Proposed Canada-Japan Peacebuilding
Learning Project Framework Draft #2

Proposed
Canada - Japan
Peacebuilding Learning Project
Framework

Draft # 2

Table of Contents

Section I
Introduction and Conceptual Approach

A.   Background
A Canada - Japan Symposium on Peacebuilding for Development w as held in Tokyo from September 16 - 18, 1999. The Symposium drew together, for the first time, the Canadian and Japanese NGO peacebuilding communities, and officials from the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Japan s Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and International Cooperation Agency (JICA) as w ell as research institutes and media from the two countries. Following this Symposium, as part of a larger Canada - Japan collaboration programme, there w as an agreement to undertake a joint assessment of Canadian and Japanese NGO peacebuilding projects.

B.   Introduction
To further explore concrete joint field activities, a Workshop and Planning Meeting w as held in Winnipeg from 18 - 20 September 2000. The Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) Unit of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) w as asked by the CIDA s Evaluation Division to produce a methodological guide to undertake the field missions. Specifically, IDRC, through its PCIA Unit, was asked to:

i   produce a draft evaluation / methodological framew ork, to serve as a starting point for discussions at the Workshop; and,
ii   present this framew ork and participate in the three-day Workshop, and produce a final version based on the discussions and feedback received.1

C.   Draft Framework —Presentation at the Workshop
PCIA is a new and relatively untested formal approach to understanding an important aspect of the sustainability of development interventions. PCIA aims to systematically and formally examine the impact of a development intervention on peace and conflict dynamics. If a development intervention aggravates violent conflict, it is, simply, unsustainable in developmental terms. If it can re-enforce capacities which sustain peace, the intervention s sustainability can be considerably enhanced.

The Draft Framew ork prepared for and presented at the Winnipeg Workshop w as, for many participants, their first exposure to PCIA. Important, then, w as the context provided by a draft paper w ritten and presented at the Workshop by Dr Necla Tschirgi of IDRC, entitled Peacebuilding Evaluations . This paper discussed some of the different approaches taken by a number of development actors to assess their w ork in this field. The Draft Framew ork prepared for and presented at the Workshop (Proposed Joint Peacebuilding Assessment Framew ork Based on PCIA Methodology) complemented this contextual paper. Both of these contributions w ere important in increasing the appreciation of Workshop participants about the nature of the challenges that could be faced in such an exercise.

The Framework presented at the Workshop included the following 8 steps:

Step 1:   Conflict Analysis —Desk Review
Step 2:   Project Analysis —Desk Review
Step 3:   Workshop / Collaborative Mapping Exercise

---

1 1 Terms of Reference, 7 September

Step 4:   Conflict and Project Analysis —In-country
               A.Workshop with local researchers
               B.Workshop with project owners / stakeholders
Step 5:   Beneficiary Interviews —Attitudes, Values, Behaviours and Beliefs
Step 6:   Lessons Learned Workshop: Design, Monitoring and Evaluation
Step 7:   Preparation of Final Documentation
Step 8:   Follow-up Action Schedule Prepared and Publicized

This proposed methodology included direct engagement with local project partners, researchers, analysts, practitioners and beneficiaries. The intent was to identify and address two gap analyses: the gap between the project and the conflict, and the gap between the beneficiaries and the project. Several steps in the initial draft, and several aspects of the process to be followed, were included in order to:
Æ   encourage participants to engage with key aspects of PCIA approaches;
Æ   provide a context and space for cooperative working relationships to develop (i.e. between participants from the two countries, their field staff, and local analysts and practitioners);
Æ   provide an opportunity for acquiring a better understanding of basic concepts and a shared set of terminology; and,
Æ   develop consensus on the foundations of the analysis as the process was followed.

The intended outcome of these steps would provide the basis for recommendations aligning the project more directly with peace and conflict dynamics and the beneficiaries. It should be noted that jointly arriving at such recommendations was viewed as an important dimension of the methodology because some suggestions had been made in discussions leading up to the Workshop that cooperative or joint programming initiatives could be defined following the application of the methodology. For such a level of cooperation to emerge from the field work, a high level of mutual understanding would need to be acquired, not only of the situation on the ground, but also about the ways in which the participants and their organizations work, and could work together.

Therefore, it was certainly expected that further tailoring and perhaps simplification of the first draft methodology presented at the Workshop would be required, based on a better understanding of the needs and expectations of the participants.

D.   Draft Framework —Post-Workshop
The objective for the first day of the Workshop was to summarize the knowledge and experience on conducting the assessment of peacebuilding projects [and] to develop a shared vision about the assessment. This amounted to defining the objectives of the joint exercise with greater precision. The following objectives were identified (these may be refined or restated in the final version of the minutes, so this is an exhaustive and perhaps overlapping list based on an interpretation of thr discussion):
Æ   learn through assessment
Æ   develop guidelines for peacebuilding projects / programming
Æ   create and / or support relations: Japan - Canada at government and NGO level and within Canada and Japan between government and NGOs
Æ   study peacebuilding methodology(ies)
Æ   joint review and application of a modified PCIA
Æ   explore possible joint programming based on what emerges from application of the modified PCIA methodology; such programming could occur between donors, or between NGOs with or without donor support
Æ   conduct workshops to work more closely with local capacity in conflict prone countries
Æ   assessment for learning not accountability purposes
Æ   develop a common language around peacebuilding
Æ   understand on-the-ground practice

Proposed Peacebuilding Learning Project Framework
(Draft # 2)

Æ   shed light on the gap between emergency and rehabilitation (horizontal) and the gap between the macro or meso level and the micro or local community level (vertical) of peacebuilding programmes

Æ   address sustainability of discrete peacebuilding projects: how do these graft onto local processes and have a catalytic or transformative effect on the immediate and broader context

The following day, these were condensed into a set of questions:
Æ   How has the peacebuilding project been catalytic for peace?
Æ   How do projects contribute to reconstruction and rehabilitation of a war-torn country?
Æ   How do projects contribute to capacity-building, energizing local capacities for peace?
Æ   What kinds of projects are most effective / appropriate to reconstruction and rehabilitation?
Æ   Have projects contributed to conflict prevention or recurrence of conflict?

The initial draft Framework was presented after this consensus on objectives was defined. As presented, it was appreciated by the participants as comprehensive, robust and rigorous. It was, however, viewed as going beyond the expectations of the participants and their objectives as defined. In the end, after a thorough discussion, the participants requested that the Framework be revised and implemented with the following steps:
Step 1:   Peace and Conflict Analysis and Project Analyses
             To be completed by an expert as desk studies.
Step 2:   Field Visits and In-country Workshop
             To be completed by the joint assessment teams in collaboration with in-country partners.
Step 3:   Lessons Learned Compilation, Documentation and Dissemination
             To be completed by each team after the field missions, one report prepared by the Japanese team for Cambodia and another by the Canadian team for Guatemala.

In accordance with this understanding of the objectives of the joint exercise and this process, Section II of this document provides a revised draft methodology for use by both Canadian and Japanese teams in extracting lessons from the projects eventually selected. This proposed methodology is informed by a number of studies and reports, and these are listed in the bibliography.

Section II
Outline of the Proposed
Peacebuilding Learning Project Framework

(DRAFT #2)

A.   Introduction
The purpose of this Framework is to provide a methodology to meet the objectives defined at the Winnipeg Workshop of the Canada - Japan Peacebuilding Learning Project.

B.   Overview
This methodology has the following 3 steps that will be followed for Cambodia and Guatemala:

Step 1:   Peace and Conflict Analysis and Project Analyses
To be completed by an expert as desk studies.

Step 2:   Field Visits and In-country Workshop
To be completed by the joint assessment teams in collaboration with in-country partners.

Step 3:   Lessons Learned Compilation, Documentation and Dissemination
To be completed by each team after the field missions, one report prepared by the Japanese team for Cambodia and another by the Canadian team for Guatemala.

C.   Description of Steps in the Framework

Step 1:   Peace and Conflict Analysis and Project Analysis - Desk review
The Japanese side will identify an expert analyst who will conduct a peace and conflict analysis and analyses of the projects selected for Cambodia, and the Canadian side will do likewise for Guatemala. The suggested approach can be found in the attached Annex. The suggested approach is based on PCIA literature and experience. The expert analyst will present this to all participants in Step 2.

Step 2:   Field Visits and In-country Workshops
This in-country work is assumed to have a time frame of two weeks. The activities are as follows:
- initial workshop: one day to have a presentation of the conflict analysis and project analyses; two days to revise and refine the instruments and tools to be used in field work. It is expected that the participants as well as local counterparts and researcher / analysts will be involved in this workshop.
- field work: this will require one day per project at a minimum.
- closing workshop: two days to present the lessons learned to stakeholders and one day to prepare the main elements of the joint donor / NGO lessons learned report.

This draft of the methodology does not go into detail about the tools and instruments to be used in-country at the project level. Nor did the previous draft. It is suggested that consideration be given to the field visit guide prepared by the consultants to the recent CIDA Peacebuilding Fund operational evaluation. This would provide a useful starting point for a set of questions to animate and inform discussions during the project visits anticipated under this exercise. (This was presented and discussed at the Workshop by one of the consultants.)

In addition, the following sources and approaches could inform the development of field level tools and instruments:

Proposed Peacebuilding Learning Project Framework
(Draft # 2)

i   A survey could be designed to shed light on individual beliefs, feelings, behaviours and attitudes. Such a survey would attempt to capture an individuals sense of how these may have changed over time and whether these changes can be linked to the project in question.

ii   The framework put forward by Mary Anderson in Do No Harm, and discussed in the previous draft, is a useful way of exploring project design and delivery alternatives.

iii   Documentation emerging from the recent lessons learned exercise of the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee (CPCC), especially the Lessons Learned Methodology and the summary of the five case studies currently under preparation, provide will be useful reference material. That exercise is similar, in many respects, to the Canada - Japan Peacebuilding Learning Project.

iv   The Brief for Case Study Writers of the Reflecting on Peace Practice of the Collaborative for Development Action also has similar objectives.

v   A document listed in the bibliography *Consultations with the Poor: Methodology Guide for the 20 Country Study for the World Development Report 2000/01"* from the World Bank (also found at http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/voices/reports/method/method.pdf) has sections related to Exploring well being (p.9) including risk, security and vulnerability dimensions (p. 10 - 12); Institutional Analysis (p.13); cause - impact mapping overviews (p.23); and (p.25) a set of suggested questions that could be adapted to focus group sessions with the people who were expected to directly benefit from the project.

In addition, gender dimensions need to be integrated throughout this step. The following are based on suggestions and comments on the first draft framework by Beth Woroniuk (Goss Gilroy Inc) and Shannon Smith (PCIA Unit, IDRC):

Æ   During the workshop, gender dimensions from both the peace and conflict analysis and from the project analyses should be included throughout the discussion.

Æ   Consideration should be given to identifying local participants (researchers / analysts / practitioners) who have proven experience in applying gender perspectives, asking them to strengthen both the preceding analysis as well as the tools and instruments for field work.

Æ   In visiting the projects and local project teams, questions can be asked applying and fleshing out ideas and insights from integrating gender perspectives in the previous steps. Example areas for exploration: how target groups were identified; composition of those participating in the project or who are visibly benefiting from it; if possible speak with beneficiaries and try to speak with different groups, including women and girls. (More and different types of questions can be identified once the projects have been identified.)

Æ   Survey design should include questions about the effects of the projects on gender roles, differential impacts, and effects on equality.

Æ   Researchers should ensure surveys (if administered) are completed by women and girls in the community.

Æ   Survey results could be dis-aggregated by sex, as one way of revealing some differential impacts, changes and attitudes.

A review of these suggestions will show that without an understanding of the projects to be reviewed by the joint teams, more specific tailoring or drafting of tools or instruments would be premature and perhaps neglect systematically project features that are important to peace and conflict dynamics.

Step 3:   Lessons Learned Compilation, Documentation and Dissemination
- the Japanese and Canadian teams take their work back to their offices and engage with the expert analyst(s) to further refine lessons learned from Step 2, and efforts will be made to link this field work to the analyses generated in Step 1.

- a final report is prepared on the exercise and prepared in formats suitable for the types of follow up activities that are recommended.
- this documentation is shared amongst the participants and also with in-country stakeholders who were involved in Step 2.
- gender should be a point of analysis by each team and explicitly discussed in all final documents.

To summarize, the following sets of documentation are expected for each of Cambodia and Guatemala:
Document 1: The Conflict Analysis
Document 2: Project Analyses
Document 3: Field Mission Report
Document 4: Final Lessons Learned Report

D.   Conclusion
Step 1 of this proposed methodology for developing lessons learned from Canadian and Japanese peacebuilding projects is informed by a relatively new approach: PCIA. If the final step includes systematic reference back to the initial conflict and project analyses, and lessons learned are presented along these lines, then this initiative will yield results consistent with the intent of PCIA.

Bibliography

Anderson, Mary B., Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace —Or War, Lynne Rienner Publishers (Boulder): 1999.

Bush, Kenneth, *A Measure of Peace: Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) of Development Projects in Conflict Zones* , IDRC (PBR-PI) Working Paper No. 1 (1998).
also available at: http://www.bellanet.org/pcia/index.cfm?fuseaction=doc_main

Department for International Development (United Kingdom), Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department (Michael Warner, Robert Walker and Robert Scharf), Strategic Conflict Analysis and Conflict Impact Assessment, 1999.

FEWER (Forum for Early Warning and Response), Conflict and Peace Analysis / Response Manual, FEWER Secretariat, 2000.
also available at: http://www.fewer.org/research/index.htm

FEWER, Generating Means to an End: Planning Integrated Responses to Early Warning, FEWER Secretariat, 2000.
also available at: http://www.fewer.org/research/index.htm

Leonhardt, Manuela: Conflict Impact Assessment of EU Development Cooperation with ACP Countries: A Review of Literature and Practice, International Alert and Saferworld 2000.

Leonhardt, Manuela: *The Challenge of Linking Aid and Peacebuilding* in Peacebuilding: A Field Guide, Luc Reychler and Thania Pfaffenholz (eds.): Lynne Rienner Publishers (ISBN:1555879128): 2000.

Peacebuilding Unit, Multilateral Programs Branch, CIDA: A Compendium of Operational Frameworks for Peacebuilding and Donor Coordination, Hull, Canada: 1999.
(also available at http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/peace)

Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP) & Conflict Prevention Network: *Conflict Impact Assessment: A Practical Working Tool for Prioritising Development Assistance in Unstable Situations* , SWP-CPN, Brussels, October 1999.

World Bank, Poverty Group, *Consultations with the Poor: Methodology Guide for the 20 Country Study for the World Development Report 2000/01"* February 1999.

ANNEX

Introduction

This Annex describes the approach the IDRC - PCIA Unit suggests the expert analyst(s) employ in conducting Step 1 of this Framework. First, some information is provided about ongoing efforts to assess peacebuilding impact in order to provide context based on IDRCs ongoing monitoring of this emerging field. Then, the recommended steps for conducting a peace and conflict analysis, and a project analysis are described. The intent is to provide the expert analyst with frameworks for (a) peace and conflict dynamics; and (b) project inter-actions with those dynamics. The structure can help in pin-pointing key issues related to conflict prevention and peacebuilding and in communicating and making accessible these perspectives to other participants in the Canada - Japan Peacebuilding Learning Project.

The Context: Peacebuilding Evaluations

There is growing acceptance of the assertion that good development practice should support peacebuilding —that development interventions are not, cannot, be neutral, particularly in situations of conflict. The fact that peacebuilding is becoming increasingly viewed as impact demonstrates that there has been some success in mainstreaming peacebuilding into development practice.

A number of donors and organizations have attempted to study and learn from their efforts to practically and operationally adopt this view. This section provides a very brief summary of concerns that have emerged from IDRCs efforts to synthesize these studies and identify areas that require more work.

Peacebuilding assessments, evaluations and lessons-learned exercises are being conducted, in spite of the challenges they present. These challenges include:

Æ the inherent political nature of the analysis: it can be messy and it can be uncomfortable in that it can challenge core values, attitudes and opinions

Æ therefore, objectivity, as part of the analytical process, can be difficult to maintain

Æ reaching beneficiaries, understanding the nature and scope of their participation in a project, and getting a good reading of their perception of the intervention is difficult and context-specific

Æ managing the constraints inherent in the often overlooked political aspects of organizational mandates can complicate the analytical process and affect objectivity

Æ ensuring both the adequacy and flexibility of financial resources for such studies, and allocating human resources with the required training, experience and skill to manage an inherently risky endeavour is often difficult

Four different types of studies have been conducted:

Æ country level studies that view official development assistance as just one of several instruments affecting peace and conflict dynamics, and ask how peacebuilding programme and policy coherence can be improved

Æ programme reviews conducted by donors interested in assessing the adequacy of programme design in relation to perceived requirements

Æ project reviews or studies, conducted by a variety of agencies, NGOs and implementing agencies, looking at the context-specific interface of a single project within a conflict setting

Æ and, finally, formally structured impact assessments aimed at shedding light on how project or programme dynamics interact with conflict dynamics

Synthesizing the main findings, peacebuilding learning, assessment, and evaluation exercises must be aware of the following concerns:

Proposed Peacebuilding Learning Project Framework
(Draft # 2)

Æ establishing causality betw een an intervention and impact on root peace and conflict dynamics is complicated by the very context

Æ peacebuilding projects have tended to be limited in their duration, view ed as transitional assistance, and sustainability of their supposed catalytic or transformative impact on peace and conflict dynamics has proven difficult to assess

Æ the benefits of an intervention are extremely difficult to assess, especially if action is being taken in preventive mode: How can successful prevention or mitigation of conflict be demonstrated?

Æ generalizing conclusions from one conflict setting to another is problematic: w hat w orks w ell in one setting may not work well in another, even in the same country or region

Æ there are several different sets of peace and conflict indicators w hich can be tracked: identifying indicators that fit the context, use available data, and have a sufficient time frame requires special attention

Æ bridging the gap betw een macro level conflict analysis and the more micro level of project impact can be facilitated through the active involvement and engagement of local practitioners and analysts w ho, in many cases, have been conducting such analysis but have not had an opportunity to codify their knowledge or make it more explicit to external actors.

The following four areas are key to PCIA frameworks developed by several donor agencies:

Æ governance and inclusion / consultation in administrative processes;

Æ economic justice and equity;

Æ socio-cultural factors related to exploitation and attitudes tow ard those w ho are perceived as different or as the other ; and,

Æ basic security issues related to freedom of movement and freedom from fear or intimidation.

The peace and conflict analysis that follow s w ill need to be completed at a level that makes sense in relation to the project analysis. As mentioned above, the links betw een macro level peace and conflict dynamics are often difficult to make w ith micro level peacebuilding interventions. The latter may have limited impact on macro dynamics, and yet be vital to peace and conflict dynamics at that local level. Therefore, it is recommended that the analyst(s) charged w ith executing these tasks access a variety of sources and present contested view s of current dynamics. To further enrich the analysis, accessing local expertise and resources (i.e. in Cambodia and Guatemala), including local analysts and practitioners, w ould assist in assembling peace and conflict indicators that are suited to the context and the project(s).

Peace and Conflict Analysis Methodology2 — For Step 1

It should be noted that, in completing the tables below , there may be instances w here data is difficult to obtain or w here the relevance seems obscure. There is a need for the user to employ judgement and note or justify w here these situations arise. These gaps are part and parcel of the analysis and need to be acknow ledged as such. This should not prevent completion of one iteration of the steps. These steps could be repeated as more information becomes available or by sw itching the analysis to a level (macro / micro) where data is available.

1.1- Establish a framework for analysing peace and conflict dynamics
Objective: Develop a baseline understanding of peace and conflict parameters.
Complete Table 1, below (Note: completing this table could mean w riting paragraphs for each box that is relevant to the context and situation under consideration):

---

22 The basis for Step 1 is Part I of the FEWER Conflict and Peace Analysis / Response Manual

Table 1

KEY ISSUE AREAS	PERSPECTIVES		
	Political Aspects (Military and Security)	Economic Aspects	Socio-Cultural Aspects
General description of the conflict: Why is there a conflict and what is it about?			
Geographic features: How is the conflict distributed spatially?			
History of the conflict: What are key milestones in peace and conflict terms?			
Actors engaged in or supporting the conflict: Who are the key individuals or institutions / organizations playing a role in the conflict?			
Agendas of the actors: Why are these actors pursuing conflict and what do they hope to achieve?			
Perceptions of the actors: How are key actors and their agendas perceived? Who or which has been accorded legitimacy?			

Gender dimension: Incorporate insights about gender and other traditionally marginalized groups. Ask key issue area questions w hich reveal w here are the w omen . E.g. in questions about Actors, explicitly investigate w hat are the roles of w omen in involved institutions or organizations; if w omen s organizations are key actors, e.g. as peacebuilders.

1.2 Identify Peace and Conflict Indicators
Objective: Create a set of indicators that describe the main features of peace and conflict dynamics at the present time.

Complete Table 2. (To aid w ith this, refer to the definitions below of indicator types as w ell as the list of suggested individual indicators for each type and perspective.3 Again, completion of Table 2 may involve writing several paragraphs):

Table 2

INDICATOR TYPES	PERSPECTIVES		
	Political Aspects (Military and Security)	Economic Aspects	Socio-Cultural Aspects
Structural Factors			
Triggers			
Accelerators			

---

33 Drawn (by FEWER) from the Africa Peace Forum, PIOOM Foundation, Russian Academy of Sciences/Institute of Ethnology, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees/Centre for Documentation and Research, and the University of _____ .

Proposed Peacebuilding Learning Project Framework
(Draft # 2)

Gender dimension: Gendering the sets of indicators in context-relevant ways can be revealing. Eg. gender-based violence, womens human rights, mobilization of masculinity/femininity (reinforcing gender stereotypes) as triggers.

1.3 Rank Importance of Conflict Indicators and Their Inter-relationships
Objective: Understand indicators identified and their inter-relationships.

Table 3 should be completed by re-examining or re-assessing the specific indicators identified in Table 2. This should be approached in the following way:
1.   Rank the importance of all indicators identified regardless of their type or perspective.
2.   Sub-divide and group indicators into two sets: those which re-enforce each other and those which counter-act or mitigate effects of others in the same group. Note that indicators ranked very important can fall in both very important / positively re-enforcing and very important / mitigating, depending on how the grouping is done. Also, indicators viewed as less important in the general ranking could become very important when grouped with other indicators. This is a key notion: how one groups the indicators affects or influences their inter-relationship.

Table 3

	A. General Ranking	B. Positively Re-enforcing	C. Mitigating
Very Important			
Important			
Less Important			

1.4 Prepare a Written Preliminary Conflict Analysis
Objective: Prepare a written summary of the conflict and of current peace and conflict dynamics, based on the preceding steps.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 provide the raw material for a written peace and conflict analysis. Prepare point form paragraphs under the following sections / headings:
Æ   Perspective on the Conflict and Key Issues (one paragraph for each perspective) (Table 1)
Æ   Current Peace and Conflict Dynamics (one paragraph for each perspective) (Table 2)
Æ   Current Peace and Conflict Trends (one paragraph each for re-enforcing and mitigating indicators) (Table 3)

For Completion of Table 2: Identification of Peace and Conflict Indicators

Structural Factors
These are root causes, institutional issues that form the background against which the conflict is occurring. These are in fact pre-conditions for the conflict: systematic political exclusion, economic inequities, limited adequate response of an institutional nature, demographic shifts / balance, ecological / natural resource issues. The indicators in the table below provide ways of tracking these structural factors.

Political	Economic	Socio-Cultural

Military and security	Internal Economic Stability	Media and Propaganda
Æ security expenditure Æ growing illicit arms trade Æ number of private security firms Unstable social structure Æ changing elites Unwillingness to effectively govern Æ human rights abuses Æ constitutional abuses Æ abuses of power Inability to effectively govern Æ systemic instability Æ unconsolidated power Æ illegitimacy Æ incomplete territorial control	Æ prevalence of poverty Æ degree of unemployment Æ inflation/ price stability Æ access to social security/welfare Æ pronounced social stratification Æ income disparities Æ land distribution Environmental Æ agricultural failure Æ pollution Æ environmental disaster Mismanagement Æ disparity and inequality Æ corruption Instability Æ macro-economic instability	Æ inflammatory statements Æ exploitation of divisions/tensions Religious institutions Æ antagonistic behaviour Æ propaganda Police and judiciary Æ institutional bias Institutional Æ lack of civil institutions Æ link between populous-government

Accelerators

Events outside the parameters of the model: [...] essentially feedback events that rapidly increase the leve of significance of the most volatile of the general conditions, but may also signify system-breakdown or basic changes in political causality (Gurr & Harff, 1996: 47)

Proposed Peacebuilding Learning Project Framework
(Draft # 2)

Political	Economic	Socio-cultural
Domestic insecurity	**International confidence**	**Ethnicity**
Æ inability, on the part of the state, to deliver security and stability	Æ capital flight Æ foreign debt Æ currency stability Æ foreign exchange reserves	Æ ethnic tension/violence Æ historical rivalries Æ territorial disputes Æ antagonistic behaviour
Æ security forces on the streets		Æ institutionalised persecution
Æ inability to maintain territorial control	**Economic decline**	Æ language laws
Æ imposition of curfews	Æ increasing poverty/ economic disparity	
	Æ food shortages	
Population movements		
Æ civilian movement across border		
Æ restriction of movement into and out of the state		
Æ IDP s and refugees		
Political opposition/ Government oppression		
Æ proliferation of opposition groups		
Æ frequency of political arrests		
Æ miniaturisation of dissent		
Æ problems processing dissent		
Æ disillusionment with security apparatus		
Æ dissatisfaction with the management of state affairs		
Æ unfulfilled expectations		
Æ general despair (linked to justice, economic welfare, personal/family security)		
Consolidation of opposition		
Æ increased opposition activity		
Æ increase in size and cohesion of opposition groups		

Triggers

Political events that can provoke violence or lead to greater trust and reconciliation. Sudden catalysts or sparks that can ignite violence or indicate a lessening of tensions. For example, assassination or arbitrary arrests of key actors would be negative triggers in the realm of human rights or violence. Positive developments in the area of human rights could include an amnesty for political prisoners .

Human rightsCross-border activityExternal intervention
freedom of expression

freedom of movement

freedom of religion
freedom of assembly
political assassinations
Integrity of elections
electoral fraud
voter intimidation

military build-upsexternal support for opposition groups
cross-border shootingsthreat of intervention

Levels of violence

political violence
ethnic violence

Internal political instability
changing alliances
purging of persons of doubtful loyalty
politically motivated arrests
dominant political positions/ideologies and their impact on peace and stability

Government policy
new discriminatory policies   mass human rights abuses
increased tension between regime supporters and opposition groups

Proposed Peacebuilding Learning Project Framework
(Draft # 2)

Project Analysis Methodology — For Step 1

1.5   The Project s Interaction with Indicators
Objective: Link peacebuilding project objectives, results and activities to conflict indicators.
Complete Table 4.
The top part of the Table on activities, results and objectives can be completed either by (a) building on
a LFA in your project documentation (use one table for each project objective) or (b) identifying implicit
or explicit project objectives from project documentation. (The arrow s are meant to indicate causality,
and there are likely many activities, and fewer results, tied to each objective.)

The bottom part needs to be completed by identifying the indicators used above and the direction of
influence it is assumed or expected that activities, results, and objectives will have on these indicators.

Table 4

	Project Activities		Project Results		Project Objectives	
Direction of Influence	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative
Structural Factors						
Triggers						
Accelerators						

1.6   Compare Project Influence to Conflict Dynamics
Objective: To understand how the project is likely to be affecting the most important areas of
                peace and conflict dynamics.
Essentially, this step requires comparisons betw een Table 3 and Table 4. Are the indicators grouped
under the Mitigating and Positively Re-enforcing columns in Table 3 also those grouped under positive
and negative influences expected from project activities, results and objectives?

Write a paragraph on the main similarities / differences betw een the tw o tables for grouping
observations under activities, results and objectives. Identify the main gaps and answ er the following
questions:
- Are indicator clusters very important / re-enforcing and very important / mitigating being influenced
by project activities, results and objectives?
- How could the project be changed to address changes in peace and conflict dynamics?

Gender dimension: Using gender sensitive (in addition to, e.g., ethnic and class sensitive) lenses can
be important tow ard assessing the resonance of peacebuilding projects: E.g. program delivery solelv
aimed at or through elite men may lack credibility w ith other actors; security can mean different thing.
for men and women; impacts of the conflict will often be experienced differently by men and women.

Proposed Peacebuilding Learning Project Framework
(Draft # 2)

Overview: Suggested Ways to Integrate Gender Awareness and Analysis into the Peacebuilding Learning Project

The Importance of Applying a Gender-sensitive Lens

Gender inequalities and differences do not **cause** conflicts, they do however influence how people participate in and experience conflicts and how people (women and men) work to bring about peace. There is clear evidence documenting that womens and mens experiences of conflict and peacebuilding is significantly different. Examples include:

Æ there is often a clear division of labour (they often participate in the conflict in different ways, they have different social responsibilities, etc.)

Æ social attitudes and different value placed on their opinions and labour

Æ mens perceptions, work, needs, priorities are often more visible to outsiders than those of women

Æ the use of rape as a weapon of war.

By failing to consider these issues, initiatives run the serious risk of increasing gender inequalities. By investing only in the training of men, failing to recognize domestic work and responsibilities of women, and ignoring the need of women to have access to land, local NGOs and international organizations can increase gender divisions and contribute to a decline in womens position and situation. Finally, there is the issue of missed opportunities. There is a current push to recognize and promote womens efforts to build peace. By excluding women from peace processes (both formal and informal, national and local) international organizations are losing out on an opportunity to harness a potentially effective trigger/accelerator for peace. (Sections from Comments from a gender equality perspective on **Outline of the Proposed Joint Peacebuilding Assessment Framework**, prepared by Beth Woroniuk September 14, 2000)