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1 Introduction

"Peace is its own reward."
Mahatma Gandhi

This paper aims to outline issues for PWJ’s move into proactive peacebuilding (PB) and puts forward concrete proposals for addressing these issues thereby providing a solid principled foundation from which to actively incorporate peacebuilding concepts into PWJ’s relief and reconstruction programming, and begin stand-alone peacebuilding programs. The range of topics undertaken is broad from basic definitions to practical methodologies for implementing peacebuilding. The paper aims to be functional document providing at least suggestions, if not answers, to many of the questions that PWJ staff may have about the shift of emphasis toward peacebuilding in recent years amongst humanitarian actors. It also attempts to convince senior PWJ staff of the importance of a proactive pursuit of improved peacebuilding practices for the long term good of the organization and its partners.

It is based on a review of literature regarding other organizations’ peacebuilding policies and principles\(^1\) and papers produced by research institutes and donor agencies while taking into consideration PWJ’s current state and mandate. Furthermore, talks were held with a number of US based NGOs such as Mercy Corps, CARE, World Vision International, and PACT during a trip to the US in August 2003. Subsequently ideas for developing peacebuilding policy internally have been exchanged between the Mercy Corps staff in charge of “peaceful change” within the Civil Society unit. Discussions with several PWJ staff in the Project and Research Units were held to ascertain the internal thinking toward PB and to widen the base of creative thought for this paper.\(^2\) It is also based on the authors experience in the field as a field coordinator and researcher in Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Indonesia.\(^3\)

In exploring possibilities and in making recommendations, this paper borrows in places from already developed definitions, guidelines and frameworks and this has been indicated by footnotes. Numerous appendices have been attached to facilitate deeper understanding of the current state of PB, especially in the humanitarian non-governmental organization (NGO) sector.

---
\(^1\) For key examples see Catholic Relief Services PB principles website at [http://www.catholicrelief.org/what_we_do_overseas/peace/principles.cfm](http://www.catholicrelief.org/what_we_do_overseas/peace/principles.cfm), also West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP) at [http://www.wanep.org/op_principles.htm](http://www.wanep.org/op_principles.htm)
\(^2\) Discussions were held with Ushida (27-2-04&5-4-04), Harada (2-4-04), Saito M. (5-4-04), Osawa (5-4-04) at PWJ office
\(^3\) Experience in Sierra Leone was with PWJ, Afghanistan with PWJ and the Japan Center for Conflict Prevention (JCCP) and Indonesia with JCCP
Far from being a final paper, it is more of a launching pad from which to explore the issues for PWJ regarding peacebuilding in greater depth through field research and further discussion, both internally and externally, and with PWJ’s strategic alliance partner Mercy Corps. It is hoped that upon completion of this paper the author will be able to take the ideas contained hereon in to discussions at headquarters, discussions with other NGOs and relevant agencies, and, most importantly, to the field for “testing” and consideration by PWJ field staff. Feedback from all staff, especially field staff, is a must for the successful reworking, refinement and implementation of the recommendations.

Finally, it is hoped that a concise set of principles, guidelines, tools and/or a specific PB mission statement will be produced to support PWJ staff in incorporating PB principles into conventional development and emergency relief programming and in designing and implementing PB stand alone programs. Suggestions or starting points for these are included in this paper.

2 Why Peacebuilding Now for PWJ?

“We will not have peace by afterthought.”
Norman Cousins

2.1 Internal Factors
PWJ has reached a point in its growth as a leading emergency relief and development non-governmental organization in Japan whereby it is taking stock of its programming strategy and mandate. Although a clear and internally supported Vision and Mission was developed in 1999 and further developed in 2003, there is currently a feeling within the organization that a comprehensive review of the organization in regard to programming strategy is necessary. This has been reflected in the recent initiatives to embrace a more comprehensive and consistent regional strategy for West Africa and review long-term program planning for Afghanistan and Indonesia. Furthermore, in the last year and a half a thorough review of the image that PWJ projects to the public through its advertising, fair trade products and website design/content has resulted in a more focused direction in PWJ public relations, marketing and fair trade operations.

As a part of this review process a re-examination of the Mission and Vision is indispensable.
The concept of “conflict prevention” and “peacebuilding”, in both a broad and narrow sense (see below for further explanation of narrow and broad PB definitions), is definitively stated within the mission and vision. However, a review of PWJ programming to date reveals that programs have consistently been “reactive” to humanitarian crisis followed by transitional programming moving from the initial emergency relief through to long-term development. While this emergency relief and development programming evidently reflects important aspects of the Mission and Vision, such as “people can live with hope and respect”, “implement reconstruction and development programs for the self-sustainability of people” and “promptly provide emergency humanitarian relief”, it does not encompass the full spectrum of activities laid out within it. Concepts contained within the Mission and Vision, such as “free from the threat of armed conflict and poverty” and “pursue the prevention and resolution of conflict through field operations”, clearly point to a mandate encompassing further proactive programming aiming to root out the causes of conflict\(^4\) as well as poverty, and to identify and utilize local opportunities for promoting peace.

Another factor is the organization name itself. “Peace Winds” would suggest an organization tackling more directly issues threatening peace and working to promote peaceful change in society. As the quotation at the head of this section states that, “We will not have peace by afterthought”, meaning that it has to be actively incorporated into program design.

---

\(^4\) Conflict in this paper refers to violent or destructive conflict unless stipulated otherwise. It is suggested that PWJ formally acknowledges that non-violent, non-threatening conflict can be a productive change agent in its literature and other avenues.
The fact that PWJ is a Japanese organization can be advantageous when working for peacebuilding. This is because Japan’s “peace constitution”, although having taken a beating as of late, is widely known throughout the world and its recovery to prosperity after the ashes of World War II is an inspiration in developing countries. Japan has an image of being a peace-loving nation that is generous with ODA and of being fairly neutral politically. Although this clean image has been eroded with SDFs dispatch to Iraq, Japanese NGOs are still in a good position to take advantage of this image. The neutrality afforded to Japanese NGOs by Japan’s history is a valuable asset when working for peacebuilding in politically sensitive areas. Except for a few countries around the world like North and South Korea and to a lesser extent China, Japan is seen to be a friendly nation. It is this image that many North American and European NGOs do not possess and therefore are regarded suspiciously by aspects of the society, especially government, that they work in. This suspicion can undermine peacebuilding efforts. In this respect, Japanese NGOs are better placed to do peacebuilding in conflict sensitive areas than their western counterparts.

Furthermore, over the last year and a half, PWJ staff have been introduced to peacebuilding concepts such as “Do No Harm” through internal presentations and workshops. Further introductions to case studies such as community arms collection programs in Sierra Leone at Lunch Meetings have also raised the awareness of peacebuilding internally. Introduction of relevant peacebuilding literature to staff, purchases of materials for the research unit, and the establishment of a large collection of electronic materials on the internal PWJ computer network have all contributed to an increased interest in peacebuilding internally.

Having said that, currently PWJ does passively incorporate PB principles into its relief and development programming simply through its professional conduct as an NGO. This professionalism and dedication to international standards such as the Sphere Project-Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response and UNHCR guidelines contribute greatly to ensuring that PWJ programs do not exacerbate conflict through poor practices. Providing training opportunities and experience in the field under the tutelage of senior staff all help to nurture inexperienced staff to become quality relief and development human resources. Maintaining staff awareness and knowledge of minimum standards is vital not only from a emergency relief perspective but also from a peacebuilding perspective. This is especially so if cooperation, as seen in Iran, with MC is to be furthered. Despite the generally mutually positive evaluations on the cooperation with MC in Iran, lack of knowledge of minimum standards by PWJ staff was identified by experienced MC staff as one area where
PWJ's professionalism can be improved.\textsuperscript{5}

This type of knowledge is not only important for improved emergency relief, but is also important from a peacebuilding/conflict prevention perspective as well. Continuing to provide opportunities to staff for focused and relevant training in aspects of humanitarian work, including specific peacebuilding training is strongly recommended. Recommendations for specific peacebuilding training will be presented later in this paper.

Furthermore, the value of plain common sense in the field is largely underestimated by critics. Many of the principles and methodologies put forward by peacebuilding "experts" are formalizations of what many humanitarian workers would label as “the obvious”. This common sense is developed not only through experience in the field but also through life itself. A person with a vast array of training but no common sense will undoubtedly exacerbate conflict in the field than an untrained person with maturity, intelligence and a high degree of common sense. Of course, the ideal is to have staff with sound common sense supported by the technical competence derived from proper training in peacebuilding practices, the correct tools and guidelines at hand for proper implementation, and proper support from experts in peacebuilding.

Guidelines and experts are resources that staff can call upon to assist them in making informed and consistent decisions regarding programming options. Guidelines developed across the organization incorporated with training, experience and common sense, arm staff with the ability to act most professionally and with least negative impact in the field. Relief and development programs designed with the best of intentions can sometimes overlook possible exacerbation of tensions. This can be true even when emergency relief and/or development programming goals are achieved.

### 2.2 External Factors

In recent years the link between conflict, peace and aid has come into focus within the international community, including humanitarian organizations. Conflict is now recognized as a cross-cutting issue with conflict sensitivity across all sectors a prerequisite to effectively address the underlying issues of conflict. Since the mid-nineties academics such as Kenneth Bush, Kim Maynard, Mary Anderson and John Paul Lederach and organizations such International Alert, INCORE, and the Bergoff Center for Constructive Conflict Management have put forward proposals for looking at humanitarian relief and development through a

\textsuperscript{5} Informal discussions with Randolph Martin, Director, Global Emergency Operations, Mercy Corps 22-1-04
“conflict lens”. Despite the fact that a clear link between aid and conflict has been established, the translation of this knowledge to practical application has generally lagged.

Several humanitarian organizations have recently embarked on the development of their own methodological and conceptual tools to facilitate understanding and improvement of how to support long-term prospects for peace through short-, medium and long-term relief and development aid. Some of these tools have been developed through internal deliberations and research, while other tools have been developed through working with academics directly, or by at least using their models as a base from which to develop models to meet particular organizational needs.

The establishment of networks of organizations pursuing a peacebuilding agenda have greatly facilitated the process of implementing development and emergency relief through a conflict lense. In the US, within InterAction, the Transition, Conflict and Peace Working Group (TCP) has been established. In Canada, the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee (CPCC) and in the UK a peacebuilding working group centered on International Alert have been established. Examples of some of these models and how they were developed will be explored in detail later in this paper. The establishment of these networks specifically for peacebuilding all point to an increased interest in peacebuilding globally.

Moreover, it is not just humanitarian NGOs that have recognized the importance of this new emphasis on conducting aid operations with a longer-term view of building capacities for peace. Many donor agencies have recognized the need for peacebuilding in conflict-affected societies. It was the 1997 publication of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Guidelines by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that clearly outlined this new approach for donors. The Guidelines emphasized the need to explore how development could “contribute proactively to conflict prevention and post conflict rehabilitation and reconstruction”. ⁶

Since then, within United States Agency for International Development’s (USAID) Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA) a new Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation has been established. This office is developing the strategy of USAID to integrate more conflict sensitivity into programming and may have some funding available for NGOs, though for now it is focused more on conflict assessments and technical

---

assistance to USAID missions. Furthermore, the Australian Government’s Overseas Aid Program, AusAID, has initiated a “Peace, Conflict and Development Policy” (see appendix 1 for a table of government agencies supporting PB).

In Japan, the Japan International Agency for Cooperation (JICA) is planning to establish a peacebuilding unit in 2004 under the directives of its new President as of October 1, 2003, Ogata Sadako formerly of UNHCR, who has declared peacebuilding to be one of the 4 pillars of the newly reformed agency. This is an encouraging sign especially for Japanese NGOs. Most of these donors require their field offices to conduct conflict assessments, including JICA who has developed the Peacebuilding Needs and Impact Assessment (PNA) methodology for use by field offices and partner organizations. Moreover, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) on page one of its ODA Charter Review of August 2003 acknowledges the threat of ethnic and religious conflict and that “preventing conflicts and terrorism, and efforts to build peace…have become major issues inherent to the stability and development of the international community.” Within this review, peacebuilding is identified as one of four “Priority Issues” along with poverty reduction, sustainable growth and addressing global-issues. Lastly, Japan Platform’s (JPF) mandate is expected to expand beyond the current emergency relief some time this year to include peacebuilding. A budget of 2 billion yen from MOFA to JPF has already been announced and it is expected that some will be available for peacebuilding activities. As a central member of JPF this year represents a good opportunity to tap into potential JPF resources.

Amongst private donors, the Compton Foundation in the USA has established a “Peace and Security” program for “Advancing peaceful means of settling global, international or regional conflicts, including the prevention of ethnic/sectarian violence”, and the Niwano Peace Foundation in Japan supports activities for peace through education, human rights and developmental cooperation with grants available for “research” and “activity” (see appendix 2 for a table of private foundations supporting PB). Sasakawa Peace Foundation has also expressed interest in support for peacebuilding though it has no specific peacebuilding or conflict programs.

Furthermore, United Nation (UN) agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) with its Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery carries out conflict

---

1
assessment studies to identify what opportunities exist for UNDP in order to address the underlying causes of conflict in the country through their development programs. The World Bank has established the Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit to “provide conflict analysis aimed at optimizing project design in conflict-affected countries, and develops tools and strategies to deal with development in conflict areas” and ease the transition to sustainable peace and support socio-economic development in conflict-affected countries (see appendix 3 for a table of UN and international agencies supporting and carrying out PB). It has also developed the Conflict Analysis Framework (CAF) to enhance conflict sensitivity and conflict prevention potential of World Bank assistance. The Bank claims that the Framework will help operational teams identify and analyze the key factors that impact conflict and their links with poverty, to determine how they best can be addressed through World Bank assistance. Furthermore, the Post-Conflict Fund (PCF) of the World Bank was established in 1997, “to enhance the World Bank’s ability to support countries in transition from conflict to sustainable peace and economic growth. The Post-Conflict Fund makes grants to a wide range of partners (institutions, nongovernmental organizations, United Nations agencies, transitional authorities, governments, and other civil society institutions) to provide earlier and broader World Bank assistance to conflict-affected countries.”

The rise in interest in the relationship between humanitarian aid and conflict has come to the fore due to a number of high profile examples of aid exacerbate human suffering. In 1994 when 2,000,000 refugees flowed out from Rwanda, many into neighboring Zaire, in response to the horrendous genocide, international humanitarian organizations also flooded into the country to provide aid to them. Amongst the refugees were many of the perpetrators of the massacre who upon receiving aid used it to rebuild military forces and subsequently used the refugees camps as safe havens from which to launch military incursions into Rwanda. In a similar vein, the role of aid in exacerbate conflict has been called into question in other refugee camps such as the Afghan camps in Pakistan and the Cambodian camps on the Thai border.

It has become clearer that NGOs must be accountable for not only their actions, but the results of their actions even when carried out with good intentions. Aid can build peace directly or indirectly, or it can purposely or inadvertently exacerbate conflict leading to further human suffering and destruction. This is an issue that PWJ must tackle more proactively than it has to date if it is to fulfill its mission and if it is to maintain good relations with donors who are

---

increasingly demanding a greater consideration of peacebuilding issues in accepting grant applications. If PWJ wants to be able to receive funding from international donors then the issue of peacebuilding has to be considered. If PWJ doesn’t take a more proactive stance, then organizations that do will be in a more advantageous position to receive funding.

It is within this context that PWJ is internally mandated and externally compelled to engage in peacebuilding.

3 What is PB for PWJ?

3.1 “Peacebuilding” Terminology

It should be noted that ultimately whether PWJ chooses to use the term “peacebuilding” or another term such as “human security”, “conflict prevention”, “peace nurturing”, “peaceful change”, “conflict transformation” or “peace practice” to describe the hereinto proposed active incorporation of peacebuilding into programming, the contents should not differ greatly. However, given the type of programming envisioned, it is recommended that the term “peacebuilding” or be used. This is because out of the words listed above, it is the most commonly used phrase in humanitarian circles in Japan. It presents a clear image of what it is aiming to achieve and translates fairly comfortably into Japanese. Although not widely known by the public, it is easier to understand than the other options, which are listed below.

- “Peaceful change” is a term that MC has been using extensively in the development of its “peacebuilding” programming within its Civil Society program. However, it is not extensively used especially in Japan and would lead to confusion.
- “Human security”, while being a concept that encompasses peacebuilding, is too broad in scope.
- “Conflict prevention” would limit the scope of programming as it can imply prevention in a pre-conflict situation.
- “Conflict transformation” is not a clear or commonly known term and therefore its use could lead to confusion.
- “Peace nurturing” is an inclusive category containing all activities that contribute to the peace process but is rarely used especially in Japan.
- “Peace Practice” is the latest word to be used due to the influence of Collaborative for Development Action (CDA) and its “Reflecting on Peace Practice Project” (RPP), which
released its findings in April 2003. The findings are aimed primarily at stand alone PB programming and does not cover peace building concepts incorporated in to relief and development programming.

There are a plethora of definitions of PB being bantered about in international circles. Some cover basically all emergency relief and development activities in conflict zones and overlap with concepts of human security such as;

Peacebuilding is the effort to promote human security in societies marked by conflict. The overarching goal of peacebuilding is to strengthen the capacity of societies to manage conflict without violence, as a means to achieve sustainable human security. (Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee)

According to the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee (CPCC) this definition includes activities ranging from emergency assistance, infrastructure development, market reform, to public consultation, health services and access to information. Obviously a wide range of activities with the only differentiating factor from "normal" relief and development being that it has to be done in a conflict-affected zone.

Other definitions are more precise in that they point to a more direct tackling of conflict.

In the broadest sense, peacebuilding refers to those initiatives which foster and support sustainable structures and processes which strengthen the prospects for peaceful co-existence and decrease the likelihood of the outbreak, reoccurrence, or continuation, of violent conflict…It should be noted that peacebuilding is not about the imposition of “solutions”, it is about the creation of opportunities, and the creation of political, economic, and social spaces, within which indigenous actors can identify, develop, and employ the resources necessary to build a peaceful, prosperous, and just society. (Kenneth Bush)

Or in more straightforward language;

---

13 [http://www.cpcc.ottawa.on.ca/](http://www.cpcc.ottawa.on.ca/) Canadian Peacebuilding Coordination Committee Website
Peacebuilding is a set of strategies which aim to ensure that disputes, armed conflicts and other major crisis do not arise in the first place, and if they do arise that they do not subsequently recur (Gareth Evans):

Further definitions can be found in appendix 4.

3.2 Developing a PWJ Specific Definition of PB

The broad range of definitions of PB lends itself to miscommunications between people even if they are supposed "experts" in the field. As Mary Anderson describes;

In recent years, there has been a tendency to label all good activities to improve the lives of some people as ‘peace practice’. As more and more individuals and agencies undertake programs in areas of conflict, and as donors designate funds for conflict prevention and resolution, the definition of what constitutes peace work has blurred….this blurring is both misleading and counter-productive.\footnote{Anderson, \textit{Confronting War}, pp.89.}

The fact that PB is a relatively new term means that to some degree a broad range of interpretations is to be expected. However, it is not inevitable. To avoid this situation, at least in relation to PWJ communications internally and externally, a clear and concise definition of what PB means for PWJ needs to be developed. This definition will help guide PWJ staff when designing peacebuilding programs and integrating peacebuilding concepts into present and future development and relief projects. Moreover, it will be vital in communicating PWJ’s PB aims to members, beneficiaries, the general public, donors, other NGOs, and other partners. With an easy to understand definition in hand the Project Unit will be able to approach implementing partners and donors with a clear picture and the Public Relations and Marketing Unit will be able to appeal to the public on this new development. As the concept is still relatively unknown, especially by the general public in Japan, this is particularly important.

3.3 A Broad Definition

Basically there are two approaches to defining PB; broad and narrow. The broad definition consists of all programs in conflict afflicted or threatened societies that directly or indirectly contribute to rebuilding. This definition would cover activities in conflict areas (threatened and actual) regardless of whether the motivation behind the action was primarily humanitarian or peacebuilding. This would basically cover all overseas activities currently undertaken by PWJ except for China and Mongolia. The types of activities that are covered by a broad definition
would be actions such as development and rehabilitation in post-conflict societies (income generation, digging wells, building schools), emergency relief in conflict related disasters, civil society capacity building and election monitoring. While all being worthwhile actions they do not have as their primary aim removing the means and motivations for violence and build capacities for peace.

3.4 A Narrow Definition
The narrow definition of PB is confined to those activities whose primary motivation is to remove the means and motivations for violence and build peace, reconciliation and mutual understanding rather than purely humanitarian actions such as emergency relief, providing clean water and supplying shelter aiming to relieve immediate suffering. Of PWJ’s activities to date, only the Art for Peace project in Iraq can be considered to be PB in the narrow sense. This is despite the fact that PWJ works in many conflict-affected geographical areas and directly contributes to the physical rehabilitation of these societies.

Possible actions by PWJ that would fall under a Narrow Definition

- Certain Development> in conflict afflicted areas that aims to specifically to remove the causes of conflict above “normal” development goals (e.g. vocational training would be measured by the degree that the causes and motivations for conflict have been removed rather than by the number of people who got jobs),
- Security> soldier reintegration, employment of youth susceptible to recruitment by terrorist, rebel and paramilitary groups
- Dialogue> negotiation/mediation (second track, community-based), conflict prevention training, dialogue aimed at increasing mutual understanding and reconciliation
- Conflict Research> early warning analysis, policy recommendations, reporting, monitoring, data collection, mapping, advocacy, distribution of information, lessons learned
- Advocacy> Addressing grievances which are fueling conflict with relevant authorities, mobilizing public opinion against violence
- Civil Society> NGO/gov. capacity building specifically in peacebuilding
- Economic> income generation/vocational training/micro-credit in conflict afflicted areas for ex-combatants and fair trade with conflict afflicted areas benefiting ex-combatants with the aim to remove the motivation for fighting
- Democracy> election support/monitoring, media development, advocacy, awareness raising,
- Human Rights> awareness raising an advocacy where rights abuse is a source of violent conflict
- Education> peace education, awareness raising in conflict afflicted areas
- Social> trauma healing, reconciliation

Actions that would not Fall under these Narrow Definitions
- Development and emergency relief work done in areas not afflicted or threatened with violent conflict (Mongolia, China)
- Development and emergency relief work done with a mainly humanitarian motivation (digging wells in Sierra Leone) even if in conflict affected areas
- Research> research aimed at improving humanitarian service (eg. Sphere project)
- Civil Society> Increasing capacity of NGOs, gov. not directly involved in peacebuilding
- Economic> income generation for the economically disadvantaged

3.5 Considerations for PWJ
In addition to the above scopes of definition, in developing a definition of PB for PWJ a number of further key factors need to be considered;
- Presence> PWJ often works in areas of protracted and cyclic conflict. This means that developing a PB definition that only includes post-conflict situations is not suitable.
- Expertise> Considering PWJ’s expertise in emergency relief and development, the PB definition should be broad enough to encompass these activities if they have the primary aim of building peace rather than providing development/humanitarian relief. Note that development/humanitarian relief maybe a secondary aim of peacebuilding and vice versa, that is, peacebuilding maybe a secondary aim of development/humanitarian relief.
- Mission and Vision> The PB definition must be consistent with PWJ’s Mission and Vision statements.
- Programs > The types of programs that are envisioned to be implemented as PB projects need to be considered. This in turn must reflect capacities, or at least envisioned capacities, to implement PB programming.
- Overlap> Given that some broad definitions of PB cover most of PWJ’s current emergency relief and development activities, a more narrow definition that clearly distinguishes between development/relief activities and PB is needed

The Reflecting on Peace Project (RPP) identified two aspects of good peacebuilding practice that PWJ should consider. The project lead by Mary Anderson of Do No Harm fame identified two basic goals of peace work which go beyond the range of specific program goals such as “bring people to table to talk” and “educate children about how to resolve conflicts non-violently” which are:
- Stopping Violence and Destructive Conflict:
  When agencies work to end war, their programs are aimed at ending cycles of violence
which become a cause for continued war, getting warring sides to negotiate and fighters to disarm, mobilizing the public against continued war, etc.

- Building Just and Sustainable Peace:
  When agencies focus on supporting social change, their programs are focused on addressing political, economic, and social grievances that may be driving conflict. Such changes are seen as foundations for sustainable peace.\(^{16}\)

These changes point to changes in society referred to by the RPP project report as “Peace Writ Large”, or the “big peace” and accomplishment of one or both of these indicates an effective peace program\(^{17}\). Program effectiveness will be dealt with in further detail later in the paper, however, these two aspects of what peace practice or PB is are reflective of PWJ’s Mission and Vision.

One criticism that has been leveled at agencies claiming to do PB is that they only tackle the issue of building the positive aspects of peace while ignoring the often more difficult issue of stopping violence. PWJ as an organization willing to tackle “difficult” issues in “difficult” geographical locations, should in turn be willing to engage in “difficult” actions aiming not only to build positive peace, but also take actions expressly aiming to stop violence. Obviously, to tackle “difficult” issues, proper staff development and support from HQ will be necessary, but aiming for such an approach would be in line with PWJ’s approach to relief and development of a willingness to take risks and be innovative.

### 3.6 A Proposed Definition

Given these above factors and considerations below is a proposal for a PWJ definition of PB.

For Peace Winds Japan, peacebuilding is the effort to transform potential or actual violent conflict to sustainable and just peace through programs that aim primarily to remove the means and motivations for violence, build capacities for peace and non-violent conflict management, and/or, reform structures and attitudes to promote reconciliation and justice.

There are several explicit and implicit concepts contained within this definition. Firstly, the fact that peacebuilding is applicable throughout pre-, mid-, and post-conflict situations is indicated in the words “potential and actual violent conflict”. Obviously mid-conflict is actual violent conflict while “potential…conflict” is applicable to both the period when the prospect of the

---

\(^{16}\) ibid. pp.12.

\(^{17}\) ibid. pp. 12-15
outbreak of violence is high in the pre-conflict period, and also the post-conflict period when the recurrence of violent conflict threatens.

Sustainability in programming is a key concept for PWJ and is included in its Mission Statement. Justice, although a contentious issue in itself, is important for establishing right relationships between adversaries, implying respect for human rights, equality and mutual respect. However, there are times when not pursuing justice fully to its end gives peace a greater chance of consolidation by, for example, granting amnesties in the name of forgiveness and hope for the future to former abusive community leaders, police officers, combatants and military leaders etc. who committed atrocities. This approach can be seen in truth and reconciliation commissions beginning with South Africa in 1995. This is especially so when a country simply does not possess the infrastructure to cope with bringing all to justice as in Rwanda.

It is recommended that PWJ support the pursuit of reconciliation ahead of justice for the sake of justice. The “just peace” and “justice”, as contained in the above proposed definition, indicates respect for basic human rights and the existence of rule of law in a society progressing toward a stable peace. However, it does not necessarily pertain to the pursuit of full justice of past crimes where such action may actually hinder the consolidation of peace in post-conflict societies. Needless to say, bringing to justice key figures responsible for gross human rights violations and war crimes can be a means to bring about healing in a community.

“Primarily” is a key word in the definition in that, as stated above, a program with its primary aim of peacebuilding may have secondary aims of reconstruction or development. This can be seen in the case of a vocational training program. For example, if the aim of the program is primarily development, then getting together people from both sides of a conflict to train and work together may not be a consideration. Furthermore, the beneficiaries may be women who were not directly involved in the fighting or used as a means for violence.

When evaluating a peacebuilding program, success would be measured by factors such as if the beneficiaries were able to gain a sustainable livelihood or not. However, if for the same type of vocational training program, PB was the primary goal, then the make up of the beneficiaries maybe from both sides of the conflict, and contain ex-soldiers or youth susceptible to being recruited to fight. Moreover, evaluation would be done in terms of to what degree the participants were able to form new perspectives and healthy relationships with their former/current adversaries, and, to what degree the motivation for fighting (e.g. hatred of the enemy, need for steady income from being a soldier, protection of one’s family) had been removed. Even if it is possible for the soldier to physically obtain a sustainable livelihood from
the newly acquired skills, if he is still forced to fight, or if the rewards of fighting are greater than working, then the program can not be deemed a success if PB is the primary objective. Conversely, although far from ideal, even if an ex-combatant were unable to find regular employment after training, but he was able to reconcile with former adversaries, gain hope for the future and lose the motivation for fighting, then the project could be deemed a success from a peacebuilding perspective.

What this word “primary” means in relation to PWJ programming is that at the time of project design, PWJ must make the decision whether the aim of the particular project, or more significantly the aim of its intervention in the entire area, is primarily peacebuilding or reconstruction. If it is primarily peacebuilding then the aim of the project will be “to reform attitudes”, “remove the means and motivations for violence”, “build capacities for peace and non-violent conflict management” and/or “reform structures and attitudes to promote reconciliation and justice.” If the aim of the project is reconstruction or development, then the aims will be to build livelihoods, alleviate suffering and improve the quality of life. Obviously there is a fine line between the two aims. As stated above a primary peacebuilding project can have secondary reconstruction aims and vice-versa. However, this fine line is critical as all program design factors and monitoring/evaluation criteria will be strongly affected by it.

Tying in with the example of the vocational training above is the concept of “remove the means and motivations for violence” in the above proposed definition. This includes actions such as providing more attractive motivations than fighting to potential or actual combatants, removing of the tools of war from a society such as small arms and mines, ceasefire negotiations, providing alternative scenarios to war to military and political leaders, and, undertaking lobbying to pressure parties to war to cease fighting.

“Building capacities for peace and non-violent conflict management”, means to develop individual, community and institutional capacities to deal with conflicts in constructive ways. The complete elimination of all conflict from a society is neither possible nor desirable. As the distinguished American journalist Dorothy Thompson once stated, “Peace is not the absence of conflict but the presence of creative alternatives for responding to conflict - alternatives to passive or aggressive responses, alternatives to violence”18. Conflict in itself is a source of growth, a means to find better ways of living and of deepening relationships. Building these capacities to handle conflict effectively and non-violently can be achieved through training in conflict management or by supporting traditional methods of addressing conflict, thereby creating or strengthening structural avenues to redress grievances.

18 http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes
“Reform structures” reflects the phrase in PWJ’s former Mission Statement, “strive for change in the social structures which to create poverty and conflict”. This points to actions such as building the capacity of existing organizations to deal with conflict non-violently, reforming laws, creating new or reviving traditional bodies to handle conflicts constructively, and addressing issues of governance. “Reform…attitudes” refers to transforming the way people interact, and view each other and conflict itself. It aims to open people to the possibility of addressing conflict through non-violent means, to seeing the conflict through their counterpart’s eyes and to finding common ground between adversaries thereby creating openings for reconciliation and justice.

The above proposed definition would cover the range of programs that PWJ could currently undertake and a range of programs that could be tackled with further training. It clearly distinguishes between relief and development actions in conflict zones, and PB. Applying a PB lens to programs with a primary relief/development goal is also obviously a priority for PWJ. This is not explicit in the proposed definition but will be taken up later on in this paper.

### 3.7 Related Terminology

There is a plethora of terminology associated with peacebuilding. Many of these terms are used interchangeably and have different meanings depending on the context and the user. Earlier in this paper a number of peacebuilding definitions were presented, however, it can be said that there a number of key words which also have a variety of interpretations such as conflict prevention, preventive diplomacy, conflict mitigation, conflict management, human security and peaceful change. A brief description of some key terms with some proposed PWJ definitions can be found in appendix 5. MC has also produced a short paper of “Definition of Terms Related to Conflict and Peaceful Change”19 and it is attached as appendix 6. It is important for PWJ staff working directly with peacebuilding issues to have a common understanding of these terms to facilitate clear internal and external communications.

### 4 Working Principles to Support a Peacebuilding Definition

| “Peace is not merely a distant goal that we seek, but a means by which we arrive at that goal.” | Martin Luther King, Jr. |

#### 4.1 Why Principles?

19 Still in draft form and not for public distribution
In addition to developing a concise definition of PB for PWJ, the development of a set of ethical principles can support such a definition by further clarifying concepts contained therein and by acting as guidelines to the implementation of PB programs. Such a set of principles can be a guide that can be applied to any activity during planning, implementation and/or evaluation. Since the start of writing of this paper PWJ has taken the positive step to adopt a Code of Conduct to guide all of its work in general although it needs to be furthered promoted within the organization for greater effectiveness (Note that several PWJ staff interviewed for this paper did not know that such a code even exists!). See Appendix 7 for the PWJ Code of Conduct. International Alert (IA), in a statement on “Lessons Learned in Conflict Transformation Work” claims;

Perhaps the single most important insight that can be drawn from IA’s experience is the importance of articulating a principled framework….Based on IA’s experience in the field, a clear and explicit framework expressing the principles and values which guides IA’s work is indispensable to avoiding any misunderstandings….In formulating programmes and activities consistent with its values and principles, the organization ensures that its work is not misinterpreted by parties to the conflict. It thus makes itself less vulnerable, while ensuring that those with whom it works are clear as to the principles and values that underpin the organisation’s programme objectives in specific conflict areas.\(^\text{20}\)

IA learnt the lesson of not having a principled framework the hard way through experiences in Sri Lanka and Sierra Leone where it was perceived by some to be partial to one side of the conflict leading to it being removed from the peace process and out of the respective countries. The development of the set of principles is vital due to the sensitive nature of conflict environment. If parties to the conflict can understand the principles that an organization works with in its peacebuilding activities, those parties can hold the organization accountable to those principles and they will have a clear idea of what are the motivations and methods of the organization. Having this kind of transparency is obviously a large step toward building essential trust, which in turn is essential for effective PB.

4.2 Various Approaches to Principles
There are several sets of PB principles that have been developed by international NGOs. Most notably is International Alert’s “Code of Conduct: Conflict Transformation Work” paper which is...
a comprehensive 32 page explanation of International Alert’s working principles aiming to provide an ethical framework for conflict transformation work. It consists of guiding principles for the organization and the “development of policies on human rights, impartiality and working in partnerships”.  

In short the “Guiding Principles for Conflict Transformation Work” are below with a brief explanation in parentheses;

- **Primacy of People in Transforming People** (Involvement of those most affected by conflict)
- **Humanitarian Concern** (Primary motivation is the alleviation of human suffering)
- **Human Rights and Humanitarian Law & Principles** (Committed to human rights and urge compliance with humanitarian law)
- **Respect for Gender and Cultural Diversity** (Respect for diversity, no discrimination on grounds of nationality, race etc., and endeavour to build capacities of people to resolve their own conflicts)
- **Impartiality** (Strive to be inclusive and do not take sides in conflicts. Derive guidance from principles)
- **Independence** (Independent organisation, free to formulate policies in accordance to aims and principles)
- **Accountability** (Responsible to those who we seek to assist and whom we work with. Bound by law and endeavour to be transparent)
- **Confidentiality** (While endeavouing to be transparent, being committed to confidentiality in situations where effectiveness of programmes and security may be at risk. Believe that most conflict transformation work is best done discretely)
- **Partnerships** (Committed to working with governments, organizations, individuals etc. and believe that effective conflict transformation is dependent upon effective cooperation)
- **Institutional Learning** (Committed to building knowledge, experience through reviews and evaluations, developing staff skills. Endeavour to share lessons learned and learn from others)

In addition to these over-arching principles, the booklet contains detailed statements on the sub-topics of Human Rights and Conflict Transformation Work, Impartiality in Conflict Transformation Work, and, Working in Partnership. These principles and statements aim to guide the organization as a whole. The set of principles put forward below in this paper for PWJ is specifically aimed at its PB programs rather than as an organization as a whole. Having said that, the author believes that the development of the general Code of Conduct for all of the

---

21 ibid. pp.2.
organization’s emergency relief, development, advocacy and PB work complements and clarifies PWJ’s Vision and Mission.

Catholic Relief Services (CRS), which similarly to PWJ is primarily a relief and development organization, has developed a concise set of principles for PB. Although in a different format to IA’s, they provide a useful reference point for PWJ.

CRS Peacebuilding:
- Responds to the root causes of violent conflict, including unjust relationships and structures, in addition to addressing its effects and symptoms.
- Is based on long-term commitment.
- Uses a comprehensive approach that focuses on grassroots while strategically engaging actors at middle-range and top levels of leadership.
- Requires an in-depth and participatory analysis.
- Provides a methodology to achieve right relationships that should be integrated into all programming.
- Strategically includes advocacy at local, national and global levels to transform unjust structures and systems.
- Builds upon indigenous non-violent approaches to conflict transformation and reconciliation.
- Is driven by community-defined needs and involves as many stakeholders as possible.
- Is done through partners who represent the diversity of where we work and share common values.
- Strengthens and contributes to a vibrant civil society that promotes peace\(^{22}\).

MC employs a basic framework to guide its civil society programs within which is PB. Drawn from the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, its core principles are participation, accountability and peaceful change with three principal actors being government, business and civic actors.\(^{23}\) This is a loose framework, which could be applied to almost any field of humanitarian concern including obviously peacebuilding. MC has also produced a Peaceful Change Strategy paper for 2004-2006 outlining similar issues to this paper and giving concrete suggestions on how to reach the goal of “Effective and innovative programs which integrate approaches and mechanisms to more directly support peaceful change, especially in

\(^{22}\) [http://www.catholicrelief.org/what_we_do_overseas/peace/principles.cfm](http://www.catholicrelief.org/what_we_do_overseas/peace/principles.cfm), Catholic Relief Services Website

transitional and conflict-affected environments.\(^{24}\)

World Vision currently does not have an organization-wide approach to peacebuilding partly due to its de-centralized nature. However, it is currently in the process of integrating throughout the organization disaster mitigation, HIV/AIDS, and peacebuilding into a development approach that will include tools for use in the program planning cycle, tools used to predict conflict or disasters, and theory and policy development.\(^{25}\) Furthermore, WVI has a large number of staff devoted to technical peacebuilding support. They have gone farthest in terms of technical training and trying to mainstream the use of the Collaborative for Development Action’s (CDA) Local Capacities for Peace (LCP) methodologies (commonly known as Do No Harm).

### 4.3 Proposed Principles for PWJ

Based on PWJ’s Vision and Mission, its capacity, resources and considering research into PB best practices, a number of principles for PWJ are proposed. These principles, as with the proposed PB definition, are intended to be a starting point for discussion amongst PWJ staff. The proposed principles are as follows:

In working for effective peacebuilding, PWJ strives to:

- Work in accordance with the PWJ’s Vision, Mission and the Code of Conduct
- Recognize that local capacities for peace are instrumental in preventing conflict and building peace, and works to support and facilitate these capacities
- Work in a participatory manner with all aspects of society from the grass roots to government, from individuals to organizations
- Undertake comprehensive analysis of the conflict looking both at root cause and opportunities for peace
- Improve continually its practices through evaluation, staff development and training, research, and dialogue both internally and in cooperation with its partners
- Act discretely and maintain confidentiality and where appropriate placing the building of peace as a priority above public relations, and giving the deserved credit to stakeholders in the process toward peace
- Build capacity and mutually beneficial relationships with diverse local staff and partners
- Be impartial, endeavoring to work with all parties to the conflict while not necessarily condoning their views and actions


\(^{25}\) Ibid., pp. 15
➢ Take risks and be innovative in its programming while being accountable to partners and stakeholders
➢ Implement programs in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and encourage all parties to conflict to also comply

Principle 1: Work in accordance with the PWJ's Vision, Mission and the Code of Conduct
Working in accordance with the PWJ Vision and Mission and Code of Conduct is fundamental to the organization. All actions must be in-line with these statements to ensure unity and direction within the organization whether it be in peacebuilding, reconstruction, development or emergency relief.

Principle 2: Recognize that local capacities for peace are instrumental in preventing conflict and building peace, and works to support and facilitate these capacities
Ultimately only the parties to conflict can themselves solve conflict and build peace. That is to say, their consent and drive toward the process can only be supported and facilitated by an outside organization such as PWJ. If the will of parties for peace is not there despite PWJ's efforts, peace will not be realized. It also recognizes that in every society there exists mechanisms for dealing with conflict to bring about peaceful change. In the midst of the most intense conflict most people will be longing for peace. As Dwight Eisenhower stated, "People in the long run are going to do more to promote peace than governments", and so PWJ must, especially when working at the community level, act to facilitate and empower these aspirations and local capacities for peace and for managing conflict non-violently.

Principle 3: Work in a participatory manner with all aspects of society from the grass roots to government, from individuals to organizations
This allows PWJ to work with a broad range of actors across the spectrum of society. Some NGOs choose specifically to work at the grass roots level with communities. However, it is recommended that PWJ does not limit itself to a certain aspect of society when working for peace. PWJ should explore all opportunities for working for peace whether it be at the governmental, military, NGO, or community levels. In certain current fields of activity such as Iraq, PWJ's political connections could well facilitate opportunities to work for peace directly through governmental channels. In other fields such as Afghanistan, a grass roots approach through working with the community on projects such as ex-combatant re-integration maybe more effective. The approach to be used must be evaluated in terms of effectiveness on a case-by-case basis taking into account factors such PWJ's relationships with the various actors, PWJ's capacity and skill locally on the ground, and the environment.
Principle 4: Undertake comprehensive analysis of the conflict looking at both the root causes and opportunities for peace

A comprehensive understanding of conflict is essential to working effectively for peace. There are a number of frameworks, tools and guidelines for analyzing conflict systematically such as the World Bank’s Conflict Analysis Framework (CAF) and a number of participatory analysis tools like Participatory Rural Assessment (PRA), which can also be applied to peacebuilding and conflict analysis. Donors such as USAID are also increasingly requiring organizations to do conflict assessments as part of the program development process. This analysis should be ongoing throughout the project life and should not be limited to areas where overt conflict is occurring. One area that the author feels has not received enough attention in academic and NGO circles is the analysis of opportunities for peace. Finding points of common ground between warring parties, along with addressing grievances and root causes, is a key to designing effective programs.

Principle 5: Improve continually its practices through evaluation, staff development, training, research, and dialogue both internally and in cooperation with its partners

This principle is applicable to not only to peacebuilding but all areas of PWJ’s work. However, in terms of training, the degree of expertise in peacebuilding in Japan compared to the development field is minimal and therefore PWJ will have to make a concerted effort to acquire the necessary organizational skills base required. This could involve organizing training in Japan by foreign organizations or sending staff abroad for training. The acquisition of mileage from Northwest Airlines, even with its restrictions, greatly reduces the cost of such training. Many trainings in the West are sponsored by donors and are therefore participation is free. Furthermore, internally ongoing awareness raising of peacebuilding issues is important not only for project and local field staff, but also for other staff at HQ. This is because peacebuilding is a cross-cutting issue that should be reflected in all aspects of PWJ’s work. For this introductory Do No Harm training has already been carried out at HQ on 4 occasions with most HQ and international staff being covered. Evaluation of peacebuilding programs as has been done with other PWJ programs should be carried out. Possible evaluation methods will be covered in detail later. Furthermore, 180-degree staff evaluation can be a useful tool for improving staff performance and motivation. In the 180-degree system superiors not only evaluate their staff’s performance but junior staff also evaluate their supervising officer’s performance, thereby mutually providing valuable feedback. This is obviously not just applicable to peacebuilding but can applied across the organization.

Principle 6: Act discretely and maintain confidentiality where appropriate placing the building of peace as a priority above public relations, and giving the deserved credit to stakeholders in the
process toward peace
In some cases discretion or even total secrecy may be necessary for successful peacebuilding involving sensitive issues even if the role played by PWJ could be a scoop for PWJ’s public and donor relations. PWJ places priority on sustainable peace and building trusting relations with parties above any promotion. Furthermore, given the conflict context in which peacebuilding projects occur, staff safety must be considered before disclosing information related to peacebuilding projects.

Principle 7: Build capacity and mutually beneficial relationships with diverse local staff and partners
This principle acknowledges the need for PWJ to engage wherever feasible with diverse local partners, whether they be local NGOs, organizations, individuals, government bodies or any other type of group that can play a constructive role in peaceful change. Local partners can be a source of sound local knowledge, connections and influence. Balanced diversity in ethnicity, religion and gender in partners and staff is needed to set an example that people of different backgrounds can work together for peace. Handing over or supporting local conflict management skills is imperative for long-term ongoing peacebuilding after PWJ has departed. Furthermore, local partners are often part of the PWJ exit strategy from a region. Although conflict afflicted areas usual require a long-term commitment, local capacity building of PWJ staff and partner organizations as part of a long-term exit strategy are indispensable from early on.

Principle 8: Be impartial, endeavoring to work with various parties to the conflict while not necessarily condoning their views and actions
PWJ works inclusively and impartially with many different and relevant parties to a conflict. However, though it engages as far as is seen to be profitable for building peace, it does not necessarily condone the views and actions of those parties. Furthermore, in small-scale peacebuilding projects, the focus may just be on one level of the conflict such as community villages without involving directly levels above.

Principle 9: Take risks and be innovative in its programming while being accountable and transparent with partners and stakeholders
Carrying on from its clear track record to date of pushing boundaries and innovation domestically and abroad in policy and programming, PWJ takes risks and is innovative in its approach to peacebuilding. While learning from other organization’s experiences, and recognizing its own limitations, it is not restricted by what is seen to be the traditional roles of NGOs in peacebuilding. It uses the skills, experiences and relationships it has acquired to date
to further its peacebuilding work, as well as creating new fields of opportunity. Furthermore, PWJ recognizes the responsibilities it has to stakeholders and partners. To build and maintain trust with stakeholders, PWJ endeavors to be transparent in its action to relevant stakeholders, sharing its peacebuilding aims and principles such as these.

**Principle 10: Uphold the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in program implementation and goals, and encourage all parties to conflict to also comply.**

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides a widely accepted base from which to approach peacebuilding. The main rights championed by the Declaration are as follows.

- the right to life, liberty and security of person
- the right to an education
- right to participate fully in cultural life
- freedom from torture or cruel, inhumane treatment or punishment
- freedom of thought, conscience and religion

Although interpretations vary widely, the above rights are clearly part of a sustainable and just peace.

5 **Incorporating Peacebuilding into Programming**

| “Development is not possible without peace; peace is not durable without development.” |
| Kofi Annan |

5.1 **Concept of Working “around”, “in” and “on” Conflict**

The OECD-DAC publication “Helping Prevent Violent Conflict: Orientations for External Partners” gives a simple description of how relief and development organizations can work in conflict affected areas.

- Working around conflict> When agencies working in crisis or in pre-war situations circumvent conflict-related issues
- Working in conflict> When they modify their programmes and make efforts to recognize the conflict
- Working on conflict> When there is an attempt to proactively prevent, mitigate or resolve the conflicts

It is useful at this point to consider where PWJ stands on this issue currently. To date PWJ has been mainly working “around” and sometime “in” conflict, but not actively “on” conflict despite a clear Vision and Mission which stipulates such a forward approach to such issues as discussed

---

in point 3.7 above. PWJ has worked “around” conflict in places like Kono, Sierra Leone where the dynamics of the conflict have not been really taken into consideration when designing water and sanitation programs. PWJ has worked “in” conflict places like Sarepul, Afghanistan, where the politics of the IDP camps and relations with warlords had to be considered to prevent further tensions arising.

However, there have not been any programs, besides the Art for Peace project in northern Iraq, where the primary aim of the program was peacebuilding as defined in the proposed PWJ definition of peacebuilding above. PWJ has resolved conflicts such as in IDP/refugee camps in Bo, Sierra Leone, but this wasn’t part of solving the bigger conflict, which gave birth to the violence and outflow of people in the first place. Setting up the camp was primarily a humanitarian response to the suffering rather than an effort to address the roots of conflict and build bridges across conflict divides. Although a thoroughly worthwhile endeavor that PWJ is mandated to respond to, it is not peacebuilding.

5.2 Applying a Conflict Lens

One way that PWJ can more actively work “on” conflict is to apply a “conflict lens” to programming. Applying a conflict lens increases conflict sensitivity which is the the ability of an organization to;

- Understand the context in which you operate
- Understand the interaction between your intervention and the context
- Act upon the understanding of this interaction, in order to avoid negative impacts and maximize positive impacts

There are a wide range of tools and methodologies available for applying a conflict lens to development and relief programming. The aim of these tools is to enhance the practitioner’s ability to analyze the dynamics of the conflict, to predict how certain actions may inadvertently exacerbate conflict, and, to identify actions that promote peace. In sensitive conflict zones, tools, which guide practitioners to gauge the impact of their actions, can be valuable assets. Some frameworks consist of a list of questions or checklists to be applied to programming options while others are represented by diagrams and follow cyclic steps. Many of the

---

29 Nyheim, D., Leonhardt, M., Gaigals, C. Development in Conflict: A Seven Step Tool for Planners, FEWER-International Alert-Saferworld, 2001
early type of tools tended to be checklists whereby the practitioner examined the point put forward and made a judgment as to whether options available exacerbate or reduced the chances of further conflict. Later types of tools developed into analytical frameworks that were designed to assist both people in the field and behind a desk at HQ to make decisions and offer concrete programming options.

Gaigals identifies 3 types of conflict analysis methodologies, namely;

- Indicator-based analytical tools used for macro-level planning
- Issue-based analytical tools for macro-level planning
- Indicator based tools which link micro- and macro-level analysis

Despite the wide range of frameworks and methodologies, it is widely accepted in both theoretical and applied humanitarian circles that there is benefit in considering peacebuilding concepts when designing emergency relief and development programs.

If PWJ can effectively incorporate peacebuilding perspectives into its relief and development programs, not only will program impact through peaceful change increase, but PWJ’s reputation as a leading and professional NGO in Japan will be further enhanced. Although the trend is strong in the US, no Japanese NGOs have yet to incorporate formally peacebuilding perspectives into relief and development programming. Obviously, this is a challenge for an organization established as an emergency relief organization/development agency. It will need investment in training, time and personnel as well as a comprehensive and honest review of current working methodologies. Cooperation between PWJ staff and different sections in terms of providing anecdotes of valuable experience, and giving input and feedback will be indispensable to developing an effective and practical PB policy.

5.3 Do No Harm and the Local Capacities for Peace Program

One framework that has been accepted by several major NGOs is the “Do No Harm” and Local Capacities for Peace Project (LCPP) approach developed by the Collaborative for Development Action Inc. (CDA). Begun in 1994, the Local Capacities for Peace Project is a collaborative project of a number of international agencies, including bi-lateral donors, non-governmental agencies and agencies of the United Nations. The Project seeks to identify the ways in which international humanitarian and/or development assistance given in conflict settings may be provided so that, rather than exacerbating and worsening the conflict, it helps local people disengage from fighting and develop systems for settling the problems which

---

prompt conflict within their societies.\(^{32}\)

This approach has been thoroughly field-tested and has been embraced as the basis for program planning by World Vision International, CRS and CARE-US. MC has already begun to incorporate DNH into its programming and evaluation. Although some of these organizations have made additions to, or further developed the Do No Harm framework to suit their own particular needs, it has proven to be a widely accepted and effective tool in programming. The fact that many international NGOs, including NGOs like PWJ based in relief and reconstruction activities, have been involved in the development, testing, refinement, and adoption in the field of the methodology makes it a uniquely practical “made-by-end-users” tool for peacebuilding. It is sometimes claimed that the methodology only aims to reduce the possible negative effects of humanitarian intervention, as the title of the book would suggest. However, the official name of the so-called Do No Harm project is “The Local Capacities for Peace Project”. As this official title suggests the methodology is about supporting and bringing to the fore opportunities and capacities for peace in local communities, which is beyond merely doing no harm by lessening the negative effects of intervention.

Following on from a telephone conversation with CDA in the US in August 2003, it is hoped that CDA can provide training for PWJ and other Japanese NGOs both in Tokyo and in the field. As of February 2004, negotiations are continuing with the Sasakawa Peace Foundation (SPF) to bring CDA out to Tokyo. There is a chance that a new Tokyo based peacebuilding group, discussed later in the paper, will be the sponsor of the CDA training later inn 2004.\(^{33}\) Although no Japanese NGOs have systematically incorporate DNH methods into programming, Takahashi from the Japan International Volunteer Center (JVC) has translated in to Japanese most of the 1999 released “Do No Harm” book, which will hopefully be finished with the support of possible funding for the study group.

CDA has recently received funding for conducting training and MC is holding talks with CDA on behalf of PWJ in the US with the aim that PWJ can participate in the new training aboard. There was a chance for PWJ to attend CDA training in Kabul recently but due to the timing overlapping with the close of the PWJ financial year and security concerns, PWJ Afghan staff were unable to attend. CDA will be coming to Afghanistan later this month again but the location has not yet been decided.

\(^{32}\) CDA website at http://www.cdainc.com

\(^{33}\) SPF is reluctant to support one-off training but are interested in supporting training as part of a longer-term study group on peacebuilding in Japan. The setting of this new study group presents a good opportunity for this.
Given its proven effectiveness, widespread acceptance and the availability of clear, concise training materials it is recommended that PWJ utilize the frameworks presented in DNH to apply a conflict lens to programming. DNH can be used to analyze the dynamics of conflict, identify opportunities for building peace, develop programming proposals and to evaluate and improve existing programming. As noted above, CDA may be able to provide training for PWJ staff in Afghanistan, but it recommended that at least 2 PWJ staff be trained to training-of-trainers level in Do No Harm. Currently, the author, who has already done on 4 occasions internally at HQ, can provide introductory training to staff but that is not enough to allow field staff to put into practice what they have learnt.

Already through internal workshops facilitated by the author most PWJ HQ and international staff have been exposed to the Do No Harm methodology. It has been positively received and seen to be an effective tool.

- "It was easy to understand and very useful"
- "Honestly, the most interesting lunch meeting presentation to date"
- "I want to put it into practice" ³⁴

As the next step to incorporating DNH awareness into programming there are two actions that need to be taken.

- International staff need to undertake more comprehensive training. The training provided at HQ for international staff was only for 3 hours at the annual meeting in late 2003. Due to time restrictions not many practical exercises were undertaken and only general overview was given. In short, not enough was given for international staff to take back to their respective offices and implement what they had learnt. Having said that, it was a useful exercise in raising awareness of the issues that need to be addressed. There needs to be more training in the field.
- Local staff need to be trained as they are the chief implementers of PWJ’s programs in the field. Just having awareness of these issues when implementing can help staff connect their own work to how that work impacts on the conflict itself.

To properly evaluate if the DNH methodology needs to be adjusted to be in line with PWJ programming, it must be tested in the field first. For the time being taking DNH to the field in its original form should be a priority. A number of trained staff visiting field offices to provide training for both local and international staff could do this. In the introductory workshop series

³⁴ Comment translated from Japanese on feedback sheet after DNH introductory presentation. 「分かりやすかったです。とてもためになりました。」「正直、今までのランチミーティングで一番おもしろかったです。」「実践してみたいですね。」
held at HQ, case studies from areas where PWJ is not active were used so that all participants were on an equal footing in doing the analysis. However, the real value of DNH can only be realized through applying it to actual examples in the field where PWJ is active. Only after application in the field can adjustments be made if necessary to make the methodology more PWJ specific.

It is suggested that a small number of PWJ staff be trained by CDA trainers intensively. The whole course to become a facilitator and trainer takes only 2 weeks. The training is often sponsored by donors and if North West mileage is used for flights the financial cost to the organization would be minimal. Cost in terms of time away from daily chores needs to be contrasted with not only the long-term benefits the organization would gain in terms of its own internal programming quality, but also in terms being able to provide training to other organizations in Japan. If Training of Trainers (TOT) is undertaken by PWJ staff, this could also be developed into a “for-profit” enterprise by PWJ in that PWJ could provide training for a fee to requesting organizations or be funded by donors to provide training as a service to other organizations both public and private.

5.4 Other Tools for Conflict Analysis and Needs Assessment

While Do No Harm is recommended to be a mainstay of PWJ’s programming, there are a number of other techniques and tools that are recommended for certain aspects of program design and implementation.

The history of Peace and Impact Conflict Assessment (PCIA) began with the work in the mid-90’s by Ken Bush and Luc Reychele. Originally the purpose of such exercises was to identify the positive and negative impacts of a particular intervention on the conflict/peace dynamic of a given situation. Interest in this field has continued and the above Do No Harm approach is but one PCIA technique developed in the late 90s.

Rather than designate one single methodology for assessment or design, it is better to introduce to PWJ a number of available and practical tools and let field staff make a decision on what suits their particular circumstances. What tools best will vary according to circumstances. In fact a leading expert in peacebuilding techniques, Mauela Leonhardt, has suggested that “generic peacebuilding frameworks for evaluation are likely to be flawed due to

---

A variety of conflict situations, peacebuilding approaches and processes. A range of government and private peacebuilding experts have produced the techniques presented below. Undoubtedly what of these tools works best for PWJ will emerge as they are tested in the field. One of the disadvantages of the below analysis methods is that while they are effective at identifying the root causes of conflict, they do not actively identify opportunities for peace amongst stakeholders. Identifying and removing root causes is only half the way to solving conflict and building bridges. This where Do No harm is strong. Saferworld, International Alert and the International Development Research Center (IDRC) in a joint paper entitled “Conflict-Sensitive Approaches to Development” provides an outline of some frameworks for conflict impact assessment (CIA) and selected NGO frameworks and approaches to conflict prevention, which has been included as appendix 8. However, of the frameworks available, many are of a theoretical nature and are not easily transferable to the field.

The below assessment and conflict analysis tools are all available unless indicated otherwise at: ¥¥Pw¥pw0210¥平和構築勉強会¥Assessment and at ¥¥Pw¥pw0210¥平和構築勉強会¥Conflict Analysis-Theory

“Peacebuilding Needs and Impact Assessment (PNA)”, JICA
A new methodology developed by JICA that analyzes conflict factors at the country level and assesses the impact of developmental assistance at the project level on the dynamic of conflict. It is a methodology that can be used for planning to prevent negative impacts and promote peace factors. The framework looks well thought out although the flow chart is complex. However, JICA will be giving one day training on the use of the methodology in the coming month. Furthermore, through the recently formed Peacebuilding Intersectoral Group, explained below, there will be opportunities for PWJ to clarify issues and even give feedback on the methodology and possible improvements. This methodology is yet to be tested out but given the fact that PWJ may be working closely with JICA in the future on peacebuilding issues it is recommended that this methodology be tested. Ushida will attend the training for the methodology later this month and hopefully it can be tried in Indonesia. Please note that information about the methodology is not available on the kyoyu file but is available from Cameron or Ushida in hard form.

“A Checklist for Post-Conflict Political Assessment”, Tom Beck, USAID,
A simple 3 page document that is basically a list of questions on issues such as “Analyze the
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actors who have driven the conflict”, “Analyze potential sources of stability and opportunities to sustain the transition”, and “Analyze potential sources of future conflict or crisis.”

“Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes”, Department for International Development, UK
A more comprehensive approach to conflict assessment which includes a section on “Developing Strategies and Options” after sections on “Conflict Analysis” and “Analysis of the International Responses”.

“Conflict Impact Assessment: A Practical Assessment Tool for Prioritising Development Assistance in Unstable Situations” Conflict Prevention Network
A practical tool which is based on sixteen problem area charts such as “Socio-economic inequalities between different identity groups” and “Destabilization brought about by movements of refugees and displaced people”. Some of the problem areas deal with government and issues that are beyond the scope of influence of an organization like PWJ but are useful for understanding the broader context in which PWJ is working.

“Conflict Analysis Framework (CAF)” Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Team, Social Development Dept., World Bank
A recently developed framework, which uses check boxes on conflict related issues such as “Human Rights and Security”, “Environmental and Natural Resources” and “Governance and Political Institutions”. It still hasn’t been released in its final form but is available in draft form on the World Bank website and PWJ’s kyoyu folder.

5.5 Tools for Program Design
A number of methodologies exist for program design. Of these the above Do No Harm approach is recommended but there are many other valuable tools. One tool is Appreciative Inquiry which was initially created as an organizational development tool in the mid-80s and is still in wide use around the world today in businesses, communities and international development and social change organizations. It involves moving stakeholders through a four-phased process of Discovery, Dream, Design and Delivery (or Destiny) known as the 4-D cycle to connect to the capacities, strengths and lived experiences within a system, create shared vision of the future, and mobilize creative action toward its realization. Although the author has just started investigating this methodology it holds promise in the field of building peace among local actors. A new book called “Positive Approaches to Peacebuilding” edited by Cynthia Sampson is in the research unit and contains details of how appreciative inquiry can be used for peacebuilding. A number of above tools for conflict assessment can also be used for
program design such as JICA’s PNA. One strong point for Appreciative Inquiry is the fact that it is used to identify positive possibilities for peacebuilding amongst stakeholders at different levels from the individual to a community to an organization.

5.6 Indicators and Tools for Project Evaluation and Monitoring

One of the difficulties that peacebuilders face is the concrete evaluation of their work through measurable indicators. Donors often require the impact of interventions be measured through figures, which in the case of emergency relief and development can be done for example by indicating the number of beneficiaries to a well project, the number of children able to attend school or the number of refugees housed in a camp. Peacebuilding was previously thought to be not so easily measured by figures. This is true to a degree still in that development evaluations are based on more concrete data such as number of beneficiaries or schools built. However, much research has been done to actual formulate measurable indicators for peacebuilding with some success. Some indicators use figures to measure change while other indicators are based on attitudinal changes. It should be noted that attitudinal or qualitative changes can be transferred into quantitative indicators through the use of tools such as surveys. Surveying people’s attitude before and after an intervention can provide donors with the “hard” figures they often require.

As with the above section a number of references are given. All are available in the shared file at [link] unless otherwise indicated.

“Programming for Results in Peacebuilding-Objectives ‘Tree’ & Performance Indicators”
Anne-Marie Laprise, CIDA
A simple and easy to understand comprehensive list suggested programs and indicators, both numerical (numbers and percentages) and trend-based, for 6 methods to reach the goal of “to contribute in a sustainable way to the establishment of a lasting peace in the country/region”.

The 6 methods include “Increase domestic capacity and propensity for the peaceful resolution of conflict” and “Assist in the recovery of the country/region from the damage inflicted by war”.

Some of the indicators in these two methods are as follows.

- Number of women active in local and regional institutions involved in conflict resolution
- Belief in possibility of obtaining fair treatment and outcome through public institutions
- % of orphans reintegrated into a family setting
- % of food needs met by local production

“Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners”, Mary Anderson and Lara Olsen,
Collaborative for Development Action (CDA)
The Reflecting on Peace Project (RPP) by CDA, who developed the Do No Harm approach, examined whether criteria could be established that could indicate an intervention's impact on the progress towards peace in the broad sense of both stopping violence and destructive conflict, and building just and sustainable peace. It can to the conclusion that a peace program is effective when:

- The effort causes participants and communities to develop their own initiatives for peace.
- The effort results in the creation or reform of political institutions to handle grievances that fuel the conflict.
- The effort prompts people increasingly to resist violence and provocations to violence.
- The effort results in an increase in people’s security.

Although not obviously quantitative, with some imagination they can be turned into concretely measurable indicators. For example, the number of initiatives for peace that begin locally or the number of political institutions established to handle grievances (and the number of grievances handled). Furthermore, number of known actions taken to resist violence and the decrease in the number attacks, crime or vandalism.

“Common Ground Productions (CGP) Rapid Survey Method”, Common Ground Productions, Search for Common Ground

Although aimed specifically at peacebuilding media programs, the methodology shows that impact can be measured concretely by a comprehensive but rapid survey technique. The survey contains 3 question categories, namely:

- Identification of the amount of listening or viewing during each hour of the broadcast day -- done to guide program scheduling decisions,
- Gathering of program reactions and advice from members of key stakeholder groups, such as refugees and internally displaced persons, leaders of governmental and non-governmental organizations, other especially knowledgeable or influential individuals, and persons in other demographic categories -- done to identify strong and weak aspects of the subject matter and presentation, and
- Measurement of outcomes brought about by the programs in the categories of knowledge, attitudes, and actions -- done to evaluate program effectiveness.

These types of tools are useful not just for PWJ to identify needs and measure program effect, but they are extremely useful in convincing donors that the necessary groundwork has been done and that the proposal under consideration is sound, thereby increasing the chance of receiving funding.
6 Creating Beneficial Relationships and Partnerships for Peacebuilding

“All men are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality.”
Martin Luther King Jnr.

6.1 The Importance of Networks for Peacebuilding

A number of networks focusing on peacebuilding in relief, reconstruction and development contexts have emerged in the last few years indicating the growing importance of this field. The cooperation of actors for peacebuilding at national levels allows network members to leverage their combined strength for the following types of activities.

- Advocacy on issues such as effective funding schemes and government policy
- Group training where the network itself becomes the sponsor and organizer representing the members
- Holding of workshops, symposiums and lectures
- Exploration of opportunities for cooperation in the field
- Informal sounding out of ideas for funding with donors who are also part of the network

Individual organizations can do the above type activities but a cooperative approach through a network is more efficient and fair in terms of workload and outputs for all members. This would also apply if PWJ became involved in networks in Japan as the new Peacebuilding Intersectoral Group.

6.2 Existing Peacebuilding Networks

A number of networks have been established around the world for improvement of peacebuilding practices and environments. Although all at this stage are national networks, there has been contact and cooperation between networks such as meetings held in London between TCP and a new International Alert based working group. The four main networks in donor countries are as follows:

- Transition, Conflict and Peace Working Group (TCP) in InterAction in the USA
- Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee (CPCC) in Canada
- New International Alert based Peacebuilding Working Group

The three groups all have similar aims and activities. For example the purpose of the Transition, Conflict, and Peace Working Group (TCP) is “to bring together relief, development, and peace practitioners in order to facilitate integrated and sustainable action to meet the needs of communities moving towards, in the midst of, or emerging from violent conflict arising from natural or manmade events.” The group focuses on the following fields.
➢ Policy
   To explore and promote more effective policies and strategies for integrating relief, development and peace building in transition and conflict affected environments.

➢ Practice
   To promote best practices in our programs by helping staff, partners and local communities seize windows of opportunity to strengthen local capacities for peace and develop durable solutions.

➢ Outreach
   To cultivate a community of expertise that serves as a technical resource, to engage in donor outreach and raise public awareness on transition, conflict and peace issues.  

Similarly the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee’s goal “is to engender greater coherence and effectiveness in building peace through fostering collaboration and coordination among diverse groups and sectors in Canada, and their partners overseas” and is engaged in three main types of activities:

➢ Analyzing, sharing and learning from peacebuilding work in specific conflict regions and on specific themes.

➢ Facilitating consultation, coordination and collaboration between the non-governmental community and the Canadian government on peacebuilding.

➢ Information exchange and networking to encourage support for peacebuilding nationally and internationally.

The network is engaged in a process of dialogue with departments and agencies of the Government of Canada and a broad range of NGOs to articulate Canadian directions in the area of peacebuilding, and to strengthen NGO and civil society input into peacebuilding policy and program development.

Furthermore, a new Peacebuilding Working Group organized by well-known conflict prevention NGO International Alert (IA) has been established with the aim to improve conflict sensitivity amongst UK and Ireland NGOs. Although still dealing with issues of structure, management and topics for closer investigation, it is viewed by many as a positive development.

These networks have proven to be durable and worthwhile enterprises for improving the practices of relief and development organizations working in conflict zones and for improving the policy environment in which they work. Involvement by member NGOs requires minimum
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39 Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee website at http://www.peacebuild.ca/
time and effort away from daily pressing work directly involving the organization, however, the
technologies necessity has been proven by their continual evolvement. The TCP and CPCC have
been able to develop better relations with government donors and improve practices. Mercy
Corps has been highly active in the TCP, recently leading one of its task forces examining
training needs for improved peacebuilding practice.

Other national donor country networks include KATU Civil Society Conflict Prevention Network
in Finland, the Forum for Early Warning and Early Response (FEWER) based in the UK, and
Peace Team Forum in Sweden.

Other networks in recipient countries have also thrived as the importance of peacebuilding has
grown. Organizations like the Southern African Conflict Prevention Network (SACPN), the
West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP), Africa Network of Young Peacebuilders,
and the Peace and Human Rights Network in Kenya.

6.3 Network Building in Japan

While peacebuilding is in its youth in Japan, there are several organizations, both NGO and
governmental (JICA, JBIC, MOFA) that are beginning to tackle peacebuilding more actively
than ever before. As mentioned above, peacebuilding is one of JICA’s new pillars of
programming. JBIC has been providing yen loans to support post-conflict peacebuilding such
as to the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao Social Fund for Peace and Development
Project to the tune of 2.470 billion yen and to Macedonian government for 9.7 billion yen. 42
Furthermore, in the Revision of Japan’s Official Development Assistance Charter released in
August 2003, Peacebuilding is identified as one of four “Priority Issues.” 43 Similarly Japanese
NGOs have increased their interest in peacebuilding. Participation and organization of
workshops by Japanese NGOs on the theme of peacebuilding have increased.

What all this interest and movement in regards to peacebuilding means for PWJ is not yet clear.
What is clear though is that there is a lack of coordination between the various actors including
NGOs and government, as well as academia, UN agencies and private foundations. In
response to this a new peacebuilding group called the Peacebuilding Intersectoral Group
(PBIG) has been established initially at JICA’s initiative, but now being organized by NGOs,
centrally PWJ and JVC. Other actors that participated so far in the group include NGOs

40 http://www.wanep.org/
41 http://www.unoy.org/African%20network%20index.htm
42 JBIC Press Release, December 11, 2003 and November 20, 2003 respectively
(Interband, AAR, JCCP, ARC), Japanese government agencies (JICA, MOFA, JBIC), a private foundation (Sasakawa Peace Foundation) and an overseas embassy (Canada).

At the second meeting chaired and hosted by PWJ on March 4, on top of a number of presentations by members on strategies and activities, progress was made on identifying the aims and structure of the group. The rough initial aims are to;

- To increase the quality of peacebuilding programming by Japanese actors
- To produce concrete output beneficial to Japanese actors doing peacebuilding
- To provide a venue for information sharing and coordination for cooperation
- To provide expert advice on peacebuilding issues

PBIG’s primary aim is to improve the quality of peacebuilding projects and improve the policy environment for peacebuilding. Its emphasis is on practical approaches to peacebuilding by organizations based in relief and development activities such as PWJ.

PWJ’s active participation in the group is important at this early stage due to the fact that many agencies’ policies have not been decided in detail. Although JICA, JBIC and MOFA have made public their intentions to further support peacebuilding, how this will affect NGOs and NGO funding is yet to be decided. Through interaction at the meetings between NGOs and government agencies it is hoped that NGOs can influence policy details for a more balanced and cooperative relationship between donors and NGOs. Although the people from the various government agencies are not high-level decision makers, it has been proposed that the group, as a single unit, advocate effective funding policy to donors. It is also a chance for PWJ to gain a better understanding of funding opportunities and to make personal connections with donors. With a variety of government employees plus some of the major NGOs in the group, it is expected that the group will assert some influence toward policy formation.

PWJ’s presence through this process at this stage is vital if it is to be recognized as a legitimate actor in the peacebuilding field in Japan. The commitment in terms of time and resources to the group’s activities is minimal. Although PWJ is trying to build relationships with the Prime Minister’s Cabinet Office for cooperation on peacebuilding issues, ignoring positive developments within JICA, JBIC and MOFA is not profitable for PWJ despite not knowing whether or not these will bear fruit for PWJ in the near future. The same reasoning applies to PWJ’s active participation in peacebuilding related symposiums, workshops and other events. PWJ needs to put its stamp on the emerging field of PB in Japan before other organizations do. Obviously, just attending events is not enough. It has to be backed up by action on the ground as a firm foundation and it is hoped that Indonesia will be the first place for this to happen. This
kind of networking and connection building is vital if PWJ is gain recognition in this emerging field.

Another potential emerging domestic peacebuilding network is Japan Platform (JPF). Although originally set up as a “system to provide emergency relief in natural disasters and refugee situations more effectively and quickly...through an equal partnership of NGOs, business and government”\(^{44}\), it’s mandate is expected to be expanded beyond just emergency relief during the course of 2004. Informal discussions with JPF secretariat staff and some member NGOs have revealed that peacebuilding is a topic of interest for future activities. JPF is currently undergoing reformation and it is unclear how peacebuilding will precisely be approached at this early stage. However, on top of funding programs in the field, the JPF secretariat welcomed the proposal that JPF be a sponsor for peacebuilding training and seminars for member organizations. PWJ should continue to advocate for support from JPF for PB activities both in the field and in Tokyo.

6.4 Building the Relationship with Mercy Corps for Peacebuilding
PWJ’s alliance with MC offers great potential to increase peacebuilding capacity internally. MC has already introduced peacebuilding perspectives into programming in Central Asia, Indonesia, Georgia, Kosovo and Liberia through activities like providing peacebuilding related training, facilitating dialogue, community mobilization and encouraging collaboration across conflict lines.\(^{45}\) In areas where MC is already carrying out explicit and/or implicit (most programs are implicit) programs, PWJ is recommended to at least seek the guidance and cooperation of MC. A case in point is Indonesia.

PWJ is currently investigating the possibility of initiating new programs in Indonesia more in line with its Vision and Mission, namely, removing threats of poverty and conflict allowing people to live with hope and respect. One area where MC is has been working since April 2000 is Maluku province in East Indonesia where it has carried out Do No Harm training for local partners, established a NGO community center for both sides of the conflict, funded dialogue between villages and supported children’s activities etc.\(^{46}\) As with cooperation in other fields such as Iran and Liberia cooperation with MC on PB has the potential to be of benefit to PWJ.

Already to date the author has exchanged notes with his counterpart at MC, Dayna Brown. Sharing of information such as recent academic papers, reports and internal organizational
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policy papers have been useful for keeping track of organizational developments and for even writing this concept paper.

6.5 Partnerships in the Field

Peacebuilding is one field where it can be particularly useful to partner with local organizations. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, in some areas like Indonesia, Afghanistan and Sierra Leone, local organizations often have experience in designing and implementing PB programs. They know the conflict first hand, have received training from funders and INGOs, and are able to mobilize local resources and people more easily. For example, CDA completed training in January for local, international and UN agencies in Kabul. Although the accountability, quality, capacity and suitableness of local organizations has be looked at on a case-by-case basis, it something that needs to be considered in the field. Engaging with specialized local organizations may be more effective than PWJ trying to act independently.

Coordinating with international organizations is something that PWJ often does especially in the contexts of IDP/refugee camps where PWJ may manage the camp but water and medical services are provided by an organization like Medecins Sans Frontieres (MSF). These kinds of partnerships where by each organization brings it institutional capacities to the field and fits in with other organizations can obviously be applied to peacebuilding and should be explored.

7 Field Issues for PWJ's Move in to Peacebuilding

“"The world is a dangerous place, not because of those who do evil, but because of those who look on and do nothing."  
Albert Einstein"

7.1 Accountability, Innovation and Risk Taking

As part and parcel of its drive in to peacebuilding, PWJ must be willing to take risks and engage in new programming without the guarantee of initial success in initial pilot programs on the strict condition that it does not incite further violence. As peacebuilding often deals with healing relationships between people who harbor deep resentment toward each other, peacebuilding not done properly can lead to those emotions exploding. New waters can be tested through thorough research followed by pilot programs to confirm assumptions and make adjustments as necessary. Engaging in a new peacebuilding programming approach to tried and tested programs like income generation that PWJ has implemented in places like Mongolia, East Timor and Afghanistan, will require staff to think in new ways in terms of design, implementation and evaluation. However, it will allow PWJ take advantage of acquired
know-how and experience when developing and implementing programs. Risks and innovative approaches will be necessary which may lead to failure in the short time, but there is no doubt that these will be valuable lessons for subsequent full-scale programs. While promoting innovation, PWJ has to be very careful that its “experiments” do not lead to violence. The outfall of mistakes in peacebuilding is potentially greater than the outfall of similar mistakes in developmental programs.

7.2 Threats to Wider Programming
Given the sensitive political climate in some of the areas that PWJ is currently carrying out its relief and development programming, PWJ must exercise particular caution if it is to begin peacebuilding programs in those same areas. This is especially so with explicit programming that deals with controversial issues that aim to remove the means and causes of conflict such as property rights, DDR, and community weapons collections etc. If PWJ’s performance in these explicit conflict prevention endeavors are not viewed favorably by political/military powers, not only would those conflict prevention endeavors be threatened with forced closure, but also any other relief or development programs that PWJ may be carrying out. Clear communication and aims with relevant authorities when implementing programs is vital. The impact that such a forced closure can be seen with the example of Iraq.

In northern Iraq PWJ has worked hard since 1996 building amicable relationship with the two major political parties there. However, if PWJ was to in some way offend or to be seen as not neutral by the parties, or conversely be seen to be moving too far away from support for the Kurds, not only would there be a chance that a particular peacebuilding program would be forced to close, but that all of PWJ programs, including unrelated relief and development programs, could be forced to close and PWJ forced to leave the region. As one of PWJ’s major areas of activity such a loss would be immeasurable.

Another related issue is when PWJ cannot gain access to certain geographical areas during conflict. This can also be seen in northern Iraq where PWJ has worked so long until recently while not being able to move southward beyond the now defunct border between the former Kurdish Autonomous Region (KAR) and Hussein regime controlled territory. This has created unintentionally the impression that PWJ has favored the Kurds in its assistance although PWJ has actively assisted people of all ethnicities in the north. PWJ staff in the former KAR are overwhelmingly Kurds which doesn’t auger well for PWJ being seen as neutral if it attempts to implement peacebuilding in other areas of Iraq. Depending on the degree that PWJ is known for its work in Kurdistan through the whole of Iraq, it may affect PWJs efforts to be seen as a neutral actor in any future peacebuilding work in Iraq.
There are a number of practical ways that these issues can be tackled.

- PWJ must analyze and acknowledge where and when it is appropriate to initiate explicit or even implicit peacebuilding programs considering possible threats to other programming field.
- Wherever possible PWJ must target both sides of a conflict.
- PWJ must set conditions for receiving aid beyond issues such as ethnicity/religion/tribe such as children who are sick (already being done) and activate those programs in a wider ethnic area
- If unable to target certain groups for a period, once opportunities arise and it wants to do PB it must reestablish trust through proactive programming to gain the trust of the other side of the conflict. (Peacebuilding can be done to an extent only on one side of the conflict but it is much more effective when adversaries can meet the “other” and work with them to achieve peace.
- Create and maintain a balance of staff representing all aspects of the conflict as far as possible

7.3 Roles of Field Staff

Local staff who are actively engaged in peacebuilding is a key to PWJ’s successful move into peacebuilding. Not only are local staff a valuable source of information regarding security threats, political developments, and community aspirations, they can also play important part in designing and implementing peacebuilding programs through activating that local knowledge with the proper training in peacebuilding.

Training local staff in peacebuilding has a number of advantages over training international staff.

- They usually keep their post longer while international staff tend to move on after 1-2 years
- They know the context of the conflict from which to base analysis
- They are more in touch with local sentiments
- They can communicate directly with communities in the local language

That is not to say that international staff as field coordinators and country directors should not be knowledgeable in peacebuilding, but that at least equal emphasis should be given to training senior local staff to a high level and other local staff to a minimum level. Especially in high-risk areas such as Iraq and Afghanistan, training local staff to view programs through a conflict lens will help reflect a more conflict sensitive approach in not only programming, but also in their daily interactions with beneficiaries. It should be noted that local staff may not be
seen as neutral in some cases and it those cases analysis and field research should be conducted by international staff.

Raising awareness and capacity of international Program Officers, Field Coordinators and Country Directors in peacebuilding is vital. If a country director is not interested in peacebuilding it is impossible to enforce it upon him/her to apply a conflict lens to programming. International staff must be convinced of the value of it to programming effectiveness.

To further capacity of all field staff in peacebuilding it is recommended that 2 PWJ staff undertake thorough training to the point of training-of-trainers (TOT) in at least initially Do No Harm. Do No Harm TOT takes only a couple of weeks. As stated previously CDA’s Do No Harm training is often sponsored and with the use of North West Mileage the costs to the organization would be minimal. These 2 staff would then take training to the field with priority given to conflict areas where peacebuilding is seen as most valuable such as Afghanistan, Indonesia, Iraq (once things settle) and possibly Liberia (if programs begin there). The PWJ trainers would train both local and international staff to the degree that they could use the tools themselves to;

- Identify points of conflict and commonality between adversaries
- Design new programs through a conflict lens
- Establish base line data for new programming
- Evaluate current programs and make necessary adjustments
- Monitor ongoing programs
- Make a final evaluation

As mentioned above recently CDA held Do No Harm training in Kabul and plans to travel to a number of areas over the coming year including West Africa and Indonesia. Furthermore, many local NGOs are capable of providing training in peacebuilding issues in places like Indonesia and Afghanistan. Tapping into these resources is recommended.

Although training can be provided to international staff when they return to HQ for the annual meeting, this would exclude local staff, who as explained above, need to play a central role. The most efficient way of reaching out to field staff is to take to them the tools and training recommended. Follow up training and support from peacebuilding staff at HQ may be necessary from time to time, but after the initial training, field staff would have a sufficient working knowledge to proactively incorporate peacebuilding principles. Trained international peacebuilding staff should continue to play a technical assistance role through occasional trips to the field to assist with the carrying out of research, documentation of lessons learned,
proposal writing, further training, base line surveys and evaluations as necessary.

7.4 Specific Field Visions and Missions
The development of country specific visions and missions for PWJ country programs can help to provide the basis for concrete and clear country and regional strategies. This is not only applicable to country programs endeavoring to carry out peacebuilding, but to any relief, recovery and development program.\footnote{Obviously in an emergency relief situation this is not applicable in the short term due to the urgency to save lives.}

Developing these kinds of statements in areas of conflict where PWJ plans to do peacebuilding is particularly important as sometimes government officials, warlords, army officials, community leaders and religious leaders can be suspicious of international organizations intervening in conflict areas. This is particularly true in places like Indonesia where often the government doesn’t like to openly acknowledge the extent or even the existence of conflict. It can help build transparency and trust with not only governments but also communities because issues that are a concern for them such as impartiality, motivations for intervention and aims of the organization can be clearly addressed in the statement. It can demonstrate to them that PWJ has no ulterior motives and is accountable, transparent, cooperative and willing to listen to and support local needs.
Mercy Corps has developed such a Vision Statement specifically for Maluku as below.\textsuperscript{48}

### Vision Statement for Mercy Corps Maluku

Mercy Corps will focus on three sectoral areas of activity in Maluku:

1. Humanitarian
2. Food Security/Economic
3. Peacebuilding

Our goal is to achieve these activities by working with and through local organizations, communities and institutions to meet needs and help address the root causes of the conflict.

**Through our work on Ambon we will:**

- Address humanitarian need.
- Support positive dialogue between communities and non-violent conflict management.
- Increase the resilience of vulnerable communities. Reduce dependency on aid.
- Increase local organizational capacity to respond to community need and help them to represent these needs to leaders.
- Support activities which work towards the re-integration of divided communities.

**Principles to work by:**

- We aim to create an integrated program in Maluku.
- Activities may fall under one or more of the sectors.
- All activities look to support local organizations.
- We will prioritize projects in the humanitarian and economic sectors, which actively support the peace building process.

This vision statement was created in November 2000. Mercy acknowledges in the Maluku report that the statement has “served to help Mercy Corps focus its activities in the province”. PWJ is currently creating a regional strategy for West Africa and the creation of such a regional specific statement may be useful in focusing direction in the long term.

### 7.5 Indonesia in the Context of Peacebuilding

Indonesia offers PWJ the first chance to initiate peacebuilding initiatives from a blank page. Although the first Indonesia office was established in Sorong in January 1999 and

\textsuperscript{48} Young, Anna, *Maluku Case Study: Mercy Corps Indonesia, April 200-April 2002*
subsequently in Jakarta in January 2001, one purpose of the author’s posting to Indonesia is to explore possibilities for initiating programs more in line with PWJ’s vision and mission, especially peacebuilding programs in new regions of the country. It will be an opportunity to create a peacebuilding program from the initial research and assessment stage to implementation. The types of programs proposed could be implicit or explicit peacebuilding programs and be targeted at the community or government level.

It will also be an opportunity to gauge donor’s willingness to support peacebuilding initiatives by NGOs with funding thereby pushing Japanese donors to go beyond what has mainly been rhetoric to date. There are at least positive signals being sent out by the Embassy in Jakarta and JICA. As mentioned above JICA and MOFA have expressed a strong interest in peacebuilding. Even locally a peacebuilding specialist is stationed at the JICA Jakarta office. A meeting was held on Maluku on February 19 at the Japanese Embassy in Jakarta, which Kobari attended. A field assessment carried out by the Japanese Government in January in Maluku identified needs in education and peacebuilding. The Embassy also expressed a wish to expand cooperation to NGOs beginning with Grass Roots then after that to Musho and Yusho support. Based on this information the signs are at least positive although nothing can be confirmed until PWJ’s priorities are set for possible new projects.

Lastly, and most importantly, Indonesia will provide a testing ground for the concepts contained in this paper. Actual using methodologies such as Do No Harm in the field as recommended will give PWJ a more realistic picture of what kind of peacebuilding activities it can do and what kind of support it can expect. Although the response of donors, including the Japanese Government, will be different from country to country, it will be a chance to see how serious JICA and MOFA are about supporting peacebuilding in a country like Indonesia which is a priority for Japan. The ideas contained in this paper can be tested initially through pilot programs and fully implemented if successful with any necessary adjustments.

It is also a testing ground in that there has been a push from within the organization to use less of our own funds for project implementation. As has been explained if projects in Indonesia are to continue they must be nearly entirely self-sufficient in terms of funding.

If PWJ can successfully implement genuine peacebuilding programs in Indonesia it would become one of the very few Japanese NGOs who are actually doing peacebuilding despite the word being bantered about loosely in NGO circles. PWJ is already invited to some peacebuilding related events in Japan, despite the fact that its programs do no actively
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incorporate peacebuilding concepts in the narrow sense. If PWJ can move from talk to action on the ground it is bound to receive support from Japanese donors at the least who are looking for avenues to promote human security and peacebuilding given its already established reputation.

8 HQ Issues for Peacebuilding

"It is better we disintegrate in peace and not in pieces."
-- Benjamin Nnamdi Azikiwe (President of Nigeria)

8.1 Better Utilization of Staff

It is not just the field that must embrace a more proactive stance toward peacebuilding. HQ as the base for all PWJ operations must supply the back up for work in the field. A number of PWJ staff realize the value of peacebuilding after studying related fields at post-graduate school. Furthermore, a number of staff have worked in other peacebuilding related organizations and/or undertaken training. However, the skills, knowledge and experience of these people are not being utilized despite PWJ’s Vision and Mission. As far as the author knows the following people have studied and/or worked in peacebuilding.

- Ushida> Conflict resolution, education, Indonesia, traditional approaches to conflict management, negotiation/mediating, forgiveness and healing, multi-track approaches
- Harada> Peacebuilding through the arts, community conflict resolution, culture and peacebuilding
- Kominami> DDR, Post conflict recovery, Divided cities, poverty and conflict, trigger causes and roots causes
- Nishikawa> Post-conflict employment, weapon collection programs, connecting theory and practice
- Saito Y.> Humanitarian intervention, Armed intervention
- Osawa> Humanitarian intervention
- Ishii Masako> transitional authorities, Mindanao, conflict dynamics

With a good base of staff which have already a sound knowledge of peacebuilding issues, PWJ can be confident in tackling peacebuilding. At least one of the above people are on each project team “islands” at HQ.

8.2 Peacebuilding “Help Desk”

It is proposed that a peacebuilding “help desk” be established at HW to support field in the staff.
The “help desk” would not be a physical desk separate from the current island layout of the office but rather just describe the function performed by 2-3 people at HQ while performing their current positions with one person being the focal point of the desk. The types of services that such a “help desk” would provide include:

- Background research to conflicts and conflict analysis
- Information on training opportunities
- Development of the materials shared “kyoyu” file on the PWJ computer server to provide easier access through an internal intranet or the Internet so that field can access resources
- Recommendation of tools for conflict analysis and program design, evaluation and monitoring
- Donor information
- Recommendation of relevant literature and other materials
- Advice to field staff on all aspects of programming from a peacebuilding perspective

Of the above tasks, provision of relevant literature and provision of information on training opportunities are being done currently by the research unit. This situation should continue but in cooperation with the designated help desk staff. The two staff of the research unit (3 if Ishii M. is counted too) currently both have experience in researching peacebuilding issues and would be able to make a valuable contribution.

The shared file on PWJ’s server at ¥¥Pw¥pw0210¥平和構築勉強会 currently contains approximately 500 electronic reports, papers, books, treaties, legal documents, essays and presentations on peacebuilding issues. Topics range from theoretical analysis to practical guidelines to research, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. However, field staff are unable to access such information from the field. Recently a CD with the information burned on it was sent to Sierra Leone but access to the Internet is more instantaneous and allows staff at HQ to respond quickly to requests for certain information and materials from the field. It is therefore suggested that a website being established to be accessed by a password listing all the materials on it. Currently not all field offices can access the Internet but at least one office in each country can. Currently all the materials are divided into categories such as “evaluation”, “development and peacebuilding”, “Afghanistan”, “Case Studies” and “DDR”. These materials, especially specific how-to guides on peacebuilding issues, can be a useful reference for field staff wanting to incorporate peacebuilding into programming.

8.3 Peacebuilding and Public Relations
Peacebuilding is appealing to Japanese as a concept as it involves using non-violent methods
to solve conflicts. It is seen to be a way that Japanese can contribute concretely to lessening war without having to encroach upon article 9 of the constitution by sending the Self Defense Forces (SDF) abroad and without using threatening methods as seen in Iraq. As was claimed by PWJ at the time when the decision to send the SDF to Iraq was being made, Japanese NGOs can more positively and efficiently work to prevent conflict through relief, development and peacebuilding program such as providing employment and scholarships to youth in danger of being caught up in violence. This is a convincing and appealing argument from the perspective of PWJ supporters.

PWJ’s policy toward peacebuilding should be made public through avenues like the website and newsletter. No other NGO in Japan has developed a policy on peacebuilding to this degree. This concept paper itself, although currently in a form for internal use only, could be edited for public consumption and put on the website as a display of PWJs commitment to and direction in peacebuilding.

9 Goals, Actions, Outputs and Impacts

9.1 Short Term Targets-To be Achieved by March 2005

**Goal 1** > To raise internal understanding of peacebuilding and reach a common understanding on the peacebuilding policy for PWJ

**Actions > By March 2005**

- To have this paper (or a further revised version), translated into Japanese for greater internal reach and external reach (after editing)
- To reach agreement on the use (or not use) of key definitions and principles, and have those key statements understood by relevant staff
- To create an overarching framework of definitions and principles for PWJ’s peacebuilding work developed from the proposals contained herein
- Field test for feasibility the proposals contained in this paper in Indonesia and other fields as far as possible to refine proposals

**Outputs >**

- A clear and completed strategy paper based field tested approaches of PWJ’s move in to peacebuilding in English and Japanese
- A number of field tested and recommended methodologies for conflict analysis, program design and monitoring and evaluation determined as the main tools for use by PWJ

**Goal 2** > To raise the peacebuilding capacity of PWJ across a number of field programs

**Actions >**

- To have selected staff receive TOT training in Do No Harm principles
Provide training to field staff in Do No Harm principles and identify training opportunities for staff by in Japan and abroad

To have a number of staff play a “help desk” role both in HQ and in the field

Write a report in one year outlining the lessons learned from PWJ’s first year of actively embracing peacebuilding

**Outputs**

- An online library of tools for easy access by field staff based on the already existing shared file resource
- Advice given in the field to 3 offices on improving conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding practices with written reports submitted to the field office and HQ
- A lessons learned report on the experience in Indonesia as a reference for subsequent peacebuilding programs

**Goal 3**  > To begin implementing peacebuilding programs in the field

**Actions**

- To use a number of the tools recommended to carry out conflict analysis and program design, and then to implement programs in Indonesia
- To secure external funding for peacebuilding programs

**Outputs**

- Running at least one peacebuilding program in Indonesia with clear objectives and methodologies
- At least one more office besides Indonesia planning to implement a peacebuilding project

**Goal 4**  > To actively contribute to the general awareness raising of peacebuilding issues and to group learning

**Actions**

- To play a leading role in the Peacebuilding Intersectoral Group (PBIG)
- To create a peacebuilding presence in PWJ’s website and literature
- Evening Coffee and Lunch Meeting presentations on peacebuilding progress

**Outputs**

- A functioning PBIG in which PWJ both contributes and receives
- Materials that are appropriate to be opened to the public as PR for peacebuilding
- An increased interest and understanding amongst PWJ supporters in peacebuilding
- To do Do No Harm introductory training outside of PWJ possibly to the PBIG group
- Presentations on PWJ’s policy and actions for peacebuilding

**9.2 Overall Impact on PWJ by March 2005**
Impact 1> Recognition by government and NGO circles that PWJ is a leading NGO in Japan actively incorporating peacebuilding principles into programming on the ground

Indicators >

➢ An increase in invitations to peacebuilding events in Japan as an active participant (speaker, commentator)
➢ Requests from donors to implement peacebuilding programs
➢ Securing of good funding for peacebuilding proposals

Impact 2> Increased interest in peacebuilding from supporters

Indicators >

➢ Interest shown through donations for peacebuilding specific campaigns
➢ Interest shown through inquiries into PWJ's peacebuilding from the general public and the media

9.3 Long Term Targets-To be Achieved by March 2007

➢ Active peacebuilding programs in at least 3 countries
➢ 2-3 staff dedicated full time to peacebuilding support
➢ Working knowledge of Do No Harm principles by 80% of international field staff and Do No Harm principles being applied as a minimum standard across all programs
➢ Be recognized as a leader in peacebuilding not just in theory but in practice in Japan especially peacebuilding through reconstruction and development type programs
➢ Have an established relationship on peacebuilding with Japanese and overseas donors
➢ 3 lessons learned reports for institutional memory on peacebuilding experiences
➢ Contributions by PWJ staff to Japanese and overseas journals/books/newspapers on the issue of peacebuilding

9.4 Conclusions

The mandate of an organization is its guiding light in to the future. It leads the way through a forest of possible programming options which can take the organization astray. If an organization follows its mandate truly it will progress straight ahead with all its strength. PWJ has a clear Vision and Mission to guide it. Even if the political and funding environment for peacebuilding were not favorable (which it is), PWJ would still be compelled to follow the path of preventing and resolving conflict.

Given the guidelines in this paper the author believes that PWJ can become a credible peacebuilding organization in Japan. Whether or not the word “peacebuilding” is always used or not is relevant, it is the actions that count.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country &amp; Agency Name</th>
<th>Programs Supported</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
<th>Restrictions, Period &amp; Range of Grants, Submission &amp; Notification Dates</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan-MOFA</td>
<td>外務省経済協力局民間援助支援室&gt;日本NGO支援無償資金協力</td>
<td>外務省経済協力局民間援助支援室 (担当: NGO班) 住所: 〒105-8519 東京都港区芝公園2-11-1 TEL: 03-6402-2211 (内線 5768, 5869, 5883) FAX: 03-6402-2146</td>
<td>&gt;1000万円まで，2000万円まで，5000万円まで年の3つのカテゴリー &gt;期間は1年 &gt;管理費、人材派遣費、本部の実施経費が支援対象になる &gt;2000万円を超えるものについて，総額80%を供与限度とする。また，条件として当該地域において対象プロジェクトに類する事業を3年以上実施した実績があることである &gt;年に4回申請書の審査を行う</td>
<td>For projects that are initiated in oject countries (ie not Iraq) this is a relatively straight forward way to get funds. However, political considerations and risk (危険度) must be taken into account (eg Aceh, Palestine difficult to fund). Usually done through Embassy in oject country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan-JICA</td>
<td>外務省経済協力局民間援助支援室&gt;NGO事業補助金</td>
<td>外務省経済協力局民間援助支援室 (担当: NGO班) 住所: 〒105-8519 東京都港区芝公園2-11-1 TEL: 03-3580-3311 内線3437・3538 FAX: 03-6402-2146</td>
<td>&gt;件当たりの供与額は、原則として当該総事業費の2分の1以下かつ事業区分ごとに補助金交付要領において定める補助対象経費の範囲内で外務省が決定する金額であり、平成14年度は原則として50万円以上1,000万円以下 &gt;1団体が複数の事業について申請を行う場合、1団体が交付を受けることができる補助金総額の上限は5,000万円です。 &gt;申請締め切り6月、7～8月採否決定、2～4月完了報告書の審査、3～4月補助金の支払</td>
<td>Not as good as 日本NGO支援無償資金協力 due to being 后払い、事業費の5割までなど</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan-JICA</td>
<td>草の根技術協力事業</td>
<td>〒151-8558 東京都渋谷区代々木2-1-1 新宿マインズタワー 6<del>13階 TEL:03(5352)5311</del>5314 <a href="mailto:jicagap-www@jica.go.jp">jicagap-www@jica.go.jp</a></td>
<td>草の根技術協力事業は10月より申請を受取る</td>
<td>Definitely worth following up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK-- DFID</strong></td>
<td><strong>USAID</strong></td>
<td><strong>Canada--CIDA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Dept. (CHAD)---principal task is to prevent conflict and disasters, or to mitigate their effects</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Enterprise Development Innovation Fund for among others micro-finance products including post-conflict microfinance</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Humanitarian Assistance---conflict preparedness, prevention and reduction and mitigation, post-disaster rehabilitation</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Small grants scheme must address DFID objectives and have maximum local involvement. Organized through local UK embassies.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Within DCHA (Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance) new Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation to start from 2003 with initial budget of $10 million</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Under Governance and Democracy Programs is Office of Transition Initiatives which supports DDR, fostering reconciliation, IDPs action</strong></td>
<td><strong>Canadian Peacebuilding Initiative---Joint undertaking by CIDA and DFAIT consisting of Peacebuilding Fund (CIDA) and Peacebuilding Program (DFAIT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department (CHAD). DFID 20 Victoria Street London SW1H 0NF T: +44 (0)20 7023 0000 DFID 1 Palace Street London SW1E 5HE Tel: +44 (0) 20 7023 0000 Fax: +44 (0) 20 7023 0019</td>
<td>U.S. Agency for International Development Information Center Ronald Reagan Building Washington, D.C. 20523–1000 Telephone: 202–712–4810 FAX: 202–216–3524</td>
<td>The Peacebuilding Fund Multilateral Programmes Branch 200 Promenade du Portage Hull, Quebec K1A 0G4, Canada Tel:(819) 994–7634 Fax:(819) 997–2637 <a href="mailto:peace_building@acdi-cida.gc.ca">peace_building@acdi-cida.gc.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Development 75,000–200,000 pounds, however, all funds currently allocated. <strong>Humanitarian Assistance no limit to funds. Upto 6 months for emergency relief &amp; upto 3 years for others.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Small Grants upto 100,000 pounds</strong></td>
<td>International PVO registration necessary to be eligible but it may be more complicated than that. I couldn’t find examples of non-US NGOs being funded. <strong>Grants ranging to huge figures</strong></td>
<td>Peacebuilding fund recipients are Canadian NGOs or UN agencies, except for International Alert of UK. “Will call upon Canadian skills where appropriate”. <strong>Funds for small arms control, gender and PB, DDR, free media support, dialogue support, peace education etc.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Upto Ca$500,000 per project</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>“joint undertakings with other donor governments and agencies likely”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although still to be determined, movements on the possible new center need to be monitored and taken advantage of if appropriate. <strong>Promising</strong></td>
<td>I called USAID office in Tokyo and they said that Yamamoto san should be visiting the PVC(Private Voluntary Corporation) on the 20th where funding for overseas NGOs will be explained. It used to be only US tax exempt orgs but it may have changed. The USAID office in Tokyo didn’t know. It is worth following up once eligibility has been established.</td>
<td>CIDA rarely funds non-Canadian NGOs. They would be interested in joint funding a Canada-Japan initiative however.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Programs/Initiatives</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada-IDRC (International Development Research Center)</td>
<td>Conflict over natural resources major program. However mainly to developing country orgs although open to partnerships with developed countries when joint funding available and “the partnership is seen as a means of strengthening IDRC-supported research in developing countries.”</td>
<td>PO Box 8500 Ottawa, ON K1G 3H9 Canada Tel: +1 (613) 236 6163 Fax: +1 (613) 238-7200</td>
<td>Supports research, including “participatory research” on peacebuilding and reconstruction, conflict prevention and natural resource management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia-AusAID</td>
<td>New initiative from June 2002 “Peace, Conflict and Development Policy” covering pre, mid and post conflict through DDR, small arms control, reconciliation support, women as peace brokers. Focus on Asia-Pacific.</td>
<td>GPO Box 887 Canberra ACT 2601 T: +61 2 6206 4000 F: +61 2 6206 4980 <a href="http://www.ausaid.gov.au">http://www.ausaid.gov.au</a> <a href="mailto:infoausaid@ausaid.gov.au">infoausaid@ausaid.gov.au</a></td>
<td>Doesn’t fund foreign NGOs through Canberra ut has funded them through local embassies. Search for Common Ground has been supported for media programs in Indonesia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>In ten points of humanitarian assistance is “5. We will give high priority to conflict prevention and the consolidation of fragile peace settlements by means of strategic efforts to promote peace, reconciliation and conflict resolution.” &amp; “6. We will give high priority to the prevention of conflicts and disasters and the consolidation of fragile peace settlements by means of targeted poverty-oriented efforts in the fields of education, democracy and the environment.” “Most of our humanitarian assistance is provided in areas where armed conflicts are in progress.”</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs P.O.Box 8114 Dep. N-0032 Oslo Tel:+47 22 24 36 00 E-mail: <a href="mailto:ud@mfa.no">ud@mfa.no</a></td>
<td>Funds foreign NGOs directly. Has funded FEWER (UK), ICG (Belgium) It emphasises CP and work in conflict zones so definitely worth following up. To what degree foreign NGOs are funded was unclear from the website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORAD</td>
<td>No programs dealing with PB/CP directly. Closest is “Civil Society”. Under this it does mention “contributing to peaceful prevention and resolution of conflict”</td>
<td>PO Box 8034, Dep. 0030 Oslo Tel: +47 22 24 20 60 E-mail: <a href="mailto:sk@norad.no">sk@norad.no</a> &amp; <a href="mailto:firmapost@norad.no">firmapost@norad.no</a></td>
<td>不明</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>No specific mention of PB or CP</td>
<td>Sida 105 25 Stockholm, Sweden Tel: +46-6-698 50 00 Fax: +46-6-20 88 64</td>
<td>Supports only Swedish orgs Not worth pursuing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Name</td>
<td>Programs Supported</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Contact Details</td>
<td>Submission &amp; Notification Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Institute of Peace</td>
<td>Unsolicited: international conflict resolution; diplomacy; negotiation theory; &quot;track two&quot; diplomacy; methods of third-party dispute settlement; collective security; arms control</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1200 17th Street NW, Suite 200, Washington DC 20036-3011 T: 202.429.3842, F: 202.429.6063 <a href="http://www.usip.org/">www.usip.org/</a> <a href="mailto:grant_program@usip.org">grant_program@usip.org</a></td>
<td>Unsolicited &amp; Solicited Grants submission 1 Mar., notification late Sept. submission 1 Oct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>Conflict resolution in field supported internationally, but currently reviewing program and not taking applications at all</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2121 Sand Hill Road Menlo Park CA 94025 T: 650-234-4500, F: 650-234-4501 <a href="mailto:info@hewlett.org">info@hewlett.org</a> <a href="http://www.hewlett.org">www.hewlett.org</a></td>
<td>Not accepting applications currently previously they were large grants from about $50,000 to $300,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Compton Foundation</td>
<td>Conflict resolution, arms control, both research and in the field, conflict prevention in ethnic/religious conflicts</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>535 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD, SUITE 160 MENLO PARK, CA 94025 T: (650) 328-0101 F: (650) 328-0171 <a href="mailto:info@ComptonFoundation.org">info@ComptonFoundation.org</a> <a href="http://www.comptonfoundation.org">www.comptonfoundation.org</a></td>
<td>Feb. 15 &amp; Sept. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughshares Fund</td>
<td>Preventing Global &amp; Regional Conflict-bringing conflict parties together, behind the scenes mediation, curb spread of light weapons,</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Fort Mason Center Bldg. B, Suite 330 San Francisco, CA 94123 tel: (415) 775-2244 fax: (415) 775-4529 <a href="mailto:ploughshares@ploughshares.org">ploughshares@ploughshares.org</a> <a href="http://www.ploughshares.org">www.ploughshares.org</a></td>
<td>November 1, 2002 February 17, 2003 April 15, 2003 July 15, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polden-Puckham Charitable Foundation</td>
<td>Resolution of international and internal conflicts, for example through developing conflict-handling skills and mediation techniques</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>BM PPCF, London WC1N 3XX, UK <a href="http://212.53.81.3/index.htm">http://212.53.81.3/index.htm</a></td>
<td>15 Feb. &amp; 15 Sept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>Peace and Social Justice including human rights, international cooperation, governance, civil society resolving conflicts and encouraging peace making mentioned under international cooperation</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>320 East 43rd Street New York, NY 10017 USA tel: (212) 573-5000 fax: (212) 351-3677 <a href="http://www.fordfound.org">www.fordfound.org</a> <a href="mailto:office-secretary@fordfound.org">office-secretary@fordfound.org</a></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Foundation</td>
<td>International Relations Governance, Law and Civil Society under which is conflict management, NGO capacity building &gt;&gt;Could be good if working in partnership with a US org.</td>
<td>USA/Japan</td>
<td>465 California Street, 14th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 Tel: (415) 982-4640 Fax: (415) 392-8863 <a href="mailto:info@asialfoundation.org">info@asialfoundation.org</a></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>Communications for Social Change &gt;&gt;Some conflict prevention under regional programs and Global Inclusion Program</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>420 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10018 T: 212.869.8500 <a href="http://www.rockfound.org">www.rockfound.org</a> <a href="mailto:global@rockfound.org">global@rockfound.org</a></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Program Areas</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Contact Details</td>
<td>Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>Global Security and Sustainability - International Peace &amp; Security - Whether and how to intervene in civil conflicts - Areas of Special Interest - Gun Violence Reduction</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Office of Grants Management 140 S. Dearborn Street Chicago, IL 60603-5285 <a href="mailto:4answers@macfound.org">4answers@macfound.org</a></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Merck Fund</td>
<td>Have supported peace initiatives by ICG and coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers but no website. - After enquiring through email discovered that only supporting US based orgs</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>11 Beacon St. Suite 1230 Boston, MA 02108 T: 617.722.2932 F: 617.523.6029 <a href="mailto:info@mertzgilmore.org">info@mertzgilmore.org</a></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mertz-Gilmore Foundation</td>
<td>Under International Human Rights &quot;Capacity-building for international NGOs focused on economic, social and cultural rights&quot; - The Foundation does not support organizations or projects focused on one country</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>218 East 18th Street, New York, NY 10003-3694 T: 212 475-1137 F: 212 777-5226 <a href="mailto:info@mertzgilmore.org">info@mertzgilmore.org</a></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scherman Foundation</td>
<td>Provides general support grants to NGOs - Disarmament and Peace Program including Search for Common Ground, American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>16 East 52nd Street, Suite 601 New York, NY 10022-5306 T: 212-832-3086 F: 212-838-0154</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Brothers Fund</td>
<td>Under Global Security - To contribute to the emergence of a more just, sustainable, and peaceful world by improving the cooperative management of transnational threats and challenges.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>437 Madison Avenue, 37th Floor New York, New York 10022-7001 T: 212.812.4200 F: 212.812.4299 <a href="mailto:rock@rbf.org">rock@rbf.org</a></td>
<td>not a strong emphasis on PB or CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Foundation for Democracy</td>
<td>WFD funds a wide range of organisations and projects that aim to build pluralist democratic institutions abroad - emphasis on NGOs working towards political structures and democratic development as well as human rights and women's support groups.</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2nd Floor, 125 Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5EA. UK T:+44 (0)20 7930 0408 F:+44 (0)20 7930 0449 <a href="mailto:wfd@wfd.org">wfd@wfd.org</a> <a href="http://www.wfd.org">www.wfd.org</a></td>
<td>4 times per year. Not yet announced for next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soros Foundation</td>
<td>-promoted academic and professional contacts with Iran and an improved U.S.-Iranian political dialogue as well as developing a grants program in the Arab Middle East. Including Afghanistan but not Iraq currently. -international and indigenous NGOs to help build local capacity, bring international expertise to bear, and the integration of local social movements into the international sphere. -Information on website unclear interms of grantees, fields etc. -Has supported AFSC for peacebuilding in 2002 for an after prison initiative &amp; ICG, SFCG for reconciliation radio broadcasting in Burundi ($534,000)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britten Pears Foundation</td>
<td>Makes grants to peace organizations although details are not readily given on website</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Grants Administrator Dr Elizabeth Gibson direct tel: 01728 451 709 <a href="mailto:E.Gibson@britten-pears.co.uk">E.Gibson@britten-pears.co.uk</a> <a href="http://www.britten-pears.co.uk">http://www.britten-pears.co.uk</a></td>
<td>details unavailable from website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Contact Details</td>
<td>Specialties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPF</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SPFPR@spf.or.jp">SPFPR@spf.or.jp</a></td>
<td>Peacebuilding projects, donor partnerships, field operations, research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCCP</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tadashi.Takatani@kosei-kai.or.jp">Tadashi.Takatani@kosei-kai.or.jp</a></td>
<td>Development, education, welfare, research, disaster recovery, public sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPF</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Program@npf.or.jp">Program@npf.or.jp</a></td>
<td>Peacebuilding projects, donor partnerships, field operations, research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDR</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:FIDR@fidr.or.jp">FIDR@fidr.or.jp</a></td>
<td>Development, education, health, life improvement, environmental conservation, disaster recovery, community empowerment, aid to NGOs, research, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPF** (特定の宗教の枠を越えて展開されている平和のための教育、社会奉仕、開発協力、環境保護、人権擁護への対策などの活動を目指す。
＞地域のエンパワーメントを創生する活動

**FIDR** (国際開発救援財団)
① 農漁村開発
② 教育・人材育成
③ 保健衛生・医療
④ 生活環境改善
⑤ 地域産業振興
⑥ 環境保全
⑦ 社会的弱者保護
⑧ 災害復興
⑨ 上記の①～⑧のいずれかに係る調査研究または広報啓発

---

**Enquete Association**
Under "Cooperation Among Private Nonprofit Organizations, Business and the Public Sector," several conflict prevention activities. At JCCP explored a joint program between Council on Foreign Relations and Hewlett Foundation but due to poor management it fell through. SPF is still interested in such a joint project.

Furthermore, there current peacebuilding projects will finish this financial year and so they are looking for new partners in peacebuilding.

I have contacts there from JCCP and it is worth following up to see if we can organize donor and implementing agency partnerships. SPF are definitely feeling "donor fatigue" toward JCCP after 7 years of continuous support so there maybe an opportunity. They are interested in field operations more than research although a combination may also be possible.
### UN and International Agencies Supporting & Carrying Out PB & CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Programs Supported/Carried Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDP</strong></td>
<td>&gt; Post Conflict Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Development aimed addressing grievances of potential conflict parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery carries out conflict assessment studies to identify what opportunities exist for UNDP in order to address the underlying causes of conflict in the country through their programmes eg Nepal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Supports Japanese NGOs in Afghanistan through REAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNHCR</strong></td>
<td>&gt; HCR provides protection and assistance to the world’s refugees, and protects, assists, and seeks lasting solutions for refugees in a variety of ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Funds NGOs as implementing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO</strong></td>
<td>Post Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reintegrating the diverse conflict-affected groups (refugees/returnees, internally displaced people, demobilized combatants, female heads of households, disabled persons, child soldiers, war-affected youth and orphans) into civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rehabilitating the socio-economic and physical infrastructure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting social and political negotiations, dialogue and reconciliation between the diverse groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rebuilding the community’s social fabric and institutional capacity of the ILO’s constituents, their skills reservoir and relevant labour market information systems;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting equity and social justice;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- And broad efforts at development and peace building and at tackling conflict’s root causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCHA</strong></td>
<td>&gt; Fact-finding in Conflict and Post conflict situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Development/Rehabilitation in the Conflict Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Emergency Relief Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Areas are (a) policy development and coordination functions in support of the Secretary-General, ensuring that all humanitarian issues, including those which fall between gaps in existing mandates of agencies such as protection and assistance for internally displaced persons, are addressed; (b) advocacy of humanitarian issues with political organs, notably the Security Council; and (c) coordination of humanitarian emergency response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Another program is “Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict” which funds NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF</strong></td>
<td>&gt; UNICEF is helping in over 25 war-affected countries to restart schools, supply drugs and vaccines, reunite children with their families, operate clinics and hospitals, support traumatized children, dig wells, campaign against child recruitment, and promote demobilization and disarmament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Works with NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNESCO</strong></td>
<td>&gt; UNESCO’s Transdisciplinary Project “Towards a Culture of Peace” Project aims to promote values, attitudes and behaviours in people so that they will seek peaceful solutions to problems. The culture of peace is based on the principles established in the Charter of the United Nations and on respect for human rights, democracy and tolerance, the promotion of development, education for peace, the free flow of information and the wider participation of women as an integral approach to preventing violence and conflicts, and efforts aimed at the creation of conditions for peace and its consolidation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Project&gt; Afghan Risk Training for journalists by the International Federation of Journalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Bank</strong></td>
<td>&gt; In recent years, the World Bank has made special grants of nearly $400 million to support emergency response and early reconstruction in conflict-affected countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Recipients include NGOs such as Center for Conflict Resolution in South Africa, Save the Children in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; The Post-Conflict Unit of the World Bank is dedicated to easing the transition to sustainable peace and supporting socio-economic development in conflict-affected countries. The emphasis is on speed and flexibility without sacrificing quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
>The Programme is increasingly involved in projects using food aid to demobilise ex-combatants and, to a more limited extent, de-mining operations on the cessation of war and civil conflict. After wars or disasters strike, WFP moves in with reconstruction and rehabilitation projects aimed at repairing the damaged infrastructure. WFP is active in over 20 Asian countries as well as Africa, Latin America and CIS regions.
>
The WPF Program on Intrastate Conflict, Conflict Prevention, and Conflict Resolution analyzes the causes of ethnic, religious, and other intercommunal conflict, and seeks to identify practical ways to prevent and limit such conflict. It is concerned currently with the consequences of the global proliferation of light weapons, with the vulnerability of weak states, with peace building and peace enforcement capabilities in Africa, and with the role of truth commissions in conflict prevention and conflict resolution. The program has been active in a major peace building project in Cyprus, and in understanding prospects for peace in Sri Lanka and democracy in Burma.
Other Peacebuilding Definitions

1 Botrous-Ghari (An Agenda for Peace): Peacebuilding, is the period when a unified response designed to rebuild civil society and, "support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict," would be pursued. Among other things, peacebuilding activities would include creating an environment where, "disarming the previously warring factions and the restoration of order, the custody and possible destruction of weapons, and repatriating refugees," would occur.

2 Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee: Peacebuilding is the effort to promote human security in societies marked by conflict. The overarching goal of peacebuilding is to strengthen the capacity of societies to manage conflict without violence, as a means to achieve sustainable human security. (http://www.cpcc.ottawa.on.ca/chart-e.htm)

3 Catholic Relief Services: Peacebuilding is a process that aims to:
   3.1 Change unjust structures through right relationships
   3.2 Transform the way people, communities and societies live, heal and structure their relationships to promote justice and peace
   3.3 Create a space in which mutual trust, respect and interdependence is fostered
   3.4 Peacebuilding activities involve changing attitudes and behaviors to promote peace and respect, restore right relationships, and work towards reconciliation. For example, peacebuilding activities can help prevent violence from erupting in the early stages of a conflict, mitigate the effects of violence if conflict does break out, and help parties reconcile and transform themselves after the violence is over.

4 Robin Hay, IMPACS (Canada): Peacebuilding-in war-torn countries around the globe-means strengthening the prospects for peace and weakening the chances of renewed violence. This can only be done to limited extent by outsiders. The goal of peacebuilding is to enhance the capacity of a society to manage its own conflicts without violence.

5 Canadian International Institute of Applied Negotiation: The concept of positive peace-absence of overt hostility and the absence of structural violence-is adopted as the goal of peacebuilding. The challenge of peacebuilding is to transform violence into peace; power must be restructured.

6 Peacebuilding and Human Security Program, DFAIT Canada: Peacebuilding is the effort to strengthen the prospects for internal peace and decrease the likelihood of violent conflicts. The overarching goal of peacebuilding is to enhance the indigenous capacity of a society to manage conflict without violence. Peacebuilding refers to conflict prevention,
conflict resolution, or post-conflict construction activities. The focus is on the political and socioeconomic context of the conflict rather than on military or humanitarian aspects. Peacebuilding consists of a set of measures which can contribute to creating a sustainable environment for human security.

7 Kenneth Bush, A Measure of Peace: Peacebuilding refers to those initiatives which foster and support sustainable structures and processes which strengthen the prospects for peaceful co-existence and decrease the likelihood of the outbreak, reoccurrence or continuation of violent conflict. This process typically contains both immediate and longer-term objectives. Peacebuilding is a two-fold process requiring both the deconstruction of the structures of violence and the construction of the structures of peace.

8 Lloyd Axworthy (former Canadian Minister for Foreign Affairs): I see peacebuilding as casting a lifeline to foundering societies struggling to end the cycle of violence, restore civility and get back on their feet. After the fighting has stopped...there exists a brief critical period when a country sites balanced on a fulcrum. Tilted the wrong way, it retreats into conflict, but with the right help, delivered during the brief, critical window of opportunity, it will toward peace and stability.

9 Gareth Evans (former Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs): Peacebuilding is a set of strategies which aim to ensure that disputes, armed conflicts and other major crisis do not arise in the first place, and if they do arise that they do not subsequently recur.

10 ??: Peacebuilding is activities which focus on improving the attitudes and socio-economic circumstances of ordinary people in war-shattered societies. It is a process which sets out with the contingency relief work and gradually moves into the realm of sustainable development. Lasting peace cannot be achieved in a short term and therefore the success of peacebuilding efforts is linked to the long-term perspective and prospects of sustainable development.

11 JICA: The concept of peacebuilding involves minimizing the possibility of the outbreak of conflict, preventing conflict that has occurred from increasing and rectifying damage occurring from conflict; it is a process linked to sustainable development in the relevant region... The ultimate goal of peacebuilding is defined as aiming for the permanent sustainable development by furnishing developing countries with related capabilities.

12 IDRC, Canada: Peacebuilding encompasses policies, activities, initiatives, programs, and projects which contribute to creating the conditions that allow war-prone, war torn,
and post-war countries to transform and manage their conflicts without violence in order to be able to address longer-term developmental goals.

13 日本紛争予防センター：「平和構築」は、紛争解決や緊急支援といった活動分野に限らず、紛争を未然に防ぐためには何をすべきか、またいわゆる「開発」が紛争という問題にどのような影響を及ぼしているのかといった「紛争と平和」を取り巻く構造的な課題への取り組みも含んだ広い概念です。

14 Council for Asia Europe Cooperation: A contribution to human society that combines security sector transformation, rights based and accountable governance, physical reconstruction, and integrated economic and social development.

15 CIDA: The goal of peacebuilding is to enhance a society's capacity to manage conflict without violence. Peacebuilding consists of a set of measures that create a sustainable environment for human security. These measures provide the minimal conditions under which a country can implement social, political and economic development.

16 International Federation of University Women: Peacebuilding includes gender-aware and woman-empowering political, social, economic and human rights. It involves personal and group accountability and reconciliation processes that contribute to the reduction or prevention of violence. It fosters the ability of women, men, girls and boys in their own culture to promote conditions of non-violence, equality, justice and human rights of all people, to build democratic institutions, and to sustain the environment.

17 NIRA: 平和構築を、「国内平和の可能性を高め、紛争前・紛争中・紛争後の武力紛争の可能性を低減する努力」と定義している。その中で、現地社会が紛争の武力化を防ぐ能力を持つようにすることが、平和構築の目的であるとされている。

18 Ulla Engberg and Paul Stubbs for UNDP: a contribution to human security that combines, security sector transformation, rights based and accountable governance, physical reconstruction, and integrated economic and social development.

19 Galtung: To reassemble the foundations of peace and provide the tools for building on those foundations something that is more than just the absence of war. In addition, peacebuilding is not limited to post-conflict scenarios but also aims at the prevention of violence. It is an associative approach that addresses the root causes of a conflict and tries to promote dialogue, mutual trust, and integration. It involves a shift of focus away from the warriors, with whom peacekeepers are mainly concerned, to the attitudes and socioeconomic circumstances of ordinary people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocab</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
<th>Proposed PWJ Definition or Explanation 1</th>
<th>Proposed Definition or Explanation 2 / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peacebuilding</td>
<td>Peacebuilding is the effort to strengthen the prospects for internal peace and decrease the likelihood of violent conflicts. The overarching goal of peacebuilding is to enhance the indigenous capacity of a society to manage conflict without violence. Peacebuilding refers to conflict prevention, conflict resolution, or post-conflict construction activities. The focus is on the political and socioeconomic context of the conflict rather than on military or humanitarian aspects. Peacebuilding consists of a set of measures which can contribute to creating a sustainable environment for human security. (Peacebuilding and Human Security Program, DFAIT Canada)</td>
<td>The concept of peacebuilding involves minimizing the possibility of the outbreak of conflict, preventing conflict that has occurred from increasing and rectifying damage occurring from conflict; it is a process linked to sustainable development in the relevant region. The ultimate goal of peacebuilding is defined as aiming for the permanent sustainable development by furnishing developing countries with related capabilities. (JICA)</td>
<td>Peacebuilding is a process that aims to: 1. Change unjust structures through right relationships. 2. Transform the way people, communities and societies live, heal and structure their relationships to promote justice and peace. 3. Create a space in which mutual trust, respect and interdependence is fostered. 4. Peacebuilding activities involve changing attitudes and behaviors to promote peace and respect, restore right relationships, and work towards reconciliation. For example, peacebuilding activities can help prevent violence from erupting in the early stages of a conflict, mitigate the effects of violence if conflict does break out, and help parties reconcile and transform themselves after the violence is over. (CRS)</td>
<td>Peacebuilding is actions in conflict-affected or threatened societies that strengthen local capacities to manage conflict non-violently, increase human security and consciously build a culture of peace. (broad definition)</td>
<td>Peacebuilding is medium-long-term actions in conflict-affected societies whose primary aim is to promote peace by removing the causes of violent conflict, strengthening local capacities to manage conflict non-violently and building a culture of peace whereby former parties to the conflict mutually forgive, respect and develop in constructive ways. (narrow sense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>A broad concept which refers to the anticipation and averted escalation and violence in social, political and international conflicts. Primary prevention: minimizing the chances of violent conflict occurring. Secondary: containment and mitigation. Tertiary: preventing the recurrence of armed conflict. FEWER.</td>
<td>紛争予防とはあらゆる当事者間の紛争が暴力化、恶化、拡大するのを防止、国際の平和及び安全を脅かす恐れのある武装紛争となるのを防止するための、あらゆる主体による、非強制的な行動であるNIRA.</td>
<td>Actions, policies, procedures or institutions undertaken in particularly vulnerable places and times in order to avoid the threat or use of armed force and related forms of coercion by states or groups, as the way to settle the political disputes that can arise from destabilizing effects of economic, social, political and international change. Conflict prevention can also include action taken after a violent conflict to avoid its recurrence. (Lund)</td>
<td>Although similar to peacebuilding it is different from the narrow definition of peacebuilding in that it is not necessarily aiming to build a culture of peace, the action may just be aiming to find a quick solution to a crisis eg. President Carter w ith Nh. Korea. Although this particular action could also be called preventive diplomacy. Peacebuilding is seen to be more working on the psychological aspects of conflict healing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Change unjust structures through right relationships.
2. Transform the way people, communities and societies live, heal and structure their relationships to promote justice and peace.
3. Create a space in which mutual trust, respect and interdependence is fostered.
4. Peacebuilding activities involve changing attitudes and behaviors to promote peace and respect, restore right relationships, and work towards reconciliation. For example, peacebuilding activities can help prevent violence from erupting in the early stages of a conflict, mitigate the effects of violence if conflict does break out, and help parties reconcile and transform themselves after the violence is over. (CRS)

*Different from humanitarian motivated emergency relief and development in that it does not primarily aim to fulfill BHNs of beneficiaries. Rather it aims to ultimately heal the wounds of war psychologically. Different from the broad definition in that actions that just contribute to human security in conflict-affected areas, such as digging boreholes in Sierra Leone, are not included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Conflict Resolution</strong></th>
<th>When the conflict is still ongoing but where there is a window for dialogue, programs to facilitate an end to the conflict should be undertaken. This would include activities such as support to peace talks, women's groups advocating peace, alternative media, training of free and independent journalists, the deployment of third party mediators or observers, and multilateral or regional initiatives to resolve the conflict. (CIDA)</th>
<th>Covers academic, activist and to a lesser extent military and diplomatic approaches to conflict termination, the reduction of violence, the management and/or settlement of conflicts and transformation of conflictual relationships. It, as opposed to conflict management or conflict settlement, implies approaching the conflict in a problem solving constructive non-violent way, recognizing the value of identities of all parties of the relationship, their human needs and interests rather than a violent, destructive solution or a mere settlement that “freezes” the current power distribution between opponents. (International Alert)</th>
<th>Actions taken during the conflict to bring opponents together at all levels of society to facilitate an end to the conflict using tools such as dialogue and training. At the grass roots level it could involve community, religious or ethnic leaders, and at the political level it could include government or military representatives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preventive Diplomacy</strong></td>
<td>Action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts, and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur. (Boutros Gali)</td>
<td>Early PD&gt; involves the provision of skilled assistance through good offices, mediation and the like in order to resolve disputes well before the eruption into armed conflict appears likely. Late PD&gt; more familiar in the UN system as far refers to attempts (often involving the secretary general himself) working through the Security Council to persuade parties to desist when such eruptions seem imminent. (Evans)</td>
<td>The range of peaceful dispute resolution methods mentioned in Article 33 of the UN Charter when applied before a dispute crosses the threshold to armed conflict. These include: negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements or other peaceful means of their own choice. Preventive diplomacy is a problem solving response which attempts to reconcile disputing parties' interests through conceptual and diplomatic breakthroughs. (Peck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sri Lanka is a case whereby negotiations were lead not by a well known figure but by government officials from Norway. Not a grass roots approach as it is usually the leaders of the parties to conflict or their representatives that are involved in negotiations. The process is a political one involving governments rather than non-governmental actors.</em></td>
<td>Efforts to avert conflict before outbreak involving good offices, mediation, negotiation etc. between the parties to conflict. Usually, but not always, lead by a well known figure employing diplomatic influence. May work through international or regional organizations such as UN or OAU. Parties to the conflict are directly involved in the negotiations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Transformation</td>
<td>A particular approach which aims to recognize the grievances, needs and issues of all parties. It focuses on the processes by which conflict develops into violence, rather than exclusively on how to bring conflict quickly to a cease fire or settlement. It addresses the structural reality of inequality, rights and injustices in the societies involved, and offers alternative ways of addressing those realities. This approach aims to transform a conflict from violence and destruction into a constructive force which produces social change, progressively removing or at least reducing the conditions from which the conflict and violence have arisen. The peace which develops can then be well-founded and sustainable. (International Alert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An integrative approach to conflict resolution which involves a re-definition of the relationship between the conflict parties through which opportunities are opened. (FEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The International Alert definition is comprehensive and appropriate. Basically conflict transformation is about changing the approaches to the conflict by the opponents toward each other and to the issues at hand thereby allowing new windows of opportunities to be developed for the transformation of the conflict from violence to constructive. Dialogue and participatory workshops are usually the methods employed to facilitate the transformation. Carries out when violent conflict is in progress or when it is threatening.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Enforcement</td>
<td>平和に対する脅威、平和の破壊または侵略行為を行った国に対して、国連が違法と認定する違法な侵略・平和的破壊行為を非軍事的・軍事的手段を通じて阻止すること。（JCCP）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most commonly multinational military intervention to impose peace or restore ceasefires by force in situations of major disturbance, war, or when peacekeeping forces are in danger. (FEWER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving military to impose peace on conflicting parties or parties threatening to engage in violent conflict so not applicable to PWJ or any other NGO. Can be applied to UN forces, multi-national forces, regional forces, or private security companies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Reabsorption</td>
<td>When peace has been declared and the transition from conflict to peace is still fragile, initiatives are needed to prevent renewed outbreaks of violent conflict. Programming in this phase of the conflict requires close coordination with development actors who will soon be taking on the long-term peacebuilding task of reconstructing democracy and rebuilding the community. Possible programming opportunities might include disarmament and reintegration of former combatants (with special initiatives for women and child soldiers), arms-buy-back schemes, training of former combatants and micro-credit schemes, psycho-social trauma clinics, community level conflict resolution training, capacity building for electoral institutions and, monitoring of the first post-conflict elections. (CIDA)</td>
<td>Bascially short-medium term immediate peacebuilding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Definitions of Terms Related to Conflict and Peaceful Change

There are many different definitions for each of these terms which may not be included here, but we hope this can be a useful guide to help staff reflect on what these terms might mean in their local context and to ensure consistency in our programmatic discussions. There is a shorter document with a few of the most-used terms on the Digital Library under the same name, but SHORT version. These are “living documents” and we are always open to suggestions of better definitions for these terms—which are often confused with one another and which mean different things to different people and organizations. If you have suggestions or questions, please contact Dayna Brown, Sr. Program Officer, Civil Society, at dbrown@mercycorpsdc.org.

**Conflict**

Mercy Corps recognizes that some level of conflict exists in every society, and that a healthy, vibrant civil society has mechanisms for dealing with change and resolving conflicts without resorting to violence. Conflict is normal and can even be good, but what we are looking to prevent is violent conflict.

The conflict we challenge is violent, destructive conflict. Some people use the word conflict to refer to healthy disagreements and struggles. For ease of discourse we use the term to mean negative, unhealthy, usually violent interactions. *(Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace – Or War, Mary B. Anderson, 1999, p. 7)*

[Conflict] takes place when two or more parties find their interests incompatible, express hostile attitudes, or take action, which damages the other parties’ ability to pursue their interests. *(Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes, DFID, January 2002, p. 34)*

When development agencies working in crisis or in pre-war situations circumvent conflict related issues they are, in the terms of the guidelines, “working around conflict”. When they modify their programmes and make efforts to recognise the conflict they are “working in the conflict”. When there is an attempt to proactively prevent, mitigate or resolve the conflict(s) this is “working on the conflict”. *(The DAC Guidelines Helping Prevent Violent Conflict, OECD 2001, p. 22)*

**Conflict Analysis**

Conflict analysis is the systematic study of the structures, actors and dynamics of (violent) conflict. It supports development, humanitarian and peace building organisations in gaining a better understanding of the context they are working in and the role they play. In particular, conflict analysis can help [program staff] to:

- Understand the political context of their work and how it affects development processes or humanitarian needs.
- Identify key conflict issues and priorities and develop effective strategies to address them.
- Develop and apply an ethical framework to their work. This includes the ability to account for how ethical principles are being applied in practice.
- Manage relations with political, economic, military and civilian actors at local, regional, national and international levels.
Inform advocacy strategies at national and international level.
Understand the impact of their work on conflict. This includes an appreciation of the conflict impact both of macro-level policies and initiatives (mediation efforts, “the kind of development being promoted”) as well as that of individual initiatives.

Conflict analysis usually focuses on macro-level political and economic processes, which provide the context for development, humanitarian and peace building interventions. From there, links to conflict issues at regional (sub-national) and local level can be followed up. Conflict analysis is complementary to needs assessments at various levels of interventions. (DRAFT 2 of Resource Pack, International Alert, 2003, Ch. 2, module 2, pg. 2).

[Conflict Analysis is] a means of developing a multi-dimensional understanding of the causes and dynamics of conflict as well as the capacities for peace. (Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes, DFID, January 2002, p. 35)

NOTE: There are numerous different analytical frameworks, tools, and participatory methods for analyzing conflicts, which can be used and adapted depending on the context and level of analysis needed—local, regional, national, or international. Which one is used is less important than ensuring that some analysis of the conflict or context is done when planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating all programs. Conflict/context analysis should be an ongoing process and is not limited to only programs in places currently affected by conflict or to assessments. Most donors are now requiring completion of conflict assessments by their missions as part of the strategic planning process, with USAID calling them Conflict Vulnerability Assessments, DFID using the term Conflict Assessment, and the World Bank’s Conflict Assessment Framework.

### Conflict Cycle or Stages of Conflict and Peace

Most practitioners and academics acknowledge that conflict is not linear, but rather cyclical, and there are numerous different terms and diagrams to describe it. For instance, Michael Lund describes the stages as **durable peace (just order), stable peace (basic order), unstable peace, crisis,** and **war.** (Preventing Violent Conflicts: A Strategy for Preventive Diplomacy, USIP, 1996, p. 38)

The European Union uses the following definitions and policy instruments, in its Framework for Conflict Prevention: (Understanding the EU Part II: The European Union and Conflict Prevention, Saferworld. www.saferworld.org)

**Situation without obvious tension**
Situation where a country is seemingly stable and largely quiet, but where (structural) causes of potential conflict may be discerned.
- **Immediate aims:** Peace-building
- **Instruments:** targeted assistance, democracy-building, good governance and civil society, institution-building, political dialogue, etc.

**Situation of tension**
Situation where conflict in society becomes apparent and whose gravity depends on events as well as existing political and power structures.
- **Immediate aims:** Conflict prevention
- **Instruments:** political dialogue, sanctions, advocacy of specific measures and/or solutions, deployment of observers, humanitarian relief aid.

**Open conflict**
Situation of sustained fighting between organised forces, which often continues until a stalemate is reached.

- **Immediate aims:** Conflict management/conflict resolution
- **Instruments:** threat of sanctions, political dialogue, (advocacy of) preventive military intervention, observer missions, support for peace initiatives, peace enforcement.

**Post-conflict situation**  
Situation where there is no longer organised armed violence and a cease-fire or peace agreement might or might not yet have signed.

- **Immediate aims:** Conflict resolution/peace-building
- **Instruments:** demobilisation and disarmament, repatriation and reintegration, de-mining, post-conflict relief and humanitarian aid, confidence-building measures, conflict resolution initiatives, rebuilding government structures.

### Conflict Management

Any efforts made to contain violent conflict, reduce the levels of violence, or engage parties in a process to settle the conflict. *(Peacebuilding: A Caritas Training Manual, Caritas Internationalis, 2002, p.14)*

Activities undertaken with the objective of preventing the vertical (intensification of violence) or horizontal escalation (territorial spread) of existing violent conflict. *(Understanding the EU Part II: The European Union and conflict Prevention, Saferworld.)*

### Conflict Mitigation

Any efforts made to contain violent conflict, or reduce the levels and destructive impact of violent conflict. *(CRS Approach to Peacebuilding: Definitions, Principles, Roles, Draft version 4 for discussion, January 2003, p. 11)*

### Conflict Prevention

Activities undertaken to reduce tensions and/or to prevent the outbreak or recurrence of violent conflict.

Any actions that are taken, procedures put in place, or policies proposed to prevent either states or groups within the state from threatening or using armed force or other forms of coercion to settle disputes…Conflict prevention is sometimes called preventive diplomacy, preventive action, crisis prevention, or preventive peacebuilding. *(Working for Reconciliation: A Caritas Handbook, Caritas International, 1999, p. xi.)*

### Conflict Reduction

Activities undertaken to reduce the incidence, duration and destructiveness of violent conflict. *(Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes, DFID, January 2002, p. 35)*

**NOTE:** When talking to DFID, this is their preferred term for talking about conflict programming.
Conflict Resolution

A very comprehensive term which implies not only the achievement of peace but also that the deep-rooted sources of conflict are addressed and resolved. This implies that behaviour is no longer violent, attitudes are no longer hostile and that the structures giving rise to conflict have been changed. Conflict resolution includes all efforts to increase cooperation among parties to a conflict and to deepen their relationship by addressing the conditions which led to the dispute, fostering positive attitudes and allaying mistrust through reconciliation initiatives and building the institutions and processes through which the parties interact. *(Working for Reconciliation: A Caritas Handbook, Caritas Internationalis, 1999, p. xi.)*

Activities undertaken over the short term to end violent conflict. *(Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes, DFID, January 2002, p. 34)*

Efforts to increase cooperation among the parties to a conflict and deepen their relationship by addressing the conditions that led to the dispute, fostering positive attitudes and allaying distrust through reconciliation initiatives, and building or strengthening the institutions and processes through which the parties interact. Conflict resolution can be used to reduce the chances of violence or to consolidate the cessation of a violent conflict in order to prevent re-escalation. *(http://www.caritasdc.com/ghai/toolbox.htm)*

Conflict Sensitivity

Conflict Sensitivity is the capacity of an organization to:

- Understand the (conflict) context in which it operates;
- Understand the interaction between its intervention and the (conflict) context; and
- Act upon the understanding of this interaction in order to avoid negative impacts and maximise positive impacts on the (conflict) context and the intervention.

In addition, ‘conflict sensitivity’ is:

- Equally relevant to the sectors of humanitarian assistance, development and peacebuilding and not synonymous with peacebuilding and conflict resolution. Thus, incorporating peace or conflict-related activities into a development or humanitarian project or programme may have little or no impact on its level of conflict sensitivity.
- Not only relevant for humanitarian, development and peacebuilding interventions undertaken in situations of violent conflict but also for interventions in situations of unstable peace.
- Relevant to interventions that aim to directly address causes of violent conflict, but also to interventions which do not focus explicitly on conflict issues, but which may nonetheless have positive spill-off effects on peace.

*(Draft definition from International Alert, August 2003, www.international-alert.org)*

Conflict Transformation

...Goes beyond the concept of conflict resolution in that it requires a transformation of the parties, their relationships to each other, and the structural elements that underlie the conflict. These
relationships and social structures are often unjust and unequal, and transforming conflict seeks to alter these structures in ways that build a more just society. It is a term that implies a long-term perspective on conflict and its transformation.  *(CRS Approach to Peacebuilding: Definitions, Principles, Roles, Draft version 4 for discussion, January 2003, p. 11)*

**Connectors**

Links between people across the lines of conflict. Even in societies where civilian-based civil war rips daily patterns apart, many aspects of life continue to connect people rather than divide them. Common history, culture, language and experience; shared institutions and values; economic and political interdependence; and habits of thinking and acting exist in all societies, including those embroiled by civil war.  *(Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace – Or War, Mary B. Anderson, 1999, p. 23-24)*

**Dividers**

Systems and institutions that historically or traditionally separate people and can thus cause tension between them. These include systems of discrimination, exclusion, and dominance, or might include spatial separation when different groups occupy separate areas. Such systems and institutions may promote or reflect long-standing tensions between groups and can cause –or be manipulated to cause– conflict.  *(Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace – Or War, Mary B. Anderson, 1999, p. 32)*

**Early Warning**

Refers to monitoring and analysis of early signals of potential conflict with a view to anticipating trouble spots in time to respond effectively.  *(Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes, DFID, January 2002, p. 34)*

**Grievance**

In the context of internal conflict, grievance refers to widely shared dissatisfaction among group members about their cultural, political and/or economic standing vis-à-vis dominant factions.  *(Ethnopolitical Conflict in the 1990s: Patterns and Trends, Ted Robert Gurr and Michael Haxton. College Park, MD: University of Maryland Minorities at Risk Project, 1996.)*

**Human Security**

(This) signifies not only protection from violence by also from wider threats to physical well being and livelihoods such as environmental degradation, disease and economic collapse.  *(Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes, DFID, January 2002, p. 35)*

**Mediation**

A process of third-party assisted communication to achieve settlement in a dispute. Mediators may be individuals or groups, and may be considered “neutral” or may be partial to one side but be
accepted and deemed legitimate by all parties. *(CRS Approach to Peacebuilding: Definitions, Principles, Roles, Draft version 4 for discussion, January 2003, p. 11)*

**Negotiation**

[Negotiation is] a process enabling parties to discuss possible options and reach a settlement through face-to-face interaction. *(Working With Conflict, Simon Fisher, et al, 2000, p. 95)*

The nature of negotiation is to arrive at the largest mutually satisfactory agreement with any one (and therefore, each) getting at least enough to make it want to keep the agreement. By that very nature, negotiation is not a process of winning and losing, so success must be evaluated against the problem, not against the adversary. *(Zartman in Negotiation Theory and Practice, ed. By J. William Breslin and Jeffrey Z. Rubin, 1995, p. 154)*

**Nonviolence**

The policy of pursuing political goals through peaceful protests involving large numbers of people. Nonviolence as a weapon of protest was put into action by Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948) and his followers in India in their campaign for independence from Britain. Nonviolence, coupled with civil disobedience, was also a main plank of the American civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s, led by Martin Luther King Jr. (1929-68). Nonviolence can be effective because it carries a moral authority that violence does not and thus often wins widespread sympathy for protesters. *(Fast Times 1999: http://www.fast-times.com/political.html)*

**Parties**

The groups or individuals involved in a conflict. There are primary parties (those who are directly involved in the conflict) and secondary parties (those who are indirectly involved in the conflict or have a stake in the outcome of the conflict). A primary party to the conflict would include the various groups fighting over power or resources, while the secondary parties might include those benefiting from war (e.g. those plundering resources or shipping arms into a country) or individuals or groups supporting the primary parties in some way (e.g., with money or soldiers). Both primary and secondary parties are stakeholders (those who have an interest in the outcome of the conflict). Third parties are those individuals that assist the primary parties in resolving the conflict, also called intermediaries or intervenors. These individuals, or sometimes groups, may be considered “neutral” by all parties, or they may be partial but are accepted by and have the legitimacy with all the parties involved in the conflict. *(Peacemaking: A Caritas Training Manual, Caritas Internationalis, 2002, p.14).*

**Peace**

Peace is a process: a many-sided, never-ending struggle to transform violence. Both those who accept the need for coercive force, including violence, and those who take a totally non-violent stance, and the many others with views in between, would say that they want peace. But their ideas about what peace really is are rather different. Stable peace is a relatively rare state. Many societies and communities are excluded from peace by a range of economic, political and social factors. Peace is often compared to health, in that it is more easily recognized by its absence…Many people understand peace to be the absence of war. While this is, of course, vital, others see it as only a first
step towards a fuller idea, using definitions such as: an interweaving of relationships between individuals, groups and institutions that value diversity and foster the full development of human potential…Absence of war is often described as negative (‘cold’) peace, and is contrasted with positive (‘warm’) peace, which encompasses all aspects of the good society that we might envisage for ourselves: universal rights, economic well-being, ecological balance and other core values. 

(Working With Conflict, Simon Fisher, et al, 2000, p. 11-12)

Positive definitions based on four concepts: peace as harmony (stressing absence of conflict); peace as order (stressing stability and ‘peace through strength’); peace as justice (stressing absence of domination and poverty); and peace as conflict management (stressing peace as process for obtaining interests and needs rather than as an end in itself). (Banks, 1987; cited by Burgess & Burgess, 1997; cited by Schmid, Alex P. in Thesaurus and Glossary of Early Warning and Conflict Prevention Terms.” Abridged version edited by Sanam B. Anderlini for FEWER. Rodderdam: Synthesis Foundation, 1998)

NOTE: Peace is not often defined in the glossaries of manuals for working on conflict, possibly because peace means different things to different people in different contexts, which is why it is important to develop a common vision of what peace would look like with the people affected by conflict if we are working towards it. Most people would agree however, that it is difficult to have peace without a basic level of security.

**Peacebuilding**

Peacebuilding represents a way to achieve societal reconciliation. It is important to note that Peacebuilding is a very widely used term, one that differs according to who uses the term and in what context it is used…it is a people-centered, relationship-building, and participatory process. Peacebuilding occurs either before violent conflict erupts (a preventive measure), or after violent conflict ends (an effort to rebuild a more peaceful society). Peacebuilding may take the form of activities designed to increase tolerance and promote coexistence, or activities may address structural sources of injustice or conflict. (Peacebuilding: A Caritas Training Manual, Caritas Internationalis, 2002, p.15).

Undertaking programmes designed to address the causes of conflict and the grievances of the past and to promote long-term stability and justice. (Working With Conflict, Simon Fisher, et al, 2000, p. 14)

Activities undertaken over the medium and longer term to address root causes of violent conflict in a targeted manner. (Understanding the EU Part II: The European Union and conflict Prevention, Saferworld.)

**Peaceful Change**

Peaceful change refers to the process and manner in which communities and societies manage, react to, live with and/or influence change. Mercy Corps recognizes that some level of conflict exists in every society, however, we believe that a functioning civil society has mechanisms for solving conflict without resorting to violence. Promoting peaceful change means providing and supporting people with tools and mechanisms to work collaboratively and solve problems peacefully at all levels – from the community level to the national level. (Mercy Corps Civil Society capacity statement 1.03)
**Peacemaking**

Any activities designed to move towards a settlement of armed conflict, usually at the official diplomatic level. *(Peacebuilding: A Caritas Training Manual, Caritas Internationalis, 2002, p.15).*

**Peace Writ Large**

A concept referring to ‘peace in the big picture’ or the overall situation in the country. *(The Evaluation of Conflict Resolution Interventions: Framing the State of Play, Cheyanne Church and Julie Shouldice, INCORE, 2002, p. 68).*

The effectiveness question at this level asks whether, in meeting specific program goals, an agency makes a contribution to the bigger picture. To understand this, agencies need to gauge changes in the overall environment that did or did not come about as a result of actions taken. Assessing effectiveness at this level puts the onus on agencies to look for changes outside the things for which they are directly responsible. They must address how their efforts have, or have not, supported the ending of violence or the achievement of justice. *(Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners, Mary B. Anderson & Lara Olson, 2003, p. 13. You can download the entire booklet at www.caainc.com/rpp/publications/confrontingwar/ConfrontingWar.pdf)*

**Proximate Causes of Conflict**

Immediate causes of conflict, are more near term conditions, developments, or trends, in which triggers for violent conflict can occur (e.g. collapsing states, intensifying leadership struggles, increased criminal control of economic or political structures, increasing and/or easy access to small arms and other weapons, rising unemployment, hate or war rhetoric). *(Reader Section 1 4/11, UW-DMC/Interworks CAPP Workshop, March 2003)*

**Reconciliation**

A longer term process of overcoming hostility and mistrust between divided peoples. It is the consolidation of constructive social relations between different groups of the population, including the parties to the conflict. Reconciliation includes the recognition among the parties of the need to develop a common understanding of the causes and nature of the conflict and develop shared notions of responsibility. *(Working for Reconciliation: A Caritas Handbook, Caritas Internationalis, 1999, p. xii.)*

**Root Causes or Structural Causes of Conflict**

Those long-term factors that create the underlying conditions for potential violent conflict (e.g. weak state structures, group inequalities, economic exclusion, lack of economic diversification, culture or history of violence, etc.). *(Reader Section 1 4/11, UW-DMC/Interworks CAPP Workshop, March 2003)*

**Track One (or ‘First Track’) Diplomacy**
Official governmental international efforts to settle a dispute or conflict. *(Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes, DFID, January 2002, p. 36)*

**Track Two (or ‘Second Track’) Diplomacy**

Unofficial confidence-building meetings and actions in support of Track 1. Often private efforts by non-state actors (religious, academic, NGO or other groups) to achieve progress in peace negotiations. *(Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes, DFID, January 2002, p. 36)*

**Triggers**

Immediate events that accelerate the outbreak of conflict (e.g. the assassination of a political leader). *(Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes, DFID, January 2002, p. 36)*

**War**

A type of violent conflict characterized by a) the fighting of at least two opponents with organized, regular military forces, b) the fact that the fighting is not sporadic but lasts for a considerable period of time, c) the fact that the fighting is intense, that is, it leads to victims and destruction. *(Reader Section I 4/11, UW-DMC/Interworks CAPP Workshop, March 2003)*
CODE OF CONDUCT

- PWJ strives to provide appropriate assistance to people in need, regardless of race, politics, religion, or faith.

- PWJ aims to provide prompt and effective emergency humanitarian relief and to implement participatory reconstruction in line with local needs.

- PWJ cooperates with government and public institutions, and other aid organizations as necessary to maximize the effect of assistance.

- PWJ utilizes its funds effectively and produces detailed program and financial reports.

- PWJ values communication with its individual and institutional supporters, volunteers, government and public institutions, other aid organizations and media in an effort to foster favorable partnerships.

- PWJ respects the privacy of its supporters and protects personal information.

- PWJ strives to secure the safety of its staff members.

- PWJ pursues professionalism while valuing innovation and creativity, untied to conventionalism.

- PWJ does not discriminate against staff members in regard to age, sex, educational background, religion, faith, citizenship, etc.

- PWJ strives to resolve domestic and international social issues as a member of civil society contributing to public interests.