

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

RAW LEARNING LAB NOTES

**November 5-7, 2003
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee**

Learning Lab	Page
Session 1: Catholic Relief Services Programming: Aiming for Just Solid Peace	2
Session 2: Track 1 – Track 2 Collaboration	4
Session 3: Integrating Peacebuilding, Civil Society, and Development in Conflict-Affected Environments: Lessons from the Field	7
Session 4: Understanding "Theories of Change" and their role in advancing the field of conflict resolution	8
Session 5: Mainstreaming Conflict Sensitive Approaches with Development	9
Session 6: Congress: Making a Pitch for Peace	11
Session 7: Framework for Strategic Peacebuilding	14
Session 8: Addressing Communal Difference in Integrated Peace-Building	17
Session 9: CAFTA and Sustainable Peace and Development in Guatemala	18
Session 11: Cooperation Among Multiple Peacebuilding Initiatives	21
Session 12: The Role of Land and Property Rights in Peacebuilding: The Case of East Timor	26

Session 1:

Catholic Relief Services Programming: Aiming for Just Solid Peace

Reina C. Neufeldt, Catholic Relief Services

**Aiming for Just Solid Peace:
Lessons from Applying A Justice Lens
to Catholic Relief Services Programming**

November 6, 2003

Presentation

CRS – work through justice lens (reflections)

Challenges

Internally:

What it means?

How far is CRS willing to go?

How much funding to give for programs

External:

Global implications

Questions

In striving for justice, can it have a burn out affects?

Discussion

Integrating justice and development by imposing the framework externally.

Once the organization has predefined goals/lens, what happens with communities that want to accept only part of the program? (How do you play this out between the donors and the community in conflict/transition)

In 1990s, CRS, World Vision, IRC were going for broader .

Were there any challenges for working through the Justice lens?

Who decided what it means?

What's the difference between having the lens and not having it?

The lens plays a key role in acceptance of funding, decision-making, and policy directions.
Longer term commitment to projects.

What happens to the notion of justice when more and more funding is given to profit orgs?
Profit vs. justice

LESSONS

Clarify the strategy

Implementation of a process Framework for Change

An understanding that transformation happens through relationships

A holistic approach to action

LINKS

Collaborate approach (interfaith) (Worked in Mindanao)

EFFECTIVENESS

If local people are not part of the decision making,

CHALLENGES

One training is not enough/On going support is needed.

Session 2:

Track 1 – Track 2 Collaboration

Andrea Strimling, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service

Outline for Session

Intros

Framing Questions/Remarks

- Background, context: track two (Joe Montville) ...multitrack (Louise Diamond and John McDonald) 9 tracks
- Processes: fleshed out track 2

Opportunities for bridging track 1-2 divide

Growing recognition/awareness of role of NGOs (legitimizes NGO work)

Dialogue

Questions we pose to each other

How we answer them

MOTIVATING QUESTIONS

How can we do it better?

How: Processes, systems, networks, guiding principles

We: Who is “we”?

It: What is “it” we are trying to do? Coordinate, collaborate, integrate, communicate, info sharing

Defining the “it”

Better: What is success? Effectiveness? Defined?

Synthesis and Conclusions

- Models

Mental models (pillars- parallel tracks “stove pipes”; multitrack model; networks, systems, self organizing... technologies- reliefweb... network-centric approach- do people/organizations want to be part of the network? Is there resistance? Is there motivation to protect your org ’s privacy?; World Bank’s model- “coalition of the willing” self-organizing, voluntary: organizing the mechanism facilitating real contact)

Making models explicit

- Language
Actors, activities, processes
- Assumptions

Why is this important?

Measures of success? What are we striving for?

Who are we?

How?

- Implications on PWL
- Insights and Surprises
- Open Questions

- Future Agenda

On-going dialogue in cyberspace (beyondintractability.org)

Challenge: any insights we can glean from track 1- 2 we can apply further

Group Discussion

Example of success: Haiti

Interests- tracks represent separate interests

Track one: state to state

Track two: underlying causes,

Other tracks

Allows everyone to have a seat at the table- represent diverse interests

Complementarity of tracks

Challenges to coordination/collaboration: battle of knowledge, competition, negative perceptions (fear, mistrust) – understanding what the other side wants, *strengths, weaknesses*

NGOs and DoD- example of successful, “mutually beneficial” relationship

NGOs: flexibility, access to people in the field (including guerillas) facilitated the entry of track one into the situation

DoD: clout, legitimacy- ability to sign treaty

UNPACKING: Difference in perspective: “use” of NGOs

How do the tracks see themselves?

Track two as an arm of track one??? According to who?

Track 2’s perspective of track 1...

Post-conflict scenarios today- absence of legitimate state (role of track 1?)

Informal systems

Info sharing: responsibility, confidentiality, implications, risks, and dangers of info sharing, transparency... managing these challenges in a cooperative environment: context-specific (OCHA: humanitarian information center)

Coordination toward a specific reason- database of success stories combined

Database of what’s available, what’s needed- problem with operating in a vacuum

Irony: what congress is willing to pay for- what’s at DoD; not willing to pay for- other initiatives for human security

Reality: military is highly funded... role in peacebuilding

Humanitarianism and Military- assistance, “Do No Harm”

Training for military action vs. training for peacekeeping

FEWER- resource, access on web

Allies in unsuspecting places

Insights, Open Questions, and Surprises

- Assumption about self and other after differ between track 1 and track 2 communities. Breaking down the negative perception and attitudes that each community has toward each other
- Bridging the gap between different organizational and professional cultures that the two communities have is a challenge (as well as the different communication style)
- Technology and language can be confusing. Track 2 refers to parties, process, and intervener simultaneously
- There's increasing interest in track 1 and 2 cooperation at in the US
- Information sharing is necessary and different suggestions have been made to that end such as:
 - Regular meetings between the two communities
 - Communities of practice model
 - Network-centric model
 - Success story database on track 1 and 3 coordination
 - Track one and track two dialogue on cyberspace
 - Need to institutionalize track 1- 2 info sharing

Implications for PWL

- Is success defined differently by track 1 and 2
- Track 1 and 2 parallels- that the two levels

Future Agenda

- Identifying those with whom the actors are to engage- who are the points of contact in track 1 and 2? Different sections within track 1 (state, DoD)
- Success story database on track 1 and 2 coordination
- Identify what's needed in track 1 and 2- interaction? What are the objectives and what are the resources that are available?
- How to integrate the different interests of the two communities in a complementary way?

Session 3:

Integrating Peacebuilding, Civil Society, and Development in Conflict-Affected Environments: Lessons from the Field

Dayna Brown, Sr. Program Officer, Civil Society, Mercy Corps

Anna Young, Sr. Program Officer, New Program Initiatives, Mercy Corps

- Maluku, Indonesia and Ferghana Valley, Central Asia case studies.
- Biggest tensions in Ferghana Valley were over access to resources, and thus the PRA could be used as a conflict analysis tool.

Discussion:

- It is much more effective to get people involved in things that really matter to them rather than just doing dialogue.
- Linking the community to other levels
 - Getting them to coordinate with themselves. Then do advocacy with the government for/with them. Mercy Corps saw the opportunity to be a bridge, but then saw that they needed help in knowing how to engage with the government.
 - Always promoting the work of the local NGOs. They had to learn to work with the government and the structures – mercy corps didn't do that for them. The government got much more involved in the coordination meeting, and in going to them. After 2 years, they could see a change in the relationship between the government and the NGOs. Capacity building is really key.
- Integrated:
 - Talking about non-stand alone activities, rather it is peacebuilding or civil society programs. There were no “just dialogue” programs. Looking at how water projects could help 2 communities... It is more complex. Looking for peacebuilding impact as well as meeting the immediate need for water.
- Interfield assumes that you work in one field to begin with (one sector)...
- What are your assumptions about your role in this change process?
- What are your assumptions about local conflict resolution practices?
- What are your assumptions about who you are going to be working with?
 - Mercy corps has a preference for working through local partners. The assumption was that this was not possible. We were looking for partners that would not make the divisions stronger, and were looking for opportunities to bring them together.
 - Worked on building capacity. Gave small grants, and had local staff provide oversights – set up checks and balances.
 - Throughout the process all decisions were made by mixed teams. There was a lot of transparency that they tried to build into the process.

Session 4:

Understanding "Theories of Change" and their role in advancing the field of conflict resolution

Donna Hicks, Harvard University, and *Paula Gutlove*, Institute for Resource and Security Studies

What is it that we are doing? Are we doing what we are supposed to be doing in Conflict Resolution?

How to achieve these goals? (6 criteria given by M. Anderson)

Even in the worst scenarios people refuse to give up their paradigms. Why? Can we do anything about it?

There are theories, analysis, paradigms that we can choose.

What is your theory of conflict? What is your theory of change?

What is your vision?

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STRUCTURE OF THE INTERVIEW

Should we ask why there is not peace and lead the answers to a negative, or should we go the other way?

Should we answer to the questions as individuals or institutions? If there is difference, that does it mean?

By looking at the question, we need to look if the organization is viable.

GROUP DISCUSSION AFTER THE INTERVIEW

What do you do with these interviews?

It is possible to use this interview as an intervention (third and first party)

Questions link and one starts to make the connections.

This interview is a good (first) step towards Theory of Change.

What can we do about the notion censorship in the interview? (One possibility is to put verifiers and cross checkers. Timing issue)

Session 5:

Mainstreaming Conflict Sensitive Approaches with Development

Paper by: *Abikök C. Riak*, World Vision

Presentation by: *Abikök Riak* and *Adrienne Paul*, World Vision

- Definition of Conflict Sensitivity, is in line with the Do No Harm Framework, Local Capacities for Peace Project.
- LCP framework applied intensively to all aspects of WV work in Southern Sudan. They did it for 3 years. There was a wide range of organizations involved – including donor orgs. The project ended in Southern Sudan in 2000. There was this fear of what was going to happen with the lessons learned. What has happened over the past 5 years, has been a good example in mainstreaming a conflict sensitive project. At what point do the lessons learned from a tiny project feed up to organizational change.
- World Vision – works on a Federation structure. The relationship is much more complex than that – national officers, with national directors who report to national boards. Have an interesting dynamic – WV is highly centralized. 10,000 staff in over 90 countries. Sometimes no direct reporting relationship.
- After the project in Sudan, WV has to decide what the role of a Christian org was working in Southern Sudan, which is characterized as a religious conflict. Who owned peacebuilding? Who owned lessons learned? What could they do in terms of disseminating all of the lessons learned to 10,000 staff.
- Partnership office – Director for peacebuilding and reconciliation – decision to hire him. Bill Lowry was able to frame the lessons learned from Sudan into WV identity, overall goals, etc...
- Almost all of the technical support originally came from CDA. But to train everyone with an external consultant was too much, so they developed an internal training programming. TOT
 - They were very strategic in selecting individuals. They chose people who were gifted as trainers and were in a position to allow them to train.
 - They trained people but were not very good with the follow up. They didn't provide a support mechanism for after the training.
 - They did a lot of translation of the do no harm framework and book.
 - Because most of the lessons learned from the LCP project came out of relief projects, the development practitioners weren't interested. So they realized that they had to reframe and repackage LCP. The challenge was that they really didn't know. All of the lessons learned were based on experiential learning of LCP projects. They didn't have that for a development context. SO, what they did was to start two centers of learning. One in Indonesia and one in the Philippines – to do the same thing that they had done in Sudan – 3-year process.
 - What they found out in centers of learning:

- LCP is applicable and right.
- Every single key lesson that was highlighted in the original project was the same thing in the development context:
 - Staffing
 - Who you partner with
- It took people a long time to see that who you partner with in the context could have a positive or negative impact. There could be partners that mirrored the underlying structural causes of the conflict. Relief practitioners are used to making a mistake. Development practitioners aren't. To think that you have been making mistakes for the past 15 years is harder psychologically.
- Organizations that already had a history of conflict resolution were keen to do this, and those that were used to working with other organizations were also keen. Those that were more insular were not interested and were very threatened by what was opened up by some of the assessments.
- In the centers of learning they developed regional peacebuilding networks. It provided the opportunity for different offices to exchange lessons learned on peacebuilding.
- Some of the initial key success indicators:
 - Ownership
 - Resources – money talks – it is very clear what an organization values by where it puts its money.
- They initially started mainstreaming LCP as a program quality tool. In the end, it turned out that they were mainstreaming a conflict sensitive approach. This is not what they had expected.
- They knew that HIV/AIDS, natural disasters and conflict all had the capacity to destroy a community and its moves toward long-term sustainable development, what are they things therefore that they would like to integrate into their programmes that would help to build peace to support sustainable development.
- Can you use economic development programs to help develop local capacities for peace.

Session 6:

Congress: Making a Pitch for Peace

Elizabeth Turpen, National Security Fellow, Office of Senator Sam Brownback and *Lorelei Kelly*, Special Projects Fellow, Office of Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey. Both presenters are also Senior Associates at the Henry L. Stimson Center

Congress

Goals

- I. Intro to Congress
- II. Basics on Peacebuilding in Congress
- III. Constraints
- IV. Packaging/Pitching Peace
- V. Effective Advocacy

- Insights, Surprises, Open Questions
- Implications for PWL
- Future Agenda

Liberal Internationals

Broadening what constitutes security

DoD – constituent needs vs. \$ allocated for peacebuilding/foreign policy (FP)

Caucasus- track two form for congress people’s pets (eliminated in reforms of 1995- power issues)

“Dear colleague” letters

Think tank, congress staff, public interest

System Problem... stemming from congress’s allocation of \$

The Stimson Center

The Study Program

Content program- target staffers

Inclusive, 1 hour, non-retribution, facilitated

Today’s security issues:

- Beyond state boundaries
- Impacted by tech
- Require new partnerships

Pick up issues that fall between the cracks – mostly nation-building, peacekeeping issues

Other issues: nuclear weapons, WMD

“Congress is reactive and peace is a non-event”

authorizations vs. appropriations

vehicles that will get signed- attaching FP to things that will end up on the Pres desk

- requesting funding with an awareness of the constraints of the funder (foreign operations staffer)
- measuring success- how effective was this program- on what basis will funding be granted in the following years? (especially for prevention- how do you measure what didn't happen?)
- How do you know when you're finished?

Creating a profile on the hill for peacebuilding

Advocacy

Holding our own representatives accountable- do the Wisconsin reps know what we're doing here?

Getting substantive issues re-staffed

Career track for peacebuilding and prevention- call for reform (“act together”)

Legislative Examples- handout

Lack of sophistication – misdirected energy, tapping into resources that already exist (USIP, for example)

Developing a constituency for peace

“Laundering the activism to a process document” (process oriented)

Cast your net wide

You never know who's a good internationalist

USAID, MCA and failed or failing states

Example of EU liaison for conflict prevention, resolution (not lobbyists)- can it be a model for something in US? (presented by Andrew Sherritt)

Independent, funded by members

Funding- Budgeting

Earmarks, directives

State's RFP for conflict prevention in the Balkans- how do we link in with that so it doesn't look like we're coming from left field?

Tapping into what's already there

Who do you send in to talk on the hill?

England's people in uniform

Uniformed people from war college

Making the concept of peace operational- make it an event- things on the hill either “are’ or “aren’t” ... there’s no response for “should”- creating a constituency – getting visibility at the district level (many people go straight for the hill, but there’s a resource at the district level) – use media (coverage)

Small links that are part of the bigger process

Insights, surprises, open questions:

Realization that there are political implications to what we do

Is there such a thing as impartiality?

Political nature of CR work

Implications for PWL:

Working in the belly of the beast – intersecting and overlapping possibilities for partnering (Dalai Lama- Chinese, our language creates our reality) ... look for the unlikely partners

Process for affecting this

Power in the collective voice- allies in the military (academies) –

Knowledge facilitators, knowledge brokers- biculturalists- bridging

Future Agenda:

Planning ahead for future opportunities (Iraq and the \$166 billion question)

Example: Winning the Peace Act – reform program for interagency process to deal with the aftermath of wars – operationalizing peace

Session 7:

Framework for Strategic Peacebuilding

Lisa Schirch, Institute for Justice and Peacebuilding, Eastern Mennonite University

- Definition of Peacebuilding – seeking to prevent, reduce, transform and help[people recover from violence.
- The number and quality of relationships in society that support peacebuilding.
- Cycle of Violence Map:
 - Look at the manifestation of structural violence at these levels – self, community and national/international destruction – the cycle of violence.
- For interfiled collaboration we have to know each other’s theories and language.
- Discussion of military role in peacebuilding – the use of the military to create an environment where peace can take place.
- The problem with the map of peace is that the circles make people think that they are only responsible for their one circle.
 - The labels are modalities of working, and then you have the fields under the modalities. The field may actually use many of the modalities.

Small group exercise:

- What are the opportunities here for interfield collaboration?
- What challenges could arise?

Report backs:

- Group 4
 - Actors: trauma healers
 - Relief and reconstruction actors
 - Advocacy - politicians
 - Community
 - Trauma counseling and large group work.
 - Have to figure out when people have gone through the stages of trauma
 - Inter-field training going on at the beginning of the process.
 - We would need to know when to do what?
- Group 3: Human rights
 - Need to take a hard look at what the connectors and the dividers are and take a look at where the funding is going and not encouraging this behavior to continue.

- Indicting the military commander for war crimes
- Coordinate with governments because we are not in charge of aid.
- Gather information – working with early warning and response teams
- Work with the media – be careful how the reports go out – need to maintain the relationship with the donors
- Peace Brigades International – monitoring
- Group 2: Humanitarian aid workers
 - There needs to be a lot of discussion of the repercussions.
 - Are there similar issues happening elsewhere
 - What have we done in other situations
 - Psychosocial programming
 - Local governance
 - Early warning organization – what we need for prevention
 - Prevention and response – who we would need to talk to in which cases.
 - We needed a conflict analysis to know a lot more about the system.
 - May also be an issue of compromise
 - Stakeholders – managing them
 - Coordination takes a lot of time – there may be things that cannot be said
- Group 1: Conflict transformation professional
 - Collective solution, not just one person, but without a leader
 - Tried to find an issue that would bring different people together doing different projects. Water was the issue chosen.
 - Rejected the idea that we were one person. The conflict transformation professional could be defined in so many different ways that we could be defined as a collective. They were going to focus on a subordinate goal, which is water.
 - Problem with leadership in interfield perspective.
 - Identify a topic, rather than a person – identify what we do it through the issue.
 - We don't need to have a leader, we are a group of people, a task force. Can this work???
 - How do you determine leadership in the absence of context and roles and responsibility.
- Discussion:

- How do we organize and structure ourselves when there are so many autonomous actors?
- What does leadership mean?
- A vision of leadership that take account of changes over time, a self-organizing model where influence and power are distributed very broadly.
- Creating the architecture or infrastructure where leadership can mean something more than hierarchy.
- Who is defining what the strategy is? Who has legitimacy and credibility to facilitate that collaboration? The strategy has to emerge from a collective voice.
- Who is going to admit that they don't have the legitimacy or the credibility? Sense of competition.
- Look at the role of the military – give them some stake in transforming the conflict because they are the ones that have the potential to continue the conflict.

Implications for Peace Writ Large:

- Are we dealing with macro and micro.
 - There is lots of talking about civil and military and how that works on the ground, which is very different.

Insights/Surprises/Open Questions:

- The skills for facilitating multi-stakeholder processes are some of the most necessary for conflict transformation.
- Many of our organizations would have difficulty dividing ourselves up into the field.
- Local involvement needs to be inserted into all of these discussions. We often get so involved in how to organize ourselves that we don't pay attention.
- It is a huge leap from inter-field cooperation to peace writ large.

Future Agenda:

- Make a whole conference on leadership and collaboration.
- We need to learn from interfield collaboration and what works and what doesn't.
- The name, interfield collaboration, needs to be dealt with. It is putting us into boxes that we don't fit into. A number of us come into this with a background in a number of these fields. Can we walk away with a different name for this inter-field?

Open space – can we come up with some more language? You are going to be a very hard field to collaborate with because of the language issue. The peace field has got to get over that.

Session 8:

Addressing Communal Difference in Integrated Peace-Building

Helen R. Chauncey, Executive Director, The Coexistence Initiative

Momentum building for best practices.

Looking at a slice of a field

What constitutes a field?

Problem of vocabulary-language (e.g. co-existence)

A simple word can start a conversation or make people leave the room.

Identity how you understand yourself. How different words mean different things.

In the field you cannot talk about identity! Creation of neutral ground=conflict resolution.

Leave your identity at the door-pick it up when you leave.

Diverse identities Address interdependence. Each indent has to be free to express. Allow you to have super identity and then you share the large identity.

Reconciliation,

Different Fields Problem

Human Rights group (rights) how you deliver is a huge challenge.

Conflict Resolution tool kit: necessity for neutral space, bringing ethnic groups together.

How to recognize publicly that communal identity is important, affects all fields.

Mapping Exercise

Who is doing what, what methodology is being used, what close are being closed, what words are being used.

Spectrum of fields: Humanitarian Aid and Relief, Conflict Management and Resolution, Political, Social and Economic Development, Justice People, Human Rights, Security.

Education field was missing but in a different sense. Education in C.R. is in the field and not in theory and research.

How much self conscious are we, Communal Issues, Language and Institution

Define your field, communal activity-language you use, methodology.

Language (constructive confrontation).

Rights: Authority-People Rights different language/words used

Word loaded emotionally cannot be used.

How to evaluate diversity as a methodology.

Recognize the differences across the fields. Language causes to segregate our efforts not unify them.

Conflict is about identity, it must be recognized.

Session 9:

CAFTA and Sustainable Peace and Development in Guatemala

Dr. Michael K. Duffey, Associate Professor of Social Ethics, Department of Theology, Marquette University and by Mr. Edwin Rivera, a junior in the College of Arts and Sciences and McNair Scholar who is currently involved in a CAFTA research project.

Framework of Dayna Brown?

Stage of the conflict

Selected programs

Recommended program approaches

Challenges of Integration and Implementation

Measuring Impact

Background to situation in Guatemala

“post-conflict” what does this really mean?

Human rights

Economic Development

Social Development

Military: unrivaled, size, influence

Truth Commission-

No assignment of responsibility to individuals

97% of killings due to army

Peace accords- reduce military

CRIME

Civilians, prominent officials still targets, people working in anything that deals with the past (exhume bodies, forensic work, psychologists)... coercion to bury the past... who

were the perpetrators of the crimes during war; neighbors?; role of “civil patrollers”-

manipulated, militarization, unpaid/uncompensated

Criminality high, drug economy flourishing

3% of crimes investigated... lack of capacity

Upcoming elections- “dictator” redefined

Root Causes of Conflict:

Inequitable distribution of wealth and land

High Unemployment

Poverty (subsistence farmers)

External Influences

1953 (?) US involvement with the fruit farmers/fallow land scheme/government

Current

“Frontier justice” – response to lack of functioning justice system

UN/OAS – trying to respond

Human rights

Land reform has never occurred

2-fold dependency issue

internal: coffee and sugar 3 months/year to survive in highlands

external: dependant on foreign markets (coffee)

Gov’t strategy (econ)

Expand export agric

Repatriation of farmers- no land upon return

Water disputes prominent in rural communities as well

Reconstruction/ construction of physical infrastructure and economic projects (animal husbandry, banking reform,...)

What will CAFTA’s effect be?

Not a transparent process

Who’s boat rises?

Ability of Guatemalans to feed themselves/ to maintain the largest indigenous culture in Americas

What are the alternatives?

How do you get out of the box of export production?

CAFTA vs. other mechanisms for resources development

2 main models

- coffee fair trade cooperatives
- community solidarity
funding for building these

Economic, Social, Culture rights fundamental

Political and civil rights violations just a symptom

Resurgence of Mayan cultural identity/ renaissance of Mayan religion, religious tradition

- Implication for the future: Development will come out of their own spiritual and cultural heritages

Process of coming to terms with past – ghosts/spirits of the dead thrown in shallow graves- the new civil patrollers-
Growing confidence

Women- establish legal identity
Positions of community leadership – a necessity

Role of Sister Parishes- promote development that helps overcome conflict

Experience of Mayan refugees
Organized a previously very diverse group (27 different languages)
Negotiated their own return

CDD- social capital development
Future- ?: need for a *process*

Obstacles to solidarity... trust
History – absence of social contract-

Grassroots and interpersonal level confidence building and structural level – bottom up / top down- more people / key people model

Work of OAS and UNDP in establishing local CR capacity

- Insights, Open Questions, Surprises
- Implications for PWL
- Future Agenda

Session 11:

Cooperation Among Multiple Peacebuilding Initiatives

Paula Garb, University of California – Irvine

Paula Garb – Working in the Former Soviet Republic of Georgia

- Created an opportunity for multiples approaches to peacebuilding. Because the peace talks have been unsuccessful, it has opened up an opportunity for more NGO activities.
- UC Irvine, Conciliation Resources and International Alert.
- It was evident that all of the peacebuilding organizations were going to bump into each other. Competitive attitudes express that showed that there was room for facilitating cooperation among us. They decided that it would be good if they could talk to each other more, or at least not bump into each other more.
- Even the funder was interested in them collaborating. All of the organizations were worrying about their own identity.
- In 1998 they set up a more formal way of coordinating themselves. A lot of effort was put into preempting any attitude that they were going to take over the field.
- The tension has been that the peacebuilding in my project has taken up so much time it has not left as much room for coordination. Our relationships have been mutually beneficial. Ex. Conciliation Resources and UCI did a joint meeting. Putting resources together has given us an incentive to work together. Joint strategizing has also been an important tool in the bigger meetings. The most functional collaboration that has gone on has been little groups from the larger group. It is also important for them to see that it is worth their time and effort.
 - Actors – international NGOs, national NGOs, UN agencies, Embassies of the negotiating team, funders – everyone come together. They do not invite the local politicians who are involved in the negotiations. Inviting the international political players in the 1st track, but not the national players in the 1st track. The 1st track and 2nd track are the hardest to deal with.
- Discussion:
 - They purposefully invited orgs and individuals that were facilitating dialogues. These were projects based on capacity building – for building civil society organizations in Abkhazia, trying to increase the number of NGOs there. These are NGOs that do anything – aid, development, income generation activities – anything that is non-governmental. Small grants are given to different organizations by conciliation resources and by our projects as well. BUT, the primary focus of all of our activities is promoting dialogue – taking people back and forth between the communities or taking them back and forth for dialogue. 1 1/2 track – Conciliation Resources.
 - In the coordination they have all taken a niche – all filling the gaps.

- The original purpose of the dialogue was relationship building. Now they are all on the same page of working on policy options and focusing on this. Now everyone wants to get into the political arena. Now every one of these dialogue projects has been politicized. 1 1/2 is a track 2 methodology with track 1 people.
- Now the different kinds of dialogue groups are now anxious to come up with some kind of agreement to establish policy proposals.
- There has been collaboration with the funding and policy issues.
- IA has a range of dialogues involving youth and women. They are also working in the regions of Georgia and Abkhazia. They have a huge number of projects. They are more one off projects – start and stop. They have developed a consortium of groups in Georgia.
- The smaller groups – IA, CR and UCI talk to each other a lot outside of the meeting. Those who are closer to each other talk with each other as well. Those are the more efficient groups who seem to do resource sharing as well. These are not facilitated by the coordination groups, it is informal, and then the big group is told about it.
 - The directors of organizations and projects outside of this larger coordination meeting will meet and coordinate their work.
 - What seems to work for everyone is the big meeting twice a year, and then there are the smaller meetings that take place informally.
- If UCI did not initiate the big meeting then it would not happen, but the smaller meetings are not initiated by UCI, but that is where the work is done.
- The meetings are inclusive. They are purposefully not inviting every aid organization because it would be unwieldy, but it is open to anyone who wants to come.
- It is primarily information sharing. It has moved from information sharing to joint strategizing. In the last meeting they got into a very political discussion and a lot of follow-up activities have gone on.
- Each time they are in town together they go to each other's embassies and agree to a political approach with the embassies.
- In the coordination meeting there is no general methodology. There is funding provided by the grant.
- At the dialogues she lets the participants facilitate. To try as much as possible not to seem to be taking over or to monopolize. It has been run from the beginning by their methodology. The other methodology is J. Rothman's action/evaluation – what, why and how.
- The first political discussions took place at a meeting that Lederach helped to facilitate.

- Paula goes 3 times a year and notifies everyone in advance. When she's not there they do their own informal coordination. They all talk on the phone for work in between.
- Coordination is a skill and not everyone knows how to do it. But there has been nothing focused on this particular coordination – training in coordination.
- This is not an organization, coalition or structure.
- Northern Ireland – the idea was to give the Abkhaz and the Georgians an idea of what they could be walking into.

People's experiences for questions and opportunities on the ground:

- What is the point or purpose of coordination? How do you know whether or not it is working?
 - Paula – natural reason why we started this was because meetings were being held at the same time without realizing it. Partners who were the same. General duplication of work. How can they not meet at the same time and use all of the same people?
- Spectrum – from preventing overlap to reducing transaction costs (shared strategies, shared implementation).
 - This coordination mechanism is sufficient for this purpose.
 - The mechanism is dependent on the purpose and the context.
 - First stage of the problem is to look at how you determine what kind of coordination is appropriate for the type of situation you are facing. It also changes over time.
 - Most donor coordination meetings are at one end of the spectrum.
 - Trust fund issue
 - Coordination funding issue
- Heidi Burgess – building one big website. Get all of the people to work together – supported by Hewlett. It has turned into CR Info and a very useful. It took all of the people who could have been competing with each other, and helped them to make something that was bigger than what each of them could do.
 - They learn so much just from coming together.
 - There is a super-ordinate task, but what happens there is more important than any task that you give it – it is the connections between people. It is just the function of bringing people together who wouldn't otherwise necessarily be together. Comparing ideas and challenging each other – ideas come out that would not have happened otherwise.
- There are many different approaches among the spectrum.
 - What is in common here is that the platform, space, convening has spawned the different activities.

- Look at these different models that emerge intentionally or unintentionally. It was the one funder who asked them both to do this.
- ACT project: launching into a different model. Rather than work directly in the field they have created a network of individuals. The point of initiation is different – a network that set out as one of its goals to create better coordination and collaboration. Caucuses and DRC.
- We often talk about coordination as a given good and we should question that. Sometimes complementarity is more important than coordination. In Israeli-Palestinian conflict it was the competition for funding that encouraged complementarity – it was because of the overlapping individuals that could see this need for complementarity.
- Having this big conversation with all of the people about how we really have to press for political action, the critical thing will be how to follow up and manage that.
- Is the donor pleased with the result of the collaboration? What are the next steps?
 - He was very pleased. This collaboration would not have been as formalized as it would have been without the donor, and Susan Allen Nan was pushing for it. The fact that there is a pot of money to hold these meetings helps to make sure they happen. IT was going that way in any case.
- In the relief and development community, coordination is a part of the work. It is expected. Coming in and figuring out who does what and what niche we are filling. It is surprising that the conflict resolution field is so far behind. You can exacerbate conflict if there is not coordination about dialogues. The CR field should look at how the relief and the development field do coordination.
- [the issue is what you are delivering and how it measures – layer of competition in an area where there is conflict we are doing harm]
- Example of Indonesia – have a local NGO and an International NGO run the coordination together. They got involved in sharing notes and taking notes. It does not take a lot of money, but it does take skills. There are different reasons for coordinating, and they demand different skill sets.
- Conflict world has a lot to learn from relief and development world who does cooperation all of the time. But they also have a lot to learn from the mistakes and the institutions that do not work within the relief and development world.
- Sometimes the informal is better than the formal. Example of the secretariat at FEWER and competition of who is the boss.
- It has something to do with how you measure the output of peacebuilding and relief/development. Easier to measure the need for coordination in relief and development.
- Coordination is about acting together.

- The relief and development world has a lot to learn from the conflict world as well, about the process stuff.
- This field has a disadvantage of having a lot of related sub-sectoral fields.
- Coordination for the sake of coordination does not mean much. In a post conflict situation when you have all of these agendas the affect is minimal because time is of the essence and livelihood is more critical. “talk is cheap in resource poor environments.” Sometimes the urgent task is to get out certain messages. Has to cut across all of these entities. People are more prone in a resource poor area to look at where there are more resources. Coordination in other sectors may be more effective than stand-alone, especially in a cross-sectoral field.
- International peacebuilding organizations aren’t based in the country. If we had offices there we would be much more likely to participate in others meetings. They have tried to make cyberspace the place where this takes place, but it doesn’t work so well. You have to go after the information. Not being on the ground and being off the screen.
- We need to be upfront about the competition that is there with the shrinking pie. Hewlett is no longer here in this area.
- Maybe the new path is the integration of the two – peacebuilding and relief/development. That is what we were here talking about.
- Structure and funding:
 - Is there a fundamental economic structural difference between the areas where coordination is working and where it is not. This needs to be put on the agenda for the future.
 - It mapped up an agenda for collaborative action around increasing collaboration.
- Competition and methodology:
 - Competition is created when different organizations are using different methodologies. They share pieces of each other’s methodology...
 - Ex. Paula now sharing the donor proposals.

Session 12:

The Role of Land and Property Rights in Peacebuilding: The Case of East Timor

Jon Unruh, Indiana University

How to deal with property rights in a war to peace transition

Land as linked to identity to land as a commodity

Destruction of records; rejection of Indonesian law

Intros

Open Questions, Surprises, Insights

Implications for PWL

Future Agenda

Potential dilemma- tension between political nature of property rights and do no harm

Politicized environment of post-settlement

Opposing normative orders between land and property rights

Identity vs. security, authority, legitimacy

Lund's model: Life cycle of conflict – peacebuilding stage, address property rights

Applied research and legislative drafting

Funding thru USAID

Formal vs. informal domain- reconstruction bridging disconnects

Introduce laws that support what's already going on (deSoto), so as not to facilitate a disconnect... issue = time

Need to move forward with law within the confines/context of the reality – one that has post-conflict characteristics

Sets of laws- address diverse domain of land tenure

Core laws to a post-war situation: dispute mediation, restitution

Inter-field implication: academic/research follows legislative schedule (ministry of justice)

Best Practice ?

PWL and do no harm... timing of intervention in conflict cycle... dilemma

Role of 3rd party

Do you want to perpetuate structures that violate internat'l norms of human rights?... how does this get sorted out?

Working for USAID as donor...

University consortium

PWL: coordination

Government, donor, implementers

(ARD- pursuing the coordination)

Interests...?

Flooding of aid – push to rebuild vs. lack of titling

Translation of identity into other forms of evidence of land ownership

Interfacing with the population

Who is the representative? Is the representative really representative?

How did that representative come to be the rep?

What is the perception of the community of that rep?

Post-conflict environments are different

Unpacking of the previous system

Subtle injustices- what am I not hearing, seeing?

Making it binding- utility of unresolved land dispute, may be leverage for another conflict

Coordination (among NGOs) as relationships and broad process- pervasiveness of effort

Developing institutional memory-

A quick-moving approach (as a best practice package)

Forces of globalization- (who owns the water?, corporations, commodification of land)

Leasing systems, arrangements- how is this dealt with at the customary level

Making leasing binding ... legitimacy (stacking as an avenue to legitimacy)

Land rights in enclaves- disputed land... unpacking of claims

Cases where there are competing national claims... where to being?

Use of disputed land during peace process ?