authority is transferred to UNRWA, substituting procedural form for evidentiary verification, stabilising a complementary Hamas– UNRWA governance configuration, and reducing neutrality oversight to the decision architecture of an institutional hostage.

This Stratum forms part of the cumulative structural dossier on UNRWA, the UN system environment, and geopolitical exploitation dynamics. Upcoming Strata examine system entanglement between UN and UNRWA, and the strategic use of the UNRWA crisis in RUS/CHN information warfare.

FOOTNOTES

1. United Nations General Assembly. “Resolution A/RES/78/73: Assistance to Palestine Refugees.” 12 December 2023. Voting Record.
 2. DURCHD8. “UNRWA: Structural Complementarity in Gaza (Stratum 1).” Substack, 2025.
 3. Ibid.
 4. United Nations. “Terms of Reference: Independent Review... Neutrality.” 5 February 2024, p. 2.
 5. Independent Review Group. “Independent Review of Mechanisms... Neutrality.” 20 April 2024, p. 13.
 6. Ibid., p. 17.
 7. Federal Foreign Office. “Joint Statement on UNRWA.” Berlin, 24 April 2024; Global Affairs Canada. “Statement on UNRWA.” 8 March 2024; European External Action Service. “Remarks on UNRWA.” 23 April 2024.
-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

European External Action Service. *Remarks by HR/VP Borrell on UNRWA*. Brussels, 23 April 2024

Federal Foreign Office. *Joint Statement on UNRWA*. Berlin, 24 April 2024.

Global Affairs Canada. *Statement on UNRWA and the Independent Review*. Ottawa, 8 March 2024

Independent Review Group . *Independent Review of Mechanisms and Procedures to Ensure Adherence by UNRWA to the Humanitarian Principle of Neutrality* . United Nations , 20 April 2024.

Independent Review Group . *Final Technical Report* . United Nations , 20 April 2024.

United Nations. *Terms of Reference: Independent Review... Neutrality*. 5 February 2024.

United Nations General Assembly. *Resolution 302 (IV)*. 8 December 1949.

United Nations General Assembly. *Resolution A/RES/78/73*. 12 December 2023.