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Foreword

Since the mid-1990s, both the international community in general, and international development organisations in particular, have become increasingly aware of both the impacts of conflicts and wars, and the increasing need to support peace-building efforts that go beyond the mere diplomatic level. As a consequence, many international organisations such as the UN system and the World Bank, as well as many bilateral actors, had started to rethink their position regarding crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace building, such that by the end of the last decade many strategies and approaches to peace building had become available in donor circles.

While many bilateral development agencies have started to incorporate peace building into their activities as a result of these discussions, according to the DAC Task Force on Conflict Prevention in Development Cooperation or the Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Network (CPR), knowledge of the current state of the art of peace building projects and programmes remains limited. There is still an urgent need for more empirical expertise and lessons learned from the actual implementation of strategies and approaches for peace building.

In 2001, the four partner countries of the Utstein group – Norway, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Germany, decided to examine closely their common store of knowledge with regard to peace building activities implemented over the past five years (1997 – 2001). The evaluation departments of their key ministries developed an approach designed to put together and assess their implementation-oriented experiences with a view to developing practical policy conclusions and guidelines. These, it was believed, would complement the theoretical aspects of the DAC Guidelines with the views of experts in the field.

The following paper examines the German perspective regarding the peace building efforts of development cooperation. As the following results show, the survey has been instrumental in uncovering many positive experiences and practical lessons learned, while at the same time highlighting some crucial issues which not only merit the attention of the official German institutions involved, but would also benefit from the coordinated efforts of the wider peace building community and like-minded groups such as the Utstein partner countries. It is hoped that this report will be widely read, intensively debated, and followed by key actions in the fields of policy and implementation.

****

This Donor Country Paper (DCP) summarises the main aspects and findings emerging from the German research activities in the context of the "Joint Utstein Study on Peace Building". The following nine countries were involved in the study: Afghanistan, Bosnia
and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Guatemala, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda and Sri Lanka. The study focused on projects and programmes implemented in the context of development cooperation, either through the channels of official bilateral Technical or Financial Cooperation, or via NGO’s financed by Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ).

In the context of this study, the term peace building was understood in a fairly wide sense and divided into seventeen categories (see annex 5.1. for details). It had been decided by the International Peace Research Institute (PRIO), the coordinating research institution for the Utstein project, to place emphasis on the context and purpose of individual project activities, in order to define whether certain approaches and activities fell under a category of peace building rather than general development cooperation. In accordance with this broad understanding, the choice of projects included in the survey ranges from rather indirect contributions such as road rehabilitation projects, through to highly specific peace building projects such as demobilisation.

The main aspects and findings aggregated in this DCP are based on:

- a policy paper summarising the state of art in Germany (see chapter 2.)
- detailed evaluations of 89 projects and programmes, following 14 survey questions
- country-specific process documentation papers
- country-specific summaries as contributions to this DCP, and
- in five cases (Afghanistan, Cambodia, Guatemala, Sri Lanka and Rwanda) a special country paper covering specific issues and remarks on peace building in the respective country.

The DCP is divided into four main parts:

Chapter 2 - Overview of German Development Policies with Regard to Peace Building - explains the context and the political frameworks that are relevant to the survey. It provides a broad overview of the actors/institutions involved in peace building activities, as well as the corresponding instruments and implementation strategies of German development cooperation, and reflects the character of the German contribution to peace building.

Chapter 3 - Survey Results – Key Observations - reflects the main aspects of PB and CT at the project/programme level that were proposed by PRIO as a framework to structure the Donor Country Paper. The following areas are examined: project portfolio, statistical overview, consistency, instruments and approaches, status of evaluations and institutional relationships.
Chapter 4 - Specific Examples of Peace Building - focuses on important methods, instruments, approaches and strategies beyond the project or programme level, such as the Civil Peace Service (CPS) - a new instrument of German development cooperation -, the complex process of portfolio development in PB and CT in Sri Lanka, or the mainstreaming of CP and CM-related issues in TC projects in Kenya.

Finally, Chapter 5 - Lessons Learned and Recommendations - sums up the key results of the country-specific analysis, and at the same time identifies future prospects for PB from the German perspective. Having said that, the recommendations themselves are addressed not only to the German actors, but also to all the involved ministries and implementing institutions of the entire Utstein group.

****

Many of our colleagues in various organisations contributed to the insights captured in the present study. They are too numerous to be listed individually. We would therefore like to express our thanks to all our colleagues at the Federal German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), GTZ, KfW, DED, the consortium CPS, MISEREOR, EED, FES, KAS, HBS, AGEH, DWHH, CARITAS, WFD, Medica Mondiale, SHL, Pax Christi, Friedenskreis Halle and the Ministry in Rhineland-Palatinate, both in Germany and in the nine partner countries, for providing us with their data, comments and critical insights. They gave us not only their precious time, but also the benefit of their own experiences and points of view. We hope that this study will be of assistance to them in their demanding daily work, and help stimulate further important contributions to practical peace-building work. Naturally, we take full responsibility for the material presented here.

Dr. Uwe Kievelitz  
Gabriele Kruk  
Norbert Frieters
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1. Summary

1.1. Background

Purpose and Objective of the Study

In the year 2001, the four Utstein partner countries (Norway, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Germany) decided to examine closely their common store of knowledge and experience acquired in the field of peace building (PB)-related issues over the previous five years (1997 – 2001). The evaluation departments of their key ministries developed an approach designed to put together and assess their implementation-orientated experiences, with a view to developing practical policy conclusions and guidelines for the future. The key questions for the whole process to answer were: What works? What does not work? What is being left out?

The Federal German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) commissioned the GTZ Crisis Prevention and Conflict Transformation Project to coordinate and prepare the German contribution. The present study is the German contribution to the Joint Utstein Study on Peace Building. It describes and analyses the approaches and experiences of German governmental, church-based and non-governmental development cooperation actors in PB, crisis prevention (CP) and conflict transformation (CT) in recent years, summarises key results, and offers recommendations for the future. The study is therefore of key significance not only within the framework of the Utstein process, but also in the context of German development cooperation.

The present paper examines the German perspective on the peace building efforts of development cooperation. As the results show, the survey has been instrumental in uncovering many positive experiences and practical lessons learned, while at the same time highlighting some crucial issues which not only merit the attention of the official German institutions involved, but would also benefit from the coordinated efforts of the wider peace building community and like-minded groups such as the Utstein partner countries. It is hoped that this report will be widely read, intensively debated, and followed by key actions in the fields of policy and implementation.

The structure of the report is as follows:

Chapter 2 - Overview of German Development Policies with Regard to Peace Building - explains the context and the political frameworks that are relevant to the survey. It provides a broad overview of the actors/institutions involved in peace building activities, as well as the corresponding instruments and implementation strategies of German
development cooperation, and reflects the character of the German contribution to peace building.

Chapter 3 - Survey Results – Key Observations - reflects the main aspects of PB and CT at the project/programme level that were proposed by PRIO as a framework to structure the Donor Country Paper. The following areas are examined: project portfolio, statistical overview, consistency, instruments and approaches, status of evaluations and institutional relationships.

Chapter 4 - Specific Examples of Peace Building - focuses on important methods, instruments, approaches and strategies beyond the project or programme level, such as the Civil Peace Service (CPS) - a new instrument of German development cooperation -, the complex process of portfolio development in PB and CT in Sri Lanka, or the mainstreaming of CP and CT-related issues in TC projects in Kenya.

Finally, Chapter 5 - Lessons Learned and Recommendations - sums up the key results of the country-specific analysis, and at the same time identifies future prospects for PB from the German perspective. Having said that, the recommendations themselves are addressed not only to the German actors, but also to all the involved ministries and implementing institutions of the entire Utstein group.

The German Framework: PB within German Development Cooperation

At the beginning of the 21st century, PB and CP have moved to the top of the international community’s agenda. Within the European Union, the German Government is one of the countries that gave systematic attention to PB and CP issues in the late 1990’s. In this context, German development cooperation has significantly stepped up its efforts to contribute to peaceful development since the change of the government in 1998. In 2000, the German Government gave this goal a formal base by devising the Comprehensive Concept of the Federal Government on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace Building1.

Given its focus on the structural causes of conflict, development cooperation thus lies at the core of the German Government’s long-term PB and CP strategy, which focuses on the one hand on reducing structural causes of conflict (such as poverty, social inequalities, lack of political participation, lack of rule of law, and lack of access to natural resources), and on the other hand on promoting peaceful conflict resolution mechanisms and approaches (such as the strengthening of peace constituencies, trauma and reconciliation work, or the support of peace media and peace journalism).

Based on this strategy, several important milestones have been reached in policy development, structures, instruments and methods, the results of which have been reflected in practical implementation in recent years:

1. At the international level, the German Government strongly supports multilateral institutions involved in PB and CP, such as the UN system, the World Bank and the European Union, by supporting or spearheading treaties and conventions, supporting peace operations, and contributing to multilateral programmes.

2. BMZ has sharpened the focus on CP in its planning procedures by using an extensive set of crisis indicators designed to detect the need for preventive measures early on, so that programmes and project portfolios can be adapted to these needs.

3. Crisis Prevention and Peace Building has become one of the eleven so-called priority areas of German development cooperation, and five partner countries (Guatemala, Sri Lanka, Colombia, Senegal and Burundi) have agreed to define PB as one of their own priority areas of development cooperation with Germany. Furthermore, in a number of other countries (e.g. Rwanda, Nepal) PB has been mainstreamed within development cooperation activities as a whole.

4. A lot of governmental, non-governmental and church-based actors have begun to address the new challenges of working in conflict environments, and have made important contributions to the field of PB in recent years.

5. New instruments have been established in which governmental and non-governmental actors cooperate closely, such as the Civil Peace Service or the Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt).

6. In order to further develop approaches, methods and instruments for key aspects of PB, BMZ has set up several research and development programmes within GTZ. These deal with issues of CP and CT in German development cooperation, small arms control, security-sector reform, and the support of local peace initiatives through a fund for peace building.

7. Since September 11, BMZ has refocused its attention on PB issues by developing conceptual approaches to CP in the context of terrorism, in which connection it has devised an ambitious programme for crisis prevention in the context of terror (ATP).

### 1.2. Methodology

#### Approach and Time Frame of the Study

The study sought to include the various peace building approaches of as many German development cooperation actors as possible. Fifteen German development cooperation organisations took part in the study: three of them were implementing organisations of BMZ (GTZ, KfW, DED), three were political foundations (FES, KAS, HBS), four were church-based organisations (EED, AGEH, Caritas and Pax Christi); five other NGOs also participated (DWHH, WFD, Medico Mondiale, Friedenskreis Halle, Schüler helfen Leben). A total of 89 development cooperation projects that had been implemented either in part
or in full between 1997 and 2001, were studied. The study focused strongly on the respective project level, while the next level of aggregation, evaluation of the respective projects at the country level, was not included in the study. TC accounted for by far the largest share of projects (two-thirds). The countries selected were: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Guatemala, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda and Sri Lanka.

The study was based on project documents, evaluation reports and interviews with project staff at their respective headquarters in Germany, as well as some interviews with staff in-project. The information gathered was first of all fed into a matrix with 14 questions focusing essentially on actors, activities, strategic approach, objectives and impacts. With respect to the German context it very quickly emerged that the focus on the project level was inadequate. Consequently, a further step was taken. This involved summarising the individual project evaluations at the respective country level, and compressing them into a single whole, shedding light on the overall German strategic orientation, coherence among the German actors and, where appropriate, particularly noteworthy trends in the respective partner countries. In a third step, general trends and tendencies in German development cooperation with respect to PB-related issues were explored.

Despite the close analysis of numerous project documents and evaluation reports, the present study was subject to a number of constraints that limited the significance of its results. In addition to the limitations resulting from the fact that it was purely a desk study, further limitations resulted above all from the very open-ended definition of peace building, compounded by the fact that only few methodologically rigorous evaluation reports were available, which in turn created an impact monitoring problem.

**Definition and Understanding of Peace Building**

In the context of this study, the term PB was understood by the responsible consultant in a fairly wide sense (as stated in the terms for the study):

Peace building attempts to encourage the development of the structural conditions, attitudes and modes of political behaviour that may permit peaceful, stable and ultimately prosperous social and economic development. Peace building activities are designed to contribute to ending or avoiding armed conflict and may be carried out during armed conflict, in its wake, or as an attempt to prevent an anticipated armed conflict from starting. As conceptualised in the joint *Utstein* study, peace building activities fall under four main headings:

- to provide security,
- to establish the socio-economic foundations of long-term peace,
- likewise to establish the political framework of long-term peace,
- and to generate reconciliation, a healing of the wounds of war and justice.
According to this broad understanding of PB, the choice of projects included in the survey ranges from rather indirect contributions, such as road rehabilitation projects, through to highly specific PB projects, such as demobilisation.

**Limitations of Impact Monitoring**

Many of the surveyed projects were planned and approved at a time when German development cooperation was only just beginning to address PB/CP/CT issues in any depth. Accordingly, this is reflected in the terms and concepts employed in the project documents. The vocabulary is not theme-oriented, and conflict is often not mentioned at all at the level of objectives and results. Only in recent years has strategic and objectives-oriented planning for PB/CP/CT assumed significant dimensions. Against this background, as the study was being drawn up it was difficult, on the basis of the project documents and evaluation reports, to identify or infer conflict-related impacts, or to directly ascribe positive impacts on conflicts to the respective projects. These results are consistent with the results of the first German cross-section study of crisis prevention and peace building projects, the so-called Klingebiel study.2

Furthermore, as a general rule it can be said that the direct impact and influence of development cooperation on conflict situations is very limited, especially in the context of acute crises. Country cases such as Bosnia and Afghanistan, for example, illustrate how secondary the peace building contributions of development cooperation are as compared with those of large-scale peace keeping missions carried out by the international community, such as the Kosovo Force (KFOR) or the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan.

**1.3. Key Results of the Study**

**Understanding of PB Among the German Actors**

There exists no common understanding of PB as a method, concept or approach among the actors of German development cooperation. During the survey, the researchers encountered many different interpretations of the term “peace building”. Sometimes it was placed on the same level as the themes of good governance or democratisation; on other occasions it was closely linked with specific issues such as demobilisation, peace education or reconciliation. Besides this sectoral view, many interviewees also understood it as a cross-cutting and integrated element of normal development cooperation. Another definition of PB was purely context-oriented, being based on the idea that any development cooperation in (post-)conflict situations contributes to peace. These different

---

perceptions of PB revealed that, in the German context, there are no common criteria to
distinguish between PB activities and measures that address conflict directly, and those
that address conflict indirectly, a distinction that has often been made in the international
debate.

**Country Specific Approaches to PB**

Nevertheless in most of the countries analysed, PB, CP and CT have become
increasingly relevant and important during the last few years. Having said that, the survey
of programmes in the nine countries chosen for the evaluation clearly shows three
different types of country-specific PB approach and portfolio design.

1. The first group contains 3 countries with a special, conflict-sensitive orientation:
   Guatemala, Colombia, Sri Lanka. In these countries, German development
   cooperation projects are on their way to being streamlined at the country level, and
   are required to specify their direct or indirect relationship to PB issues. Parallel to this
   streamlining process, work recently began on preparing Sector Strategy Papers for all
   3 countries. Although this development of country-specific sector strategies is still
   under way, the survey did show that PB or related topics such as peace education or
   reconciliation are already found very often in the projects at the level of the overall
   goal, the project purpose or the conceptual approach. Commensurate with the degree
   of strategic incorporation of PB into development cooperation as a priority area, those
   countries usually have a high degree of vertical and horizontal consistency within their
   PB approach.

2. The second group contains those countries where there is neither a specified donor
   policy nor any emphasis given to PB through any official or strategic orientation but in
   which, in spite of this, the topic has been integrated into many projects and activities.
   This group includes Rwanda, Kenya, Cambodia and Bosnia. In most of these
   countries, PB is located at the level of project activities. Kenya and Bosnia represent
   good examples where both approaches could be found: Some projects mention
   PB/CP as part of the project purpose, and there are many projects where these
   thematic issues are integrated into the activity level (conflict analysis, training of local
   staff, community-based conflict management, etc.).

3. Additionally, a third group of countries can be identified that contains the post-conflict
   countries Afghanistan and Mozambique. Despite the socio-economic and political
   situation there is no defined PB strategy at the country level, nor any coherent
   implementation of PB concepts and approaches, even though direct PB activities do
   exist to some extent.

**Specific Aspects of Actors and Organisations**

The range of PB activities within German development cooperation is very broad and
heterogeneous, although a clear focus was identified in two sectoral categories, namely
"socio-economic fundamentals" and "political frameworks" (a total of around 66% of all projects). The respective actors each have their specific strengths and weaknesses. While TC focuses on the wider field of empowerment and capacity-building of governmental and non-governmental institutions on all levels (from the ministry up to the community level), FC concentrates more on reconstruction and post-conflict investment in infrastructure, health and education. The political foundations have placed political and civic education, support of democratisation and civil society at the top of their agendas, whereas the Churches and other NGOs are usually active in the struggle for human rights, civic conflict transformation, peace education, reconciliation, and support for the victims of conflicts. Projects implemented within the framework of the new Civil Peace Service (CPS) focus on supporting peace processes at the micro level, e.g. through encounter, reconciliation and refugee work.

Specific Examples of Peace Building within German Development Cooperation

In the course of the Utstein study, it became evident that German development cooperation has developed specific new and innovative approaches and instruments over the last two years. These innovations are therefore highlighted in more depth.

Mainstreaming PB-related issues in the country portfolio

One paradigm for the successful mainstreaming of PB-related issues in the country portfolio is Sri Lanka, where the activity area PB/CP/CT has been continuously developed and expanded in recent years. A "Poverty alleviation and conflict transformation" priority area has now been established, and numerous projects (mostly TC) are operating with an increased focus on conflict-sensitive frameworks, or are even explicitly oriented towards peace building in Sri Lanka.

Another approach to the mainstreaming of PB within TC is being pursued in Kenya, where the GTZ-financed measure COMANI has led to PB issues being mainstreamed in a number of GTZ projects. Most of them are regional rural development projects operating in conflict affected areas (see section 4.1.).

Increasingly important areas of PB within German development cooperation

Trauma healing, reconciliation work and a greater focus on youth in conflict situations are three themes that have taken on major importance within German development cooperation in recent years, and in which governmental and non-governmental actors have significantly broadened their activities and expertise. The evaluation shows that the importance of these thematic areas is growing (see section 4.3.).

New instruments

Furthermore, the establishment of new instruments has made a considerable contribution towards the enhancement and professionalisation of PB/CP/CT. Alongside the setting-up of national peace funds to promote projects at the micro level, and the BMZ Working
Group on Development and Peace, which is comprised of permanent representatives of major German governmental and non-governmental development cooperation organisations, the establishment of the CPS is also worthy of mention. The CPS is a new instrument of personnel cooperation that was jointly conceived by governmental and non-governmental development cooperation actors and peace groups, and now has a pool of over 100 peace experts at its disposal (see section 4.4.).

1.4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Overall, given the limitations inherent in the study only limited conclusions can be drawn concerning the impacts of German development cooperation in crisis and conflict situations. Nevertheless, it did emerge that German development cooperation has made valuable contributions towards peace processes, and tends to be most successful where a systematic country strategy has been developed and implemented. Key findings of the Utstein study in relation to German development cooperation are:

1. Over the last five years, German development cooperation for peace building has undergone significant theoretical and practical development, and gathered experiences that could potentially be developed into model approaches (e.g. the maintaining of development cooperation activities in Afghanistan during the conflict in an indirect form from Pakistan, or the mainstreaming of peace building in Sri Lanka). Having said that, those experiences have not been systematically studied or adequately analysed in relation to impacts. In this context, PCIA will become a more important instrument. Country-based evaluations, such as the 1999 Klingebiel study, are needed in order to assess both absolute impacts, and details of the progress made over the last four to five years.

2. Most of German development cooperation's experiences with PB have been gained in post-conflict rehabilitation and reconstruction. Sound strategies for the prevention of violent conflicts and the de-escalation of acute crises are only just beginning to be built on the basis of existing experiences.

3. In recent years a clear trend has been evident away from "working around conflict", and towards "working in conflict and "working on conflict". This trend is also a policy aim of BMZ, and reflects the increased sensitivity of the various development cooperation actors.

4. A key prerequisite for the achievement of significance and impacts in peace building efforts is the development of a consistent country strategy, combining a direct and explicit peace building approach with cross-cutting peace building activities in other fields.

5. Projects in many countries have illustrated the importance of local "peace constituencies" that need support in order to widen and deepen their "local capacities for peace". Political foundations, NGOs or church-based organisations can play a
specific, strong and strategic role in such contexts. Furthermore, given their capability to respond flexibly and rapidly in conflict situations they can also open doors for further development cooperation measures.

6. Despite the considerable increase in awareness of the importance of a conflict-sensitive orientation in development cooperation, procedures (e.g. appraisals or project proposals) have not yet been adjusted accordingly. At present, many project planning documents often make only passing reference to conflict as an issue. This does not mean that development cooperation personnel are ignorant of the problem, but it does mean that this awareness is not reflected in planning documents. Although peace building and related issues/activities have entered the development cooperation arena, they have only recently found their way into project planning, if at all.

7. Peace building plays a significant role both as a mainstreamed theme, and as a "sector" in its own right, closely linked to other sectoral themes such as good governance or political participation.

8. The study underlines the need for horizontally and vertically integrated peace building strategies.

9. Personnel working in peace building require both specific professional expertise and an awareness of the problem, in order to be able to deal with the difficult strategic issues, as well as the subject matter, involved. Hence those individuals working in conflict situations or in PB-related measures will require special training. Although training approaches have been developed, conflict sensitivity and knowledge of conflict-related instruments need to be mainstreamed more systematically into the preparatory training modules of development cooperation institutions dealing with PB.

Recommendations

In the view of the German team of consultants, the following recommendations for the future orientation of development policy for peace building would be appropriate:

**Understanding of PB**

1. The various German development cooperation actors, and the Utstein partners, should develop a joint and definitive understanding of PB (embracing both the conceptual and the operational dimensions).

**Peace Building and the Partner Country**

2. It is important that partner countries be in the driver’s seat as far as peace building efforts are concerned, especially in post-conflict situations. The development of national frameworks for peace building is a key factor in the peace process, and donor countries should see this as one of their key responsibilities in supporting their partners in the development of such frameworks.
3. As the partner government is often a conflict actor in crisis situations, donor countries need to develop clear positions on key issues which affect the government's position towards the conflict. Continuous political dialogue - in which the partner governments also "learn to disagree" - is a key factor for involvement in peace building.

4. Within the scope of cooperation with conflict countries, donors need to develop and introduce improved procedures to monitor PB activities, including human rights issues.

**Peace Building Strategies**

5. Peace building support delivered through development cooperation needs to follow a dual approach: on the one hand, it needs to pursue direct "work on conflict" via specific conflict-mitigating or peace-enhancing methods and instruments; on the other hand, it should pursue more indirect "work in conflict" via cross-cutting PB activities within other sectoral approaches.

6. In order to be successful in post-conflict reconstruction and peace building, it has proven of key importance to maintain at least a minimal presence within the respective country, even during times of crisis.

7. Development cooperation should make a conceptual and strategic shift in phase-specific emphasis away from post-, and towards pre-conflict situations. The Utstein countries should press this issue at the political level, and the implementation organisations should develop activities at the operational level.

8. The instrument of national or regional funds for peace building initiatives can become a crucial additional "tool" in supporting innovative or pilot measures, as well as peace building or conflict transformation initiatives at the local level.

9. As many conflicts – at least over time – show a tendency towards growing regional involvement or escalation, it is becoming increasingly important to develop regional approaches to peace building.

10. German development cooperation possesses good examples of successful pilot approaches. TC and FC in particular should intensify their efforts to harness this potential, and scale up these approaches.

**Cooperation and Coherence**

11. Both multilateral cooperation between national donors in peace building, and bilateral support and cooperation with UN bodies (e.g. measures to back up UN actions), should be stepped up.

12. Coherence and cooperation between governmental and non-governmental German development cooperation actors should be improved (so-called strategic alignment), which is not to say that NGOs must always follow the line pursued by governmental development policy. Coherence should be achieved through jointly developed guiding frameworks that still leave sufficient scope for action by the respective actors. Such agreements should be elaborated by all German actors in all conflict-sensitive regions, in conjunction with the development of roadmaps for peace.
2. **Overview of German Development Policies with Regard to Peace Building**

2.1. **Background**

- At the beginning of the 21st century, crisis prevention and peace building have moved to the top of the international community’s agenda. One reason for this is the failure of the world community to prevent a series of violent internal conflicts in a number of countries during the 1990s, most importantly in Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia and Kosovo. These political disasters have exposed the enormity of losses in terms of not only human lives and health, but also political stability, economic prosperity, social development and internal security that can be generated at the national and international levels as a result of violent conflicts. The events of September 11, 2001, were a further indication of the potential threat of violence and political instability with which the world is confronted today. These have led to even greater attempts, at both the international and national levels, to address the issues of crisis prevention and peace building.

- The international community reacted with a number of policy measures. In 1999, UN Secretary-General Kofi Anan called for a “culture of prevention”, starting with a reorganisation of UN peacekeeping and peace building missions. For its part, the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD established its Guidelines on Conflict, Peace and Development, while the Council of the European Union established an EU Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts.

- In many donor countries, these conflicts indicated the need to reorient political agendas not only in the Foreign Offices and the Ministries of Defence, but also in other sectors such as development or trade policy.

2.2. **The German Policy Context**

- Within the European Union, Germany was one of the countries to have devoted systematic attention to peace building and crisis prevention issues since the second half of the 1990’s. As early as in 1997, a first concept for development cooperation and crisis prevention was developed that reflected the OECD debate on the DAC Guidelines on conflict prevention. Since the coalition government of the Social Democratic Party and the Green Party came to power in 1998, Germany has

---

attached overriding importance to the prevention and management of violent conflict in the international arena.

- In 2000, the German Government gave this goal a formal base by devising the Comprehensive Concept of the Federal Government on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace Building. The goal of crisis prevention and peace building was also reiterated in the political strategy Poverty Reduction - a global Responsibility: Programme of Action 2015, as well as in the agreement of the 2002 Coalition Government that calls for a Joint Plan of Action for CP and PB.

- At the core of the German Government's concept lies a widened definition of 'security', focusing on 'human security' and encompassing political, economic, ecological and social stability. The basis for such stability, as identified in the concept, lies in respect for human rights, social justice, the rule of law, participatory decision-making, protection of natural resources, development opportunities in all regions of the world, and the use of peaceful conflict resolution mechanisms.

- As follows from this definition, the German Government’s strategy with regard to the goals of crisis prevention, conflict resolution and peace building is a comprehensive one, relying on instruments from foreign, security, development, financial, economic, cultural and legal policy fields. Such a strategy, to be successful, calls for coherence, i.e. successful coordination at both the national and international levels. At the same time, it is emphasised that solutions for specific conflicts need to be developed on a case-by-case basis.

- As such, Germany attempts to pursue the goal of crisis prevention and peace building on various fronts: The comprehensive strategy embraces the further development of international law, the subjection of conflicts to legal adjudication (international criminal jurisdiction and arbitration), the pursuit of human rights policy as preventive peace policy, the improvement of civilian sanctions, the reform and strengthening of the UN system, the pursuit of disarmament and arms control policy; and the furthering of common international rules and standards in the areas of trade, finance and the environment.

- As follows from such a broad approach, various actors are involved in policy formulation for crisis prevention and peace building. In general, all ministries coordinate their activities regularly within the framework of the Government's Common Cooperation Policy. Furthermore, the main ministries involved in peace building activities, i.e. the Federal Foreign Office, the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development and the Federal Ministry of Defence, cooperate closely in a number of areas:

---

The “joint plan of action for crisis prevention and peace building” which is presently being developed under the leadership of the Foreign Office.

The activities of the German security council, in which the three ministries as well as others are represented and take joint decisions, e.g., on the control of weapons exports.

The financing and supporting of the Federal College for Security Studies (BAKS).

An early warning mechanism for countries in crisis, in which the three ministries as well as the Federal Intelligence Service (BND) cooperate.

To guarantee a coherent strategy, the Government’s concept highlights the need for a greater involvement of non-governmental organisations and civil society. In this respect, the ministries are increasingly coordinating with non-governmental organisations in their respective areas of competence. Specific funding mechanisms have been developed within the Federal Foreign Office as well as the BMZ, in order to help enable civil society to become more active in peace building.

With regard to the broader political framework, it goes without saying that Germany’s policy for crisis prevention and peace building is guided by and in accordance with its multilateral commitments. Germany’s close ties with its partners in the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), as well as its work in international organisations, particularly the United Nations, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), and the Council of Europe, are the mainstays of German foreign policy for peace building. Especially European Cooperation within the context of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESVP) is, in the eyes of Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development Ms. Wieczorek-Zeul, a key element of crisis prevention and conflict resolution.

Germany has ratified a number of key treaties which are directly related to peace-building issues, such as human rights or weapon-related treaties and conventions. For example, it has become a signatory to the

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the European Convention of Human Rights (1950)
- International Criminal Court (2000)
- Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (1969)
- Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1996)
- Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons (2001)
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- Genocide Convention (1954)

Similarly, Germany has been increasing its active support to UN peace building operations, such as in Bosnia, Kosovo, Macedonia or more recently in Afghanistan, where Germany took over the leadership of the International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF) in 2002. All these special operations are subject to close parliamentary monitoring.

In April 2002, the Berlin-based Centre for International Peace Operations (ZIF) was established, and mandated to improve the infrastructure for deploying civilian personnel on international crisis prevention, conflict resolution and peace-building missions. The ZIF belongs to a core group of EU member state training institutions currently developing a European training programme for such personnel on behalf of the Commission. It was established explicitly in order to increase German commitment and active involvement in UN and OSCE peace-building missions.

2.3. German Development Cooperation and Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Peace Building

2.3.1. Concept and Strategy

When the Government of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) and the Green Party came into office, they responded to the already ongoing international debate on how to place stronger emphasis on peace-building issues in development cooperation (e.g. DAC Guidelines 1997) by incorporating the theme systematically into the orientation of German development cooperation. Since the change of government in 1998, stronger and more systematic emphasis has been placed on the contribution of development cooperation to peace building. Although this notion had already been expressed during the times of Willy Brandt, it is only in the last few years that is has been fully operationalised. “For the Federal Government”, as Minister Wieczorek-Zeul writes, “… development policy is part of our common security policy. It is a cornerstone of securing the global future” and thus, a direct contribution to peace policy. In consequence, in the 2002 Coalition Government agreement, development policy was declared a part of German foreign policy - and especially peace policy - “in its own right”.

Development assistance plays a particularly important role in the German Government’s strategy for civil crisis prevention, conflict resolution and post-conflict peace building. The emphasis on development policy as one crucial ingredient of German policy in this area is also reflected by the fact that the ministry in charge of German development policy, the BMZ, in 1998 became a member of the Federal German Security Council, and thus part of a comprehensive strategy.

Given its focus on the structural causes of conflict, development policy lies at the core of the Government’s long-term Comprehensive Concept on Crisis Prevention. The strategy focuses on
- the reduction of structural causes of conflict, such as poverty, social inequalities, lack of political participation, absence of the rule of law, and lack of access to natural resources (e.g. land and water) and
- the promotion of peaceful conflict resolution mechanisms and approaches, such as peace constituencies, trauma and reconciliation work, or the support of peace media and peace journalism.

In the context of the approach towards structural stability, Germany’s Programme of Action 2015 for Poverty Alleviation is of key importance. In one of the programme’s 10 chapters focusing on 10 strategies for poverty alleviation, peaceful conflict resolution and human security are identified as being key to preventing a mutual increase in violence and poverty worldwide.

The attention which professionals devoted to the development of policies, concepts, approaches and methods for peace building had its origin in a cross-cutting BMZ evaluation entitled Impacts of Development Cooperation in Conflict Situations. The study was an effort made by German development planners to pay greater attention to the impact of aid, particularly in conflict situations. It had a significant influence on the strategies for delivery of aid in conflict-prone countries.

While a specific policy paper on the contribution made by development cooperation to peace building has yet to be published, a BMZ cross-sectoral concept on crisis prevention and peace building is presently under preparation. So far, an article by the Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development on “peace building and crisis prevention” has been used as the main guideline.

---
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2.3.2. Actors, Instruments and Implementation

- The BMZ, as the responsible Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, has moved to consider the aspect of crisis prevention to a much greater extent in its planning procedures: Using an extensive set of crisis indicators\(^{15}\), since 1999 the Ministry has been working to systematically monitor the political situation in its partner countries; the goal is to detect the need for preventive measures early on (early warning) and to adapt programmes and project portfolios to these needs (early action).

- “Crisis prevention and peace building” was one of the eleven themes identified as "priority areas" of German development cooperation in the aid concentration and consolidation process launched three years ago. This focus on peace building is then further developed as part of the individual country strategy for the respective partner country. These strategies are usually agreed on between the relevant national actors and the German development institutions in country talks. So-called Sector Strategy Papers are then developed to operationalise the approach. As of today, a total of five partner countries (Guatemala, Sri Lanka, Colombia, Senegal and Burundi) have agreed to define peace building as one of the focal areas for development cooperation with Germany.

- Although PB and CP are an important priority area in themselves, this priority area is at the same time mainstreamed into the other ten priority areas as a cross-cutting theme (e.g. support of economic reform processes). In 2003, some 20% of all bilateral TC and FC programmes made a contribution to PB and CP.

- BMZ, as well as the Federal Foreign Office, have also increased their emphasis on peace building at the regional level. One major area of attention has been South-Eastern Europe following the disintegration of former Yugoslavia. Through the "stability pact", Germany provides significant support to the process of reconstruction and peaceful development in the successor states. Within the G8 initiative, Germany has recently focused attention on supporting African initiatives such as NEPAD, and organisations such as the AU, IGAD, EAC or ECOWAS, with a view to promoting "peace and security".

- At the institutional level, Germany has a diversified structure. To understand how Germany's approaches to peace building are translated into action, it is important that the reader familiarise him-/herself with this structure. The following matrix summarises the major institutions and their main contributions to peace building.

### Table 1: Relevant German Development Cooperation Institutions and their Contribution to Peace Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Instrument</th>
<th>Contribution to Peace Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy level:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)                         | ► Policy guidelines  
► Multilateral contributions  
► Financing of projects, programmes, NGOs  
► Special funds (e.g. anti-terror funds)                                                 |
| **Technical Cooperation:**                                                             |                                                                                                |
| Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH                         | ► Capacity building  
► Advisory services for PB projects/programmes  
► Development-oriented emergency aid  
► R+D for new approaches, methods for PB                                                  |
| **Financial Cooperation:**                                                             |                                                                                                |
| Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW)                                                   | ► Rebuilding of infrastructure  
► Stabilisation of social conditions through job creation and income generation              |
| **Human Resources Cooperation:**                                                        |                                                                                                |
| German Development Service (DED), Civil Peace Service (CPS), AGEH, DÜ/EED, Eirene, WFD, CFI, Forum ZFD, AGDF, InWEnt | ► Personnel support to local organisations or to DED cooperation partners (GTZ, KfW, UNDP etc.) and their projects  
► Training/qualification and procurement of personnel support (peace workers/experts)  
► Training and capacity building                                                        |
| **Churches** (MISEREOR, EED)                                                         | ► Support programs for victims of conflicts  
► Civil conflict transformation  
► Advocacy work in Germany on international conflict issues                                  |
| **Other NGOs** (e.g. DWHH)                                                             | ► Humanitarian assistance  
► Support programs for victims of conflicts                                                    |

In order to further develop approaches, methods and instruments for key aspects of peace building, the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development has since 2000 set up several research and development programmes within the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH. They deal with:

- Crisis Prevention and Conflict Transformation in German Development Cooperation
- Development Cooperation and Small Arms Control
- Security-Sector Reform.

Additionally, a Fund for Peace Building Institutions and Peace Initiatives is mandated to support small innovative peace-building activities of NGOs and local organisations in developing countries.

---

Important experience has been gained with regard to new methods and tools, especially (strategic) conflict assessment, “Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA)”, and the “do no harm” methodology. Conflict assessment in particular has paved the way for a strategic approach to policy and portfolio development in partner countries.

In order to share recently developed approaches and new methods for CP and PB with all interested governmental and non-governmental actors, the Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt) was created in 2001. This group consists of one permanent representative each of the major organisations involved in crisis prevention and peace building programmes.

BMZ also created the Civil Peace Service in 1999 as a new instrument for development cooperation, mandated to perform development and peace work aimed at promoting the non-violent transformation of conflicts. Tasks implemented under the CPS include:
- Measures to encourage mutual trust between members of different parties to a conflict; development of peace education programmes;
- Mediation in conflicts between members of different interest, ethnic or religious groups; human rights observation;
- Contributions towards reconciliation and reconstruction.

Today, more than 100 trained professionals have been assigned to different conflict and crisis regions where, through their project work, they assist partners in actively developing themselves as peace actors within their own societies.

Wars and crises in particular often require a significantly more flexible and timely approach than normal development cooperation procedures permit. In the German context there have been positive developments in this respect. German development cooperation is now able to respond more swiftly and less bureaucratically to conflict-related challenges in its partner countries, either through crisis prevention measures (e.g. through the national TC peace funds in Colombia and Sri Lanka), or through measures for timely structural and economic reconstruction (e.g. FC in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Afghanistan). Above all, post-conflict rehabilitation measures make a considerable contribution towards restoring normal everyday life. These first steps are key to stable processes of peace building within the structures of the state and civil society.

In 2002, InWEnt was founded as an organisation for international human resources development, advanced training and dialogue. It was established through a merger of

17 BMZ, GTZ, consortium ZFD, FES as a representative of the political foundations, the “platform civil conflict transformation” – an NGO network -, as well as the two major church organisations EED and MISEREOR.
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the Carl Duisberg Society (CDG) and the German Foundation for International Development (DSE), and can draw on decades of experience in international cooperation. Its practice-oriented programmes are designed for experts, executives and decision-makers in the fields of trade and industry, policymaking, public administration and civil society in numerous countries worldwide. InWEnt engages with PB-related issues in several areas of activity on different levels, e.g. international policy dialogue, training, education, civil conflict management and rehabilitation in post-conflict societies (see Annex 6.3. for details).

Due to the structural reorganisation process that was under way while this study was being carried out, the new organisation InWEnt did not participate in the study. Nevertheless, InWEnt will play an important role in PB/CP/CM-related issues in the future, especially in the organisation and management of training and dialogue programmes for executives and specialists of partner countries, as well as in the hosting of international conferences, e.g. the Petersberg Conferences, or the promotion of training and sensitisation measures for development cooperation personnel.

- At the international level, BMZ strongly supports multilateral institutions dealing with peace building and crisis prevention, such as the UN system, the World Bank and the European Union. For example, in the case of Afghanistan significant resources were committed to the UN-managed Trust Fund. The BMZ also plays an active role in helping shape the policies and financial practices of these institutions. Germany is an active partner in the design of policies and strategies for peace building within the framework of the DAC Task Force on Conflict Prevention in Development Cooperation (CPDC), and the Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Network (CPR).

- After September 11, the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) sharpened its focus on peace building issues yet further. Since then it has developed conceptual approaches to crisis prevention in the context of terrorism. Secondly, it has developed an ambitious programme to increase its attention on crisis prevention in a number of countries threatened by terrorism. Within this programme, for example, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH carried out activities in some 30 countries in 2002.

- In conclusion, since 1998 Germany has significantly stepped up its efforts to contribute to PB and CP. Important milestones have been passed in the development of policies, structures, instruments and methods, and these developments have been fed into the implementation process. Having said that, of course, these milestones mark only the first steps for PB and CP.

---

3. Survey Results – Key Observations

3.1. Potentials and Limits of the Present Study

Since the present study emerged as one part of a broader international analysis conducted by the Utstein group, it incorporated the methodological approach pursued by the joint study. In terms of its content and conclusions, the potentials and limits of the present study were therefore already defined by the given frame of reference.

3.1.1. Frame of Reference of the Study – the Utstein Process

The background and intention of the Utstein process are summarised in the study concept as follows (see Annex 6.1.):

"The aim of the project is to help shape peace-building policies and activities by producing policy guidelines based on experience. The aim of the survey is to provide part of the empirical basis for assessing experience, the other part being provided by a sweep of the evaluation and policy literature and some other sources, reaching more widely than the four Utstein countries. The key questions for the project to answer are, what works, what does not work, what gets missed out?"

The process of finding sound and detailed answers to these three key questions in the course of the present study was subject to the following three constraints imposed by its design:

- First of all the focus of investigation was project-based: The essential aim was to analyse individual German development cooperation projects. However, from the German perspective in particular it emerged clearly during the preparation of the study that this project-based perspective was not fully adequate, and needed to be complemented by a country-based perspective. This, however, was not provided for by the study design, which meant that these aspects could be addressed only occasionally (see 4.1). In this context it should be emphasised once again that in the generic Utstein study, 354 projects (89 of which were German) were analysed without being directly related to the country level. This weakness was identified from the German perspective, which is why the German team decided to prepare five supplementary Recipient Country Papers (on Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, Rwanda, Guatemala, Cambodia), giving greater weight to the respective strategies and developments of German development cooperation in these partner countries at the national level. In the view of the German side, it is important and indeed essential to include the country-specific dimension and broaden the perspective. This is the only way to ensure that the conclusions drawn are stringent and meaningful. However, since the country perspective was not included in this way by the other Utstein countries, it will not be possible for the generic Utstein report to draw comparable..."
conclusions. Thus although the five German country studies remain isolated in the overall context of the Utstein study, they do underline the need to look and act beyond the project/programme level, as well as providing valuable insights into portfolio development and coherence in German development cooperation.

- Secondly, the survey of an average of ten projects per partner country is a small sample, and cannot be considered representative of the overall approach of German development cooperation in a country.

- Finally, the whole study was conducted on the basis of project documents, concept and strategy papers, and internal and external evaluation reports, the information contained in which was in some cases explored further by conducting interviews. No analysis or data survey in the partner countries themselves was provided for in the design, which meant that the analysis remained a desk study throughout.

The period covered by the study (1997 to 2001) was one in which considerable change processes were under way within development cooperation in general, and peace building in particular, both internationally and in the German context. Whereas peace building approaches and strategies played only a minor role in development cooperation in 1997, by the end of 2001 this had changed at the levels of both planning and implementation. At the same time, the policy framework continues to shift towards conceptual and strategic development (e.g. the German Government's plan of action for crisis prevention). A supra-sectoral strategy for German development policy is also being prepared.

The increased sensitivity to, and broader understanding of, peace building and conflict prevention that have now emerged are also reflected in the terminology used in the more recent project documents, as well as in the more recent strategic planning activities and methodological approaches.

The lack of terminological clarity, strategic orientation and implementation methodology for peace building in older project documents was identified, and assessed in the context of the professional debate and ongoing developments of recent years.

### 3.1.2. Definition and Understanding of Peace Building

The understanding of peace building on which this study is based is a very broad one. The study defines peace building projects in relation to their context and their purpose/objective: " [...] the context of crisis and conflict and the purpose of making things as peaceful as possible" (Annex 6.1). This definition opens up a spectrum along which virtually all development cooperation projects in regions of conflict or crisis can be placed, making it difficult to draw any fine distinctions.

This problem arose both when reviewing project documents, and when conducting interviews with various development cooperation actors.
Various criteria for project selection have been discussed. Goodhand, for instance, distinguishes three approaches, the first two of which are relevant to the issue of peace building orientation and development cooperation activities in the present study:

- working on conflict: involving conscious attempts to design programmes in such a way that they do good
- working in conflict: recognising the links between programmes and conflict and making attempts to minimise conflict-related risks, so that aid 'does no harm'
- working around conflict: treating conflict as an impediment or negative externality that is to be avoided.

On the basis of these initial criteria, for the purposes of the present study an attempt was then made to distinguish between direct and indirect approaches. The following criteria were identified:

- Direct peace building approaches/projects aim to address the social, economic and political dimensions of conflicts through specific approaches designed to help build peace.
- Indirect peace building approaches/projects involve structurally-oriented or general development cooperation measures which, although peace building is not their overarching goal, are nevertheless conflict-sensitive.
- Direct peace building approaches/projects seek to respond to a conflict through an explicit orientation of their project approach (e.g. demining, demobilisation, trauma and reconciliation work, peace education).
- Indirect peace building approaches/projects incorporate conflict issues more implicitly, i.e. the link to peace building is not immediately apparent, but does become evident in the overall context of the project documents. Indirect approaches to peace building are often also characterised by the fact that the personnel involved are indeed aware of where and how their projects are oriented towards peace building, even though that orientation is not reflected in the corresponding wording.
- Direct peace building approaches/projects address conflict issues explicitly in their stated objectives. One can only speak of a direct approach to peace building where the project objectives are clearly conflict-related. A focal emphasis on peace building must be intended and planned.
- Indirect peace building approaches/projects refer to conflict-related issues, if at all, at the level of activities. Conflict-related measures are among the secondary issues, if they are included at all, and are not a key focus of the project.

---

Although these distinctions do provide a broad defining framework, they are not a strict set of criteria for selection. As the distinctions are not specific enough to constitute strict definitions, there is a risk of describing the project approaches inadequately, categorising them prematurely, and in so doing failing to capture the project reality accurately. Furthermore, the distinction between direct and indirect peace building also fails to capture the full picture, as many projects deliberately pursue integrated approaches that cannot be clearly assigned to one or other priority area. The general problems of distinction and definition are often further compounded by country-specific perspectives on peace building in partner countries which would then receive even less prominence under a broad definition.

Against this background, the authors of the present study decided neither to adopt one of the existing definitions of peace building, nor to construct one for the purposes of the study.

Where the study draws a distinction between indirect/implicit and direct/explicit peace building approaches, this is not based on a fixed or generally applicable definition of peace building, but is rather an attempt to present complex relationships in a concrete and accessible form.

The goal of the study, and of the entire Utstein process, should therefore be to act as a sounding board for the debate, and in so doing make a contribution towards the ongoing development of the definition of peace building.

3.1.3. Impact Monitoring

"Impact monitoring" is a many-sided and complex theme, and one which is discussed in more detail at two other points in the present study: in the methodological section (see 3.4) and in the conclusions section (see 5.1).

Against the background of the understanding of peace building outlined above, it should be mentioned at this point that, on the basis of the underlying study design and the available documents, it was barely possible to identify or infer conflict-related or conflict-reducing impacts. Nor did in-depth interviews with project personnel facilitate sound impact monitoring.

Nevertheless, the study can - like the Klingbiel evaluation (1999) before it - deliver results that will contribute towards the ongoing development of concepts and strategies for peace building.
3.1.4. **Assessing the Contribution made by Development Cooperation to Peace Building**

It should first of all be emphasised that bilateral development cooperation is only one of the possible, and by no means the only contribution by a state or the international community to peace building and conflict transformation in partner countries. The modest capabilities of development cooperation become clear when compared to the peace missions of the international community, their mandate, their level of intervention, and their human, infrastructural and material resources.

Nonetheless, development cooperation does have a number of different contributions to make at the three key socio-political levels: the politico-diplomatic level (track 1), the level of the (urban) civil society (track 2) and the level of the locally organised (rural) society (track 3). Although development cooperation as a rule does not become active on track 1 (state, governmental actors = top leadership of a society), there are a number of country examples such as Zimbabwe, Mali and Sri Lanka where, depending on the circumstances, key agreements concerning the future strategic orientation of German development cooperation are in place at the highest diplomatic level. Most development cooperation activities run along track 2 (organised civil society: various organised groups, such as trade unions associations, NGOs that are usually urban-based = middle-range leadership of society) or track-3 (grass-roots level of civil society: from community actors to local NGOs and small associations that are usually based in rural areas = local leadership). At these two levels, however, development cooperation operates on a longer-term basis, and more indirectly. This means that development cooperation interventions in the context of crises and conflicts are often only able to generate their full impacts after several years, which often makes it very difficult to ascribe those impacts unequivocally to development cooperation.

In this context it should also be noted that, to date, very little experience is actually available as to how development cooperation might generate impacts that help prevent crises. Most of the experience on hand with development cooperation in the context of wars and violent conflicts involves post-conflict project activities and approaches. This is also reflected in the countries and projects selected for the study.

3.2. **Selection of Projects and Methodology of the Survey**

3.2.1. **Participating Institutions**

In Germany, a total of 15 governmental and non-governmental organisations took part in the survey:
Table 2: Institutions Involved in the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Acronyms and Abbreviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Cooperation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ GTZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Cooperation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ KfW (Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources Cooperation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ DED (German Development Service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ AGEH (Association for Development Cooperation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ WFD ((World Community Service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Foundations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ FES (Friedrich Ebert Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ KAS (Konrad Adenauer Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ HBS (Heinrich Böll Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Churches</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ EED (The Church Development Service of the Protestant Churches in Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other NGOs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ DWHH (German Agro Action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ CARITAS (German Caritas Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Medica Mondiale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Pax Christi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ FKH (Friedenskreis Halle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ SHL (Schüler helfen Leben)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the BMZ Evaluation Division had commissioned the GTZ Crisis Prevention and Conflict Transformation Project to conduct the survey, the first step was to identify and contact all relevant German executing institutions. Not all contacted NGOs agreed to submit their project files, thus not all ongoing activities could be included in the survey. The following diagram shows percentage figures for participation of institutions by project submitted:

**Figure 1: Participation of Institutions by Project (in %)**
3. Survey Results – Key Observations

3.2.2. Selection of Projects

Unfortunately, no comprehensive country list of ALL German bilateral and non-governmental cooperation projects per recipient country was available for selecting projects for the survey. Instead, the survey team had to proceed step by step with the participating institutions in receipt of funds from the German Government, check all projects with the respective regional divisions for each recipient country, and draw up a list of the relevant individual projects.

It emerged in these discussions that notions of what peace building actually meant differed greatly not only amongst but even within participant institutions. The only exceptions were the projects run in the recipient countries Guatemala and Colombia. In talks with the various regional desk officers it became clear that the definition of the focal area of German development cooperation as “Peace and Reconciliation” (Guatemala as of 2000) or “Promotion of Peace and Crisis Management” (Colombia as of 2001) had made a large contribution to arriving at a reasonably consistent concept of peace building.

Thanks to conflict-sensitive portfolio realignment in countries such as Guatemala and Colombia, more projects than were actually included in the survey had a clear and pronounced peace building component, whereas in countries such as Mozambique it was difficult to detect a direct project link to the prevailing post-war situation and peace building. In selecting projects, therefore, the survey team had to draft its own guidelines to make case-by-case decisions on whether to include a project or not.

The initial benchmark for this was the description given in the PRIO terms, also intended to help facilitate project selection (see Annex 6.1.):

"...the survey operates with a concept of peace building activities that reflects on the implementation of the same kind of activities under other headings – peace building uses a variety of tools from a range of different toolboxes. When these activities are part of peace building rather than, say, development it is not necessarily because the activity itself is different but because its context and purposes are specific to peace building – the context of crisis and conflict and the purpose of making things as peaceful as possible".

To these broad and vague terms of reference, the survey team added the distinction between a direct/explicit and a rather indirect/implicit link of the project to peace building. Projects with a direct link to peace building (such as demobilisation or trauma healing/counselling) were easy to classify. Projects with an indirect, imputed link were more difficult: Here, the team looked closely at the context and the purpose of project activities, but they also sounded out in interviews with persons familiar with or in charge of the projects whether the project design revealed an intent, awareness or consciousness of
the peace building impacts\textsuperscript{21}. In the survey a total of 58 projects had a direct link to peace building (65%) and 31 projects showed an indirect link (35%).

The analysis of the peace building approaches adopted by the individual organisations in chapter 3.3. shows clearly that this selection method served the intended purpose, and despite the stipulation of selection criteria left enough room for the current diversity of opinions on and interpretations of peace building – provided they had a tenable rationale.

### 3.2.3. Methodology

#### Building the database

The database for the 89 projects consisted of around 500 records (project descriptions, annual reports, evaluation reports, relevant studies…) which had to be gathered through 200 to 300 individual initiatives. To take the GTZ as an example: To compile the needed information for one single project, 2-4 contacts had to be made. The first source of information was the files that are kept at GTZ Head Office. Because of the organisational structure of GTZ, the files had to be gathered from the regional as well as from the sectoral desk officers. In some cases and for certain background information, the project or programme manager of the respective project / programme had to be contacted in the field, and in some cases even the director of the GTZ office of the recipient country played a crucial role as resource person.

The period of time covered by this study was 1997 – 2001. Due to the lack of institutional memory going back further than 3-4 years (1999/2000), it was in some cases necessary to contact further persons who had been in charge of the projects in the past and who could provide information on earlier stages of the projects.

Where interviews were used to complement project documents, this is indicated in the questionnaires.

#### Project summaries

The projects were analysed by completing a questionnaire of 14 questions, focussing on actors, activities, strategic approach, objectives and impacts. In filling out these questions, the team of German researchers concentrated on the aspect “what does work and what does not work” – e.g. in the analysis of the Trincomalee Integrated Food Security Project (IFSP) in Sri Lanka, the positive impacts to date, as well as the constraints, were described. One question about the basic data of the project aimed at the period/phase of

\textsuperscript{21} A good example of this is an FC road rehabilitation project in Cambodia including a demining component, which demarcated the project regions according to which provinces were most heavily affected by the war and where many returnees had to be resettled.
the project and the budget spent during that time. Whilst the comprehensive terms of reference elaborated by PRIO for all 4 Utstein-Countries required a detail description of the spending pattern and its evolution (see Annex 6.1.), this detailed analysis was not possible for most of the German projects. Since the budget of each project is related to a given project phase of about 3-4 years (Technical and Financial Cooperation) or at least 1-2 years (foundations, churches, NGOs), the exact spending pattern per year could not be ascertained (e.g. when the phases under investigation covered the period 1995-1998 (phase 1) and 1999-2002 (phase 2)).

Therefore it was not possible to identify the exact amount of money that a country had received through German development cooperation for peace building activities during the period of time under review. This meant that the anticipated conclusions concerning the evolution and change of the spending patterns within the broad categories – security / socio-economic / political / reconciliation – could not be drawn. Given that this was the case, another interesting aspect (which was not included in the terms of PRIO) could also not be given due consideration: It was not possible to draw any conclusions concerning contributions of the German Government to peace building activities as compared with overall German aid spending in the survey countries. However, a clear institutional pattern could be observed concerning the budget and sector categories:

Table 3: Main Actors of German Development Cooperation – Sectors and Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Euro</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Socio-economic</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Reconciliation</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GTZ/ Foundations</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>Foundations/ Churches</td>
<td>Foundations/ NGOs</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - 1 million</td>
<td>GTZ/ Churches</td>
<td>Foundations/ NGOs</td>
<td>Churches/ Foundations/ DED</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 million</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>GTZ/ KfW</td>
<td>GTZ/ NGOs/ Foundations</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project documentation

The basic documents that were analysed in this study were project proposals that the implementing bodies of German development cooperation prepare for the BMZ, and the project short descriptions (two pages). Further materials used were the annual and final project reports, as well as proposals for subsequent phases of the project and the evaluations. Internal evaluations are mostly undertaken by consultants on behalf of the
institution concerned, while external evaluations are mostly commissioned by the BMZ. Table 4 illustrates the allocation pattern of the evaluations that have been available or at least accessible for the study.

**Table 4: Pattern of External and Internal Evaluations from 1995 to 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ext</td>
<td>int</td>
<td>ext</td>
<td>int</td>
<td>ext</td>
<td>int</td>
<td>ext</td>
<td>int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of consulted evaluation reports was 60, carried out in about 45 projects – in other words: Half of the (total of 89) analysed projects had between 1 and 3 evaluation reports that were made accessible and consequently used in the survey. Between the recipient countries the number of reports for the relevant period varied between 2 (Afghanistan) and 12 (Mozambique). 75% of the evaluations were internal and conducted predominantly after the year 2000. The remaining 25% of external evaluations also tended to have been conducted after 2000. These figures have to be handled with care since at least 35% of the included projects have only an indirect relation to peace building (see above). Accordingly, a certain part of these evaluations are of a general or other sectoral nature and do not focus on peace building (see also chapter 3.4.).

**Quality checking and general observations**

To check the reliability of the completed questionnaires, they were in most cases sent to the responsible desk officer at GTZ Head Office in Germany, or to the team leader in the field. About 80% of all questionnaires were cross-checked in this way, thus ensuring at least a minimum of quality checking and verification.

One general and significant aspect is the fact that the Utstein study focuses on the project or programme level (micro level), but not on the country level (macro level). Hence country-related strategies or mainstreaming-oriented approaches are neglected by the prescribed survey approach. Due to the fact that in the German context these aspects are important in understanding the overall peace building approach, the German contribution
to the Utstein study integrated these aspects through supplementary specific country papers, in which country-related issues were explicitly taken into account and separately documented. In Annex 6.4, the five country papers on Afghanistan, Cambodia, Guatemala, Sri Lanka and Rwanda comment on the German donor strategy towards the country concerned, and country-specific portfolio development for peace building, crisis prevention and conflict transformation.

3.3. Project Activities, Portfolio, Consistency and Statistical Overview

The survey of programmes in the nine countries chosen for the Utstein evaluation clearly shows three different types of country-specific PB approaches and portfolio designs.

**Figure 2: Types of Country-specific Peace Building Approach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries with specific conflict-sensitive orientation (PB as focal area)</th>
<th>Countries with PB-orientation on the level of project purpose or project activities</th>
<th>Countries with some PB-activities but without any system or defined strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Countries with specific conflict-sensitive orientation (PB as focal area)

The first group contains 3 countries with a special, conflict-sensitive orientation: Guatemala, Colombia, Sri Lanka. The BMZ has agreed with five partner countries (Guatemala, Colombia, Sri Lanka, Senegal and Burundi) to make Conflict Transformation and Peace Building one of their focal areas. In these countries, projects of German development cooperation are on the way to being “streamlined” at the country level, in which connection they are required to specify their direct or indirect relation to PB issues. Parallel to this streamlining process, for all 3 countries the elaboration of Sector Strategy Papers has been tackled recently. Although this development of a country-specific sector strategy is still under way, the survey did show that PB or related topics such as peace education or reconciliation are already found very often in the projects at the level of the overall goal, the project purpose or the conceptual approach. Commensurate with the degree of strategic incorporation of PB into development cooperation as a priority area, those countries usually have a high degree of vertical and horizontal consistency within their PB approach.
In the case of Colombia, the agreement to make Peace Building and Conflict Transformation a focal area was reached in 2001. In consequence, almost all German development cooperation projects have adapted their project concepts or are in the process of reorientation. Through this re-orientation and the recent contribution of German development cooperation to certain PB-related aspects of the National Development Plan of Colombia a high level of coherence was created, which supplements the already existing vertical consistency. In Sri Lanka, Conflict Transformation and Peace Building became a focal area in 1999/2000. This was in effect the final expression of an ongoing process (since 1997/98) in which the whole country portfolio of German development cooperation had been adjusted to mainstreaming the issue of PB in response to the effects of a protracted civil war. In consequence, vertical and horizontal consistency has also been established. A more thorough analysis of the Sri Lankan programme can be found in chapter 4 (specific examples of peace building).

**B. Countries with a PB-oriented project purpose or project activity**

The second group contains those countries where there is neither a specified donor policy nor any emphasis given to PB through any official or strategic orientation but in which, in spite of this, the topic has been integrated into many project activities. This group includes Rwanda, Kenya, Cambodia and Bosnia. At times, PB is even located at the level of the overall goal, project purpose or conceptual approach of the projects (e.g. in Rwanda, where conflict prevention, reconciliation, peace and solidarity and peaceful cohabitation of different ethnic groups are formulated as overall goals or the project’s purpose). But in most of these projects, PB is located at the level of project activities. Kenya and Bosnia represent good examples where both approaches could be found: Some projects mention PB/CP as part of the project purpose, and there are many projects where these thematic issues are integrated into the activities (conflict analysis, training of local staff, community-based conflict management, etc.).

Another situation is that of Cambodia, which also belongs to this second group. There is also no official statement or paper that describes the role of PB in the country programme; nevertheless, many of the involved actors and institutions of development cooperation regard PB as well as CP/CM as inherent elements of German development cooperation, in the sense that the alignment of the portfolio seeks to help facilitate a stability-creating development process in this post-conflict country. Despite this inherent focus on PB at the macro level, only a few projects (mostly those of the political foundations) have integrated PB into the goal/project purpose level or into the level of the results to be achieved. Most German TC and FC projects do not make any PB/CP/CM approaches explicit, but have started sporadically to integrate elements of CP/CM into their activities (e.g. involving pagoda committees and local NGOs in the settlement of land disputes in the Land Management Project of German TC).
As a result of the lack of political or strategic orientation towards PB, coupled with the quite wide range of the analysed portfolio designs in this second group, the vertical and horizontal consistencies vary widely. While vertical consistency is absent in Kenya and Bosnia, it is improving in Rwanda\(^{22}\) and Cambodia\(^{23}\). In terms of horizontal consistency, the picture is somewhat clearer. While there is no significant horizontal consistency in Rwanda, due to competition within the donor community, and just a very delicate and insufficient consistency in Kenya\(^{24}\), only Bosnia and Cambodia have established stronger horizontal cooperation mechanisms for steering of development cooperation at the multilateral donor level. In the case of Cambodia, the World Bank has initiated regular meetings of a consultative group, where representatives of the most important donor countries meet to coordinate their strategies in the country. In Bosnia, the stability pact, where 24 donor countries and 6 international organisations cooperate in the areas of democratisation and human rights, economic reconstruction and security is an important and extra-ordinary steering instrument.

### C. Countries with some PB activities but without any system or defined strategy

Additionally, a third group of countries can be identified that contains the post-conflict countries Afghanistan and Mozambique. Despite the socio-economic and political situation there is no defined PB strategy at the country level and no coherent implementation of concepts and approaches in the area of PB which – nevertheless – do exist to some extent. In Afghanistan, TC and FC have consolidated work in the field of Development-Oriented Emergency Aid and some other areas, but an adequately institutionalised link to the German political foundations or the NGOs does not as yet exist. Efforts to establish an institutional structure for international coordination have had some success, but that structure remains limited in scope. In Mozambique, specific PB approaches have been neglected since 1996. Instead, the orientation of development cooperation has been shifted to other classical policy areas like socio-economic and institutional development where peace building has become an integrated element (a deeper analysis of Mozambique can be found in chapter 4 (specific examples of peace building).

In all nine examined countries it is clear that the issues of peace building, crisis prevention and conflict management have become increasingly relevant and important during the last

\(^{22}\) Since 2001, when peace building was made to one sub-component of the focal area “democratisation”.

\(^{23}\) In Cambodia, peace building was an inherent element of German development cooperation from the very beginning (German development cooperation started in Cambodia in 1992). The preservation of peace and support of stability are defined as overall goal in the foreign policy of Germany. In 1998, this orientation became even more visible, since the new German Government put much emphasis on considering the political dimension of development cooperation in project designs and concepts.

\(^{24}\) Mainly established within the TC through the COMANI-initiative in which the issue of PB/CP/CM was mainstreamed and integrated into other TC-projects; a deeper analysis of the COMANI example will follow in chapter 4 (specific examples of peace building).
few years (from the mid- to the late 90s). During this process of growing awareness of the importance of peace building concepts, approaches and activities, the survey countries started to develop certain individual strategies to match the need to consider these issues. Some started to adjust their whole country portfolio, some paid more attention to implementing consistent PB concepts at the project level and others just designed sporadic PB activities.

Until the mid-90s, German TC and FC were only in exceptional cases the driving forces behind the explicit integration of aspects of peace building into country/programme portfolios. Peace building was more focused on by political foundations and churches, which are usually less overburdened with bureaucratic procedures and therefore proved to be quicker to react, more flexible and at times more innovative in dealing with such topics; this could be seen in Colombia, Bosnia, Kenya and Cambodia, for example. Other reasons for their success could be the choice of the respective intervention level and their many years of experience in the fields of civil society promotion, democratisation and civic education, support of marginalised sections of the population (thematic issues that only emerged in TC relatively recently, and started to be integrated into TC approaches in a consolidated way only about 5 years ago).

By the end of the 90s, German TC had developed it’s own competency in the fields of PB/CP/CM as well as in the area of good governance, and two years ago German TC also started to professionalise in the mainstreaming, dissemination, cross-sectoral integration and PB-sensitive portfolio adaptation. Nowadays the complementarity between the approaches of the political foundations and churches on the one hand, and TC as well as FC on the other hand, has become much clearer and is pursued in a number of ways, as illustrated in the next chapters.

Table 5: Statistical Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Budget in €</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Socio-economic</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Reconciliation</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1x GTZ</td>
<td>1x KAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 – 500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1x GTZ</td>
<td>1x Caritas</td>
<td>2x FES</td>
<td>2x FES</td>
<td>1x GTZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1x Pax Christi</td>
<td>1x HBS</td>
<td>1x SHL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1x EED</td>
<td>1x FKH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1x HBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1x Medica Mondiale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The allocation pattern shows that about one third of the projects fall within the sector “socio-economic”, with emphasis on activities for reconstruction and infrastructure. A second third of the sample belongs to the sector “political”, where contributions to democratisation and good governance take centre stage. Finally, about one sixth (1/6) of the projects have a clear affiliation with the sector category “reconciliation”, mainly in the areas of promotion of grass-roots dialogue and cultural bridge-building.

Further observations on the portfolio

- The integration of PB/CP/CM into a country portfolio has to be considered at least as a mid-term, and more often as a long-term process. Cases like Sri Lanka and to some extent Colombia and Guatemala demonstrate that portfolio adaptation is a lengthy process. From the point in time when the political decision is taken to its actual realisation within the portfolio of German development cooperation, it takes about two to three years. This time is needed to develop a suitable strategy, to coordinate approaches with the partner, to screen/verify the options and to prepare for implementation before the respective measures can be put into practice.

- Most of the examined projects and programmes have a budget of more than € 1 million (66% of the selected projects). This figure usually relates to one operational phase of a project/programme of TC/FC or 2-3 operational project phases of
foundations or churches\textsuperscript{25}, and reflects the fact that most official German development cooperation projects are planned on this financial scale. About 20\% of the projects have a budget of under EUR 500,000, most of them conducted by foundations and churches.

- Roughly speaking there is a division of labour between the different actors: While TC focuses on the wider field of capacity-building on all levels (from the ministry to the community level), FC concentrates more on reconstruction. Finally, the foundations have placed civic education and democratisation at the top of their priorities, whereas churches focus much more strongly on human rights and support for victims of conflicts (see also chapter 3.3.).

- KfW has demonstrated a strong conceptual and political interest in reinforcing its efforts to integrate PB/CP/CM as cross-cutting issues into its regional and country-specific portfolios. Examples where German FC is already “on the way to peace building” are Cambodia (Project of Tertiary Road Rehabilitation (TRIP), whose project concept aimed at supporting the resettlement of refugees/IDPs and at facilitating reconciliation) and Guatemala (Rural Primary Education project, where reducing discrimination against the indigenous population is included in the overall goal).

- In Sri Lanka, Colombia and Guatemala (and to some extent in Mozambique), German development cooperation has a clear regional orientation towards regions that are economically or socially most affected by war and/or conflict. In some cases, the country portfolio also includes a focus on work with ethnic or religious minorities (Guatemala, Colombia).

**Conclusions regarding consistency among German actors**

Vertical as well as horizontal consistency is strongly related to the design of the respective portfolio (each reflects the quality of the other). In countries where Peace Building and Conflict Transformation has been declared to be one of the focal areas, vertical consistency increased significantly. In general, the thematic direction and inner cohesion of PB approaches (= horizontal consistency) among many German actors is insufficient and should be improved.

Coherence with respect to a partner country is understood here to mean the attempt to align peace building activities within a jointly elaborated framework. Such guiding frameworks are seen as outlining the scope of action and content agreed on between all actors. As such they would afford a certain transparency, whilst at the same time allowing key scope for all participating organisations to operate self-responsibly and self-reliantly. Governmental and non-governmental actors would then be able to incorporate their particular interests and strengths into the joint framework. These framework-building

\textsuperscript{25} The political foundations have usually project phases of 1 year, whereas a project phase of TC or FC takes 3-4 years.
processes do not yet exist, and should be elaborated by all German actors in conflict regions in conjunction with the drawing up of roadmaps to peace.

It would also be appropriate that this approach be pursued at the international level, and implemented in accordance with the range of actors involved.

Moving beyond partner-country-based coherence, German actors should also continue to generally develop their processes of exchange and open cooperation. With regard to cooperation between governmental and non-governmental organisations, steps were already initiated with the change of government. The expansion of the CPS and the establishment of the FriEnt working group are important examples of this. Yet here too, far-reaching improvements would be possible, without having to call into question the self-reliance and specificity of the respective actors, and especially the non-governmental ones. This is particularly relevant because many governmental actors and policymakers have taken notice of certain issues and placed them on their agenda only after those issues had first been raised by non-governmental actors. The experiences and advocacy work of churches, other NGOs and the political foundations for instance made a significant contribution towards the fact that the calls for "democratisation" and "peace consolidation" are seen by the government today as being more directly linked to sustainable change / grass-roots back-up measures in partner countries (including for instance support for human/civil rights work, decentralisation programmes and the CPS). This link came to be perceived independently of the major importance of the cooperation programmes at the central level, so-called political dialogue, consultation and participation in international committees.

Nevertheless, there remains a need to further develop and shape the paradigm shift that has occurred with regard to cooperation and coherence between governmental and non-governmental actors.

3.4. Instruments, Methods, Approaches

3.4.1. Understanding and Development of Peace Building

No concise understanding of peace building as a method, concept or approach could be identified among the German development cooperation institutions or individual actors in the survey countries. During the survey, the researchers encountered many different interpretations of the term “peace building”. Sometimes it was placed on the same level as good governance, democratisation, political participation or support of the civil society; on other occasions it was closely linked with the work of certain (prominent) themes such as demobilisation, peace education or the work of the Civil Peace Service (CPS – for further information, see chapter 4.4.). Besides this more or less sectoral view and interpretation
of the term “peace building”, many discussion partners also understood it as a cross-cutting and integrated element that is part of a project or portfolio design and has its own meaning and methods. Another interpretation of PB was merely context-oriented, based on the notion that any development cooperation in (post)-conflict situations contributes to the peace process. Finally, the manner in which peace building was interpreted and practised in the survey countries very often displays the presence of all these three approaches (the issue-oriented approach, the cross-sector integration and the context orientated approach).

One major aspect of the quality with which approaches to peace building can be supported in a specific country is the position of institutional partners in the country itself. In many cases the government of the partner country is a conflict actor itself, thus making policy dialogue and agreement on a support strategy by an external donor even more urgent and at the same time more difficult. Development cooperation approaches which aim at a network of partners on different PB tracks are therefore generally more successful, as the cases of Sri Lanka and Guatemala demonstrate. Such approaches were chosen to lead the political dialogue with the official partner (usually the key ministries of the partner government,) while at the same time being able to support civil society organisations.

It is essential to conduct a balanced analysis of the constellation of the executing agencies, and take appropriate account of the different executing institutions in this context. The executing institutions and counterparts selected should constitute a broad and diversified mix so as to really encompass the various actors, in an attempt to defuse and overcome existing social tensions. The point is not just to include and cooperate more with so-called civil-society actors (national and regional universities; private sector; church; social movements and organisations; research and training institutions in human rights and conflict management), but also to improve and strengthen capabilities for dialogue and negotiation between governmental and non-governmental actors.

One other notable aspect in the handling of the fairly broad and diverse interpretations of peace building is the growing sensitivity of the different actors towards the distinction between the two main concepts, “working in conflict (in an indirect way)” and “working on conflict (in a direct way)”. One positive example in this context is the strategic approach to PB in German development cooperation in Bosnia. As a direct approach, personnel from CPS were integrated as neutral and recognised experts into the partner structures of local projects (in the context of work with refugees and youth); whereas – as part of an indirect approach - GTZ and KfW focused on the reconstruction of the infrastructure and the re-establishment of economic, political and administrative structures, as well as on obtaining the support of returning IDPs and refugees.
3. Survey Results – Key Observations

3.4.2. Typical Instruments and Approaches to Peace Building

Technical Cooperation (TC)

In general (as well as in the context of PB approaches), TC operates in various fields and policy areas and concentrates on the wider field of empowerment and capacity-building of governmental and non-governmental institutions. For the implementation of projects, German TC operates on all relevant levels - from the grass roots up to the governmental/decision-making level - and is therefore able to utilise (at least in principle) all available approaches necessary for peace building.

The survey revealed two principal TC project approaches to PB: on the one hand, PB-related solutions are aimed at by using the right mix of measures selected from the proven TC repertoire26, aiming at the achievement of structural stability. Within this TC repertoire, typical issues with which PB was very closely associated were projects/programmes for “good governance” or “development-oriented emergency aid”. Therefore, many of the examined projects with the indirect PB-approach of the “right mix” are to be found in the context of one of those two areas of activity.

On the other hand, PB could also be supported by direct project contributions in the narrower context of the crisis or conflict (e.g. in the case of Guatemala, through specially designed projects such as the “reconciliation process”, “inter-cultural dialogue and political participation of indigenous people” or “education for peace and democracy”). Additionally, there are some recently established areas with strong direct links to peace building such as “small arms” (one project in Kenya and one in Cambodia) or “community-based peace building” (as in the project “paths to peace ” – “caminos para la paz” in Colombia). In those cases where projects followed a direct PB approach, the most important basic rule of intervention was the “do no harm” principle.

An important dimension in the field of TC activities is the “research and development”-work on new approaches and innovative instruments. Besides the general development of methods and instruments for conflict analysis and assessment as well as for approaches to conflict resolution, some specific regional adaptations of those instruments have been developed. For example, in the context of the recently (2001) established "Working Group on Development and Peace" (FriEnt), German TC (GTZ) and one of the political foundations (Friedrich Ebert Foundation – FES) have been working together to further develop and adapt PCIA methods for deployment in Afghanistan.

German TC has recently taken up two issues which are innovative and important for the future orientation of PB. They are described in detail in chapter 4.3., which examines

26 E.g. through the large-scale support of the ongoing multi-sectoral state reforms in a post-conflict country like Cambodia.
trauma healing/reconciliation and youth work. Equally remarkable and highly innovative is the GTZ Project “Support for the Peace Process and National Reconciliation” in Guatemala (support consisting of psycho-social measures in Mayan communities particularly badly affected by the civil war). This project has chosen an extraordinarily sensitive approach designed to integrate a socio-cultural dimension into the political and socio-economic activities for PB.

Financial Cooperation (FC)

The contribution made by FC to post-war stabilisation and peace building encompasses the following areas: reconstruction of infrastructure and the establishment of institutional structures, job creation and income generation, the strengthening of groups suffering ethnic discrimination, demining, and the reintegration of former fighters and soldiers.

The contributions of Financial Cooperation via the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW) comprise the categories "reconstruction", "investment in infrastructure" and "investment in health and education". Within these three categories, some FC projects offer remarkable examples of innovative concepts. In Cambodia, for example, the relationship to PB/CP/CM is not highlighted explicitly in the documents (which do not mention any such strategy), but instead through thematic linkages such as mine clearance in the area of road construction, or the focus on IDPs as a target group. In the project “Programa Nacional de Autogestion para el Desarrollo Educativo” (PRONADE) in Guatemala, the KfW has a very explicit relation to the conflict: besides seeking to improve the national school education system, reducing discrimination against indigenous population groups is also aimed at. By supporting the participation of groups suffering discrimination, by encouraging them to articulate their political will and by taking their interests into consideration, KfW seeks to defuse the social conflict potential. These two KfW projects are notable as they demonstrate an increasing shift of attention towards the integration of PB/CP/CM into national and regional strategies as cross-cutting issues.

In this context both FC and TC are profiting from the growing importance of CP/PB within German development cooperation, and the resulting flexibilisation of the approval procedures for development cooperation projects. This is the case particularly in acute post-conflict assistance and reconstruction, as it is becoming increasingly possible to respond promptly and flexibly to a situation in a country, and to employ quick-acting measures with a high impact on security (see above). Within the scope of German development cooperation, and FC in particular, such measures are becoming increasingly important, and make a significant contribution towards stabilisation, normalisation and peace building in regions recovering from war or conflict.

Human Resources Cooperation

Human Resources Cooperation is a key element of all instruments of German development cooperation, especially in PB-related measures and activities. It aims to
enable people and organisations in partner countries to develop their skills and expertise to their true potential.

In general the PB-related Human Resources Cooperation of the three Development Services does not operate at the national macro level but at the meso and micro levels. It may complement other activities at the macro level. Human Resources Cooperation projects cooperate with NGOs rather than GOS. The German experts in Human Resources Cooperation projects are integrated into local structures, and are mainly engaged in political and reconciliation issues (such as democratisation, institution building, human rights, promotion of dialogue between antagonistic groups, bridge-building in society, truth and reconciliation). The German personnel in these projects train, support and advise local partners and organisations who are engaged in PB/CP/CM related issues.

Three development services operating in the field of Human Resources Cooperation were involved in this study. The projects in Kenya, Guatemala and Cambodia are part of the CPS programme. Established in 1999, the CPS is a new instrument of German Human Resources Cooperation, in which governmental and non-governmental organisations are involved. The basic concept behind the CPS is the deployment of appropriately qualified experts from the recognised development services. The tasks undertaken by CPS differ from the traditional tasks of the development services in that they involve targeted measures to promote the non-violent transformation of conflicts and crises. The first experiences of CPS are analysed more thoroughly in chapter 4.4.1.

For example, in Cambodia the projects of the CPS are designed in particular to help facilitate the development of communicative and mental processes to strengthen mechanisms of non-violent conflict transformation. They form part of the programmes of each partner organisation, by whom they are coordinated and managed. Therefore, the emphasis of Human Resources Cooperation lies on capacity building of partner organisations engaged in peace and human rights work, as well as on the support of measures to strengthen peace constituencies in Cambodia.

Political foundations

The Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS), the Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) and the Heinrich Böll Foundation (HBS) all have long-standing PB traditions: political and civic education, support for democratisation, support of institutional development (for NGOs and, at times, for political parties), civil society organisation, training of journalists/working with the media, etc. The overall goal of most of these foundations is to help improve the frame conditions for the stabilisation of peace, political participation and social stability. Two notable PB-related projects among the foundations should be mentioned. One is HBS’s “preservation of cultural heritage” in Cambodia, focusing on, among other issues, reconstruction and support of the Buddhist Institute as the largest and most important

27 (DED in Cambodia and Guatemala, AGEH in Kenya and WFD in Mozambique)
national institute of religious education and research. The other project is KAS’s “promotion of human rights” in Colombia, where the project is seeking to strengthen legal and political institutions in human rights policy through the training of relevant decision-makers. Both are important because they represent first steps in very delicate fields of cooperation, socio-cultural and religious areas and questions of human rights which have hitherto been addressed mostly by churches or NGOs.

In addition to these two notable PB-related projects of HBS and KAS, the FES approach to developing instruments and methods for conflict analysis and peace and conflict impact assessment should be mentioned. FES is increasingly active in this field, and is a driving force among German NGOs dealing with this issue. Country-specific conflicts analyses and assessments were implemented in Afghanistan (in cooperation with GTZ).

In most of the survey countries, the political foundations have established solid networks with local NGOs and churches/religious groups, and have worked consistently on all levels, from the grass roots up to ministry level.

**Churches and NGOs**

Churches and NGOs are usually active in emergency and food aid, in the struggle for human rights, civic conflict transformation, peace education, intercultural cooperation, reconciliation and in providing support for victims of conflicts and wars (ethnic, religious, social minorities or other conflict-affected persons, refugees, IDPs, etc.). Their intervention level is more or less confined to the grass roots, and their concepts start from the perspective of the victims. In some countries, they are involved quite strongly in the PB-related network of German development cooperation in general (as in Colombia). Only in some exceptional cases have the churches acted in highly political fields at the national level. One such example is Kenya, where the EED promoted peoples’ participation in the process of democratic reform through information dissemination, awareness training and civic education through its project “support for the civil society oriented activities of the National Council of Churches in Kenya”.

Another example is Cambodia, where the EED is currently acting on three intervention levels within the Demining of Villages and Resettlement of Refugees Programme. First of all the EED coordinates, together with local NGOs, the demining of villages. Secondly, it supports the resettlement and reintegration of refugees and IDPs in the cleared areas. And thirdly, it has launched an extensive advocacy campaign on mines, as well as having publicised the need to stop producing further mines. These activities show that the churches and NGOs are shifting the focus of their activities towards a more political and higher-level involvement: democratisation and reconciliation are increasingly regarded not only as a crucial field for development cooperation at the grass-roots level, where specific groups or conflict-affected regions/areas are focused on, but also as a challenge at national level.
Another major function that churches and NGOs perform is advocacy for the promotion of peace and peace building initiatives at both the national (German) and international levels. A prominent example of this kind of involvement is the EED-coordinated study on the role of coltan in Eastern Congo and the related “war economy”.

### 3.5. Evaluations

Because each of the participant institutions has its own system of processing project data and table of contents for evaluation reports, it was difficult to scan and evaluate the project information required for this study. GTZ and KfW evaluation reports were available for nearly all of the countries studied. Reports by political foundations were not accessible to the same extent. Access to evaluation reports by churches and NGOs was either denied or no such reports existed. For some countries (Kenya, Sri Lanka and Rwanda) it was possible – at least for some projects – to make use of external evaluations and especially of the “Klingebiel Study”\(^28\) (see below). However, the sample of evaluation reports consulted lacked both conflict-orientated indicators, and a systematic conflict impact assessment.

As already indicated, the current state of knowledge on the impacts of German PB activities in the context of development cooperation is very limited. Besides the Utstein initiative of this survey, there has been essentially only one overall evaluation focussing on this aspect – the above-mentioned impact study by Stephan Klingebiel which was undertaken on behalf of the BMZ in 1998/1999\(^29\). Another important analysis in the context of peace building was the evaluation of the Civil Peace Service (CPS), undertaken in 2001/2002 (8 country case studies, among other in Bosnia). Moreover, German development cooperation is making increasing efforts to assimilate crisis prevention, conflict management and peace building as major cross-sectoral topics in other sectoral evaluations. An assessment of the recommendations of the Utstein study coupled with the findings of the Klingebiel study could provide a basis for starting to prepare an overall strategy for evaluating peace building activities within the ministry responsible (BMZ).

Important aspects of the Klingebiel study:

- The aim of the evaluation was to examine the role German development cooperation has played in conflicts and crises in the past. It looked both at aspects that defused and those that aggravated conflicts. The study is a cross-section report on six internal country studies (evaluating the cases of Ethiopia, El Salvador, Kenya, Mali, Sri Lanka and Rwanda, as countries in different phases of conflict) covering more or less the period from 1991 to 1998.

---


At the macro level (the influence of overall German development cooperation), the impacts in the cases of Sri Lanka and Kenya are quite positive, while the study on Rwanda reaches a generally negative conclusion.

At the micro level (individual projects and programmes), rehabilitation and reconstruction measures by German TC in Sri Lanka made particularly constructive contributions by normalising and stabilising the economic and social situation in conflict regions. In Kenya, the direct action taken by the churches to resolve conflicts in areas of unrest promoted peace. It helped to make political processes more transparent and to improve the quality of political debate at the national and local levels.

The Klingebiel study showed that conflict awareness and professionalism in dealing with it in German development cooperation improved in the course of the 1990s. The study itself was one important factor in prompting more reflection and discussion, and the improvement of new strategies and activities for crisis prevention, conflict management and peace promotion at different levels.

As several new instruments and approaches for peace building in the German context (like FriEnt) and most of the conflict related measures in the partner countries (such as all the CPS projects) began after 1999/1998, it is too early to observe and assess the impacts in depth in this survey. Nevertheless, the Utstein survey findings do confirm some crucial observations of Klingebiel, and underline the fact that awareness and professionalism have clearly improved further in recent years.

Several recommendations made in the Klingebiel study, some of general and some of more country-specific relevance, were accorded priority and implemented by the countries concerned – at least to some extent.

In the Sri Lanka case study, Klingebiel recommends that:
- Overall, greater account should be taken of the conflict situation in development cooperation in Sri Lanka.
- A conceptual interface for conflict should be developed for German development cooperation, which could then also help define the focal area in Sri Lanka and accord higher priority to conflict management/prevention.
- Through conflict impact assessments, the conflict should be included as a trans-sectoral facet in individual development cooperation measures. The question of whether a development measure has or can have an impact on the conflict should be included more in project planning, implementation and monitoring.

As the mainstreaming of conflict and demarcation of the focal area in Sri Lanka indicates, the major recommendations of the study have been implemented (cf. 4.1.1.)
In the substudy on Kenya, Klingebiel’s recommendations include the following:

- The flow and transparency of information on conflict amongst the different actors should be improved in general.

- Starting from regional conflict analysis, a general preventive strategy should be developed for Kenya, drawing attention to the threat of violence and escalation at an early stage. The conflict management experience of different development cooperation actors should also be evaluated, and on the basis of the conflict analyses interfaces between development measures and the course of the conflict should be identified, and approaches developed for peaceable conflict management at project level.

- In general, project planners’ and practitioners’ awareness of the role of development cooperation in mitigating crises should be raised through training in methods of peaceful conflict management, and transfer of the analytical essentials for classifying individual crisis phenomena.

The GTZ-assisted measure COMANI makes a major contribution to implementing some recommendations of the substudy (for more details see 4.1.2)

Moreover, the Klingebiel study makes major general recommendations for German development cooperation, such as:

- Procedures and instruments of German development cooperation in conflict situations should be revised and adjusted.

- New forms of cooperation between governmental and non-governmental actors should be created.

- Peace building issues should be mainstreamed and established as trans-sectoral tasks.

- The training and professionalisation of personnel should be improved.

These recommendations were implemented in different ways and at different levels, and some of them are analysed in detail in this study:

- All relevant facets of the given recommendations have been picked up and converted into action by the creation of the Crisis Prevention and Conflict Management Project, which is mandated to develop innovative instruments that enable German development cooperation to deal with crises and conflicts in the field, to mainstream the topic and to contribute to capacity building inside and outside of Germany.

- As an example of more flexible procedures, see 4.4.2 on National Peace Funds.

- As an example of cooperation between governmental and non-governmental donors, see 4.4.1 on the setting up of the Civil Peace Service and 4.4.3 on the establishment of FriEnt.
3. Survey Results – Key Observations

- The case studies on Sri Lanka and Kenya cited in 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 can serve as examples of increased mainstreaming of the whole topic.
- One example of improving personnel training is the CPS, described in 4.4.3.

As the above shows, the Klingebiel study has given a major strategic impetus both to the work of individual countries and to German development aid.

3.6. Institutional Relations

PB activities take place in a complex institutional landscape, both on the part of the involved donor agencies and on the part of the partner country. Therefore, institutional coordination with the aim of achieving greater coherence has been a permanent, and to some extent a contentious issue.

At the international level, coordination, cooperation and coherence have posed a major challenge that has often been insufficiently met. In the context of post-war situations, the UN has in many cases taken up a coordination mandate, as in the cases of Guatemala or Afghanistan. In Guatemala the cooperation between the UN mission and the German actors, especially GTZ, has been close, systematic and positive over a number of years, especially in the field of reconciliation. In Afghanistan, however, cooperation has taken place on a more occasional and selective basis, most prominently in the context of the Loya Jirga.

Cooperation between bilateral donors has likewise met with difficulties and has been mostly achieved among "likeminded PB organisations", such as GTZ and DFID in the case of Sri Lanka. Here, DFID has provided the GTZ-supported Fund for Local Initiatives in Conflict Transformation (FLICT) with a substantial financial contribution, which is managed by GTZ. Therefore, initiatives like the present one between the Utstein countries carry a lot of potential to foster cooperation and coherence by forging informal ties as well as a common conceptual understanding, which would be the basis for developing greater coherence.

Within Germany, the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) is the only responsible ministry for the projects involved in the survey. While the German Federal Foreign Office also has a grant facility to support measures for peace building and crisis prevention, the projects it supports are usually small and short-term in nature, and thus were not considered in this study.

For the purpose of coordination between different German organisations involved in the implementation of peace building activities in a specific country, the BMZ has in many instances established strategic country round tables, as in the case of Colombia. In other cases, such as Afghanistan, the need for coordination was so great that different
mechanisms were developed, such as an inter-agency working group within the BMZ, or a joint office structure in Kabul for GTZ and KfW.

Formal relations between the BMZ and the implementing agencies are either managed by means of contractual relations, fixed in the form of “commissions” as in the case of GTZ or KfW, or in the form of grants, as in the case of NGOs. A number of important NGOs (on the one hand the two important church-based organisations EED and Misereor, and on the other hand the political foundations) involved in PB receive block grants of several years’ duration, with only very general objectives and terms. A rather new but effective instrument within the formal cooperation is the recently (2001) established inter-agency Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt) (see chapter 4.4.3.).

Another form of formal cooperation on a more conceptual level has been the establishment of country round tables, common conflict assessments and harmonised country strategies between different organisations within German development cooperation.

Informal relations between German agencies have increased over recent years, both on an informal and on a formal level. Informally, cooperation on specific PB issues and methods has increased, as in the case of democratic decentralisation in Mozambique (supported by FES and GTZ).

Institutional relations with partner countries and their organisations are complex in the case of Germany. For TC and FC projects of official bilateral development cooperation, a political partner ministry and an implementing partner usually exist; the latter can be a line ministry, an NGO or another agency. The nine countries examined in the Utstein survey have diverse partner structures in which no general pattern can be observed. Of these, only Sri Lanka had developed its own peace building strategy, enshrined in a framework for Rehabilitation, Reconstruction and Reconciliation. The significance of this concept in Sri Lanka as a guiding framework for donor involvement in peace building in the country demonstrates the importance of such political frameworks as guidelines for institutional relationships.

Coordination structures in the respective country are of key importance, especially within the donor community, and between it and the partner country. However, in a number of cases significant weaknesses could be observed, as in Rwanda. In these cases, German agencies have sometimes been instrumental in establishing informal donor coordination rounds for specific PB issues, for example with regard to land reform in Cambodia (“peace alliance for land disputes”), or human rights issues in Rwanda (Réunions informels sur les droits de l’homme; “Friends of the commission”). However, in other cases such as in Guatemala, the establishment of so-called Consultative Groups represents an important step towards successful inter-agency coordination.
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The Utstein study, while focusing on empirical assessments of about 90 projects supported by German development cooperation actors in nine countries, revealed a wealth of information regarding the present state of the art in PB. Many of these insights did not concern the issues discussed above, but rather wider issues. In order to do justice to these learning aspects, the following chapter focuses on four specific dimensions:

- the strategic process of PB support in a specific country over a number of years (exemplified by Sri Lanka as a “best practice” example; the COMANI initiative in Kenya; and Afghanistan, due to its special status within the Utstein study).
- specific examples of innovative and challenging issues, such as trauma healing and reconciliation or youth programmes.
- observations on the long-term development of PB approaches in post-conflict countries such as the country portfolio in Mozambique (“From demobilisation and disarmament to socio-economic reform programmes in Mozambique”).
- specific new instruments within the German approach to PB, such as the Civil Peace Service, the National Peace Funds or the stronger institutional networking through the Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt).

Each of these topics offers valuable insights into present-day peace building approaches which, in many ways, offer additional lessons to be learnt and transfers to be made.

**Figure 3: Inter-institutional Relations in Peace Building**
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4.1.1. Mainstreaming Peace Building Approaches in Sri Lanka

Germany has been a partner in economic cooperation with Sri Lanka since 1958. In 1997, at the beginning of the evaluation period of the Utstein study, official German aid pledged to the country for a two year period amounted to roughly EUR 20 million. The overall objective of cooperation was poverty alleviation, while the project portfolio focused on physical infrastructure development (water and energy), regional development and natural resource management, as well as the education sector (primary education as well as vocational training) and private sector promotion.

The year 1997 marked the beginning of discussions about the reactions of German Development Cooperation to the protracted civil war which had just escalated between the Sinhalese-dominated government and the Tamil Tigers after a short recuperation period in 1995/96. It led to the establishment of three programmes which were intended to reduce the negative impacts of the conflict on the local population, regardless of their ethnic affiliation. Thus, two water supply programmes in contended regions were begun, and an Integrated Food Security Programme for the Trincomalee district was conceptualised. While this was the beginning of a systematic German involvement in conflict transformation, the emphasis (as well as the official labelling) of activities was still on development-oriented emergency aid.

While work in the traditional areas of German involvement continued, in 1999 two more projects with a conflict transformation orientation were agreed upon between the two governments: on one hand, rehabilitation measures in the conflict-affected Northeast province, and on the other hand, education programmes for conflict-affected children in the North, in which a trauma healing component was included.

In 2000, the German Government started to implement its strategy of focusing development cooperation contributions on just one to three focal areas. In the case of Sri Lanka, this meant a continuation of the overall objective of poverty alleviation, but with a clear focus and concentration now on the following two thematic areas:

- employment-oriented private sector promotion
- poverty alleviation and conflict transformation.

This marked the first time that "crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace building" – one of 11 priority areas of German development cooperation – was agreed upon between Germany and a partner country.
This thematic focus was further developed in bilateral negotiations in 2001, when new financial commitments of around EUR 25 million were made. Development cooperation was again concentrated on two thematic areas as above, but with a slightly different focus:

- private sector promotion and vocational training,
- poverty alleviation and conflict transformation, as a direct contribution to peace building.

The former focal area of basic education was retained, but with a significant shift in orientation towards conflict transformation and peace building. This reflected the fact that “working on the conflict” had become an increasing priority for both countries, as the ongoing war was increasingly affecting all sectors of society and had become the greatest obstacle to development. Germany therefore agreed to support the “Triple-R Framework” of the Sri Lankan Government, which focuses on a strategy of Relief, Rehabilitation and Reconciliation.

Today, the official development cooperation project portfolio consists of two parts: on the one hand, poverty alleviation projects or programmes which indirectly contribute to conflict transformation. Step-by-step, conflict sensitivity has been integrated into these programmes as a cross-cutting issue under the principle of “do no harm”. On the other hand, projects and programmes that are directly peace-building-oriented are also development-oriented in a larger sense. These projects and programmes are organised within a professional network which is increasingly mainstreaming professional conflict transformation know-how, such as conflict analyses, mediation skills, etc. New programmes such as a Fund for Local Initiatives in Conflict Transformation (FLICT) have recently been established (for details on the instrument of funds, see chapter 3.4.2.).

One important aspect of German support to Sri Lanka over the last few years which was key to the high regard in which Germany is held in the country, was the mobilisation of people and organisations for emergency-oriented development (such as with regard to water supply, school rehabilitation or food security), even during the last phase of the war. This was acknowledged by the people and political institutions of all ethnic groups in the country, and won their respect.

Cooperation and coherence with other development actors in the field of conflict transformation and peace building is organised through the Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies (CHA), which meets on a regular basis. As a result of this originally informal cooperation, several formal cooperation agreements have been developed for Sri Lanka. For example, the British Department for International Development (DFID) has started contributing to a GTZ-managed peace fund; the Dutch Embassy is supporting activities with regard to poverty and conflict monitoring; strategic partnerships have been established with the Asian Development Bank (ADB) for the programme on rehabilitation,
and with WFP for the food security programme in the Northeast; while similar arrangements are presently being discussed with the World Bank and UNHCR for the North and Northeast. In addition, the Swiss and German Governments are cooperating on a strategic R&D programme for the development of a resource network on conflict transformation and peace building at the national level.

The Resource Network on Conflict Studies and Transformation (RNCST) is a unique approach which tries to bring actors on all peace building tracks together for discussion in search of strategic solutions to the conflict. A roadmap for peace which differentiates the key peace building issues according to whether they are short, medium or long term is the main instrument by which political and civil dialogue on issues such as reconciliation, politico-administrative solutions to the conflict or demobilisation and reintegration are guided. International experiences from other post-conflict countries are systematically incorporated by involving experts from the areas of politics, business, security or civil society. RNCST has thus been able to become a significant contribution to the peace building discourse in Sri Lanka.

As a result of this strategic approach, the German Government has been able over the past few years to set up a programme with a high degree of vertical and horizontal coherence which practically works on all three levels of peace building. In addition, because of its involvement in the conflict-affected zones even during periods of hostility, German development cooperation was in an excellent position to significantly step up its peace building efforts once the Cease Fire Agreement between the Government and the LTTE was signed in February 2002. Since then, it has become a prominent, impartial partner for both sides in its efforts to help create a peaceful Sri Lanka.

With the establishment of the focal area and the intensification of the conflict-sensitive orientation of German development cooperation in Sri Lanka, crucial requirements of the Klingebiel study have been implemented.

4.1.2. GTZ-Kenya Conflict Management Initiative (COMANI)

COMANI is a self-financed measure set up by GTZ in order to address the political, social and economic conflict potentials in Kenya, mainly by supporting and consulting ongoing TC projects in the country.

COMANI was initially conceived as a 2-year pilot measure (1999-2001) and was extended just recently for a second phase of another 2 years (2002-2004). The main target groups were the CBO and development partners cooperating with GTZ in conflict-affected areas, Kenyan experts working in the context of PB/CP/CM and GTZ experts in the projects. Focusing on these target groups, COMANI aimed at promoting CP/CM related issues on two levels: on the one hand at the GTZ level by mainstreaming the issue in the selected GTZ projects and programmes, and on the other hand at a national level by creating and
supporting coordination and networking among relevant actors. The objective of COMANI was to make available applicable instruments and procedures for conflict resolution and crisis prevention, and pilot-test them.

The initiative aimed to achieve the following results in order to develop readily applicable procedures and instruments of CP/CM:

- Local experiences in crisis prevention and conflict resolution over and above the already existing data and material are evaluated and documented. Such experiences shall be within the framework of participatory planning procedures.
- Training courses that address potential crisis and conflicts in planning and implementation processes are developed and pilot-tested.
- A documentation and reference centre of tried and tested experiences in crisis prevention and conflict resolution is set up.

In Kenya, especially regional rural development projects operate in conflict affected areas. It was intended that COMANI would, in due course, be in a strategic position to facilitate and offer the following services to GTZ and partner-assisted TC measures:

- screening of CP/CM related concepts/proposals submitted by different agencies/partners.
- conduct of case-studies on specific CP/CM related issues.
- forum for debate of CP/CM-related issues in TC projects.
- reference centre for literature and information on relevant activities on CP/CM-related issues.

One major and essential achievement of COMANI was the development, mainstreaming and integration of CP/CM-related tools and concepts in the following GTZ projects: TDP (Transmara Development Project), IFSP-E (Integrated Food Security Programme East) and MDP (Marsabit Development Project). The experiences gained in these projects underline the importance of implementing CP/CM related issues in development cooperation measures operating in a conflict-affected environment, in order to facilitate a process of reflection, rethinking and modification of project strategies and activities.

This could be achieved either by integrating conflict-specific tools and instruments such as conflict analysis into all stages of the Project Cycle Management process, or by implementing conflict-related measures on the ground, such as community-based crisis prevention and conflict management.

Further achievements of COMANI were the preparation of a Country Conflict Risk Assessment and Map, the building of strategic alliances with different partners in the field of CM/CP, and CP/CM-specific training of project personnel.
Despite the short project duration and the limited resources available, COMANI has developed into an innovative, accepted and reliable initiative.

General conclusions of COMANI are:

- Through COMANI it became evident that the GTZ projects, as well as initiatives purporting to work on CP/CM in Kenya, lack adequate knowledge and experience to deal with CP/CM-related issues.
- The majority of development partners insist on the inclusion of CP/CM components as a prerequisite to funding. But due to the lack of sufficient expertise and capacities for CP/CM, many applicants only pay lip-service to this requirement.
- Development cooperation agencies should be proactive rather than reactive in addressing CP/CM issues.
- There is a clear need for recognised authority in CP/CM, in particular addressing TC measures.
- Functioning dialogue fora should be supported, with the aim of bringing together practitioners involved in CP/CM activities.
- None of the conflicts in Kenya occur and/or exist in isolation. Besides the need to understand the root causes of every conflict, it is also important to understand and address its context. Thus the subject of CP/CM is an integral and cross-cutting issue in matters of good governance, respect for human rights, poverty eradication, small arms control, equitable development etc.

The pilot phase demonstrated the importance and the need for a CP/CM mainstreaming instrument such as COMANI in a complex conflict situation like that of Kenya. Hence it is planned to continue the work within a second phase, with a special focus of GTZ activities in the project areas of TDP, MDP and GASP (German Assisted Settlement Programme).

4.1.3. Peace Building Activities in Afghanistan

Present-day Afghanistan must be seen as a country which is still not in a post-conflict phase, but rather in a situation of simmering conflict, partly due to the international war on terror which is still being pursued in parts of the country, and partly due to ongoing violent conflicts between regional warlords. The current conflicts have their origin in the almost 23-year-long “internationalised civil war”, which has left the country in an economic shambles compounded by social fragmentation and political delegitimisation – in short, in the situation of a failed state.

Prior to the Soviet invasion in 1978, Afghanistan was one of the main partner countries of German development cooperation. In the following years most of the bilateral development projects were suspended or phased out, leaving development aid to be channelled through various NGOs who implemented emergency and relief projects in
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Afghanistan as well as refugee-oriented projects in Pakistan. Support was also provided through financial contributions to multilateral organisations such as the WFP and UNHCR.

At the same time, BMZ funded some GTZ projects in Pakistan which focused on vocational training and basic education for Afghan refugees. From 1994 to 1997 GTZ implemented an emergency and relief programme, mainly with Afghan NGOs working cross-border from Pakistan into Afghanistan. With civil war continuing inside Afghanistan and only limited prospects of shifting activities into Afghanistan, these projects were phased out around 1996/1997, with the exception of the basic education project (BEFAR(e)). From the mid-nineties until September 2001, bilateral development projects were no longer considered, and NGO assistance was increasingly reduced and only occasionally granted. Only humanitarian aid was being granted, channelled through multilateral organisations.

After September 11 the situation changed dramatically. Due to the long-standing bilateral ties between Afghanistan and Germany, as well as the international responsibility towards Afghanistan in the context of the war against terror, Germany assumed a leading role in Afghanistan. Immediately after the demise of the Taliban Government, the BMZ sent a fact-finding mission to Afghanistan to identify immediate needs for emergency and relief assistance, as well as future focal points for bilateral development cooperation. In February 2002, on behalf of BMZ, GTZ launched a development-oriented emergency project to address needs in the field of social and physical infrastructure rehabilitation, and KfW launched programmes for the rehabilitation of schools, water supply, health posts, electricity supply, roads and street lighting. In April 2002, GTZ began implementing a good governance project which included gender-related activities, promotion of the judicial system, capacity-building for fiscal institutions, health and education, as well as conflict prevention/peace building involving aspects of conflict assessment, security sector reform and the demobilisation and reintegration of ex-combatants.

Germany has assumed an important role in the political process of the reconstitution of the Afghan Government. It hosted the Petersberg conference, and through GTZ provided technical assistance for the organisation of the Loya Jirga. The BMZ has categorised Afghanistan as a “priority partner country”, ensuring that the country will remain one of the focal points of German development cooperation.

With the inter-governmental negotiations of October 2002, the BMZ narrowed the focus of its contribution to “being directed towards the most rapid and efficient support for the reconstruction”.30 The rehabilitation of key sectors became the major focal area, while more directly peace-building-related activities, such as crisis prevention, security-sector reform, reintegration of combatants or justice reform, were either phased out or were

---

30 Minutes of the Meeting on Afghan-German Development Cooperation on 16 October 2002 in Kabul.
planned to be incorporated into the new focal areas as cross-cutting issues, or were scheduled to be continued only until 2004. However, Germany remains the lead country for the establishment and reform of the police force. A German country strategy to further coordinate and strategically orient the German inputs has yet to be developed. Peace building as a cross-cutting issue would still need to find a prominent place within such a country strategy.

The political foundations have started to develop specific profiles. While they generally operate rather independently of official bilateral cooperation, of late coordination and common work on specific issues, especially Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA), has started between FES and GTZ. While FES has started to develop a clear profile, focusing on peace building with democratic actors at the political and civilian levels, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) is more involved at the university level and in the media sector. The Heinrich Böll Foundation (HBS) is also involved in these thematic issues, but follows a clear mandate of strengthening civil society structures for peace building, concentrating on women as its main target group.

Other NGOs such as German Agro Action, Caritas or Medica Mondiale each have specific components which can be classified as directly peace-building-oriented, such as trauma work or the rehabilitation of victims of mines.

The example of Afghanistan shows that it is important in crisis countries to keep at least a minimal presence in the country or a neighbouring country. This is important in order to monitor the development of the conflict situation, to ensure continuity in the country, and to have a logistical base both in case peace building possibilities emerge, and to symbolise solidarity with the local population.

Capacity-building for peace building and crisis prevention is a key issue in countries like Afghanistan. This concerns all levels of society. An experiment by the Hamburg Winter School on Crisis Prevention and Peace Support, which represents one specific measure for peace building, has shown that an external approach, in this case bringing together senior personnel from two post-conflict areas, Afghanistan and the Balkans, can have important positive training effects.

Finally, high-risk development cooperation investments in peace building in the context of ongoing instability and local conflict, as is the case in Afghanistan, need stronger emphasis to be placed on Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment, including potential early warning – early action monitoring systems, than is presently the case. This is an area where donor cooperation could prove very fruitful.
4.2. From Specific Peace Building Orientation to State Reform and Structural Stability: The Case of Mozambique

In Mozambique, the period from 1992 (the signing of the peace accord) to 1996/1997 encompasses the years of peace consolidation. This post-conflict period was characterised by a number of inter-related but specific phases and interventions: peace keeping (UNOMOZ), demobilisation and disarmament, repatriation and resettlement of refugees and displaced persons, and the re-establishment of basic administrative structures and of social and economic infrastructures and services. German TC focused on four, later three provinces which were economically and socially most affected by the war, and where the antagonism between the former war opponents, RENAMO and FRELIMO, was still particularly strong. The German principles of refugee policy and development-oriented emergency aid were followed. Resettlement and reconstruction led to Humanitarian Mine Action, an area in which GTZ/German TC developed a specific development and community-oriented approach. Unfortunately, this approach was not continued after 1999, even though the landmine problem is still considerable. Several national programmes addressed the need to economically and socially reintegrate demobilised soldiers; German TC implemented one of them in its priority provinces. Socio-economic reconstruction and development was regarded as a major contribution to consolidating peace. However, while relevant peace building activities were integrated into project designs, this did not result in the development of a coherent PB strategy.

With the Country Strategy Paper for Mozambique (1996), political and institutional development became a new focal area. Future peaceful development was related to a process of political and administrative reforms: Democratisation and decentralisation were seen to be as important as further economic development. Institutional reform and capacity-building received more attention. The classical project approach of addressing specific target groups, such as ex-combatants, refugees, or refugee women, was changed into an inclusive approach integrating different target groups within whole communities. In this sense, the alignment of the portfolio aims at contributing to a sustainable and stability-creating development process in this post-conflict country.

It is interesting to note that TC and FC have put emphasis on, and their major resources into, socio-economic development (rural development, education, health, development of the private sector and market economy), while the German political foundations and

---

31 All projects were first and foremost directed at supporting people's ability to survive (emergency food aid) and to rebuild their lives (which meant demining and building roads so that they could return to their villages, providing them with agricultural tools and other equipment, building wells and health posts, etc.).

32 Integrated Humanitarian Demining for Development and Community Mine Awareness for Development – IHDD/CMAD.

33 In the first few years, there was a serious risk that reintegration would fail and the situation could regress or, at worst, revert to a state of armed conflict.
NGOs have emphasised the promotion of dialogue among political actors, capacity-building of political parties and NGOs, and civic education as important activities in the context of further peaceful development. In recent years, German civil society organisations have increasingly stressed the importance of CP/CM methods.

Mozambique is one of currently four focus countries covered in the German Government’s Programme of Action 2015. The focus is on poverty reduction, not on peace building. This needs to be viewed in the context of the consolidation of the peace process. Though the political, social and economic situation is still regarded as fragile, it is assumed that the risk of a return to violent warfare is low, since people want peace and development.

In conclusion, German development cooperation in Mozambique has not developed a specific approach to peace building. A number of strategies and approaches were followed, without there being a coherent framework. It would be worthwhile to further analyse the lessons learnt during the implementation of projects started after the war. One of the major lessons learnt was that the transition from projects implementing physical reconstruction measures (infrastructure, agricultural production) to capacity-building projects supporting the institutional development of partners and implementing organisations proved difficult. A shift from emergency to sustainable development strategies was not easy.

4.3. Increasingly Important Peace Building Areas within German Development Cooperation

4.3.1. Trauma Healing and Reconciliation

In post-conflict and war-affected societies, healing the wounds of the past and preparing the ground for reconciliation are essential contributions towards a sustainable and lasting peace process. In countries like Cambodia or Rwanda, the Utstein survey has shown that peaceful conflict resolution at the societal level needs to deal with both the trauma of victims of violence and the twin processes of justice and reconciliation that link victims and perpetrators. Justice requires that those who have committed crimes during times of war be brought to account and tried in a court of law, so that civil coexistence is made possible. In the sensitive context of trauma healing, careful approaches to reconciliation and justice must be identified. Development cooperation cannot be made responsible for dealing with such issues. However, specific programmes within peace building approaches can support partner countries in dealing with them.

In the context of the growing importance of CP/CM/PB-related issues in German development cooperation, a number of activity areas have gained specific attention over the last few years. Activities concerning trauma healing and reconciliation are not completely new issues within German development cooperation. Church-based
organisations traditionally working with victims of human right violations have in particular implemented activities involving psycho-social support at a local level in the past. Nevertheless, interventions aiming at trauma healing and reconciliation have until recently not been part of larger-scale development cooperation programmes. In the last ten years, non-governmental and governmental German development cooperation organisations have enhanced their activities in these fields, and the evaluation shows that their importance is growing. The experiences differ in each specific country and conflict situation:

**Trauma healing**

One of the few examples of this is the GTZ’s Trauma and Reconciliation project in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo. As part of a general approach to youth work, a number of NGOs have worked in the region in order to develop trauma healing and psychosocial services at the regional level. The challenge for the GTZ project in this context was to conceptualise an approach which is geared towards the psychological problems of traumatised individuals, but also towards the institutionalisation of trauma healing in local structures (schools, youth centres, etc.). Thus, the issue of capacity-building and networking is of key importance.

A similar approach to the problem has been adopted in the GTZ project on Basic Education for Children in Disadvantaged Areas (BECARE) in Sri Lanka. This project aims to provide basic education to children with learning difficulties and/or psychological problems. The innovative character of the project consists of the creation of school psychological centres. The methodological approach involves training selected teachers in counselling in order to sensitise other teachers, equipping them with basic knowledge on trauma-related behaviour in children and how to respond adequately.

**Reconciliation**

A similar situation exists with regard to the problem of reconciliation. Again, individual examples from different countries indicate potential avenues, but there is an urgent need for more innovation, learning and sharing among the main actors in the development community. Three examples highlight this point, as outlined below:

Very fertile ground for learning can be found in Rwanda, where GTZ is supporting the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, which is in charge of guiding and monitoring national reconciliation. The project has been instrumental in developing a basic policy on reconciliation, in training staff, supporting qualitative social research and supporting international exchange among experts from other conflict-ridden countries.
The experiences of CPS projects in South-Eastern Europe show that the local population rejects and dislikes concepts of reconciliation when they are understood to be concepts provided by the international aid community that are not based on the expectations and experiences of the local population. Hence CPS activities have taken the avenue of only contributing in an indirect way to the reconciliation process through education and training, bridge-building in society and supporting inter-ethnic communication and cooperation.

Finally, a specific issue can be highlighted from Kenya: reconciliation, which was one of the main objectives of the Tribal Clashes Resettlement Programme of the Boell Foundation in Kenya, but nevertheless could not be achieved. One reason was that mostly only one conflict party was addressed by the project. Constructive and lasting reconciliation seems only possible with the involvement of higher-level political leaders. Educational work at the community level can only prepare the ground for such work.

Drawing a conclusion from these three examples, successful approaches to reconciliation must follow a multi-track strategy. On the one hand it is important to start at the grassroots level, building on the experiences and needs of the local population, while on the other hand it seems absolutely vital to include higher-level politicians and to institutionalise reconciliation at the state level, for example in a truth commission. There is a clear need for innovative avenues, which preferably should be developed in joint actions linking different development cooperation organisations, including church-based organisations and other NGOs. Particularly as regards a multi-track approach towards trauma healing and reconciliation, development cooperation organisations working on different levels of society could complement each other's activities.

4.3.2. Target Group Youth

The link between CP/CM/PB-related issues and youth promotion is a topic of growing importance within German development cooperation.\(^3\) On the one hand, many young people in developing countries are abused in the course of internal wars and conflicts, in that they are forced to take part as combatants or become victims of violent confrontations. On the other hand, the use of violence is often a source of great fascination to young people in particular: Violence is accepted and used by adolescent offenders and perpetrators as a means of settling conflicts, for example. At the same time, young people represent great potential for creativity and innovation, which is why they are considered to be bearers of hope for non-violent conflict resolution, reconciliation and understanding in crisis regions.

\(^3\) In cooperation with the GTZ Crisis Prevention and Conflict Management Project the study Developing Education and Youth-Promotion Measures with Focus an Crisis Prevention and Peace Building was published in 2001, in which on the one hand concepts and strategies and on the other hand experiences of GTZ project activities are described and reflected on in depth. The study constitutes a key conceptual input within the scope of youth promotion and PB, and contributes to the further development of this important activity area in German TC.
Against this background, and taking into account the fact that development countries have a high proportion of young people, it is obvious that PB among and with adolescents is an important approach that should not be underestimated.

In several conflict-affected countries, German development cooperation actors have been trying to implement youth- and peace-promoting activities through new projects and programmes within the last few years.

Some projects are working on conflict in a direct way, for example by
- focusing on trauma healing and reconciliation (GTZ in South-Eastern Europe),
- focusing on interethnic and multicultural encounter and youth centres (CPS in Bosnia and Herzegovina),
- supporting youth networks, youth councils and youth umbrella organisations in order to improve and strengthen the proactive role of young people as change agents in conflict situations (GTZ in Colombia and Rwanda).

Others are working in conflict in an indirect way, for example by
- supporting disadvantaged young people in conflict-affected areas (GTZ in Rwanda and Sri Lanka).

Youth projects are mostly unable to address and resolve conflicts through a short-term approach. Conflicts run their course, and there is often no opportunity for peace-orientated youth work during the ongoing escalation of violence. However, PB involving the target group youth is especially suitable in times of latent conflict and post-war phases, and also in times of peace. As most of the youth projects described in the German contribution to the Utstein study only started in 1999 or 2000, it is as yet too early to observe any detailed impacts or draw conclusions. But what is evident is the fact that young people and adolescents are an increasingly important target group, since they can be agents of change in conflict and crisis-affected countries, as well as in CM/CP-related measures such as peace education, trauma healing, small arms control or intercultural cooperation.

4.4. New Instruments of Development Cooperation

4.4.1. Human Resources Cooperation: The Civil Peace Service

One of the central political goals of the German government since 1998 has been to prevent or end violent conflicts. Within this overall political concept, the role of development policy is to contribute to crisis prevention and to promote peace processes in Germany’s partner countries. One important element of the strengthened orientation of
German development cooperation towards crisis prevention and conflict management is the Civil Peace Service (CPS), which was established in 1999.

The tasks of the CPS include:

- strengthening the potential for peace; measures to encourage mutual trust between members of different conflict parties; the development of information and education structures and programmes to publicise and explain peace activities and to overcome prejudice and hostile images (e.g. peace education);
- mediating in conflicts between members of different interest groups, ethnic groups and religious groups; training and assignment of personnel for observation missions on issues of human rights and democracy;
- contributing towards reconciliation and reconstruction (including support for administrative tasks at the municipal level).

The CPS is a new instrument for Human Resources Cooperation which involves both governmental and non-governmental organisations. Besides the five recognised development services, two peace services (Forum ZFD, AGFD) also form part of the programme.

The basic concept behind the CPS is the deployment of appropriately qualified experts from the recognised development services. The tasks undertaken by CPS differ from the traditional tasks of development services in that they involve targeted measures to promote the non-violent management of conflicts.

Experts working for the CPS require special training and preparation. The training measures must meet uniform standards. The task of constructive conflict management in an intercultural context requires skills beyond those normally expected of staff in development services. Experts working for the CPS are, as is usual in the development services, paid a sum sufficient to cover basic living expenses.

Compared to other actors, the peace services involved in the CPS set very high standards in their training and preparation of personnel. The Forum ZFD, for example, offers a very intensive and compact three-month training course. Graduates of these courses are awarded the title “peace expert”, independently of any job opportunity they might or might not have within the CPS.

**Example: Civil Peace Service in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Kosovo**

The Civil Peace Service (CPS) in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo is implementing multi-ethnic youth work, peace and reconciliation initiatives, and return and reconstruction programmes. The majority of CPS peace workers in the projects there have taken on important tasks in the post-war situation of each country which were not covered by other
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organisations. The goal is to support the peace building process between the different ethnic groups after the war and to contribute in this way to the prevention of future violent incidents. The projects are working in close cooperation with local partners, and are established at the grass-roots level of post-Yugoslav society. Especially in the case of these two countries, most CPS projects are being implemented by small NGOs specialised in civil peace work and with a special regional concentration of activities in South-Eastern Europe. The neutral status of the CPS peace workers leads to a higher acceptance of their work, both internally within the project with local staff and target groups, and externally with community authorities and political actors. From this it can be concluded that the integration of an external neutral expert into local projects and partner structures is an appropriate and suitable strategy for the successful implantation and realisation of peace building activities in such a complex (post)conflict situation.

In BiH and Kosovo, the CPS is being implemented not by the recognised major German development services, but by a small NGO with extensive local experience and a special peace building approach. The development services are only involved as legal cooperation partners.

In general it was found that the CPS had been successfully established in the region. Compared with former volunteer peace projects, the CPS represents a fundamental improvement with regard to working conditions and the modalities of cooperation with local partners. Furthermore, the projects have become more professional in the following areas: personnel recruitment, training and preparation for deployment. This development was acknowledged by the local population as well as by other international organisations.

One specific potential of the CPS is that the CPS peace workers, coming from outside, benefit from a position of neutrality which is accepted by all sides. Hence the parties to the conflict are provided with a neutral buffer, which helps them put past events into perspective. This buffer function can be used to establish space for dialogue on a long-term basis.

CPS peace workers in all projects have built up very close contacts with the target groups, contacts which are characterised by a high degree of mutual confidence, respect and appreciation. The local interviewees stated that the CPS peace workers operate with great sensitivity to cultural and conflict conditions. These skills are due on the one hand to specific preparation and training, and on the other hand to the highly professional and personal commitment of the CPS peace workers themselves.

This example of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo illustrates very impressively how flexibly the CPS could be employed. Especially the close collaboration with specialised local institutions could be a promising strategy to meet the forthcoming complex
challenges of PB faced in post-conflict countries, which include the risk of re-emerging conflicts.

4.4.2. Financial Support at the Micro Level: National Peace Funds

In order to achieve a high degree of flexibility in crisis situations, activities for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace building are increasingly being implemented through peace funds. Under these arrangements, NGOs and – in some cases – GOs can apply for funds for (micro) projects. Fund projects usually complement more long-term projects, and offer the possibility of strategic positioning, as well as the testing of innovative approaches. They can cover subjects such as peace education, human rights, mediation, traditional conflict transformation, peace journalism, early warning systems, academic exchange, etc.

Funds can cover the local, national, regional or supra-regional levels. Most funds are national funds focusing conceptually on the specific national situation, as is the case in Sri Lanka and Colombia. To enhance a transparent and just decision-making process, they work mainly with a steering committee at the national level (general strategic issues, decisions on projects approvals) and a management team working at the operational level, delivering advisory services to partners (NGOs).

A fund constitutes an appropriate instrument in areas or situations of conflict. It is flexible and fast; local expertise, experiences and relationships can be used and capitalised upon and peace-oriented actors can be strengthened, while ownership remains with the local actors. Innovative approaches can be tested, which creates scope for institutional learning processes. A fund project can generate experiences that prepare the ground for greater involvement in the region. Synergy effects may be generated, and sustainability can be enhanced by linking the fund’s activities with more long-term development cooperation activities. Working in a comparatively small area creates scope for designing tailor-made concepts.

The most obvious limitations on a fund consist in constraints imposed by the security situation. If local NGOs can no longer work in certain areas, a fund will be unable to exert any influence. A comparative weakness can be the strong need for advisory services, and a possible lack of significance and sustainability due to unlinked micro projects. Peace building cannot be performed with micro projects alone; some issues necessitate more long-term involvement. Cooperation and networking with other projects therefore constitutes an important strategy. Due to the partners, the projects work mainly at the local level, though not only at the grass-roots level, but also with multipliers such as teachers and traditional leaders. Projects that cooperate with governmental institutions or work at a higher level are still rather the exception.
4. Specific Examples of Peace Building

4.4.3. Institutional Networking: The Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt)

The Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt) was established in 2001 as an instrument for inter-organisational cooperation among German development cooperation actors. FriEnt is made up of seven German governmental and non-governmental organisations and networks, including BMZ, GTZ, church-based organisations (EED, Misereor), the political foundation FES, and organisations specialising in PB/CP/CM (Konsortium Ziviler Friedensdienst and Plattform Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung/INEF). These organisations send permanent representatives to the working group, which is based at the BMZ. In order to ensure the link between FriEnt and the member organisations, the representatives are required to spend one-third of their working time on tasks related to the PB activities of their “home” organisation.

The aim is to deepen knowledge about successful ways of using development policy and instruments to further peace, and to create an opportunity for closer cooperation and consultation between the members.

The work of FriEnt is guided by a steering committee in which the member organisations are represented. FriEnt jointly determines permanent tasks and projects with a pre-determined time limit, which are guided by the fields of work covered by the group:

- knowledge and information management (gathering, evaluating and providing information and knowledge on instruments, project approaches and research findings of practical relevance),
- further developing technical and conceptual principles for peace and development,
- promoting contact between the members of the working group, for example through country-specific or topic-based forums,
- promoting expert exchange and coordination with other institutions working in peace and development in Germany and abroad.

The current focal issues of FriEnt are

- Economies of violence and war (“What conclusions must be drawn for approaches to CP/CM from the existence of war economies?”).
- Informal networks and clan structures (“What role do informal networks and clan structures play in building and consolidating government and civil society structures in crisis regions?”).
- Development and Islam (“Which development policy players and concepts are to be found in Islamic societies? What experiences of and possibilities for cooperation are there for development cooperation actors under the aspect of “do no harm”?“).
Initial experiences have shown that one major challenge is how to coordinate cooperation among seven organisations with such different working backgrounds, mandates and philosophies. However, the first cooperation projects, like the common improvement of the PCIA tool by FES and GTZ within FriEnt, demonstrate that inter-organisational coordination and cooperation is not only possible but can also be successful. To further strengthen the impact of FriEnt, the network is currently being evaluated.

**Figure 4:** Inter-institutional Cooperation Network: FriEnt
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5.1. Some Thoughts on Impacts

Until now, there have been no systematic assessments of the impact of German contributions to peace building. So far, there has only been one overall evaluation (the Klingebiel study, undertaken by the BMZ in 1998/1999, approximately in the middle of the five-year period analysed in the context of the Utstein study). In general, this study was rather sceptical of the actual impacts of development cooperation as compared to large-scale peace keeping missions carried out by the international community, such as the Kosovo Force (KFOR) or the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) to Afghanistan:

“As a general rule, it can be said that the direct influence which German development cooperation and the whole of the international donor community can have on conflict situations is very limited; this is particularly true of acute conflicts”.

However, the Klingebiel study did prove that sensitivity to conflicts, as well as the professionalism of German development cooperation’s measures to address them, increased over the course of the 1990s. The present study’s results confirm these observations, showing that sensitivity as well as professionalism have clearly further increased.

The Klingebiel study also indicated a number of potential positive as well as negative impacts at the macro level, and many positive impacts at the micro level. The following matrix gives a short overview of these impacts:

Table 6: Impacts of German Development Cooperation on Conflicts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro level</th>
<th>Positive impacts</th>
<th>Negative impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Removal of conflict causes (e.g. regional disparities)</td>
<td>► Stabilisation of governments which are conflict parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Socio-political stabilisation by means of reconstruction</td>
<td>► Encouragement of clientele systems and corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Democratisation and conflict awareness</td>
<td>► Increased regional imbalances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Improvement of human rights and security</td>
<td>► Reduction of pressure on governments for reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Reduction of self-enrichment and clientele systems</td>
<td>► Increase of modernisation pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Increase of competitive behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 Ibid. P. III
37 Based on the BMZ evaluation, Klingebiel 1999.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro level</th>
<th>Positive impacts</th>
<th>Negative impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Decreased local conflicts through rehabilitation/stabilisation work</td>
<td>► Danger of support to repressive structures through social monitoring support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Successful reintegration of combatants</td>
<td>► Encouragement of corrupt clientele structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Peaceful conflict resolution through German church NGOs</td>
<td>► Increase of socio-economic disparities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Long-term positive effects of democratisation activities of political foundations</td>
<td>► Unintended and indirectly conflict-exacerbating effects of socio-economic measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Positive contributions to structural stability, improvement of participation and decentralisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the limitations of this study, our findings on these possible impacts are only weak, although there are clear indications that the various peace building projects and programmes have contributed to socio-economic stabilisation in a number of cases, such as Colombia, Rwanda or Sri Lanka. In countries like Cambodia or Kenya they have indirectly contributed to the political and socio-economic reform process going on in the country. Usually, this does not concern the whole country, but rather specific regions; in Colombia as well as in Sri Lanka, the regional concentration was on those provinces that were worst affected by the conflict.

A number of aspects can be mentioned as being important prerequisites for achieving positive mid- and long-term impacts:

- continued presence in the respective country throughout times of crisis (such as the IFSP programme in Sri Lanka);
- long-term commitments to peace building contributions (in TC usually 5-10 years, in the case of church work, even longer);
- vertical integration of peace building strategies by means of a combination of policy advice and active field work (as in the combination of legal advice for reconciliation and the support of local gacaca courts in Rwanda);
- development from pilot measures to broad-scale implementation (as in the case of the COMANI initiative in Kenya, see chapter 4.1.2.);
- cooperation with other leading agencies in key peace building areas, in order to increase political weight and broaden impact (as in the coordination efforts in Guatemala);
- complementarity of approaches between TC, FC, Human Resources Cooperation and NGO work, aiming at a systematic convergence of approaches and strategic use of synergies (e.g. in the “peace alliance for land disputes” in Cambodia).
Generally though, ascertaining impacts in peace building projects still poses some problems in terms of methodology and content:

- The fact that many project planning documents mention conflict issues only cursorily or not at all in any explicit way makes it more difficult to measure and evaluate impacts on conflict, as no suitable indicators have been developed.
- Peace building processes frequently cover long time spans, so it is barely possible to register any profound impacts in short project cycles. So far, due to their short duration, many promising project approaches cited in the Utstein study can only be monitored for initial activities, not long-term impacts.
- Frequently, there are no criteria or guidelines for evaluating peace building projects and their effectiveness.
- As a rule, societal changes in conflict dynamics do not come about as a result of the involvement of one actor or project. Tangible success is the outcome of interaction among numerous actors and projects. How, then, can we assess individual initiatives and their specific contribution in this context?
- In conflict situations, which are very frequently complex, the multilayered conflict dynamics hamper concentration on one facet of conflict, and hence the handling and assessment of the project.

5.2. Conclusions of the Survey: Lessons Learned from Five Years of Peace Building

The Utstein survey has uncovered a number of key lessons from the experience of implementing peace building approaches in nine countries. However, in order to do so it was necessary to go beyond the project level and look at the transformations that have taken place over the last five years at the country strategy and implementation levels themselves.

The Utstein Study and its results present an opportunity to continue the process of improving conflict sensitivity and professionalism among the actors of German development cooperation.

To sum up, the Utstein study has shown that

- German development cooperation has, since the middle of the 1990s, systematically developed its crisis prevention and peace building competency not only in theory but also in practice.
- The effect of this quality improvement cannot yet be ascertained in empirical terms, although country cases like the Sri Lanka one clearly illustrate the potential which a strategically guided and well coordinated development cooperation approach can exert on the peace building efforts of a partner country.
Country-based evaluations, such as the 1999 Klingebiel study, are necessary in order to assess absolute impact as well as detailed progress made over the last four to five years.

A key prerequisite for the achievement of significance and impact in peace building efforts is the development of a consistent country strategy, combining a direct and explicit peace building approach with cross-cutting peace building activities in other fields.

While many strategies and experiences are already available for post-conflict reconstruction, there is still a disturbing lack of know-how and experience available for true crisis prevention.

Aside from these very general insights, the following detailed lessons can be learned:

**Peace Building Concept and Principal Issues**

- Peace building has been shown to be a term which still has wide-ranging interpretations and connotations. Different organisations may have quite different approaches and activities in mind when they say they are contributing to peace building. This means that a coherent strategy for peace building in the context of development cooperation is not yet available.

- In essence, PB approaches, as generally defined by context and purpose, need to be understood as both a cross-cutting and a sector-specific issue. While there are approaches and activities which can be integrated into classical strategies to achieve structural stability, others have a very specific and direct contribution to peace building. Cases such as Cambodia, where important conflict-mitigating measures have already been integrated into the German-supported land reform programme, while specific demobilisation and reintegration programmes were simultaneously developed, clearly illustrate this point.

- At present, many project planning documents frequently make only passing reference to conflict as an issue; greater account of this must be taken in future. This does not mean that development cooperation personnel are ignorant of or indifferent to the problem, but it does mean that this awareness is not reflected in planning documents. Peace building and related issues/activities have entered the development cooperation market, but they have only recently found their way into project planning, if at all.

- Over the years, it is obvious that development cooperation strategies have moved from “working around conflict” to “working in conflict” and “working on conflict”. In some cases, such as Sri Lanka or Rwanda, it is clear that the institutions involved (especially BMZ and GTZ) have strategically steered this process. However, the wide divergence with regard to the systematic orientation and quality of these developments in a number of cases indicates that such strategic development is still
more due to personal than to institutional factors. Consequently, the professional know-how needed for such strategy development still needs to be mainstreamed.

- Peace building requires specific professionalism as well as problem awareness to deal with both the difficult strategic issues, and the subject matter involved. A practical example of this is the trauma and reconciliation work in two post-conflict countries, Mozambique and Rwanda. While in Mozambique the issue was hardly dealt with by German development cooperation, in Rwanda the GTZ, together with various NGO actors, demonstrated impressive professionalism and contributed significantly to the national strategies adopted (e.g. in the Conflict-Prevention Support for the 'National Unity and Reconciliation Commission' in Rwanda).

- Hence personnel working in conflict situations or in PB-related measures need special education and training. While training approaches have been developed, conflict sensitivity and knowledge of conflict-related instruments and tools for example need to be mainstreamed more systematically into the orientation and preparation seminars of all institutions dealing with peace building activities in the context of development cooperation.

### Peace Building Strategy

- There is a clear need for a horizontally and vertically integrated approach to the development of a PB strategy. The recent case of Afghanistan, where a development cooperation strategy is still absent, illustrates the need as well as the effort necessary to develop such integration from the very beginning (see chapter 3.1.3.).

- Experiences in Rwanda have shown that attention must be given to strategically developing PB approaches step-wise from a pilot approach to a large-scale implementation design. In Rwanda, many donors have experimented with PB strategies, but large-scale mainstreaming is still lacking to a significant extent.

- Projects in many countries have illustrated the importance of local peace constituencies, which need support in order to widen and deepen their local capacities for peace. The country cases of Guatemala or Colombia are good examples of the key role which external actors can play in order to support local peace agendas or “islands of peace”. Political foundations or church-based organisations can play a specific, strong and strategic role in such contexts. Experiences such as the TC-church cooperation “Caminos de la Paz” in Colombia offer particularly good lessons learned.

- The study illustrates a number of thematic areas which need to be mainstreamed and included in country strategy development in the near future, as they are crucial for successful peace building. The most important issue could be the improvement of security, especially for civil society; in countries such as Colombia or Afghanistan, where reconstruction and development is seriously hampered by the lack of security, the issue is conspicuously absent from the agenda of German institutions.
5. Impacts, Lessons Learned and Recommendations Derived from the Survey

- The important work carried out with the target group of youths in a number of countries, such as Colombia, Bosnia, Rwanda or Sri Lanka, features approaches which could be transferred to other regions; youths, especially males, represent the most important target group, as they are both the major victims of, and actors in, conflicts. Trauma healing has already been mentioned; given its importance, it is worth noting that only in Bosnia and Sri Lanka has this played more than a miniscule role. The same is true for reconciliation approaches, where the case of Rwanda illustrates the important role an external donor like BMZ can play.

- Finally, dealing with corruption as well as with other governance issues is a particularly sensitive but important area that should be linked to PB more closely.

### Peace Building and Conflict Phases

- Most experience in peace building has been gained in post-conflict situations. A number of lessons can be learned from the following cases: 1) the case of Mozambique illustrates the difficulty and complexity of developing programmes from an original emphasis on physical reconstruction towards more integrative “crisis-preventive rehabilitation”. 2) In order to be successful within a short period of time, it is of crucial importance to have had a presence in the country during the conflict itself. The case of Sri Lanka illustrates the advantages of having worked even during the periods of conflict with development-oriented emergency aid and food security programmes in the North and Northeast of the country, while the case of Afghanistan illustrates the difficulties of not having been able to maintain a presence. 3) Swiss-German activities in Sri Lanka exhibit a strategic dimension to reconstruction, peace building and development, showing the advantage of supporting an R&D programme which connects the necessary socio-political research regarding successful peace building approaches with actual development activities.

- Significantly less experience has been gained with escalating conflict situations or development cooperation work during protracted conflicts. It seems that it is much more difficult to strategically place development cooperation to make important contributions to conflict transformation and peace building. The case of Kenya highlights the importance and potential of PB mainstreaming via a well-positioned NGO, while the case of Colombia illustrates that clear country strategies and peace building programmes are a prerequisite for any significant impact. In this context, strategic conflict assessments can play an important role.

---

Peace Building and Institutional Development

- The Crisis Prevention and Conflict Management Project plays a crucial role in the development of concepts and instruments for crisis prevention and conflict management and in the inter-institutional mainstreaming of PB issues. Closely linked with German TC, the sector project delivers advisory services to BMZ as well as to projects and programmes of German development cooperation, the elaboration of country strategies, etc. Its services focus mainly on:
  - development, and advisory services for the utilisation, of key methods such as conflict analysis, peace and conflict impact assessment or conflict monitoring
  - support of country-based as well as institutional mainstreaming processes, including project portfolio adaptation and development
  - advice on the development of policies, sector concepts and instruments with a view to PB
  - know-how transfer and capacity building.
Since the sector project is mandated to develop and to disseminate innovations, it will in the future focus on lessons learned and best practices and make them available for all other actors of German development cooperation.

- The Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt), an instrument for inter-organisational cooperation between German development cooperation actors, has important potentials for further harmonisation of PB approaches between the involved institutions. First cooperation projects have been carried out by FriEnt, demonstrating the potential for inter-institutional learning and cooperation processes in the near future. Generally speaking, coordination and cooperation in PB, CT, CM and CP between different German actors have improved significantly.

- German NGOs have made important contributions to peace building; for example, the Protestant Church organisation EED has carried out important demining as well as reconciliation work in Cambodia, while the political foundations have supported Human Rights Watch in Colombia. However, since they are working independently of the German Government and only receive global financial contributions, coordination and cooperation with official German development cooperation institutions remains an issue.

- One approach which has worked in a number of cases (for example in Colombia) has been the establishment of strategic round tables involving the major actors in-country, as well as in Germany. However, such approaches have not yet become standard procedure and have not been used in an iterative form so as to develop into regular strategic processes among the main German actors.

- The Civil Peace Service, established in 2000, is already developing into an important new actor and instrument of German development cooperation, as cases like Bosnia...
illustrate, and will be able to develop its full potential by linking up with TC and FC programmes.

**Peace Building and the Partner Country**

- Cases like Colombia or Sri Lanka have shown that it is important to acknowledge that in many cases the partner government is a conflict actor as well as a key institution for conflict transformation. This has implications for the question of how and to what extent cooperation with governmental institutions for peace building can exist, as well as how a donor country needs to deal with issues such as human rights violations or specific conflict-related strategies (e.g. in Colombia, the US-promoted Plan Colombia, which is a contentious approach designed to cope with the rampant drug and war economy). In cases such as these, support delivered to peace actors at the level of civil society via external NGO’s can play a particularly important role.40

**Impacts Assessment and Peace Building**

- The previous chapter showed that, up to the present day, there remains a difficulty in assessing the impacts of peace building measures. This is as much due to the lack of evaluation approaches focusing on this issue as it is a consequence of the complexity of the issues involved.
- There is a clear need to include Peace and Conflict Impact Assessments (PCIA) as a cornerstone of future peace building work, due to the many potentially positive as well as negative consequences of crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace building activities.

### 5.3. Recommendations for the Implementation of Peace Building Approaches

The following recommendations are derived from the many different insights gathered during the empirical part of the Utstein study. As the Utstein evaluation is oriented towards developing practical recommendations for the implementation of peace building approaches in the four Utstein countries, these recommendations are also directed at the Ministries of the participating countries, and at the Utstein group itself as an important informal coalition within the EU and the OECD/DAC Task Force on Crisis Prevention in Development Cooperation.

---

40 The case of Zimbabwe is illustrative in this regard. While official development cooperation has been terminated by the German side, the support of civil society via instruments such as the Civil Peace Service will continue and even be strengthened. Cf. BMZ/GTZ/DED: Länderstudie Simbabwe. Analyse der schwierigen Rahmenbedingungen und Empfehlungen einer mittelfristigen Strategie. Eschborn 2002.
Understanding of Peace Building, Impacts and Monitoring

- The study showed that there is presently no common understanding regarding the classification of development cooperation contributions to peace building. This is as much a result of the lack of conceptual clarity among different actors as it is of the particular understanding within the empirical approach of the Utstein study itself. There is therefore a need to develop a clearer understanding of PB approaches in actual implementation.

- Only on the basis of a clear definition and common understanding of PB will it be possible to plan PB-related projects on an objectives-oriented and strategic basis, and hence to establish an appropriate monitoring and evaluation system.

- Due to the current lack of (available and high quality) evaluations in this policy area, the empirical base for putting PB policy into practice as well as for evaluating the positive and negative impacts of PB is still rather weak. It is therefore recommended that this base be improved on four levels: a) within the individual donor countries, additional efforts should be undertaken to assess the impacts of PB portfolios and programmes; b) within the NGO community, where evaluations often exist but are not made available, more openness regarding the sharing of experiences should be developed; c) at the Utstein group level, the present study should be repeated after a period of about three years, albeit with a modified methodological format; d) it is proposed that the understanding gained through this study be deepened by carrying out a common in-depth country study.

- The insights, conclusions and recommendations that could be drawn from the four Donor Country Papers (from Norway, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Germany) as well as from the aggregated Utstein Study that will be aggregated by PRIO should be used as valuable and useful source material for further sensitisation, exchange and strategic orientation of the Utstein partner countries. Following on from this, the Utstein group should use its common understanding and base of experience to become a nucleus for practical PB mainstreaming within the EU and OECD/DAC groups.

Peace Building and the Partner Country

- It is important that partner countries be in the driver’s seat as far as peace building efforts are concerned, especially in post-conflict situations. Country examples show that the development of national frameworks for peace building is a key factor in the success of peace building. Donor countries should see this as one of their key responsibilities in supporting their partners in the development of such frameworks for peace, reconciliation and reconstruction, in which context the process of strategic cooperation should be recognised as being at least as important as the potential result.
In addition to this, donors can be instrumental in developing the conceptual base for the implementation of such frameworks. A roadmap to peace programme that defines the key goals of peace building in terms of the short-, medium- and long-term security, political, economic and social issues should be supported by donor countries. It should aim at establishing, together with local and international research partners, the R&D base and process for the development of country-specific solutions to each of these issues.

As the partner government is often a conflict actor in crisis situations, donor countries need to develop clear positions on key issues which affect the government’s position towards the conflict, such as human rights issues or specific approaches to dealing with a war economy. Continuous political dialogue is a key factor for involvement in peace building, including the development of “learning to disagree” between the partner governments.

In cooperation with the partner country, donors should establish national peace building and human rights monitoring approaches, in order to be able to jointly assess progress on the road to peace. In this context, it is important for the Utstein partners to jointly agree on benchmarks for monitoring such progress in peace building, and to develop joint approaches for strategic Peace and Conflict Impact Assessments with their partners.

Peace Building Strategies

Peace building support by means of development cooperation measures needs to follow a dual approach: on one hand, a direct “working on conflict” via specific conflict-mitigating or peace-enhancing methods and instruments; on the other hand, a more indirect “working in conflict” via cross-cutting PB activities within other sectoral approaches.

In order to be successful in post-conflict reconstruction and peace building, it has proven to be of key importance to maintain at least a minimal presence within the respective country, even during times of crisis. This, however, entails much more attention to the development of sound security strategies for development cooperation involvement in crisis countries. The potential for cooperation between donors with regard to such security strategies, and for institutional approaches such as risk management offices, is great, and should be explored much more systematically.

In post-conflict situations, bilateral development cooperation can become an important partner in UN peace building missions. The aspect of capacity-building of partner administrations recovering from (civil) war should in general receive a more prominent input from bilateral development cooperation; however, there are additional

---

41 See the case of Nepal, where GTZ and DFID have jointly established such an office.
indications that bilateral agencies can in individual cases take over functions on behalf of UN peace building missions (e.g. the case of MINUGUA in Guatemala).

- The existing or future potential of strengthened multilateral cooperation with international actors/donor institutions (bilateral donors, World Bank, EU, UN, etc.) should be reflected on and considered by the Utstein partner countries. Since this survey is focused on bilateral cooperation, these aspects have not been analysed in detail, but are of enormous importance for future orientation to achieve effectiveness and a broad reach of the implemented activities.

- While the tendency of international actors to agree on a division of labour with regard to reconstruction approaches in post-conflict situations is laudable and important, key issues of peace building such as security-sector reform or support for nation building in failed states cannot be left to the mandate of one donor alone, because of the implied financial dimension, as well as the necessity to avoid one-sided approaches. Instead, the available best practices of the involved actors should be consolidated to develop joint strategies, including joint implementation approaches.

- In order to be successful, general peace building approaches need to be developed into operational, mid-term country and/or sector strategies. The regional or sectoral focus within such strategies should take into consideration the availability of competent local or international actors. Such strategies should also describe the direction to be followed from pilot approaches to larger-scale implementation as regards key PB issues. Close cooperation between German actors as well as international donors in order to strategically develop PB concepts from pilot to implementation stages offers significant perspectives for more efficiency and better impacts.

- As many conflicts – at least over time – show a tendency towards regional involvement or escalation, it is increasingly important to develop regional approaches for peace building. Utstein partner ministries should therefore jointly develop regional approaches to key conflicts, including the strategic involvement and capacity-building of regional organisations.

- It is high time for a practical exchange among donors regarding key issues of direct peace building, such as trauma healing, reconciliation, security-sector reform, etc. While there is by now an abundance of theoretical and conceptual papers, the quantity, quality as well as the level of innovation in implementation is seriously lagging behind. There is particular scope for exchanges between governmental and non-governmental actors in this regard, with a view to identifying innovative and synergetic cooperation approaches.

- The instrument of national or regional funds for peace building initiatives can become a crucial additional “tool” in supporting innovative or pilot measures, as well as peace building or conflict transformation initiatives at the local level. Donors should therefore make strategic use of it. Furthermore, Utstein partners should cooperate in using and financing such fund structures.
The Utstein study again shows that there is little practical know-how and experience available with regard to successful crisis-prevention efforts, aside from more “classical” approaches emphasising structural stability. The main focus of peace building efforts is still on post-conflict countries and issues. Therefore, Utstein partners should jointly explore avenues to significantly step up their involvement in the development of this particular PB competence.

Cooperation between German Peace Building Actors

The different intensity of participation in the Utstein study by the major German actors has unfortunately led to a relatively skewed distribution of empirical evidence between Technical Cooperation projects and others, thus limiting the conclusions which can be drawn from the study in this regard. However, successful peace building needs to build on a strategic alignment of peace actors at different levels of society, including the complex institutional landscape which exists in Germany. The main actors of German development cooperation have great potential to make a significant impact on peace building, provided that they coordinate and cooperate closely, and at the same time make use of their respective institutional roles and strengths:

- Technical Cooperation has an important role to play, especially with regard to the capacity-building dimension of peace building, while Financial Cooperation should be involved more systematically in scaling up pilot measures, especially with regard to the socio-economic and security dimensions (i.e. reintegration of ex-combatants) of PB.
- The Human Resources Cooperation has a new important dimension: the instrument of the Civil Peace Service (CPS). The work of CPS (see chapter 4.4.1.) creates significant added value, but needs to be combined with TC and where possible FC in order to generate more impact.
- The newly founded institution of InWEnt (Internationale Weiterbildung und Entwicklung – Capacity Building International) can play a crucial role in the organisation and management of training and dialogue programmes for executives and specialists from developing and transition countries. Through issue-specific programmes and courses InWEnt supports on the one hand capacity building for partner countries, and on the other hand the mainstreaming of peace building.
- German NGOs such as the political foundations or the churches not only have important, long-standing experiences but can usually act faster than official bilateral development cooperation. Therefore they can become important “entry gates” for development cooperation. However, there is a clear need for more strategic networking and coordination between the NGOs and official development assistance, e.g. by means of regular country round tables.
- A particular new feature could be a network approach of experienced official development assistance institutions (such as GTZ or DED) and small local or regional...
NGOs (in the partner countries) with particular expertise in specialised fields of peace building (e.g. in trauma healing or reconciliation work).

- Coherence between German governmental and non-governmental development cooperation actors should be improved, which is not to say that NGOs must always follow the line of official development cooperation policy, thereby running the risk of undermining their own original mandate. Sector Strategy Papers (SSPs) and Country Concepts which are binding e.g. for governmental actors cannot be made a binding orientation or guideline for non-governmental actors. With respect to a particular partner country, coherence should be understood to mean an attempt to orient peace building activities on the basis of strategic round tables, within the framework of jointly elaborated goals and agreements reached. These agreements would broadly outline the scope of action for planning and implementation on which all actors would agree, thus creating scope for a certain transparency. At the same time, however, these frameworks would leave the participating organisations with key scope for self-reliant action. These agreements should be reached by all German actors, in conjunction with the elaboration of roadmaps for peace.

Experience from the country studies shows that such forms of successful cooperation and strategic networking develop best on the basis of common interests in specific countries. Jointly carrying out strategic steps such as strategic conflict assessments can become a major point of entry into medium- and long-term cooperation. In this way, the common methodology can support the coherent development of strategic agendas.

**Cooperation between the UTSTEIN Partners**

The process which the four partner countries of the Utstein group – Norway, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Germany – started in 2001 demonstrates the potential and the opportunities for common development of experiences and “lessons learned”, as well as strategy development, for PB/CP/CM.

Therefore, this study and the planned Utstein-PB-Conference in November 2003 should not be regarded as a single event, but as a starting point for a deeper and more intensified cooperation between the Utstein countries on PB-related issues. The following recommendations are proposed in order to put this potential into practice:

- There is a clear need for the Utstein partners to develop a common understanding regarding the classification of development cooperation inputs to PB, as well as the definition of PB itself.

- The Utstein group should become a nucleus for PB mainstreaming efforts within the EU system, trying to input its understanding gained via the study as well as its practical policy guidelines into the work of the DAC-CPDC as well as the EU.
5. Impacts, Lessons Learned and Recommendations Derived from the Survey

- The Utstein group should jointly step up their involvement and develop more practical approaches to conflict prevention.
- The Utstein partners should focus greater attention on international cooperation and coherence regarding their common country-specific PB-activities. Such an initiative could start in the focal countries of the Utstein study itself.
- The assessment of PB in nine partner countries should be continued by undertaking an in-depth analysis of the actual work experiences of all four Utstein countries in at least one of the nine partner countries. Such a follow-up process should not only focus on the project or programme level of development cooperation in crises and conflict situations, but especially on country strategies and country portfolio development for PB/CP/CM-related issues.
6. Annex

6.1 Joint Utstein Study of Peacebuilding Survey:

Design and instructions
Dan Smith
27 September 2002

This note is to help guide the researchers in each of the four Utstein countries who will be conducting the survey of their country’s recent experience in peacebuilding. Drawing on feedback at meetings in the Hague, London and Bonn this note replaces an earlier (21 August) draft.

Aims

The aim of the project is to help shape peacebuilding policies and activities by producing policy guidelines based on experience. The aim of the survey is to provide part of the empirical basis for assessing experience, the other part being provided by a sweep of the evaluation and policy literature and some other sources, reaching more widely than the four Utstein countries. The key questions for the project to answer are, what works, what does not work, what gets missed out?

Activity

Seventeen categories of peacebuilding programmes are used in the survey. About each programme that is covered in the survey, fourteen questions will be asked. For those projects that have been evaluated, the evaluation report should provide most if not all of what is needed.

Many of the 17 types of activity are also carried out under other headings than peacebuilding – democratisation, development, support to civil society, etc. Like the project as a whole, the survey operates with a concept of peacebuilding activities that reflects on the implementation of the same kinds of activities under other headings – peacebuilding uses a variety of tools from a range of different toolboxes. When these activities are part of peacebuilding rather than, say, development, it is not necessarily because the activity itself is different but because its context and purposes are specific to
peacebuilding – the context of crisis and conflict and the purpose of making things as peaceful as possible.

The survey will look at activities rather than policies, and therefore primarily at projects (or groups of projects, see below). The survey is not comprehensive or representative in a scientific sense. It will provide an adequate empirical basis for sustainable generalisations, and thus needs to be broadly representative (or illustrative) of the range of peacebuilding activities carried out or financed by the Utstein countries.

Selection

The number of projects that could be studied is far greater than the number that needs to be. In undertaking the survey the first task is one of selection. A quick scan of project files and evaluation reports should permit researchers to sieve out the projects to include in the survey. The following categories should facilitate this exercise:

(a) Countries – see below
(b) Project titles
(c) Budgetary source
(d) Period (=context) – see below
(e) Stated objectives – NB: Projects often have several objectives, of which only one may be peacebuilding. Such projects are to be included in the survey.
(f) Implementing agency
(g) DAC codes / own codes
(h) Desks’ own assessment

The period of activities to be covered in the survey is within the five years 1997-2001; activities that either start or finish or both in that period are included as well as those that run within the period and those that started before and continue after it.

Country selection has been agreed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Bosnia-H</th>
<th>Sri Lanka</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Mozambique</th>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Rwanda</th>
<th>Sudan</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Angola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Bosnia-H</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Bosnia-H</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Bosnia-H</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>DRC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of Afghanistan, the emphasis falls on looking at project plans worked out in the period since September 2001.
Once this first selection has been carried out, there are still likely to be too many projects for the time available for the survey. Further mechanisms of selection are the scale and the theme of the project, which can be understood in terms of a simple grid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Socio-economic</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Reconciliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process of selection will be to list all projects in the four large categories – Security, Socio-economic, Political, Reconciliation – plus “Other”. From those listed in the four large categories, identify those activities that are clearly part of peacebuilding will indicate where the emphasis of activities has fallen – in which category, at what scale, in what period within the 1997-2001 timeframe. This will permit researchers to characterise the overall approach of the donor towards each recipient.

Further selection, to arrive at a manageable number of projects to survey in each country, will be on the basis of:
- Those projects for which evaluations have been done;
- Discussions with desk officers etc;
- Inclusion of projects that are routine and projects that are innovative;
- Inclusion of projects at different phases in the conflict cycle;
- Arbitrary choice based on convenience.

If the Utstein donor funds programmes or groups of projects, as well as single projects, it will be important to include the programmes or groups in the survey.

Further guidelines

1. The survey is not interested in the detailed history of any project or programme. The survey covers actors, activities, objectives and identified results. However, in cases where objectives were modified along the way, the survey is interested.
2. The answers to the questions may range in length from one word (a country, if that is specific enough) to about 100 for questions 5-14. The language used is English.
3. Consistent liaison is the way to resolve many of the detailed issues that will arise as the material is confronted.
4. NGO projects that the donor government specifically approves are included; those that are independently carried out by an NGO with a multi-year framework grant (or independent funds) are left out.
5. It has been agreed that as well as carrying out the survey work and forwarding the results, the researchers will each write a paper based on the material they unearth in
the course of the survey. The themes of these papers could vary according to what is most relevant and what has been brought out by the survey, but it could also be that the vertical consistency of policy from enunciation to implementation would be relevant for all the Utstein countries.

6. In the Dutch and German cases, it has been agreed that the researchers will write a brief paper outlining the policy of the government in peacebuilding activities.

7. For each recipient country, the researchers will briefly characterise the Utstein donor’s approach – how much spent, evolution of spending pattern, which broad categories.

Survey categories

1. SECURITY
   1.1 Humanitarian Mine Action  Mine clearance to restore civilian access/use and mine-awareness programmes
   1.2 DD&R  Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration of combatants
   1.3 DD&R Children  Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration programmes for child soldiers
   1.4 Security Sector Reform  Retraining in the police, military services, prison services etc, with emphasis on professional efficiency and ethics, including respect for human rights
   1.5 SSR: Small Arms  Specific measures within Security Sector Reform to restrict availability of small arms in the country or the region

2. SOCIO-ECONOMIC
   2.1 Reconstruction  Aid for physical reconstruction of buildings and structures, electrical supply and other utilities, roads, and for addressing war-related environmental damage
   2.2 Infrastructure  Investment in the future: Economic support for improving the economic infrastructure (communications, roads, water, sewage systems, electricity) and for training in issues relevant to the functioning of a modern economy
   2.3 Investment in Health & Education  Economic support for improving health service provision and for improving access to and quality of basic education
2.4 Repatriation & return  Support for the repatriation of refugees and return of IDPs, including to regain access to property, restoration of land rights and distribution of land

3. POLITICAL

3.1 Democratisation  Support for democratic institutions (political parties, independent media, NGO sector), and activities in the fields of education & culture that have a democratic theme or intention

3.2 Good governance  Promotion of ethics, efficiency, transparency & accountability in government; Rule of law, justice system, legal reform

3.3 Institution building  Training programmes in government and NGO sector and among political parties

3.4 Human Rights  Promotion of awareness of international standards and of monitoring and reporting of abuses

4. RECONCILIATION

4.1 Dialogue (a) Leadership  Dialogue opportunities between leaders of actually antagonistic groups

4.2 Dialogue (b) Grass roots  Dialogue opportunities between members of antagonistic groups

4.3 Bridge-building in society  Other activities (in media, education curricula, cultural activities) to erode barriers in highly divided societies

4.4 Truth & Reconciliation  Commissions – and /or other means – of enquiry into recent and violent past, using knowledge as basis for reconciliation

We can also retain an eighteenth box for 'other' – i.e., activities that do not fall under one or more of the headings listed above.

Survey questions

About each activity, the survey will seek the following information:-

1. Technical information  (a) Project/programme name
   (b) Location

2. Category/ies  Which of the survey’s 17 categories does the activity come under

3. Dates:  The start and end dates or planned duration of the activities
4. Budget:
   (a) Total
   (b) Donor’s contribution

5. Other donors

6. Project partners
   Who were the project partners:
   (a) Outside beneficiary country?
   (b) In beneficiary country?

7. Summary aim:
   The objective of the programme

8. Strategic perspective:
   The project’s role (if stated) in an overall strategy towards the conflict problems of the country/region

9. Cross-cutting themes
   What cross-cutting themes are addressed in the statement of aims/strategy?

10. Evaluation:
    Has there been an evaluation of the programme or of major components of it? If so, was the evaluation internal or external? (Specify documents)

11. Impact assessment:
    Did the evaluation (if any) or the project design and reporting (if no evaluation) assess the impact of the programme for the beneficiaries and on the society as a whole; if so, what means and what criteria were used, and what was the result?

12. Financial assessment:
    Did the evaluation (if any) or the project design and reporting (if no evaluation) ask whether the programme gave ‘value for money’; if so, what means and what criteria were used, and what was the result?

13. Organisational assessment
    Did the evaluation (if any) or the project design and reporting (if no evaluation) assess organisational efficiency in the programme; if so, what means and what criteria were used, and what was the result?

14. Overall conclusion:
    What was the overall conclusion of the evaluation (if any) or the project reports (if no evaluation) about the project’s worth? What (if any) was the project’s perceived contribution to peacebuilding? What (if any) lessons were identified?
6.2 List of projects analysed during the survey

**Afghanistan:**

- GTZ: Basic Education for Afghan Refugees (BEF ARe)
- GTZ: Development oriented emergency aid and reconstruction of Afghanistan (DOEARA)
- GTZ: Emergency help and relief programme for Afghanistan (EHRP)
- GTZ: Reconstruction of Afghanistan – Promotion of democracy (RAPD)
- KfW: Emergency winter aid for the university of Kabul (EWAUK)
- KfW: Rehabilitation of the water supply in Kabul
- FES: Socio-political programme of cooperation in South Asia: Subproject Afghanistan (SPPA)
- HBS: Support for the creation of civil society in Afghanistan: Promotion of women, media and university education (SCCSA)
- Caritas: Distribution of food for drought victims in the district of Sharistan/ Hazarajat (DFDVS)
- DWHH: Programme of food security in Eastern and Central Afghanistan (PFSECA)
- Medica Mondiale: Qualification of women in tools of trauma healing (QWTH)

**Bosnia and Herzegovina:**

- GTZ: Support for establishing a cadastral system in BiH (SECS)
- GTZ: Trauma and Reconciliation (TR)
- Institutional Capacity Building to strengthen the Environmental Sector within the “Regional Environmental Reconstruction Programme” (REReP) as Part of the Stability Pact for South East Europe
- KfW: Credit Guarantee Funds (CGF)
- KfW: Housing Construction Loan Programme as part of the European Fund for BiH (SMEP)
- KfW: Loans for small and medium-sized Enterprises Programme as part of the European Fund for BiH (SMEP)
- FES: Regional Project Stability Pact South East Europe: Social-political and Trade Union Consultation in south East Europe: Country Project BiH (STUC)
- Schüler helfen leben (SHL): Promotion of Multicultural Youth Activities and Interethnic Communication in Sarajevo (PMYA)
- Pax Christi: Refugee Return Programme (RRP)
Friedenskreis Halle: Educational and Meeting Centre Jajce-Civil Conflict Management and Multi Collective Social Work (EMCJ)

Cambodia:
- GTZ: Cambodian-German Health Care System Development Project
- GTZ: Integrated Food Security Programme (IFSP)
- GTZ: Provincial Development Programme (PDP)
- GTZ: Land Management project (LMP)
- GTZ: Demobilisation and Reintegration of Ex-Combatants
- KfW: Tertiary Roads Rural Improvement Programme (TRIP)
- KAS: Assisting Democracy development, establishment of rule of law and development of rural areas
- EED: Demining and Resettlement of Refugees as Preconditions for a Rural Development Programme
- HBS: Cultural Heritage and Traditional Knowledge for Development
- ZFD: Civil Peace Service Programme

Colombia:
- GTZ: Proyecto alto Patía
- GTZ: Caminos para la Paz Antioquia/Chocó
- GTZ: Programma de Mejor Gestion de los Departamentos (PMGD)
- GTZ: Fondo de Convivencia y Concertación Social
- GTZ: Programa de Apoyo Institucional y Social a Jóvenes (Paisa Joven)
- KfW: Programma Social Medellín
- KfW: Saneamiento en zonas periféricas de Bogotá
- FES: Country Programme Colombia – la participación de la Sociedad Civil en el proceso de la Paz
- KAS: Catedra de Derechos Humanos (CDH)
- EED: Programa Gestión Pública y Participación Ciudanana

Guatemala:
- GTZ: Cooperación Organizaciones Gubernamentales, Organizaciones No-Gubernamentales y Fortalecimiento Institutional del Sector ONG en Guatemala (FORIN)
- GTZ: Apoyo a Género en el proceso de paz (GENERO)
GTZ: Fundamentalos para el Cadastro Nacional (FCN)
GTZ: Apoyo al proceso de paz y conciliación nacional (PCON)
GTZ: Proyecto de Educación Maya Bilingüe Intercultural (PEMBI)
KfW: Escuelas de magisterio – Asociación Salesiana de Don Bosco (ASDB)
KfW: Educación primera rural – Programa Nacional de Autogestión para el Desarrollo Educativo (PRONADE)
KAS: Self Aid Support programme Maya-Tzutuhil “Federación de Pueblos Mayas” (FEDEPMA)
DED: Civil Peace Worker in the project “Alianza contra la Impunidad” (ACI)

Kenya:

GTZ: Transmara Development Programme (TDP)
GTZ: Marsabit Development Programme (MDP)
GTZ: Integrated Food Security Programme East (IFSP-E)
GTZ: Small Arms and Light Weapons in the IGAD-Region (SALIGAD)
GTZ: GTZ-Kenya Conflict Management Initiative (COMANI)
GTZ and KfW: German Assisted Settlement Programme (GAS)
KfW: Mathare 4A Development Project (M4A)
Boell Foundation: Tribal Clashes Resettlement Programme / Civic Education (Green Belt Movement) (TCRP)
AGEH: Civil Peace Worker in the Justice and Peace Department of the Catholic Diocese of Eldoret (CPW)
EED: Support of the development and civil society orientated activities of the National Council of Churches of Kenya (NCCK)

Mozambique:

GTZ: Aid to Orientation “Community Mine Awareness” (CMA)
GTZ: Democratization and Decentralization (DD) (phase I); Decentralisation and Development of Local Government (phase II)
GTZ: Project for the Reintegration of Female Refugees (PROMUR)
GTZ: Manica Agricultural Rural Reconstruction Programme (MARRP)
GTZ: Open Reintegration Fund (phase I); Open Fund for Employment Promotion (phase II-IV) (ORF/OFEP)
FES – Socio-political Advisory Programme (SAP)
KAS – Civic Education Southern Africa and Country Programme Mozambique (CESAC)

EED: Programme to Support Institutional Development and Programme of Capacity Building in Conflict Resolution and Mediation for NGOs (SID)

DWHH: Integrated Food Security Programme, Meluco District, Cabo Delgado (IFSP)

WFD – Support to a Vocational Training School in Chimoio (SVTS)

Rwanda:

GTZ: Conflict Prevention – Support for the National unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC)

GTZ: Support of Rehabilitation of the Justice institutions and Good Governance

GTZ: Support of Employment for Youth

GTZ: National Youth Council

GTZ: Support for Widows and Orphans (AFSO)

EED: Country Programme for Teacher In-Service Training at protestant church schools

Sri Lanka:

GTZ: Basic Education for Children in Disadvantaged Areas (BECARE)

GTZ: Fund for Local Initiatives for Conflict Transformation (FLICT)

GTZ: Integrated Food Security Programme Trincomalee (IFSP)

GTZ: Jaffna Rehabilitation Project (JRP)

GTZ: Northeast Community Restoration and Development Project (NECORD)

GTZ: Poverty Impact Monitoring Unit (PIMU)

GTZ: Resource Network for Conflict Studies and Transformation (RNCST)

GTZ: Teacher In-Service Project (TIP)

GTZ: Water Supply and Sanitation Project (WSSP)

GTZ: Youth Livelihood Programme (YULIP)

FES: CT-Political Dialogue

FES: CT-Culture of Peace