

New Paths to Peace: Integrated Approaches to Building Sustainable Peace and Development

ACTION PLANNING GROUPS

**November 7, 2003
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee**

In the last segment of the New Paths to Peace Conference, participants were asked to convene groups, using a variant of the “Open Space Technology,” on proposals for follow-on activities that built on the conference themes.

Six open space action planning groups were formed:

- A. Community Driven Development
- B. Mainstreaming Conflict-Sensitive Approaches to Development
- C. Inter-field Roundtable Collaboration Initiative: A Conference Series to Build Cooperation Among Agencies Working for Peace and Security
- D. Peace Gaming (No notes - contact William Stuebner)
- E. Working Group on Interaction Between Conflict Resolution and Humanitarian Assistance/Development Cooperation (No notes - contact Peter Woodrow at the Reflecting on Peace Practice Project)
- F. Cross-Sectoral Collaboration in the Democratic Republic of Congo (No notes - contact Steven Smith at stevenasmith@earthlink.net)

A. Community Driven Development Discussion in Open Space Technology Exercise

Network of Practitioners

Aiming toward regional rep.

CDD in conflict settings

How does it work?

What is the application of CDD on conflict? In conflict environments?

Lacking: research that says CDD is effective

Assumption:

CDD as a mechanism to build social capital, faster, more effective

December 1-3 workshop

How do we determine what's community driven? Influence of donors?
Assumptions interveners bring in?

Short-term vs. long-term results? (the peace dividend?)

Paul Thompson (WSP)

Stable environments vs. war-torn/post-conflict environments (operation in these areas)

What's "community"? WB: a geographic area

Community driven (decision-making; self organized- achieve empowerment... operational and sustainable mechanisms through which all relationships/interaction to take place) vs. participatory (consultation, resources, broad-based sharing/access to info)

What's the role of the outsider?

- How to
- Examples/cases
- Key elements

Role of WB: funder/donor

Who implements?

Past experience of WB (how to) participatory...? = precursor to this
(learned lessons/building)

- WB (development) Social Fund
Block grants
Process through which resources are provided
Successes: Angola and Indonesia

? getting involved in workshops

? bringing together those with past experience (other orgs)

USAID

Mercy

Save

IRD

A./VOCA

OTI (?)

Definition: demand lead, financial element, government element

Limiting factors: bypasses other elements on the ground, conflict

Communities in the lead vs. Communities being facilitated

Maputo workshop- Norwegian funded

Defining conflict- Critical conflict

Assumption ? – Is this the best way in critical emergencies? Or Is it better than what's being done now?

Appropriateness of this approach- when; what context

Need parameters of what this is

Rural vs. Urban

Modifications for differing conditions

CARE- piloting Cote d' Ivoire

Rural/urban

Notion of community- what is community? What's the reality? Common needs

Building long-term sustainable communities

Capacity building

Training

Issues: Prevention, effectiveness, length of commitment/sustainability, transparency, accountability, legitimization of the community

Facilitated

Catalyst

Theory... what is going on with other agencies? What are they doing? (Kosovo)

Do No Harm: Somalia, ICRC– identify structures within conflict (connectors)

CDD as a means vs. CDD as an end

B. Mainstreaming conflict-sensitive approaches to development

IDEAS

We learn about some of the conflicts and seem to be experts, however, when conflict happens and design programs, we seem to forget those lessons learned.

The learning is there, but the integration between the two fields does not exist.

We need to bring the Europeans on board in this discussion.

International Alert organized an event on conflict sensitivity that will facilitate along with the UK NGO's. (would be great to get some info with the findings, share experiences)

There have been partial approaches to Conflict sensitivity, however, the finding is that those approaches cannot be separated, it has to be a wholistic approach. It seems that the people are there to be consulted on development or peacebuilding just that.

Although many agencies have made progress in the UK, it has not been shared.

Donors need to deal with this issue because the continuation of the projects depends on the long-term involvement.

The idea of mainstreaming, over time, has translated into an establishment of conflict office, but it does not really address the mainstreaming reality.

Organizational reflection is a painful process for mainstreaming and this is why it is not moving forward as wanted.

International Alert is a kind of coordinator/facilitator in UK to direct NGO's to come up with their processes towards mainstreaming.

For the future, the mainstreaming "champion" website (those who lead) can provide more info:

www.fewer.org/pcia (Coming out in March)

www.conflictsensitive.net

Peace and conflict impact assessment became mainstreaming.

Mainstreaming is challenging because it is particular for every organizations.

In the conflict analysis, the org needs to place itself in the environment and see the risks involved.

(usaid) you can have the mechanisms for mainstreaming, but you will really see if it is working only in the field.

One way to make a program work is to get them involved in the designing of it, and when it starts those people own the process and in some ways are responsible for its effectiveness and sustainability.

Implementation wise, you need to work with all of the organizations because you do not want to favor one group that you are concentrating and mess up other orgs work.

(Mercy core in Georgia) When the conflict analysis is done and the strategy is drawn up for the next 5 years, until you "trip over a stone, you will not notice that stones exist in

the driveway.”

The current programs are not that different from the previous.

QUESTIONS

Question of terminology in the fields of peacebuilding and development? How can we make it workable for everyone?

How can you ensure that mainstreaming is covered in the organization and not in the individuals?

How do you mainstream development in the peacebuilding process? (Development sector is bigger)

How do you create mechanisms for learning?

FURTHER discussion will continue over e-mail group that will be set up by Saji Preliis, Peacebuilding and Development Institute, American University. (saji@american.edu)

C. Inter-field Roundtable Collaboration Initiative: A Conference Series to Build Cooperation Among Agencies Working for Peace and Security

- Who is the group of partners?:
 - Lisa Schirch schirchl@emu.edu
 - Christina Schweiss jc9699@usma.edu
 - Leigh Caraher caraherl@ndu.edu
 - Claudia Liebler Claudia@claudialiebler.net
 - Susanna Campbell – susannacampbell@tufts.edu
 - Andrea Strimling – astrimling@fmcs.gov
 - Kim Maynard – kmaynard@worldbank.gov
 - Peter Woodrow (hopefully) – pwoodrow@mediate.org
 - Rob Ricigliano (hopefully) – robr@uwm.edu
 - William Stuebner (hopefully) – wstuebner@aicpr.org
 - Lorelei Kelly (hopefully) – loirelei.Kelly@mail.house.gov
- Next Steps:
 - Send around the notes – SPC
 - Claudia will draft the concept paper. Andrea volunteered to help, and also to help with identification of next steps, including next planning meeting.

- Who else do we need to get involved?
- Have the Alliance as the face of one or more???
- Have a face-to-face meeting in early January – in DC – January 8th.
- Meeting space at NDU would work.

(Purpose and details need to be copied from the paper, which Andrea will send this week.)

- Conflicts in national security strategy – India/Pakistan, Columbia, etc... would help with government buy-in.
- Include Alliance buy-in projects in the list for crossover.
- Partners:
 - International Alert and Saferworld
 - Combating terrorism center at West Point
 - National Defense University – can be used proxy for state or DOD organization.
 - Others
- Funding:
 - Seed funding will be key.
- Coordination:
 - Need someone to take on the coordination:
 - Information sharing
 - Timeline
 - Keep the lines open
 - Coherence
 - But, everyone needs to assume some leadership and at least one organization will need to organize each meeting, to divide up the work and ensure ownership. The overall team will ensure coordination.
- Methodology:
 - Different people invited
 - The same core group that goes to every meeting – process and the content.
 - For organizational learning you have to have a team of people from that organization. If there is a smaller conference then there might be less learning.

- What about having 3 people from each organizations? Then we can break up into groups and have them each participate in different groups.
- The invitees would drive the agenda.
- Actors:
 - Media
 - Funders
 - State
 - mid-senior level of state
 - human rights
 - conflict
 - Professional staffers on committees – to help them understand the interconnections of building sustainable peace
- There is no single group doing this – correcting a market failure.
- Can host one at West Point – look at the Center for Combating Terrorism. They would be willing to pay for it if you put terrorism
- Can we change the name each time – one underlying theme that stays the same and then the entity that is sponsoring it can put on the new name.
 - In the way that you name it you can pull on different groups.
- Feedback within the staff who are going from each agency.
- Tie in with the peace gaming at the end. Or even begin with it.
- Do a simulation – tabletop – add on a day or a half-day. Put it in the middle or wrap up – role-playing or conflict resolution scenario. We have a real conflict and the real simulation – you can pick the issue
- Structure – can we do it two days?
- Structure proposed:
 - Information sharing – what is everyone doing?
 - Some analysis – why are we approaching this in the way that we are? What are the theories of change?
 - Conflict resolution intervention among this group. Do some exploration of stereotypes among the group.
 - What are the assets that each of the groups brings?
 - Joint analysis
 - Getting at assumptions even more
 - Concrete action plans
 - Tentative agreements.

- Comments on the structure:
 - Agency and their approach
 - Stereotypes and perceptions
 - Plug the gaming exercise into the middle
 - The first part of the scenario is that each organization identifies their assets and strengths that they bring back to the problem.
 - Then do the scenario
- The more real we can make it, the more practical then the more likely you are to make them participate after the first experience.
- Is it possible to go too far to the other extreme and focus too much on solving the problems? Is it highlighting, building relationships or making concrete recommendations. Not necessarily helping.
 - It could be framed as having an idea of who is doing what.
 - You have to be careful at what level you are trying to invite people.
- It depends on where the meeting is held. In DC it could focus on one level. In another place at another level. That's how you cover all of the levels.
- The people coming from the organization should represent different roles – policy, field, etc...
- Building the relationships is equally as important as the producing results.
- Other players:
 - NATO's partnership for peace consortium
 - Representatives from regional organizations that might be playing a role.
- Do we have any that aren't in the middle of conflict, but are preventive?
- Other areas:
 - Looking at the preventive application of peacebuilding – what about Central Asia or other areas? Don't want to focus only on conflict countries.
- Funding:
 - Each of the hosting organizations could do some discrete fundraising for that particular event. We would want to have some fundraising for the R& D work and for some container over time:
 - DOD
 - State
 - USAID
 - Compton
 - Corporate – Ethan Allen, Microsoft

- If we are looking for diversity of participants we may want a diversity of funding.
- What about inviting sub-contractors???
- Ones that we like and ones that we don't.
- Next steps:
 - Participation would not be an issue.
 - We would only have to write up the concept once in a packet that we could each use what our channels are.
 - What is our timeframe?
 - 6 months
 - game plan
 - Who are the key people we are missing?
 - Media
 - Human Rights
 - UN
 - Business