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1. Overview

Although theories and strategies on conflict prevention are well-developed, institutionalised practice remains limited, especially at the national level. Experts consulted referred to a gap between rhetoric and reality: “there is a dearth of real substantive (as opposed to simply theoretical) work on conflict prevention!” (David Bloomfield, Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation) The literature contains some descriptions of individual projects set up by mainly international NGOs that their sponsors have claimed to be successful, at least at local levels regarding mainly community-level conflicts. However, these are not necessarily sponsored by the governments in those countries.

While there is a lot of information on what third party actors have done to prevent intra-state conflicts from occurring, there is not yet much literature about work by national government in devising their own strategies for conflict prevention. Preventive efforts are moving away from specially dedicated activities to incorporating conflict-sensitive development into countrywide development strategies such as PRSPs and the UN’s Common Country Assessment (CCA) and Development Assistance Framework (DAF). Conflict and peace-building criteria are increasingly being ‘mainstreamed’ into all development sectors (e.g. agriculture, health, education, economic growth, environment, youth, democracy- and state-building, civil society building, as well as security sector professionalism), and into the full programming cycle. However, there is also a growing call for the establishment of dedicated ministries and departments of peace in governments around the world (see Global Alliance: www.mfp-dop.org).

Nevertheless, the literature and experts consulted highlighted a number of examples of country (national and sub-national) strategies on preventing conflict and building a culture of peace:

Ghana: conflict prevention is a central element of Ghana’s Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). A tripartite partnership between the Government of Ghana, the UN and civil society
has helped develop decentralised peace architecture with National and Regional Peace Councils (and plans to go down to the district level).

**Guinea-Bissau:** the International Peace and Prosperity Project (IPPP) is an ongoing conflict prevention project which began operations in 2004. Although it is not sponsored by the national government, it has involved consultation with government officials.

**Kenya:** a National Steering Committee on Peace Building and Conflict Management has been established, which has drafted a framework for a policy on conflict management, as well as formulating a draft national policy on peace building and conflict management.

**Uganda:** the Government of Uganda's ‘Peace, Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda 2007-2010’ (PRDP) has peacebuilding and reconciliation as one of its four priority pillars and strategic objectives.

**Indonesia:** The Kecamatan Development Program (KDP) is a national government programme aimed at alleviating poverty, strengthening local government and community institutions, and improving local governance. It includes elements of peace-building and conflict prevention and is located in areas which have experienced severe communal or separatist conflict.

**Afghanistan:** the Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development has seven interlinked national programmes that integrate elements of conflict prevention into development.

**Nepal:** The Ministry of Peace & Reconstruction is one of the first national peace ministries and is developing a national strategy at the government level - the Nepal Peace Trust Fund (NPTF).

Some of these country strategies are at an early stage of design/implementation and are seen by some experts as “more of a shopping list than a strategy”. At the sub-national level, the following examples were recommended:

**Southern Serbia:** initiated largely by the national government in 2002, the “Covic Plan” is an elaborate strategy, which involved the OSCE, the EU, NGOs, several donors as well as government ministries in a fairly comprehensive approach to dealing with the ethnic Serb - ethnic Albanian tensions in the Presevo Valley area (east of Kosovo).

**Eastern Sri Lanka:** the ‘Early Warning and Early Response System’ is a citizen-based system which conducts both conflict prevention and aims to build a culture of peace. Field monitors and local committees provide daily peace and conflict information to a computer software program (FCEWARN) for early warning and conflict prevention.

It should also be noted that it is not easy to separate out “strategies on preventing conflict” and “building a culture of peace” from the literature; the terms are often used interchangeably or may not always be referred to explicitly.

As well as the frameworks used at the country-level (mentioned above), there are also strategic tools available to assist policy-makers in designing and implementing conflict prevention strategies. Many of the experts consulted as part of this query noted that both the theoretical and the country-specific frameworks can be adapted and used by national governments. For example, the Strategic Framework for Conflict Prevention (developed by USIP) was recently applied to the Ogaden conflict in Ethiopia as part of an exercise during a recently organised seminar at the US State Department. In addition, there are examples of countries learning from the experience of others (e.g. Kenya sent a team of Government officials to study the Ghana example in 2007; the Sri Lankan NGO FCE was invited to Nepal by International Rescue Committee to adopt their early warning system to the conflict there).
2. Strategic frameworks and country case studies


This paper examines the significance of state reform for conflict transformation, both as a prerequisite for sustainable peace, but also as a potential source of conflict. The author presents a model for strategic intervention, based around three approaches:

- Participation and democratisation (i.e. participation of the rural population; strengthening civil society; democratisation as participatory process; dialogue oriented intermediary institutions)
- Institution building and institutional reform (i.e. federalisation, decentralisation, constitutional and judicial reform, protection and integration of minorities); and
- Security sector reform (i.e. human rights, human security, (re)establishment of monopoly of power, objective and subjective civilian control).

The paper gives brief country examples, but does not provide detailed examples of country strategies. Instead, it outlines a useful overview of the different challenges in crisis regions and the ways in which state reform can deal with these problems.


This chapter explores the gap between “the promise of conflict prevention and its more deliberate pursuit” (p.288). Under the sub-heading ‘What is being done? A well-kept secret’, the author highlights a number of little-publicised, direct and structural conflict prevention activities, such as the UNDP local community development programme in southern Kyrgyzstan, which was explicitly entitled ‘preventive development’. He also notes that international agencies have supported unofficial diplomatic initiatives, such as in Georgia, Uganda, Senegal, and the DRC. Preventive efforts are moving away from specially dedicated activities to ‘mainstreaming’ conflict and peace-building criteria into all development sectors (e.g. agriculture, health, education, economic growth, environment, youth, democracy- and state-building, civil society building, as well as security sector professionalism), and into the full programming cycle. The author also notes that the UN and some donor and multilateral organisations are also trying to incorporate conflict-sensitive development into countrywide development strategies such as PRSPs and the UN’s UN’s Common Country Assessment (CCA) and Development Assistance Framework (DAF).

The paper recommends focusing more attention at the country level, “where the diverse agendas and tools are most clearly juxtaposed and concretely reconciled” (p.307). Joint consultations are recommended with key actors (governments, UN, EU, regional actors, NGOs) to assess the country situations and devise and implement analytically-based targeted strategies. Lund suggests that this process should be linked to existing country-specific development planning procedures such as the PRSP and CAS, while also engaging with diplomatic and military agencies as well as inside stakeholders.
This handbook is based on reconciliation experiences from the last thirty years. A series of tools to address post-violence issues and reconciliation are presented. At the end of several chapters, the following detailed country case studies are included:

- Zimbabwe: Why Reconciliation Failed (pp.34-39)
- Reconciliation in Cambodia: Politics, Culture and Religion (pp.49-54)
- Victim–Combatant Dialogue in Northern Ireland (pp.89-96)
- The Gacaca Tribunals in Rwanda (pp.116-121)
- The Truth Commissions of South Africa and Guatemala (pp.140-144)

The Reflecting on Peace Practice Project (RPP) is an experience-based learning process that involves over 200 agencies whose programmes attempt to prevent or mitigate violent conflict. This paper is based on country case studies from Northern Ireland, Cyprus, Burundi, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Kosovo and Israel/Palestine. This report includes the findings from the first Consultation on Understanding Cumulative Impacts held in January 2008. It examines how to make individual, diverse programmes “add up” to peace and how this evidence can inform international actors’ efforts. The evidence is mixed as to whether uncoordinated efforts can ‘add up’, although a surprising case study from Northern Ireland illustrates that peace can be achieved without a coherent overall strategy: “Indeed, there appeared to be a redundancy that was helpful – duplication that facilitated progress rather than waste.” (p.6)

The United States Institute of Peace’s Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention has developed a Strategic Framework for Conflict Prevention. This strategic framework - one in a series of peacebuilding frameworks – was developed to assist policy-makers to systematically design and implement conflict prevention strategies with a specific focus on mitigating risk factors and preventing early escalation. The framework is organised around a desired end state (described as stable peace), key objectives, and leadership responsibilities. The key objectives, the core of this framework, are divided into three broad preventive strategies aimed at structural and operational prevention at the global, national and sub-national level. Although the strategy is not country-specific, it is applicable to a variety of pre-conflict cases. For example, as an exercise during a recently organised seminar at the US State Department, the strategic framework was applied to the Ogaden conflict in Ethiopia.
3. National country strategies

Ghana

http://www.gppac.net/page.php?id=1889

This paper examines how the tripartite partnership between the Government of Ghana, the UN and civil society has been central in developing ‘Infrastructures for Peace’ as a strategy for conflict prevention at both the national and sub-national level in Ghana. The National Peace Council (NPC) operates at the national level and is supported by the establishment of Regional Peace Councils in the 10 administrative regions of Ghana with plans to go further down to the district levels. This peace architecture complements the pre-existing Security Councils which focus on enforcing peace, for example, by imposing states of emergencies or deploying police or military to suppress violence. This example from Ghana is instructive because it highlights the value of a decentralised peace architecture, where ownership of peacebuilding processes is in the hands of communities, while outsider assistance facilitates processes.

Challenges to its implementation include the need for greater funding for the councils and a supportive and non-partisan political environment. Nevertheless, there have been some early positive results from the 2008 elections in Ghana. Despite tensions and potential election-related violence following the second round of voting, WANEP provided dialogue support to the NPC and worked with the leading political contenders. WANEP believe this has set the parameters for successful elections including mediating concession, a smooth transition and the effective management of anxieties and expectations.


Ghana’s Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) covers governance and conflict prevention as a central element. It outlines the national conflict prevention programme, established by the government and supported by UNDP, and is covered in pages 13-14. Components of the programme include the creation of an early warning and early response policy mechanism, addressing the youth question, the creation of a national process and mechanisms for conflict management and resolution, responsible media reporting, the development of a critical mass of dispute resolvers, and small arms and light weapons management.

Guinea-Bissau

http://www.ciian.org/assets/forms/wholeofproblemmodel.pdf

Hoffman’s article outlines an operational model for the prevention of violent conflict in fragile and weak states. This model, known as the ‘Whole-of-Problem Prevention Model’ has been operating in Guinea-Bissau since 2004. The underlying basic concept is one of a core group of internal and external actors working closely on the project, performing joint analysis, reaching consensus and then galvanising the support of other actors. The Guinea-Bissau
model has ten main steps, and a strategy for implementing the steps. The ten main steps of the Whole-of-Problem Prevention Model are to:

“(1) identify a potential location through an early warning exercise,
(2) dispatch a multi-disciplinary team on an initial scouting trip in order to confirm country selection and begin real-time analysis of the situation,
(3) obtain endorsements and partners,
(4) construct a flexible operational plan,
(5) build working relationships with local leaders through targeted activities,
(6) continue ongoing real-time analysis of the situation,
(7) facilitate a joint diagnostic and prevention action planning process to develop a prevention action plan,
(8) support the implementation of the prevention action plan,
(9) address vulnerabilities to violence as they are identified, and
(10) measure success and agree on an exit plan.” (pp.17-18)

The National Action Plan produced for Guinea-Bissau identifies eight key problems, their multiple causes, and provides recommendations that span the sectors of education, governance, armed forces, the media, etc. The article critically examines key aspects of the model’s design and operation. Limitations identified include: (1) the national prevention action plan is based on the analysis conducted by the local actors, potentially leading to an inaccurate analysis of the causes of violent conflict and the corresponding preventive actions; and (2) the national prevention action plan does not account for the changing dynamics of the situation (although the project in Guinea-Bissau was able to counter this limitation by a process of ongoing assessment); and (3) the model is implemented by an NGO, which limits its ability to generate high levels of political will.

The author argues that the strength of this model is that it works at both the structural and systemic levels. The flexible approach is also beneficial, because it has enabled the project to shift focus to shorter-term crisis management activities when needed (e.g. urgent alerts were issued by the project in response to the assassination of a high-level military leader).

[For more information on the International Peace and Prosperity Project (IPPP) in Guinea-Bissau, see also: http://www.ciian.org/projects1.shtml#gb”]

Kenya

http://practicalaction.org/docs/region_east_africa/practical_action_conflict_management.pdf

This report sets out the current initiatives for developing national policy on conflict management in Kenya. While a number of peace-building interventions exist (district peace committees, traditional peace processes and participation in regional peace and security initiatives), an important step forward has been the establishment of a National Steering Committee on Peace Building and Conflict Management. This committee has drafted a framework for a policy on conflict management, as well as formulating a draft national policy on peace building and conflict management.

This paper aims to increase understanding on current policy development initiatives and strengthen institutional capacity to participate in strategy formulation and policy implementation. It outlines the critical issues and key challenges that should be addressed by the policy. Key recommendations include:

- Complete the national policy formulation process (without delay).
- Promote African systems of governance and conflict resolution.
- Enact and enforce relevant laws relating to conflict issues, such as land, firearms and small arms, recognition of traditional peace processes, access and use of natural resources.
- Institutionalise and strengthen peace committees.
- Engender peace building.
- Address cross border conflicts.
- Reform and strengthen policy force.
- Improve physical and social infrastructure (a Marshall Plan for Northern Kenya).

Also critical is the development of an effective advocacy strategy that will inform the policy formulation and implementation process.

**Uganda**

Banfield, J. and Jana Naujoks, 2009, *Enabling peace economies through early recovery – Perspectives from Uganda*, International Alert


The government of Uganda is currently coordinating a Peace, Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda (PRDP), which aims to provide an overarching framework for recovery of the region. The PRDP’s four priority ‘pillars’ and strategic objectives (SOs) are:

- SO1: Consolidation of state authority;
- SO2: Rebuilding and empowering communities;
- SO3: Revitalisation of the economy; and
- SO4: Peacebuilding and reconciliation.

This report is based on International Alert’s fieldwork in Uganda which focuses explicitly on economic dimensions of peacebuilding in the north, as well as elsewhere in the country. The authors reveal the difficulties involved in planning for ‘early recovery’ in the context of an ongoing and fragile peace process. They also highlight some of the ongoing challenges to the success of the PRDP, not least the delays, poor communication strategy and limited vision for national reconciliation, while acknowledging that “the PRDP represents a significant opportunity for moving towards greater parity and integration between the economies of Uganda’s north and south.” (p.17)

**Indonesia**

Indonesia Kecamatan Development Program (KDP)

http://www.worldbank.org/id/kdp

The Kecamatan Development Program (KDP) is a national Government of Indonesia programme, implemented by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Community Development Office, and aimed at alleviating poverty, strengthening local government and community institutions, and improving local governance. It includes elements of peace-building and conflict prevention and is located in areas which have experienced severe communal or separatist conflict such as Aceh, Central Kalimantan, Papua, Poso in Central Sulawesi, North Maluku and Maluku. For example, in North Maluku a special Reconciliation Team facilitated reconciliation among warring factions in two kecamatan (subdistricts), Ibu and Loloda. The team was composed of Christian and Muslim community leaders, traditional leaders, youth, university students, and KDP Kecamatan Facilitators. The team joined KDP meetings, as well as informal meetings at churches, mosques, and village gatherings to inform the community about KDP. KDP consultants also went door to door to raise awareness about the programme. The official website is: http://www.kdp.or.id/default.asp?Language=1
This report highlights the findings of a Peace and Development Analysis process (PDA), conducted by UNDP in cooperation with Indonesia’s State Planning Agency (Bappenas). The PDA is a process of multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral analysis and strategy development that provides a consultative input to national level strategic planning and has also been implemented in adjusted forms in other countries, amongst others the Kyrgyz Republic. The PDA process in Indonesia revealed that, “despite a great deal of progress in terms of peace building, there are several peace vulnerabilities in all conflict-affected areas in Indonesia” (p.xiii), including security (shootings and bomb attacks), internally displaced persons, youth clashes, and the burden on women.

Afghanistan

The National Solidarity Programme (Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development, Afghanistan)

The Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development has seven interlinked national programmes that integrate elements of conflict prevention into development. The key programme, on which the others depend, is the National Solidarity Programme (http://www.mrrd.gov.af/nsp and http://www.nspafghanistan.org/) (“The National Solidarity Programme is the primary vehicle used to build social capital by promoting good local governance thereby empowering rural communities to take control over their lives and livelihoods. Empowered rural communities collectively contribute to increased human security.”). The NSP aims to achieve this by establishing a national network of community development councils (CDCs) that empower communities to make decisions.

A discussion of the NSP can be found at:
Kakar, P., 2005, ‘Fine-tuning the NSP: Discussion of Problems and Solutions with Facilitating Partners’, Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit, Kabul

Nepal

Nepal Peace Trust Fund – Government of Nepal Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction
See: http://www.peace.gov.np/eng/default.asp


Notwithstanding the lack of an effective government as a result of the resignation of the Maoist Prime Minister in May 2009, Nepal has a national strategy at the government level - the Nepal Peace Trust Fund (NPTF). Established in February 2007, the NPTF implements the provisions of the historic Comprehensive Peace Accord (CPA), which was signed by the Government of Nepal (GoN) and the Nepal Communist Party Maoist (CPN-M). NPTF is a
three year programme and its scope of work has recently been increased from five to eight as follows:

1) Rehabilitation of the internally displaced persons (IDPs);
2) Election of the Constituent Assembly (CA) and other entities;
3) Promotion and strengthening of peace and security;
4) Management of the cantonments and rehabilitation of the Maoists combatants;
5) Support to the peace building process;
6) Rehabilitation of the conflict affected people (New);
7) Mine actions (New); and
8) Reconstruction of public sector infrastructure damaged during the conflict (New).

http://www.gppac.net/page.php?id=1889

This chapter explores how civil society came together in a broad alliance called the Nepal Peace Initiative Alliance (NPIA) and lobbied through marches and other activities for a state-level Ministry/Department of Peace, and exerted pressure on all parties to find a negotiated settlement of the ongoing conflict. The author notes that “the establishment of the Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction makes Nepal the second nation in the world to have such a ministry (after the Ministry of National Unity, Reconciliation, and Peace in the Solomon Islands), placing Nepal at the forefront of the rapidly growing global movement for ministries of peace in countries around the world.” (p.56). The paper outlines some of the functions and duties of the Ministry of Peace, before exploring the challenges to civil society and government cooperation on peacebuilding in Nepal.

4. Sub-national strategies

South Serbia and the ‘Covic Plan’

http://www.developmentandtransition.net/uploads/issuesAttachments/18/Dev_And_Trans%20eng.pdf

The outbreak of violence in the Presevo Valley in 2000-2001 led to joint efforts by the government of Serbia, the military and police forces, local leaders, NATO and international humanitarian and development agencies to develop a comprehensive plan to bring peace to South Serbia. Known as the ‘Covic Plan’ after the Serbian Deputy Prime Minister, the plan comprised of three elements: negotiating a truce with the UCPMB (ethnic Albanian secessionist group); addressing the political grievances of the ethnic Albanian population in affected municipalities; and providing humanitarian and developmental assistance. This paper highlights the importance of negotiation between ‘warring parties’, and of a rapid, effective response by the international community. Key lessons include:

- A quick response that yields visible, tangible benefits for some of the main conflict protagonists.
- Appropriate UN support.
- Extensive local visibility.
- Impartiality - working broadly across the region and among all parties, instead of just focusing on directly affected municipalities.
Employing and investing in local staff from different ethnic communities.
Effective international coordination.
Performing external evaluations at key points in the programme cycle to identify problems and make necessary adjustments.

Eastern Sri Lanka and citizen-based early warning and response


This working paper outlines the ‘Early Warning and Early Response System’, established by the Foundation for Co-Existence - a Sri Lankan NGO (with assistance from the Swiss Peace Foundation). The project aims to prevent inter-communal violence between the Tamils, Muslims and Sinhalese in the Eastern Province of Sri Lanka and has been operating since 2003. The system is a ‘third generation early warning system’ (created by people in conflict areas for themselves). It is a citizen-based system and has intervened in a recorded number of 174 cases of conflict (as of the 23rd June, 2009) and its effectiveness has been attested by several assessments conducted by internationally acclaimed scholars.

The FCE has developed a computer software program called FCEWARN for early warning, which can be utilised to monitor conflicts at the ‘micro’ level, especially at the village level. The software quantifies conflict and peace indicators to display them as descriptive statistics such as tables and graphs. The FCE combines this software with Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software to give a spatial dimension. The peace and conflict information fed into the software programme is collected by the Foundation’s 37 field monitors operating in the conflict zone, who are members of the communities they represent. The system is sustained on the ground by Co-Existence Committees (CECs), made up of volunteers from each major ethnic group and consisting of women, youth, religious groups, media, fishermen, farmers and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). For example, a religious CEC is composed of Buddhist, Hindu and Muslim religious leaders in a region.

Unlike other conflict early earning system, the Sri Lankan example conducts both conflict prevention (early warning) and aims to build a culture of peace at the same time. It addresses both aspects of structural (long term) conflict prevention and operational (short term) conflict prevention. Moreover, the CECs play the roles of connectors in three ways in overall peacebuilding activities: (1) the connectors of early warning and conflict transformation, (2) connectors of different ethnic groups and (3) connectors of early warning and early response since they work as the first informants of the symptoms of inter-communal violence and becoming stakeholders in interventions.

A good summary is provided at Patrick Meier’s blog: http://earlywarning.wordpress.com/2009/03/05/sri-lanka-citizen-based-early-warning-and-response/
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