Conflict Prevention and Peace Building

Review of MDG-F Joint Programmes Key Findings and Achievements

MDG:F

MDG ACHIEVEMENT FUND

Conflict Prevention and Peace Building
MDG-F Thematic Study: Review of Key Findings and Achievements

Author: **GABRIELLA S. BUESCHER**

Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BCPR   Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (UNDP)
BDP   Bureau for Development Policy (UNDP)
CBO   Community based organisation
CDA   Conflict-related Development Analysis (UNDP)
CPAP   Country Programme Action Plan (UNDP)
CPPB   Window on Conflict Prevention and Peace Building
CPR   Crisis prevention and recovery
CWGER   Cluster Working Group on Early Recovery
DDR   Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration
DPKO   Department of Peacekeeping Operations (UN)
DSRSG   Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary General
GBV   Gender Based Violence
HC   Humanitarian Coordinator
IASC   Inter-agency Standing Committee
IDPs   Internally displaced persons
ILO   International Labour Organization
JP   Joint Programme
MDGs   Millennium Development Goals
MDG-F   MDG-Achievement Fund
MDTF   Multi donor trust fund
NGO   Non-governmental organization
OCHA   Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN)
SDGs   Sustainable Development Goals
UNDAF   United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG   United Nations Development Group
UNDP   United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR   Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees

I. Executive Summary

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) have framed much of the discussion on development priorities and strategies in the past decade—among governments, international organizations and civil society. In December 2006, UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of EU 528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. The Fund uses a joint programme (JP) mode of intervention and has currently approved 130 joint programmes. Out of the 130 joint programmes, 20 are on conflict prevention and peace building, with an allocation of US$ 94 million.

This report focused on the **Window on Conflict Prevention and Peace Building**. The programmes in this window seeked to contribute to the achievement of the goals through interventions tackling conflict prevention and violence reduction, livelihood improvements against youth violence, and the fostering of dialogue and equity. One common premise is ensuring that people know and exert their rights as an important component of a peace building and conflict prevention strategy.

The JPs under the MDG-F CPPB thematic window are **Afghanistan, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, DRC, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Lebanon, Haiti, Mexico, Mauritania, Panama, Serbia, Sudan, South Sudan, and the FYR of Macedonia.** The programmes are very **context-specific**, and so are some of the key results.

Section II focused on the background and contextualized the Joint Programmes. A key feature of this Window is that the results are very country/region and context specific --as observed in the positive examples of Mexico, Serbia and Colombia, for example. What the 'successes' share is a focus on community needs and specific needs that make it difficult to be replicated in other contexts.[1] As a result of this challenge in finding similarities among very different contexts and approaches, the analysis is grouped by theme.

Section III, **Achievements and Results,** focused in more detail on the successful work carried out so far, grouped by **thematic areas**, as follows below:

> ➢ Promoting and Protecting the Rights of IDPs (Mexico, Serbia, Croatia)
> ➢ Conflict and Violence Prevention (Serbia, Sudan, Guatemala, and FYR of Macedonia, Haiti)
> ➢ Access to Justice, Strengthening of the Rule of Law (Afghanistan, Mauritania, Bolivia, Mexico)
> ➢ Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue (Colombia, FYR of Macedonia, Chile, Serbia)
> ➢ Citizens Security (El Salvador, Panama, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Haiti)
> ➢ Preventing Conflict Targeting the Most Vulnerable Areas (Lebanon, DR Congo)

A few programmes are of note in terms of positive results: **Mexico, Serbia, Colombia, The FYR of Macedonia, Croatia;** also of note are the **Citizens Security** programmes in Central America.

In the thematic area of Promoting and Protecting the Rights of IDPs, **Mexico** provides an excellent example through its programme on conflict prevention, development of agreements and peace building for internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Chiapas State. Besides supporting the population and improving their condition of life, the programme assisted civil society, organizations, universities and women groups, in outlining a draft framework law to protect and promote the rights of IDPs and guarantee access to justice. The law is a significant achievement as it has led to positive changes in the area of discrimination, inequity and rights of IDPs in Chiapas, through the assistance of the JP. It provides a good example of collaboration of many stakeholders at local level, and with the participation of the beneficiaries themselves. The key result of this effort is that the law has put displacement in the public arena. This is the first law in Mexico that deals with displacement. For the first time in Chiapas (and other areas in Mexico), displacement and the rights of the most vulnerable have become part of the public discourse.

---

[1] As the Mid-Term Evaluations and Final Evaluation reports show, interestingly the 20 countries have more in common in terms of challenges and gaps than they do share commonalities in terms of good results (for additional analysis please refer to Annex Four).

As in Chiapas, providing information to IDPs about their rights and increasing their access to services is crucial to lower their vulnerability and marginalization. In another region, in **Southern Serbia**, this approach has also produced some good results. The JP has assisted the most vulnerable minorities by supporting the government in establishing a more equitable and improved access to public services and welfare benefits. It helped displaced populations to gain access to services and inform them on their rights.

From **Sudan to Serbia to Guatemala**, **social cohesion** is critical for communities coming out of divisive conflicts. As a result of activities in social cohesion, communities in south Serbia, for example, now possess the tools to build stronger and more integrated communities, with fewer inter-ethnic tensions. Improving **access to the Rule of Law** as well as the understanding between different communities and promoting human rights and the rule of law is a proven way to help reduce conflict in many contexts. In **Mauritania** the JP produced good results by targeting areas with high potential for conflict, and focusing on vulnerable groups such as women and youth, as well as communities of returning refugees. Through 'mobile theater' performances, the JP in **Afghanistan** reached out to the broader public on domestic violence and family law.

Inter-ethnic community dialogue is a useful tool for conflict prevention and peace building. Experience in several fragile settings has shown that empowering and strengthening the capacities of individuals, communities, and institutions to manage conflicts is essential to peace building. The conflict-affected region of **Nariño,** in **Colombia,** is a case in point. And so are the cases of the **FYR of Macedonia and Serbia**—different continents and different regional contexts, but the same positive results in fostering understanding and dialogue have been achieved through each of the JPs respectively**.**

Strengthening local capacities for peace building in the Department of Nariño has brought some concrete positive achievements, especially in the areas of institution building, political, cultural and inter-ethic dialogue—with a focus on ethnic and cultural differences, gender, early recovery/food security, as well as the principle of **'Do no Harm'.**[2] The JP's strategy improved communication and interaction with municipalities, ethnic groups, indigenous councils and community leaders—increasing understanding and social cohesion, which are critical elements in peace building in communities that have suffered conflict and discrimination.[3] As a result of activities in social cohesion and inclusion, communities in south **Serbia** are now stronger, more integrated; the project is also striving to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and conflict drivers.

Citizens Security has become a major challenge in **Latin America**. The homicide rate in Latin America is the highest in the world, and murder is the leading cause of death in various cities in countries like Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela, El Salvador and Mexico.[4] The best examples of how to counter this trend come from Central America, foremost from **El Salvador**, a country that initiated this type of intervention, which is now being followed by most JPs in Central America. El Salvador developed innovative security projects and the JP has brought into the municipal committee the armed forces, the police and the representative of the office of the mayor. This synergy and cooperation has led to a reduction of violence.[5]

The analysis of the JPs has revealed a few **key trends** including:
> - **Integrated Multi-sectoral approaches:** the cases of Serbia, DR Congo, Mexico and Colombia stand out in creating a good synergy among key stakeholders, leading to integrated results to better serve the beneficiaries.
> - **Equity:** Three JPs stand out, based on the research, in the area of addressing **inequalities**. The cases of **Chiapas/ Mexico, Narino/Colombia, and Southern Serbia** were particularly successful in addressing inequalities in marginalized communities.
> - **Regional Trends in Citizens Security:** Latin America is a good example of how to foster best practices in CPPB, through the JPs, to:[6]

---

[2] Please refer to Definitions in Annex one.
[3] ESTRATEGIA DE SOSTENIBILIDAD PROGRAMA CONJUNTO VENTANA DE PAZ, Colombia.
[4] UNDP, "A Decade of work on Citizens Security and Conflict Prevention in Latin America and the Caribbean, 2001-2010".
[5] Conversation with UNDP Coordinator, Panama, name withheld for security reasons, 10 October 2010.
[6] Source: PP presentation Board/CPR

- Support national dialogue processes (as in Nicaragua or Honduras) to prevent and transform the impact of conflicts on the basis of consensus.
- Promote the strengthening of national and local capacities to mitigate the impact of conflicts (Bolivia, Mexico, Colombia).
- Improve citizen security through the support and design/implementation of national citizen security policies in Central America (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala).
- Support institutional and legal framework, as in Mexico, with a new law in Chiapas.
- ➢ **Inclusion of a Gender Dimension in Joint Programmes:** Social inclusion of women is important for sustainable development, reconciliation and conflict prevention.

Section IV analyzed the sustainability and possible 'replicability' of many of the JPs reviewed in Section III. **Mexico, Colombia, El Salvador, Lebanon, Serbia and FYR of Macedonia** provide interesting practices**.**

In the area of 'Promoting and Protecting Rights of IDPs', a new Law on the prevention of and focus on internal displacement in the State of Chiapas, Mexico, is quite innovative in its approach to protect the rights of the most marginalized and vulnerable communities. The law has now put displacement in Chiapas on the political agenda and it has now been owned by the regional government as well as the newly empowered beneficiaries. The new law is also significant in the context of a growing internal displacement challenge at national level in **Mexico**, due --in other areas outside Chiapas – to narco-traffic. This law protecting the rights of the displaced and most marginalized (including the protection of host communities) has a good chance of not only becoming sustainable in Chiapas, but also of being replicated in other regions of Mexico.

The JP in **Colombia,** likewise, stresses community and government participation, including a close interaction with civil society, women and youth groups—this approach makes it a prime candidate for the sustainability of the programme and evidence of national and local ownership. In Eastern Europe, another JP that focuses on marginalized minorities and their rights has a good potential of sustainability: the reason for the success in **Southern Serbia** is the close collaboration with the government on ownership, visibility of results and impact. The root cause of conflicts in Southern Serbia is not disagreements but rather inequity, discrimination and economic issues. The projects targeting youth and women have been successful as they focus on economic opportunities for marginalized populations. The youth and gender programmes being carried out in the communities covered by the project have a good chance of being replicated across other vulnerable communities in Southern Serbia.

Citizens security is a common concern in Latin America, and especially in Central America. **El Salvador** provides a good practice already being replicated across the sub-region. What is also significant is that this good practice in citizens security is not only sustainable, but it also provided a good example to other countries in Central America, who are now replicating this approach, such as **Panama and Costa Rica**.

Finally, **Section V** considered the **Key Conclusions and Recommendations—**by thematic and programmatic area, and also included comments and recommendations on the **post-2015 agenda.**

Key enabling factors for generating an **enabling environment** at programmatic approach level include the following:
- ➢ **Local Ownership**: local ownership starts with ensuring that peace building priorities, needs, as well as approaches are determined locally.

Recommendation: Pursue locally owned solutions and the principle of 'do no harm'.
- ➢ **Increased Access** by vulnerable communities to social services and legal aid is crucial as we have seen in many of the examples in the preceding sections. So is increased access to information about their rights and about services. The examples of Serbia, Mexico and Colombia showed how this approach helps vulnerable and ethnic communities be less marginalized.

Recommendation: The governance of solutions needs to be localized.
- ➢ Enabling factors within the programme approach include **outreach to communities**. Selection of capacity building and selection of trainees—adapted to the local context and to beneficiaries is also crucial. **Multi-sectoral partnerships and dialogue** are key. Ensuring that programmes create mechanisms to bring local actors together for dialogue and co-operation helps build trust and social cohesion, and building the resilience of communities.

Recommendations: Foster trust

- ➤ **Empowering and strengthening** the **capacities** of individuals, communities, and institutions to manage conflicts is essential to peace building. Focus also at community level for sources of resilience in local institutions and civil society.

Recommendation: Develop local capacity for managing conflict and resilience.
- ➤ **Community participation** fosters ownership and accountability.

Recommendation: Ensure inclusive participation at all stages.
- ➤ **Redressing inequalities** is crucial to peace building.

Recommendation: Leverage equity to build peace.
- ➤ The scale and multidimensionality of peace building demands **collective engagement**.

Recommendation: Pursue innovative partnerships.

- ➤ **Mainstreaming gender** in all peace building interventions, including gender disparities and GVB; strengthen the peace building roles of women and girls.

Recommendation: Strengthen mainstreaming.

Finally the report describes a few recommendations on the **Way Forward: Post-2015 and the MDGs**. The post-2015 agenda has identified three broad sets of goals, which coincide with the three main pillars of the UN: Peace and security, including targets on personal security and democracy, and inclusive political participation. The MDGs, agreed at a UN conference in New York in 2000, helped galvanize anti-poverty efforts by setting out eight goals, including one to halve the proportion of people whose income is less than $1 a day and who suffer from hunger. But with less than three years from 2015, many of the goals will be missed --particularly in fragile settings-- and **social inequality** is becoming a pressing issue following the Arab spring.

One important lesson from the MDGs is that any new framework must be formulated transparently and inclusively, informed by the voices and knowledge of people living in poverty and exclusion.
Recommendation: The SDGs and MDGs must also be fully integrated into a global, overarching post-2015 development framework to avert the risk of developing them in isolation, which risks being both inefficient and counterproductive. A single unified process to define the post-2015 framework should be built upon **multi-stakeholder participation including**, most importantly, **people living in poverty** whose lives and livelihoods will be most impacted by such a framework.

II. Background

II.1 Introduction

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) have framed much of the discussion on development priorities and strategies in the past decade—among governments, international organizations and civil society.

About 1.5 billion people live in areas where violent conflict limits their ability to live, work and get educated. Meanwhile, conflict can reverse developmental gains by decades and it is a huge impediment to achieving the Millennium Development Goals.[7]

The gap in MDG performance between post-conflict and conflict-affected countries, and other developing countries has widened and the reality is that no low-income fragile state has achieved any of the MDGs. Inequities are staggering: 60% of the undernourished, 61% of impoverished, 77 % of children not in primary school live in conflict-affected or fragile countries. About 65% of people with no access to water and sanitation, and 70% of infant deaths occur in the most fragile countries; statistics show that about 58 countries have a homicide rate of more than 10 out of 100,000 people, with 14 countries exceeding 30 per 100,000. Many of these most vulnerable people are in countries in Latin America, others in Sub-Saharan Africa, as DR Congo or Sudan.[8]

Many of the fragile States[9] that have experienced violent conflict have a high chance of relapsing into violence: some 40% of them within 10 years.[10] Peace building is about reducing the risk of relapsing violence and conflict. In addition, one crucial aspect of the relationship between development, peace and security is through the capacity and legitimacy of the State. After a violent conflict, the provision of social services by the state can go a long way toward (re)establishing trust and legitimacy and reinforcing commitment to the peace process—especially if inequity and discrimination issues were some of the drivers of the conflicts and disputes.

The UN system as a whole has concerned itself with addressing the relationship between violent conflict and human development since the signing of the UN Charter in 1945.

II.2 The MDG-Fund

In December 2006, UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of EUR 528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. On 24 September 2008 Spain pledged an additional EUR 90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG-F supports countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other development goals by funding programmes that have an impact on the most vulnerable populations.

The MDG-F operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme (JP) mode of intervention and has currently approved 130 joint programmes in 50 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards the MDGs. Out of the 130 joint programmes, 20 are on conflict prevention and peace building, with an allocation of US$ 94 million. The work carried out addresses conflict both as a cause and symptom of poverty and hunger in the world, recognizing it as a precondition for the fulfillment of the MDGs. These efforts contribute to achieving MDG goals on eradicating extreme poverty, including through the promotion of gender equality and empowerment of women.

The JPs under the MDG-F CPPB thematic window are **Afghanistan, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, DRC, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Lebanon, Haiti, Mexico, Mauritania, Panama, Serbia, Sudan, South Sudan, and the FYR of Macedonia.**

---

[7] World Bank *World Development Report 2011: Conflict Security and Development,* 11 April 2011

[8] Geneva Declaration, Global Burden of Armed Violence, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[9] Please refer to Definitions in Annex one.

[10] World Bank, World Development Report, 2011.

Within the broader development agenda, the JPs are aligned with the broad development strategies at the country level (UNDAF, MDG country strategy, Poverty Reduction Strategies, etc). The programmes in this window seek to contribute to the achievement of the goals through interventions tackling conflict prevention and violence reduction, livelihood improvements against youth violence, and the fostering of dialogue. One common premise is ensuring that people know and exert their rights as an important component of a peace building and conflict prevention strategy. Some joint programmes also pursue specific outcomes that are relevant in their context and situation, such as helping IDPs or building the capacity of a particular minority. The joint programmes support a variety of stakeholders, including the most vulnerable populations, the government, at the national and/or local levels as well as civil society, community, and local leaders.

This report is based on an extensive desk review, including the Mid-Term Evaluations of the 20 programmes and the 4 Final Evaluations.[11] It is also based on UNDP and UN documents as well as interviews with UNDP managers at NYHQ and the coordinators/programme advisers of a few JPs (in addition to the Secretariat of the Fund).

Since the establishment of the MDG-Achievement Fund, emphasis has been placed on the importance of systematically capturing best practices and lessons learned as key factors in the achievement of the MDGs. The consultant reviewed all JPs, but focused on a few key achievements from the Joint programmes. Special attention was also paid to a few key achievements that have potential for sustainability, and possibly replicability.

A key feature of this Window is that the results are very country/region and context specific (as in the good examples of Mexico, Serbia and Colombia, for example). What the 'successes' share is a focus on community needs and specific needs in a specific setting that make it challenging to be replicated in other contexts; as the analysis in the report shows, there are some commonalities by theme. Following are the achievements in the countries in this thematic window grouped by **thematic areas**:

➢ Promoting and Protecting the Rights of IDPs (Mexico, Serbia, Croatia)
➢ Conflict and Violence Prevention (Serbia, Sudan, Guatemala, and FYR of Macedonia, Haiti)
➢ Access to Justice, Strengthening of the Rule of Law (Afghanistan, Mauritania, Bolivia, Mexico)
➢ Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue (Colombia, FYR of Macedonia, Chile, Serbia)
➢ Citizens Security (El Salvador, Panama, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Haiti)
➢ Preventing Conflict Targeting the Most Vulnerable Areas (Lebanon, DR Congo)

II.3 Conflict Prevention and Peace Building

Conflict sensitivity is an approach used by many of the JPs. It considers the potential impact of development or humanitarian interventions on their environment and, particularly, prevailing conflict dynamics, and supports organizations to conduct their activities in the least harmful way. For instance, health or education projects can avoid legitimizing or supporting systems and structures that promote violence and conflict, or creating tensions between groups over access to services. Conflict sensitivity has an important role in supporting humanitarian principles and ensuring that humanitarian assistance fulfills its humanitarian objectives.

Whereas conflict sensitivity can be viewed as the "minimum standard" for development and humanitarian interventions in all conflict-affected contexts, peace building represents a more explicit effort to address the root causes of conflict and violence. In this respect, peace building represents an intervention into conflict dynamics and, therefore, involves a much greater degree of social transformation. The concept of peace building originated in the field of peace studies more than 30 years ago,[12] as an endeavor to create sustainable peace by addressing the root causes of conflict and supporting local capacities for peaceful management and resolution of conflict through both

---

[11] Four Final Evaluation reports are available at time of writing.

[12] The term was coined by Johan Galtung in his *Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking, and Peacebuilding*, in Peace, War and Defense: Essays in Peace Research, Vol. II, ed. Johan Galtung (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers, 1976), 297-298 .

structural and relational means.[13] Up until the 1990s, civil society organizations and NGOs were active in pursuing peace building approaches, but these efforts were largely in parallel to the UN and diplomatic communities.

Conflict prevention cannot be dealt with outside its context, in particular that of conflict analysis. There are many approaches to conflict prevention and a few common definitions.[14] The twenty countries of the MDG-F CPPB Window are all experiencing a different degree of conflict. Social and economic inequalities, and lack of good governance and rule of law, still represent the greatest challenges in the achievement of the MDGs and in determining the transition to a sustainable development and long-lasting peace and democratic participation to decision making processes. [15]

This study focuses on accomplishments and attempts to capture the **positive elements** brought about by (some of) the JPs. However, these **results need to be contextualized**—any best practices need to be understood and appreciated within a context of challenges at the field operational level in many of these countries. For example, in some conflict-affected settings (most notably in Afghanistan, DRC, Sudan, South Sudan, etc.) the overall security situation undermines delivery and programme implementation. What the 'successes' share is a focus on community needs and specific needs that make it difficult to be replicated in other contexts.

III. Achievements and Results

As described in the Background, this section contains the analysis of the achievements grouped by **thematic area**.

III.1 Promoting and Protecting the Rights of IDPs

The legal protection of internally displaced persons (IDPs) is different from that of refugees -- displaced populations across an international border who are protected by an international law convention. IDPs, despite not being the beneficiaries of a specific convention, as is the case for refugees, are protected by national law, human rights law and, if they are in a State experiencing an armed conflict, international humanitarian law. [16] The majority of IDPs are nationals of the State in which they find themselves. As such, they are entitled to the full protection of national law and the rights it grants nationals, without any adverse distinction resulting from the fact of their displacement. Human rights law, which is applicable both in times of peace and in situations of armed conflict, also provides important protection to IDPs. It aims both to prevent displacement and to ensure basic rights should it occur.

Displaced communities are especially vulnerable to discrimination, inequity and are often conflict-affected. Communities that are emerging from conflict benefit from learning about conflict prevention. Basic tools for conflict prevention are knowledge of one's rights and dialogue--at the national and local levels. It brings mutual comprehension on what the problems are and how they can be addressed. Through these tools, JPs try to strengthen the capacity of governments and communities in addressing conflicts.

Often displaced populations are also part of a minority community. Their rights are framed by the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), the UN Declaration of Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities (1992) and other relevant international instruments.

Mexico provides an excellent example through its programme on conflict prevention, development of agreements and peace building for internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Chiapas State. Mexico has an IDP population in Chiapas as a result of the revolution and conflict of 1994 and IDPs are the most vulnerable groups in the region, poor and marginalized. Besides supporting this population and improving their condition of life, the programme assisted civil society, organizations, universities and

---

[13] John Paul Lederach, <u>Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies</u> (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 1997), 20.

[14] For these Definitions please refer to Annex One.

[15] CPR Practice Leader, UNDP Regional Center Panama, name withheld for security reasons, October 2012.

[16] Please refer to annex on Definitions.

women groups, in outlining a draft **framework law to protect and promote the exercise of rights of IDPs** ('Protection Law for IDPs in the State of Chiapas') and guarantee access to justice.

This process began with a study promoted by different local partners (including universities), helping create a sense of ownership in the community. The programme is also carrying out capacity building of local and State authorities in conflict resolution, and building a culture of peace.

The key achievement is the draft of the Chiapas State Government's law on internal displacement, the 'Protection Law for IDPs in the State of Chiapas'. Moreover, more than 100 judges and agents of the Public Prosecutor's Office received training in the procurement, delivery, and administration of justice. This law was approved on 14 February 2012 to prevent displacement and to focus on the rights of IDPs. It was possible due to the good collaboration of four UN agencies, local government and the Government of Chiapas. The Joint Programme for a Culture of Peace promotes access to justice and builds the capacity of local government, local population and improves the situation of IDPs in Chiapas. Since December 2010, and for a period of 13 months UN agencies worked closely with the local government, civil society, academic institutions and the beneficiaries themselves in a very participatory process. The UN provided technical assistance for a document on the new law for the government of Chiapas; it was also involved in the follow-up sensibilization exercise on displacement with local government. This resulted in a good document that reflected international law standards.

The displaced population faces serious marginalization, in addition to poverty, inequity in access to basic social services, including health and education. The JP is helping to change this situation for the vulnerable population through projects in income-generating activities, as well as providing IDPs awareness about their rights.

The law is a significant achievement in the areas of discrimination, inequity and rights of IDPs in Chiapas, through the assistance of the JP. It provides a good example of collaboration of many stakeholders at local level, and with the participation of the beneficiaries themselves. The key positive result of this effort was that the law has put displacement in the public arena. This was the first law in Mexico that dealt with displacement. For the first time in Chiapas (and other areas in Mexico), displacement and the rights of the most vulnerable have become part of the public discourse.

The 'Protection Law for IDPs in the State of Chiapas' includes the rights of IDPs, as recognized by the UN normative principles on displacement. The key objectives of the law are to prevent further displacement and to focus on the needs of those who are already displaced. The law is an achievement as it focuses on preventing the displacement of indigenous communities, as well as other vulnerable populations such as farmers.

What makes this law innovative is the development of a registry of displaced people (recognizing the existence and needs of the displaced) and analysis of this issue at the state legislative level with the goal to better protect the rights of IDPs; this system gives power to the state to apply this law. The JP reached through training local authorities: 914 men and 179 women at local government level (capacity building). It also reached through training (on their rights) 4,971 men and 4,899 women, for a total of 9,870 beneficiaries at the community level.

In addition to the law, the Programmes for Youth (employment, capacity building) have led to an increased awareness of the IDPs (many of them indigenous youth) on issues of gender equity and rights of IDPs and indigenous people, through a communication/information campaign on anti-discrimination and rights. The capacity building included learning about the rights of IDPs and also had a gender and anti-discrimination focus. Training reached 3,200 youth teachers, and parents, on the themes of drugs, alcohol, and violence; about 65 women and men (youth and adults) were trained as 'community communicators'/ facilitators in cultural and community issues, building and became 'agents of change' within their local communities (and training in turn others in the community),

Other interventions resulted in the restructuring of 503 dwellings, as well as sanitation facilities in 15 communities in the localities of Salto, Agua and Tila—reaching more than 1,439 families. The JP also held 68 training session in capacity building on issues such as displacement, community infrastructure, and services, to infirm communities of their rights.[17]

---

[17] All data above courtesy of JP—by email and interview on Skype with programme advisers (names withheld for security reasons).

The process of implementation of the JP in the communities has generated trust between local authorities and communities.[18] The JP has contributed to this trust through its outreach and communications projects. According to the staff on the ground, local government authorities and local leaders appear to be satisfied with the results of the JP, and how it has positively affected the general population (respecting the rights of the displaced and their indigenous culture).[19] This trust has in turn led to a more active participation by the beneficiaries in the social/political activities of the wider community in the state; it has empowered the communities to get more involved in their own development. Specifically, the activities of the JP have resulted in more agencies (UN and NGOs) becoming involved at the community level; it also had the authorities' support to welcome the increased participation of women in the activities of the JP.[20]

Providing information to IDPs about their rights proved crucial in the JP in Chiapas. In another region, in **Southern Serbia**, this approach has also produced positive results. The JP has assisted the most vulnerable by supporting the government in establishing a more equitable system and providing better access to public services; it helped displaced populations gain access to services through the provision of basic registration documentation. Over 600 Roma obtained their first ever ID cards and personal documents thanks to free legal aid, enabling them to exercise their education, health and welfare rights. More than 1,500 Roma have been reached with individual and group health education activities, while 360 Roma had access to the health system for the first time.

Many of Serbia's more than 100,000 Roma are not registered at birth, baring them from most public services, from health care and education, to social assistance and employment – all of which contribute to the Roma's feelings of marginalization from mainstream Serbian life. Poverty and illiteracy also create barriers: most Roma families are unable to afford the fees to initiate administrative procedures and obtain their documents.

Through the fostering of social inclusion programmes, many of the Roma are now able to exercise their basic human rights on an equal footing with other Serbian citizens. For example, a total of 252 Roma in the south Serbian districts of Jablanica and Pcinja have gained access to their personal documents, and have increased awareness about their rights. In addition, local authorities were trained about the difficulties facing unregistered Roma-- a vital first step toward assisting the Serbian government to create stronger, more integrated communities and with fewer discrepancies in wealth and employment between ethnic groups.

Helping IDPs resettle, the JP's efforts resulted in 55 IDP families, with 262 members, purchasing village houses across Serbia or receiving building material packages to finish construction of their private houses helping the Serbian government fulfill its Closure of Collective Centers Strategy.

In addition to access to services, access to jobs is critical for displaced populations; as in Mexico, the JP in Serbia has been working with youth, and as a result, 10 Youth NGO projects have established voluntary services, opened Youth Clubs, and implemented youth programmes. The activities at the centers include language skills (for non-Serbian speaking minorities such as Albanians and the Roma) that are crucial for youth to be able to find employment and pursue higher education. About 2,000 IDPs and refugees were provided with free legal aid in Serbia. In addition, the National Ombudsman Office has opened offices in the towns of Presevo, Bujanovac and Medvedja, establishing its first field presence outside of Belgrade.

Through the JP, migrants in South Serbia have become more able (with appropriate support) to participate in the social and economic life of the region. Key results included the strengthening of municipal capacities for migration management, including the establishment of five Citizens' Advisory Services at community level. In addition, 70 municipal administrators were trained on how to proceed with the reintegration process of returnees according to readmission agreements. [21]

The JP in **Croatia** ('Regional Development, Safety and Social Inclusion in War Affected Areas Enhanced') also focused on groups most in need, including:
- Returnees facing institutional and human obstacles to reintegration

---

[18] This is according to the MDG-F staff on the ground and hard to confirm independently.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Ibid.
[21] PBild Results to Date, By PBILD Office UN, Bujanovac, Serbia, 2012.

- Women facing the risk of violence, exclusion and structural unemployment
- War veterans facing social exclusion and at risk of committing violence
- Children and youth facing exposure to prejudice and intolerance, and at risk of violence

The programme had a strong gender equality component, supporting relevant legal frameworks, national strategies and substantive projects that target women at high risk of poverty and violence, particularly those in rural areas with lower levels of education and those living in areas of former conflict.

A few of the interventions are noteworthy, including the establishment of a coordination mechanism for regional development of war affected areas and violence prevention under the office of the Vice Prime Minister. This includes 'Witness and Victims Support' (WVS) offices working in 4 county courts (Zagreb, Zadar, Osijek and Vukovar) with new offices opened in 2 additional courts (Sisak and Karlovac). A total of beneficiaries 4,209 were reached by Jan 2010 (thanks to an information campaign, a big increase since the 2,269 beneficiaries in October 2009).
The support to the implementation of fundamental rights for returnees has also brought positive results, with 71% of requests for free legal aid approved (6,248 out of 8,755 requests).[22]

Another positive intervention was the enhanced ability of the local population to plan and realize 'Safe Community Plans' with Community Policing: the plans were developed by local crime prevention councils and focused on traffic safety, education on alcohol abuse; creating recreational opportunities and safe environments for youth.

The JP also reached many returnees, women, youth, and war veterans through job creation and business development projects. For example, 50 Cooperatives, associations and family farms improved business processes and access to market through implementation of following activities: assessment of training needs of family farms; vocational trainings; 8 training workshops on EU Leader approach to Rural Development; and radio programs in Vrhovine, a returnee area, to share information on trainings and job opportunities. The total estimated number of direct beneficiaries of the MDG-F Programme in Croatia comes to 19,729 men, 20,963 women; as well as 29 national institutions and 406 local institutions.

National ownership was critical for the success of the programme, and so was the high-level engagement of government partners. Moreover, local project boards and community councils provided the political and managerial framework to ensure communities felt a sense of ownership of the programme, leading to sustainability; co-financing of project activities with local government also ensured ownership of the project.

Promoting the full incorporation of displaced communities in the institutional, political and economic life of a country is one of areas of critical work done by the JPs. This process implies a substantial change in the relations of the State and society. As observed in the cases of Mexico, Serbia and Croatia, fostering local ways to manage displaced communities and returnees is crucial for empowering them.

III.2 Conflict and Violence Prevention

What constitutes conflict and violence prevention support for the UN encompasses a range of development activities, including the development of forums for non-violent settlement of disputes, employment generation activities and rule of law development support. While the overall responsibility is on national actors as the protagonists in a conflict prevention setting, UN support has increasingly been geared toward building so-called infrastructures for peace, a specific set of interdependent state structures, cultural norms and resources which cumulatively contribute to conflict prevention and peace building.

Conflict prevention has three interrelated elements: (i) to help reform governance/institutional reforms required for the peaceful management of conflict and the prevention of emerging violent conflict, (ii) the identification of non-violent means of resolving tension, and (iii) stopping the spread of ongoing

---

[22] MDGF-1975: Closing the Chapter, Social Inclusion and Conflict Transformation in
War Affected Areas of Croatia, *Final Report,* Aug 2011

conflict. These can be further categorized as operational prevention (direct intervention such as deployment of peacekeepers) and structural prevention (addressing root causes in governance, human rights, etc.).

In the area of conflict prevention, the use of crisis and risk mapping analysis as a tool to provide specific conflict related information and analysis can be effective. **Sudan**, faces huge challenges, coming out of a decades-long conflict, still facing areas of conflict/potential conflict (border with South Sudan, Darfur). The country has also undergone a separation from the new State of South Sudan (July 2011) during the course of the project implementation. Risk mapping has helped participating agencies and partners identify areas and activities. The programme's focus ("Sudan: Sustained Peace for Development: Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building") on strengthening systems and capacities for sustainable conflict prevention and management had some good results in 1) helping communities to recover from conflicts through basic service delivery and development of economic opportunities, and 2) introducing reconciliatory practices through training at the community level. [23]

In the border areas between Sudan and South Sudan, the JP supported the training of UN partner agencies involved in the Sustained Peace for Development programme. The mid-term evaluation reported that "The conflict sensitivity training conducted by UNDP for partner agencies was extremely useful, with agencies reporting that it influenced their programming in the Joint Programme and other interventions. It is a positive example of interagency collaboration that can have wide ranging impact on the quality of crisis/post-conflict programming in Sudan." This positive assessment is tempered by the fact that the initiative was part of a wider package of inter-agency activities that suffered from contextual delays and too-great an emphasis on assessments with a commensurate lack of actual 'peace dividend' inputs.[24]

Results are mixed, given the decades-long conflict, but the sensitivity training resulted in a positive influence on local communities.[25] The JP identified local level conflicts that it tried to address pragmatically through various interventions designed either to consolidate peace processes or to foster an environment that prevents the outbreak of conflict. Achievements included institutional capacity assessments conducted to identify technical skill gaps/know-how and needed trainings of local partner institutions. Conflict sensitivity trainings were provided to local authorities, women and youth groups. Moreover, community workshops were conducted bringing conflicting sides together to identify and prioritize basic service interventions. In addition, a focus on gender and children's rights resulted in gender-based violence awareness sessions conducted in Southern Kordofan, as well as community awareness sessions held on children's rights—all these activities created greater awareness for human rights and advocated against violence.

Supporting local communities is a good approach to solve inter-community conflicts, as the support to Tribal Elders in Sudan shows. The Southern Kordofan's Reconciliation and Peaceful Coexistence Mechanism (RPCM) and UNDP's Crisis and Recovery Mapping and Analysis (CRMA) and Conflict Reduction Programme (CRP) supported a community interaction in Al Buram locality to enable the Shatt Nuba and Rawawga Hawazma tribes to jointly decide on interventions for consolidation of peace and reconciliation.

This type of participatory exercise is a good example of how to provide a forum for leaders of two communities to jointly identify the pressing issues affecting both sides and to prioritize these interventions. In addition, it allows the UN system and the state government to identify partners to deliver infrastructure, service and capacity needs. UNDP's capacity to deliver on these needs in Al Buram locality is believed to be boosted by the presence of the Joint Programme (JP) on Conflict Prevention and Peace Building. [26] The programme, implemented in and around Daloka town in Buram, brought resources of eight inter-governmental agencies to assist in consolidation of peace between the Shatt and Rawawga tribes. This type of workshop methodology encourages communities in conflict to jointly reach a set of decisions, and provides a model for future interactions between the communities. [27]

---

[23] No specific data/information available.

[24] Steve Munroe, Mid-Term Evaluation, 'Sustained Peace for Development: Conflict Prevention and Peace Building in Sudan through targeted interventions in selected communities along the 1-1-1956 border', January 2012.

[25] According to JP documents—no data available.

[26] Knowledge Management document on project, UNDP SUDAN CO, 2011.

[27] Ibid.

Haiti has suffered from decades of poverty, vulnerability, political violence and disasters.

The JP features some interesting approaches to conflict and **violence prevention** through local community empowerment and capacity building. For example, 2,000 youth were reached through sensitization on violence through a programme called 'National Observatory on Violence and Crime'. The 'Observatory' was reestablished in 2011 (it had been first developed in 2009) after the destruction suffered in the quake.

Haiti, like many fragile States, has a challenge with reliable raw data, and this 'observatory' which is part of the University in Port-au-Prince has set up a programme for data collection. It is too early to see impact after only one year, but it enjoys a good reputation with the Haitian National Police, which uses the data. In addition, the JP runs training and capacity building sessions on violence and crime prevention in the capital and in six other cities in Haiti (Gonaives, Port-de-Paix, Saint Marc, Les Cayes, Aquin and Ouanaminthe). The programme also brings the police, the municipalities, NGOs and civil society together on issues of violence and crime prevention, through studies, consultations and workshops.

The Observatory helps identify the type of violence affecting communities; it is too early to quantify impact on communities, but it already has a positive impact at the academic level as it has fostered dialogue and discussions on violence and crime prevention. No impact on the institutions themselves yet, but positive strides in identifying how to improve data collection, working closely with the Haitian National Police (PNH). So far, 526,366 people were sensitized in violence and crime prevention through education and information through radio (248,025 men and 278,341 women).[28]

In **Guatemala,** the approach of "Consolidating Peace in Guatemala through Violence Prevention and Conflict Management" has led to the development of three models of "Safe Cities" in three communities in the country (Coban, Chennenula and Santa Lucia). A total of 210 youth were trained in human rights, and IT, job training in courses of 6 months; the JP also reached 123 women and 87 men. As part of violence and crime prevention, about 6,000 women were reached with counseling on GBV, domestic violence, on their rights etc. in the three communities.[29]

The good results in keeping cities safe and preventing crime are now being adapted in other regions in the country, with a special focus on preventive violence and protection for adolescents, women, and community organizations.[30]

Another intervention was the establishment of the 'Delinquency Prevention Division' in the locality of Coban using a violence prevention approach to fight local crime. The 'Delinquency Prevention Division' worked in three departments that prior to the intervention had a high violence and crime index.[31] The JP established alliances with and trained several members from local institutions, media, indigenous leaders and government authorities in the localities of Suchitepequez, Chimaltenango, and San Marcos. The training, which focused on gender, multi-culturalism, community organization and prevention, benefitted about two hundreds local parents, teachers, and women. According to programme documents, this initiative resulted in a decrease in the local violence index and better collaboration between the communities, local government and better response to communities' needs by the police.[32] In addition, 30 members of the local police were trained for 5 months on how to better respond to the needs of communities affected by violence and crime.[33]

Promoting peace building has also improved social cohesion in Southern Serbia, improved access to public services and has supported economic development of minorities. It has established a good partnership between local, national and international stakeholders that has led to collaborative approaches for supporting local media in fostering prevention or mitigating conflict and its effects.

---

[28] Skype interview with Programme Analyst with the JP in Haiti (name withheld for security reasons), November 2012.

[29] Based on interview on Skype with JP's Coordinator and area coordinator (names withheld for security reasons, 20 November 2012).

[30] MDG-F website

[31] Ibid.

[32] This is according to JP's documents and website—no specific data available in either.

[33] Based on interview on Skype with JP's Coordinator and area coordinator (names withheld for security reasons, 20 November 2012).

In **Haiti** 29,300 people (many of them youth) were reached as part of campaign against violence—through radio and print media. Moreover, 300 journalists were trained in reporting on violence prevention, elections, and political violence. An additional 150 youth leaders were sensitized on violence in 5 cities in Haiti.[34]

Gender-sensitivity training is also important in any post-conflict context; in **Serbia**, the training resulted in the town of Vlasotince establishing its first-ever Gender Council and the four municipalities of Vlasotince, Bojnik, Medvedja and Lebane adopted their first-ever Gender Action Plans. Gender equality capacity-building activities to achieve increased participation of women and gender equity at the local level have been done following a 'gender equality survey'.

Other results in increased access for vulnerable communities include the Roma community in Vlasotince now having better access to the National Employment Service programmes; and 13 Safety Councils provided information bulletins to communities to address citizens' safety and security concerns. This also led to increased networking among municipalities.

Inter-ethnic peace building has brought good results in **FYR Macedonia**, where 130 Local Media workers were trained in conflict sensitive reporting, a crucial result, based on the lessons learned of the conflict in the Former Yugoslavia in the 1990s where media propaganda became a tool of war. Moreover, 10 local leaders and activists received training to better address inter-community tensions (in Kicevo, Kumanovo, and Struga). Inclusive reporting and intercultural communications gained official accreditation as separate university courses within the School of Journalism and Public Affairs, with 130 journalists trained on inclusive reporting.

From **Sudan to Serbia to Haiti to Guatemala to FYR of Macedonia**, violence prevention and social cohesion are critical for communities coming out of divisive conflicts. As a result of activities in social cohesion, communities in south Serbia now possess the tools to build stronger and more integrated communities, with fewer inter-ethnic tensions. Conflict-sensitive reporting can result in a more cohesive society: to this end, 24 journalists were trained in gender-, minority- and conflict-sensitive reporting and have since produced 20 conflict-sensitive documentaries. Conflict management training resulted in 30 local professionals trained on mediation skills. The JP places much emphasis on communication, including writing blogs for national media outlets as well as the UNDP Bratislava site. Additional results include a case study of PBILD in the soon-to-be released Social Inclusion handbook by UNDP Bratislava.[35]

III.3 Access to Justice and the Rule of Law

The UN Secretary General has urged the United Nations and its agencies to "focus on finding better ways to support Member States and their populations in the domestic implementation of international norms and standards, working to achieve compliance with international obligations and, most critically, strengthening the institutions, policies, processes and conditions that ensure effective enforcement and enjoyment of a just national and international order."[36] Such support is especially important for conflict-affected countries and is a focus of some of the JPs.

A common feature in conflict-affected countries is the lack of public confidence in the composition and functioning of the national justice system. Outreach beyond main towns is often non-existent and the weaknesses in the prosecution element of the criminal justice system stem from the lack of qualified and properly trained prosecutors. The risk is that a dysfunctional justice system perpetuates a culture of settling disputes through violence. Some of the key factors that lead to violent upheaval in some of the countries under review here were human rights violations, unresolved land disputes, corruption, and inequity. Improving understanding between different communities and promoting human rights and the rule of law is a proven way to help reduce conflict in many contexts.

---

[34] Skype conversation with JP Programme Analyst, November 2012.

[35] In fact on 7 November the government is hosting a donor conference on under-developed municipalities and PBILD is one or two projects that will be presented as a case of best practice in programmatic responses to such challenges. (Documents from Serbia/JP and website).

[36] Strengthening and coordinating United Nations rule of law activities, Report of the Secretary General, New York, 20 August 2010 Report A/65/318.

In **Mauritania** ("Strengthening conflict prevention capacities and the rule of law"), the JP produced good results by targeting areas with high potential for conflict, and focusing on vulnerable groups such as women and youth, as well as the inhabitants of 'adwabas' (villages of former slaves) and communities of returning refugees. The programme strengthened national capacity in conflict prevention and resolution, and established mechanisms for mediating and managing conflict situations, such as early warning networks and trained mediators.

Mauritania presents an interesting use of rule of law and civic education to promote peace.
A total of 3,600 local judicial and administrative officials, village chiefs, NGOs participated in training and capacity building on human rights, rule of law and conflict prevention. About 40,000 beneficiaries were reached directly or indirectly, 79,201 students and 925 youth were reached through civic education; 550 community leaders and 40 journalists were trained in human rights and civic education. An additional 25,000 people reached through cultural activities, such as the initiative 'Building Bridges'.

'Building bridges' through shared spaces is an interesting concept that has helped integrate different ethnic groups in 58 communities in Mauritania. About 47 community parks and infrastructures benefitted 38 100 people; it provided a common space for people to meet.
Through the use of community markets, parks, and income-generating activities managed by committees from the two targeted villages, the communities now enjoy better relations. These interventions have built bridges of reconciliation, trust and peace between the two communities. In addition, new classrooms and playgrounds have brought together children and youth from different backgrounds. Meeting daily in the same schools and recreational areas, this new generation is building relationships and friendships. Obviously it is difficult to measure impact—it is a process that sometimes takes generations in post-conflict settings; however the fact that the two communities are trying to live peacefully together is an achievement in itself. [37]

The project on 'early warning' is an interesting approach, but too early to measure impact. This conflict prevention mechanism is present in 58 localities supported by the JP:

> ➢ As part of the 'early warning' project, 348 conflicts and disputes were identified in the 58 localities; and 261 of them were resolved by the 'early warning' system put in place—a forum for conflict resolution and dialogue.[38]
> ➢ Although it is too early to measure the impact of this system, according to the JP the population appears to appreciate the extra-judiciary mechanism for conflict resolution. According to a survey conducted in May 2012 by the JP, 82% of the population was satisfied.[39]

Post-conflict settings sometime call for creative ways to reach an often illiterate population on peace building issues. Art and theatre are good tools to reach beneficiaries and share information with them in a way they understand. **Afghanistan** is a complex post-conflict setting, but public awareness has brought more visibility and good results at the district level, outside the capital.

Through 'mobile theater' performances, the JP ("Afghanistan: Joint Access To Justice at the District Level", JHRA) reached out to the broader public on issues that are closer to their everyday life (land and domestic violence, family law) and tried to create awareness on sensitive matters such as forced marriage. This is especially significant as the inclusion of women in any programme implementation still presents a challenge in Afghanistan.   What worked in this case was the negotiation with religious and community leaders, followed by their inclusion in the activities. It was the open dialogue with religious and community leaders that led to positive results.

With literacy rates of around 30 percent for adults (and less than 15 percent for women), the theater provided a good tool for learning. The project has partnered with local NGOs (including the NGO Feroogh Media Galaxy) in 21 districts in three provinces in northern Afghanistan to reach communities and inform them about issues related to the law and their individual rights under the law. This good

---

[37] No specific data available from JP
[38] The term 'early warning' is a bit misleading, as in this case it means a forum for discussion and solution of disputes—rather than the 'early warning' strategies used prior to an emergency or disaster.
[39] Information provided by JP Programme analyst by email.

collaboration resulted in 42 theatre performances in public squares and performance centers on topics such as domestic violence, family law and the settlement of land disputes. The performances were popular; in the Kishem District of Badakhshan, for example, approximately 1,500 spectators turned up to watch some of the country's best-known actors stage a performance on forced marriages.[40]

The JHRA project also used more traditional approaches, such as the "training of trainers" (ToTs), in partnership with local NGOs to inform community leaders about local issues. These leaders – such as teachers and village elders – can in turn train their constituents. Since community councils, known as '*shuras*' or '*jurgas*', often resolve family and other disputes where the formal justice system is unable to operate, JHRA and its partners have also reached out to Islamic leaders to integrate human rights principles into traditional community dispute mechanisms. Through the NGO 'Humanitarian Assistance Muska' (HAM), JHRA ToTs reached over 46,000 teachers and secondary school students in 2010. In the Faryab provincial capital of Mainmana, JHRA monitored a ToT covering the International Convention for the Rights of the Child (CRC) and "Justice in Schools," engaging the participants in role plays to deepen their understanding of the issues.[41]

The activities in public awareness brought more visibility and allowed more interaction especially at the District level, outside the capital. Even if results in this area are difficult to quantify, it still can be seen as a successful intervention, in such a difficult socio-cultural-political context.[42]

Bolivia shows how support to improving access to the law, through the JP on "Integrated Prevention and Constructive Transformation of Social Conflicts" can support communities. The JP resulted in the technical support to the assembly and representatives of the legislative branch, as well as support to the Ministry of Autonomy on conflict management. Other assistance included framework laws on protection of the environment, human development, human rights and risk prevention and management. A strong communication strategy was built in the JP, providing support in public awareness on conflict resolution in urban areas and creation of political and social consciousness. Achievements include technical support for the new Constitution and rule of law; capacity building for civil society, and, as a result, increased dialogue among beneficiaries.[43]

The JP focused on strengthening of Rule of law, Justice and capacity building in the area of conflict prevention. It dealt with discrimination, dialogue and conflict resolution. The Final Evaluation identified some aspects of the JP and partnership with the government that are significant in terms of impact. One pertains to 'La Comisión Técnica del Ministerio de Justicia' (The techical Commission of the Ministry of Justice) where most of the judicial reforms were developed. The support to the 'Defensoría del Pueblo' was also important as it helped reduce dependence on internatonal aid, and also supported the conflict prevention unit of this institution.

The State of Chiapas had weak capacity at the government level and lagged behind other states in criminal justice reform and rule of law. The JP in Chiapas has produced good results in the area of capacity building of local authorities and in the area of rule of law. A positive result was the increased access to justice for vulnerable populations. [44]

III.4 Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue

Inter-ethnic dialogue is a useful tool for conflict prevention and peace building. Experience in several fragile settings has shown that empowering and strengthening the capacities of individuals, communities, and institutions to manage ever-present conflict and violence factors is essential to peace building. Attention should be paid not only to national level institutions, but also to the community level for accountability of institutions to its citizens. This helps local partners find compromises, and develop constructive relationships.

---

[40] Information from interview with programme adviser KM/BCPR (name withheld for security reasons).
[41] Ibid.
[42] The JP was eventually closed due to the inability to implement most of its activities because of the security situation in the country. However, even if the programme was ended before the official deadline, it gave some promising results (Source: KM, BCPR, name withheld for security reasons).
[43] CPR Practice Leader, UNDP Regional Center Panama Name withheld for security reasons, October 2012.
[44] For additional details on Chiapas and the new law on IDPs, please consult the section on this earlier in the text.

Inter-cultural dialogue has taken a new meaning in the context of globalization and it is becoming a vital way of maintaining peace and world unity, to ensure space for and freedom of expression to all cultures. Therefore, it isn't a matter of identifying and safeguarding every culture in isolation, but rather of revitalizing them in order to avoid segregation and cultural entrenchment and prevent conflict.

A few of the JPs, are designed to facilitate the establishment of a functional conflict transformation system by strengthening capacity at the local and national levels, as well as promoting a multi-cultural civic identity—as in the cases of **FYR of Macedonia, Serbia, Colombia, and Mexico** among others.
   The strategy is to facilitate a systemic linkage among existing responsible mechanisms at national and local levels, building conflict resolution expertise where none/few exist; enhancing the capacity of central and local bodies to facilitate inclusive problem-solving processes and consensus-building around community priorities, strengthening the commitment to an inclusive civic national identity with respect to diversity, supporting the longer term role of education, and work with local leaders, civil society and the media to facilitate constructive civic dialogue that promotes inter-cultural awareness and values informing peaceful co-existence.

The conflict-affected region of **Nariño,** in **Colombia** is a case in point. And so are the cases of the **FYR of Macedonia and Serbia**—different continents and different regional contexts, but the same positive results in fostering understanding and dialogue have been achieved through each of the JPs respectively**.**

Colombia's internal armed conflict dates back over 40 years, with serious violations of human rights as a direct consequence of ongoing fighting reported each year. As a direct consequence, Colombia figures as one of the world's largest crises of internal displacement, with between 3.2 million and 4.9 million people being displaced since the mid-1990s. It is estimated that guerrillas and paramilitary organizations are present in 31 of the country's 32 departments and that these armed groups sustain their military operations by controlling land and people, often through the use of anti-personnel mines and improvised explosive devices. This has brought greater pressure on communities whose civilian causalities have actually increased from 24% since 2008 to 35% in 2009. Moreover, for those communities taking part in state programmes associated with the substitution of illicit crops or collaborating with the security forces, there are increased risks of reprisals by these insurgent groups.[45]

Violence, forced displacement and territorial confinement of local communities affect many of the **indigenous communities in the department of Nariño** (as well as those of Arauca, Cauca, Vaupés, and Chocó). This, together with the historical marginalization and exclusion, structural problems of poverty, malnutrition and illiteracy have placed indigenous communities at high levels of risk.

Afro-Colombian communities are also increasingly being forced off their lands by illegal armed groups and mega projects such as the expansion of extractive industries (oil palm, commercial tree plantations, mining, oil and gas exploration) which have an important impact on their land tenure, resource management systems and livelihoods.

Strengthening local capacities for peace building in the Department of Nariño has brought some concrete positive achievements, especially in the areas of institution building, political, cultural and inter-ethic dialogue—with a focus on ethnic and cultural differences, gender, early recovery/food security, as well as the principle of **'Do no Harm'.**[46]

The process has led to improved relations with national partners and among participating agencies. In addition, it has brought to a more active engagement of the UN Resident Coordinator (RC) who established a direct dialogue with the government of Nariño. Furthermore, it helped to integrate and identify synergies with activities related to other programmes carried out in the same region thus improving performance of 'Do no Harm'. The success of the programme intervention is due in part to the focus at the programmatic level on improving the coordination with national counterparts,

---

[45] IASC IA Inter-Cluster Mission to Colombia, Report, August 2010. (The consultant was one of the main writers of the report following a high-level IA mission to Colombia in June 2010.
[46] Please refer to Annex on Definitions

enhancing institution and capacity building, in particular in the provision of services to vulnerable groups (protection, assistance, support to nutrition, income generating activities).

A key element of this system is on how to increase the empowerment of and dialogue with communities, including establishing focal points at the level of the Department. This strategy improved communication and interaction with municipalities, ethnic groups, indigenous councils and community leaders—increasing understanding and social cohesion, which are obviously critical elements in peace building in communities that have suffered conflict and discrimination.[47]

Inter-cultural dialogue: the representatives of 3 ethnic groups (both indigenous and Afro-Colombian) worked closely with the 'alcaldia', the local government in Nariño in eight localities. Capacity building and 'direct implementation' are areas of focus for the JP's work with NGOs and ethnic organizations. One of the latter, Ciern, is not only receiving capacity building support, but is also implementing some of the projects, thus creating a sustainable process of 'double capacity building'. This means that capacity building reached the target population in two ways: one as beneficiaries of the project; the second as implementers of local institutional capacity in their communities. One must note that this second capacity building strategy develops the internal institutional managerial capacity of local organizations, providing them with the tools to interact with local leaders and authorities and other organizations. This result is also innovative as it moves the concept of target population from the role of beneficiary to that of participant.

The JP's activities led to improved relations and communication between the communities and local authorities. Achievements included the establishment of two capacity building schools (one for the Afro-Colombian community and one with the indigenous community Eperara). About 500 people were trained, focusing on local development and peace approaches. The communities in Pasto and Eperare also developed, through the JP, 2 "planes de vida" (Life plans) and four administrative plans (as part of the 'Life Plans').[48]

Other results included supporting the cultural identity and knowledge of three communities[49] and strengthening the organizational know-how of the communities through capacity building in administration and management for four 'offices' of three ethnic groups.

Providing information to vulnerable communities on the rule of law and their rights is an excellent peace building tool. In Colombia, this approach led to better communication and relations between ethnic groups and local institutions, particularly in connection with a new law. The new Law on victims and land (Law 1448) has been in use since 2011. The JP was also instrumental in assisting the community of Eperara with providing information and awareness about the regulation 'Auto 092' which dealt with the application of laws for the protection of women who are victims of forced displacement/relocation; and assisting the community to include their proposals on protection of victims as part of another social protection plan. This plan, 'El Plan de Salvaguarda' was a plan to strengthen indigenous communities that are in danger of disappearing. Ethnic community councils ('cabildos indígenas') supported two cases of victims of violence, working with the local authorities.

Another successful result is the 'Nomadic/Itinerant School' – a project that focused on capacity building for women in the ethnic and indigenous communities, giving them capacity and skills and a voice, including teaching them how to interact with local government and ask for their rights. It traveled between different communities to reach more women, and it also provided 'training of trainers' activities, leading to better sustainability.

Capacity building is a very powerful tool to empower local communities. In addition to the 500 women trained, 227 community leaders and local authorities were trained in this region. Training in IT and literacy classes strengthened the capacities of local authorities and leaders in this under-developed region. In addition, training in human rights and dialogue and crisis management provided these

---

[47]ESTRATEGIA DE SOSTENIBILIDAD PROGRAMA CONJUNTO VENTANA DE PAZ, Colombia, and Skype interview with JP Coordinator, October 2012 (name withheld for security reasons).

[48] The 'Life Plans' are equivalent to development plans of western authorities, but they are of indefinite duration, as decided by the community itself. The 'administrative plans' of the Life Plans pertain to the normative rules of the ethnic community.

[49] Inti Raymi (Pastos), Tachinawe (Eperara), Minga Cultural (Afro)

community leaders with new peaceful tools to resolve crises. A third group benefitted from training: 172 children were educated on culture and indigenous traditions. It is expected that a total of 500 will have been reached by the end of the programme. In addition, 400 youth were reached through job training.

Protection of children and youth as well as a gender perspective have been included in municipal plans, as a result of the efforts and awareness campaigns by the JP. Specific results included the inclusion of gender issues in municipal development plans; victims' participation in local socio-political and judicial context; development of local plans with focus on victims of the conflict; and awareness campaigns on ethic development plans through community training centers. The process also resulted in protection plans for children through youth initiatives in dance, traditional music.

The success of the programme intervention was due in part to the focus at the programmatic level on improving the coordination with national counterparts, enhancing institution and capacity building, in particular in the provision of services of vulnerable and conflict-affected communities (protection, assistance, support to nutrition, income generating activities). Key results included reaching 3,629 families as beneficiaries of interventions in food security and income-generation:
- ➢ 659 families were reached on food security;
- ➢ 880 women reached by capacity building in income-generating activities;
- ➢ 400 youth reached for income-generating actitivities;
- ➢ 1,690 families reached on income-generating actitivities (food production).

Ethnic communities became more knowledgeable on the implementation of the Law no 1448 (2011) on victims and land issues—thus providing them with the information about their rights regarding crime and land issues and discrimination.

With the support of the JP and the law, communities most at risk of displacement had access to humanitarian assistance and to legal aid. For examples, four cases of victims of crime/discrimination are going through the judicial system at present. Moreover, a protection plan is now in force in the Eperara community, with focus on protecting vicitims within the local justice system. Similarly, Afro-Colombian communities in the region of Sanquianga and Telembi now enjoy better support and protection.

Pursuing locally owned solutions (and 'do no harm') and fostering local ownership begins by ensuring that peace building priorities, needs, as well as approaches are determined locally. Including the principle of 'do no harm' as one of the objectives of the programme and its approach is innovative. It focuses attention on the concept and how it directs the approach to rights and dialogue with vulnerable communities. Although this is widely recognized as a key humanitarian principle within the context of the Paris Declaration, it is significant that it was spelled out as one of the objectives of the JP. This project is unique as it takes the principle of 'do no harm' one step further as it is part of the main goals of the joint programme.[50]

As a result of activities in social cohesion and inclusion, communities in south **Serbia** are now stronger, more integrated; the project is also striving to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and conflict drivers. As language is a barrier for minorities, directories/information for the communities of Jablanica & Pcinja districts are now available in Serbian, Albanian and English. The Roma community in Vlasotince has better access to the National Employment Service programmes. Moreover, 30 local professionals were reached through training in conflict management through mediation skills.

Chile is a culturally diverse country with 9 major indigenous groups; the JP has helped increase the space for dialogue and participation of citizens, especially indigenous communities. There have been recent changes in public policies for the recognition of indigenous rights and cultural diversity and within this context the JP ("National capacity-building for intercultural conflict prevention and management in Chile") supported training of executive and legislative branches on pluralism, cultural diversity and dialogue.

The strong conflict resolution and mitigation component was quite effective and brought some results with indigenous communities—especially regarding land and property rights. Expropriation of land and consequent exploitation of natural resources are the main causes of conflict, aggravating the

---

[50] Please refer to footnote no. 21.

social conflict between the 'dominant' population and ethnic minorities—within this context, the JP helped increase dialogue and understanding between different groups.

Moreover, a study is being developed on intercultural relations in Chile and two training sessions on international law were delivered to 350 indigenous leaders. An agreement was reached with the Chilean police force to integrate international human rights standards and standards pertaining to indigenous peoples into staff training.

In an effort to improve inter-ethic dialogue, one JP ("Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration in **FYR Macedonia**"), followed the good example of Ghana and Suriname on Mediation. Looking at the experience of Suriname and Ghana in the area of good governance, for example, resulted in the creation of new mechanisms at the local sub-governmental level called peace councils as well as the creation of a quasi-independent body for mediation support.

Moreover, by following good practices in education from Ghana and Suriname, resulted in the creation of youth educational and cultural programmes. Another key results was better access to services for minority young people, through the provision of language classes as the language barrier is still an issue for minorities.[51]

Over a hundred representatives of civil society organizations and community leaders were trained in dispute resolution methodologies. Grants were also implemented to enhance inter-ethnic dialogue in universities and in three pilot municipalities. A "Diversity Reporting" handbook was distributed to journalists offering guidelines on how to reflect country's diversity.[52]

Croatia provides an interesting case of enhanced community integration, safety and social cohesion through its Safe-Community Plans, These plans, designed by Crime Prevention Councils, are sustainable mechanisms for communities to jointly discuss, analyze and agree courses of action to improve safety and security. A total of 10 safe-community plans were developed by local crime prevention councils and implemented under the MDG-F Programme. The safe-community plans focused on common problems affecting communities and included traffic safety, education on alcohol abuse, creating recreational opportunities and safe environments for youth as well as refurbishing community centers.

III.5 Citizens Security in Latin America

As noted in the Background section, one of the two broad categories in this window is the focus on Citizens Security in Middle Income countries. Citizens Security has become a major challenge in Latin America. The Human Development Report for Central America, published by UNDP in 2009, points out that security is the main issue of concern for the sub-region. The homicide rate in Latin America is the highest in the world, and murder is the leading cause of death in various cities in countries like Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela, El Salvador and Mexico.[53]

The best examples of how to counter this trend come from Central America, foremost from El Salvador, a country that initiated this type of intervention, which is now being followed by most JPs in Central America. El Salvador developed innovative security projects and is now planning to conduct a survey of beneficiaries to document the process.[54]

The issue of security requires an integrated strategy with three components: preventing and counteracting violence and crime; making security institutions more efficient and effective by incorporating a gender-sensitive approach and respect for human rights, and, lastly, strengthening communities.

This Thematic Window has specific objectives in each country in terms of both conflict prevention and security. However, it is necessary to refer to citizens security as an important regional initiative because it is targeted on a country basis, but with regional coverage. It has four main areas of work,

---

[51] No data is available, on the initial results of these efforts to bring about societal change with the support of local media, community and religious leaders, women and youth groups and business community.

[52] No additional data available.

[53] UNDP, "A Decade of work on Citizens Security and Conflict Prevention in Latin America and the Caribbean, 2001-2010".

[54] Skype interview with UNDP Regional Coordinator (name withheld for security reasons), October 2012.

including two in matters of security, namely: i) Support systems and capacities for the prevention and reduction of armed violence and ii) support for recovery and sustainable reintegration at the local level.[55]

El Salvador ("Building social capital to reduce violence: A new transition in El Salvador") provides a good practice, in its effort to build capacity of national partners in reducing violence, the programme has brought into the municipal committee the armed forces, the police and the representative of the office of the mayor. This synergy and cooperation has led to a reduction of violence.[56]

The strategy to reduce violence, for example, has resulted in the decision to prohibit the carrying of firearms in 27 municipalities in El Salvador, after an assessment on trends in violence conducted at the local level. This measure was implemented and adopted with the involvement and coordination of different institutions at municipal level, including the mayor's office. The results of an awareness campaign against violence and citizens participation have been positive. After two months, homicides dropped by 12% in the municipalities involved. The number also lowered injuries reported by the National Civil Police by 40% and thefts by 7.1%. [57]

There is an obvious strong link between crime and inequality—the latter is a serious issue in **Panama**, with 40% of the population now living below the poverty line. In the first decade of the 21st century, homicide rates more than doubled, making Panama one of the countries with the highest rates of crime in the region. This UN Joint Programme has strengthened institutional mechanisms and policies in the security sector and increased coordination with government organizations, civil society, and other key stakeholders in the security and justice sectors.

A system has been created at the national level in Panama to analyze information and knowledge to recommend the most appropriate actions in terms of violence reduction, citizen security and construction of peace. Key achievements of the JP ('Improving citizens' security, contributing to the social construction of peace') include conducting an assessment (with a gender perspective) that determined the effectiveness of the regulations and incarceration procedures applied to juvenile offenders. An 'Advisory Council for the Observatory on Citizen Security' is now operational and made up of respected members of Panamanian society. Domestic violence is a challenge of citizen security and the JP has led to the strengthening and reorganization of networks against domestic violence to better assist women in the targeted communities of Arraijan, Chorrera, and San Miguelito districts. Both gender and human rights perspectives were integrated into the programme, which provided for the inclusion and participation of vulnerable groups, particularly young people.

Given the context of stability in **Costa Rica** (despite the 2011 border dispute with Nicaragua), achievements of the efforts of the JP included the creation of educational and recreational opportunities for youth and children as well as strengthening their capacities for conflict resolution through dialogue. This encouraged local capacity to prevent violence and promote peace through the "National Plan for Prevention of Violence and Promotion of Social Peace: A Country without Fear", and strengthened the institutional capacities of 9 targeted communities, creating alternative spaces for people who live close to violence. Awareness training was provided to teachers and 124 officials from the nine communities on topics related to fostering a culture of peace.

Public institutions have fostered a management model for the programme. In particular, the governance and implementation of the programme are left to 2 committees, one technical/political bringing together every two months representatives of ministries and UN agencies, and another, technical/operational which meets more frequently ensuring exchange of information and coordination of activities. This model has resulted in improved coexistence through violence reduction, re-building of the social structure and control over arms and drug use.

Moreover, at national level, it promoted the adoption of a national policy on citizen security. This effort resulted in a mapping of all institutions dealing with security and crime prevention and reduction; and the information gathered was shared with the national police to create synergies. An additional result

---

[55] UNDP, "A Decade of work on Citizens Security and Conflict Prevention in Latin America and the Caribbean, 2001-2010".
[56] Conversation with UNDP Coordinator, name withheld for security reasons.
[57] Compendium of Lessons Learned, Knowledge management documents, September 2011.

was the contribution to the formulation of a new national policy on the issue, launched officially in 2011.[58]

Another accomplishment dealt with capacity building on conflict resolution, reintegration of youth, counter trafficking/ consumption of drugs, capacity building of national police, rehabilitation of community areas and parks to create opportunities for dialogue and cultural exchange. One key result was the improved understanding and dialogue between the community and police, another, the opening of 'Casas de Justicia" (Legal Aid Justice Centers) in Santa Cruz, San José, Desamparados, and Heredia as well as an additional seven in two other regions.

As part of the strategy to improve coexistence and build communities without fear, the JP established youth networks in ten communities. The 10 networks represent a space for exchanging views on issues such as violence prevention, building a culture of peace, alternative dispute resolution. Prevention activities and dialogue in the community of Limón are also improving security; for example, policemen /policewomen were trained and took the role of leaders working together with youth in Limón on prevention of violence.[59]

One feature the JPs have in common is the inclusion of gender in Latin America's Strategy on Citizens Security. A gender-sensitive programme proved essential in vulnerable communities affected by conflict, inequality and marginalization: from the IDP women in Chiapas to the Afro-Colombian women in Narino, from El Salvador to Chile, mainstreaming gender in security pays dividends. The JP in Guatemala, for example, has managed to strengthen the legal framework in key areas of violence prevention, particularly benefitting women. Of note is the set-up of the Office of Gender in the Guatemalan national police which is in charge of training the police on gender and human rights.

Women and girls are at risk of domestic violence as well as Gender Based Violence (GBV). The JP in **Guatemala** provided support to women in communities by fostering understanding and dialogue through awareness campaigns on GBV, for example. **Haiti** is a country where the vast majority of the population is poor and vulnerable. Reported cases of gender-based violence have risen sharply in the last ten years, especially after the 2010 earthquake. Conditions in the IDP camps in Port-au-Prince – where still half a million people live [60] are dismal and GBV is rampant.[61] GBV is underreported, but OFC, one of five women's organizations supported by the MDG-Fund, sees up to five cases of physical or sexual violence every week. The center offers psychological care and legal assistance to victims of assault, and has served more than 80 women in less than seven months.

Haiti, the poorest nation in the western hemisphere, struggled with violence even before the trauma and dislocation of the 2010 earthquake brought fresh tensions to already strained communities. Between 2002 and 2008, for example, the reported number of rapes grew almost 2000 % from 57 cases to 1192. [62] Though possibly reflecting a greater access to victims rather than an absolute increase in rapes, the need for services is great (much of the population in the camps were residents—before the quake-- of the violent neighborhoods of Cite Soleil, Carrefour, Bellair, which are run by gangs and so violent that international agencies and even government services cannot often gain access to these areas.)[63]

To combat gender-based violence, the MDG-Fund is financing a joint UN programme to help understand where and why violence is occurring and to create targeted responses for each of the five cities in the project area. With the State University of Haiti, the joint programme is supporting the National Observatory on Violence and Crime, with the State University of Haiti to collect and provide reliable data on violence and criminality in the country. As part of an integrated response, it has also strengthened the ability of women's organizations like OFC – as well as health clinics and camps for

---

[58] UNDP, Citizen Security, Ibid.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Based on direct observation by the consultant during several UNICEF missions in 2010-11 and by direct observation in April 2012 when conducting as team leader an evaluation of the emergency programmes of the American Red Cross in the camps. More recent UNICEF documents still quote same figure in fall of 2012.

[61] Data is unclear—due under reporting mainly, and insufficient M&E.

[62] Various JP documents.

[63] Based on direct experience and knowledge from the consultant previous assignment as the head of OCHA in Haiti (2004-05) and again through UNICEF and American Red Cross missions in 2010-12.

people displaced by the earthquake – to counsel and care for victims of violence through material assistance as well as technical support provided by UN Women. To help tackle the drivers of violence, the programme has reached hundreds of beneficiaries through awareness-raising campaigns; it has also trained youth on conflict management skills and community leaders on violence and conflict-resolution. It set up centers for women in 5 cities; trained the personnel; the centers served 1,004 women with health services, psychological counseling.

The JPs in Latin America are starting to show results in this key area—through innovative approaches in dialogue, mediation, capacity building, small business creation, access to justice and social services—all with an inclusive focus on girls and women.

While justice and peace are sometimes thought to be at odds in post-conflict contexts, gender and citizens security makes a compelling example of (access to) justice contributing to sustainable peace.

III.6 Preventing Conflict Targeting the Most Vulnerable Areas

Though measures of fragility vary, fragile States typically lack some of the basic tools of nation-building: good governance, strong policies, skilled personnel, functional infrastructure and services, educated citizens, an active civil society and a competitive private sector. Civil and border conflict is an all-too frequent reality. As a result, the JPs are focusing not only on the most vulnerable populations, but also on areas of great vulnerability within a country—such as a border area (as in the cases of Sudan and South Sudan, for example).

Countries may be fragile in some areas and not others, and they may also move in and out of that condition. In this precarious environment, communities and families lack resilience, leaving them highly exposed to natural and human-caused disasters. The challenges of reducing poverty and achieving the Millennium Development Goals are particularly daunting. Working effectively in fragile states requires a long-term, context-specific approach, and that is the approach taken by a few of the JPs. Two Joint Programmes stand out in this area, both in countries that have experienced conflict for decades, and are still fragile states, Lebanon and DR Congo.

The JP in Lebanon ("Lebanon: Conflict prevention and peace building in Lebanon") targets Palestinian refugees in camps, the Lebanese community, and communities on the border with Syria, all affected by historical conflict and poverty. In this region
capacity building on conflict resolution and mediation and reducing risk of conflict through socio-economic activities are crucial.

One good example is the support to the so-called Popular Committees (governance mechanisms in the Palestinian camps), providing members with capacity building and training on mediation, conflict resolution and participation. These committees, appointed by different factions and parties, and used to be frequented only by men over 50 years of age, and saw women participation as a taboo. The intervention resulted in confidence building and renewed trust in the UN and the new participation of women. Participation of women and collaboration with women working groups is now a pre-requisite for any allocation of grants to the 'committees'.

As we saw from the achievements in some of the other countries reviewed, focusing on youth brings big peace dividends. Youth participate in violence for many reasons, including lack of hope for the future, limited economic opportunities, traditional structures that neglect the voices of young people, and broken ties with families and communities. In 2009 and in partial fulfillment of the MDG-F JP "Conflict Prevention and Peace Building in North Lebanon", Lebanese and Palestinian young people were trained in a local schools-based initiative in twinned Lebanese public and UNRWA (refugee) schools. This lead to better understanding and dialogue among the students and both groups were empowered through the training. The training was launched and youth dialogue clubs were established, providing youth with opportunities to engage in as members of communities and to express themselves creatively. Additional results included better understanding among students through the work with the Ministry of Education and different religious groups in Lebanese schools. A website was also created where youth could upload MDG-F success stories, pictures, and other news of interest, and interact.

Social media can be a powerful tool, especially to reach young people. The *"Youth Empowerment on the use of Social Media"* training in Lebanon, for example, provided youth with opportunities to learn about managing conflicts and expressing themselves without violence by creating tools such as a website where they could upload stories of interest. In addition, the training and the implementation of its strategies provided young people with self-esteem, connection to peers and communities and a positive self-identity, all of which reduce vulnerability to joining violent movements. The low-cost tools of social media are essential to implement an effective practice of a conflict resolution program. [64]

Social media and the internet can indeed be used effectively to help young people expressing themselves without conflict, and also to assist them in finding employment and honing their skills. Within the 'Knowledge is power youth Grant', 62 young people in **Serbia**, of whom 32 were women, between the ages of 15—30, completed a training to: 1) active job searches; 2) how to start your own business; 3) how to write and business and marketing plan. This has resulted in fostering a group of youth who are now ready for employment and for developing their own small business.[65]

By stabilizing and reducing violence and providing economic alternative and social services (health centers, water wells), the JP "**Democratic Republic of the Congo**: Project to Support Stabilization and Conflict Prevention in North Kivu" is working to prevent that the population and youth in particular fall back in the dynamic of recruitment by armed groups. Each implementing partner in the JP has a specific role and works with others creating synergies even outside the participating agencies: the JP has set-up centers for the assistance of women victims of sexual violence --health and psychological support and training are used to empower women by promoting system of socio-economical reintegration.

The Joint Programme contributed (before it closed in 2012) to improved security and stabilization in the Democratic Republic of the Congo's violent province of North Kivu. It assisted 70,000 returnees and victims of sexual violence to reintegrate into their communities and to equitably manage their livelihoods. It directly benefited these returnees, their dependents and vulnerable members of host communities. [66] Women represented 50% of the beneficiaries.

III.7 Trends

Like most global thematic studies, this review also presents a challenge in terms of showing general commonalities and trends. As seen in this section, what the JPs have in common is wide themes and approaches, with as many approaches as there are countries in the thematic window. But a few significant trends stand out:

> ➤ **Integrated Multi-sectoral approaches**

Simultaneously addressing multiple Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) has the potential to complement essential interventions to accelerate gains for the most vulnerable. This approach is challenging in reality as most UN Agencies still have strong individual mandates and identities. The UN system is however moving toward a more integrated approach, i.e., with the ONE UN strategy, and with Integrated Peacekeeping and Political Missions. The MDG-F Joint Programmes present another interesting attempt at improving coordination in often difficult operational settings.

Within this very diverse group there are a couple of issues to point out. In terms of successful **integrated multi-sectoral approaches**, the cases of Serbia, DR Congo, Mexico and Colombia stand out in the group of countries in the CPPB window (for additional details, please refer again to the section on results above). In these four cases reviewed as well as in a few other JPs, the JP assisted in creating a good synergy among key stakeholders, leading to integrated results to better serve the beneficiaries. The approach of working together in a coordinated manner across sectors is a positive strategy; this strategy has benefitted some of the JPs reviewed; others are still facing a few challenges in adapting operationally to a more integrated and coordinated approach across sectors.[67]

---

[64] Report of the Training Workshop On Managing Knowledge for Conflict Prevention and Peace Building: "Youth Empowerment on the use of Social Media", May- July 2012

[65] PBILD, Newsletter, March-April 2012.

[66] JP documents and DRC website

[67] In some cases, as seen in the Mid-Term Evaluations, there is still a strong Agency identity rather than a Joint programme identity, with duplication, and lack of coordination. (Afghanistan, South Sudan, among others).

➢ **Equity**

Equity provides a good framework of analysis as witnessed in a few of the more successful JPs. Three JPs stand out, based on the research, in the area of addressing **inequalities**. As we have noted in the above analysis on results, the cases of **Mexico, Colombia, and Serbia** were particularly successful in addressing inequalities in marginalized communities. Part of the success in all three cases was to focus on region- and community-specific contextual inequalities and issues, fostering dialogue between communities and local governments, advising beneficiaries of their rights in terms of access to social services and legal rights. The case of Mexico was particularly significant as it led to a law on the rights of IDPs and put displacement on the map in terms of social discourse (for additional information on this, please refer to sections IV and V on Mexico).

➢ **Regional Trend in Equity and Citizens Security**

Most countries at global level face increased expectations by their citizens in terms of rights, and bridging gaps in inequalities and discrimination. Many of the populations, including ethnic and indigenous populations, are now demanding increased human rights, protection and judicial process. However the capacity to respond by most governments is weak. Indigenous people now have a voice but are pushing for more rights. Tensions are high and dialogue and mediation are crucial.[68]

Moreover, in Latin America, the theory of armed conflict does not apply in the same way as in sub-Saharan Africa or Afghanistan, with the exception of Colombia. Equity and citizens security are the two key issues in Latin American Countries (LAC). In fact, a new kind of conflict affects this region, a socio-political conflict; this type of conflict has to do with the role of women, indigenous people, good governance, natural resources, organized crime, drug trafficking, and corruption.

The Latin America region is a good example of how to foster best practices in CPPB, through the JPs, to:[69]
➢ Support national dialogue processes (as in Nicaragua or Honduras) to prevent and transform the impact of conflicts on the basis of consensus.
➢ Promote the strengthening of national and local capacities to mitigate the impact of conflicts (Bolivia, Mexico, Colombia).
➢ Improve citizen security through the support and design/implementation of national citizen security policies in Central America (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Brazil, Honduras and Guatemala).
➢ Support institutional and legal framework (as in Mexico, with a new law in Chiapas).

Within this context, the Joint Programmes have played a key role in terms of citizen security—from El Salvador to Brazil, from Panama to Chile.

➢ **Inclusion of a Gender Dimension in Joint Programmes**

Social inclusion of women is important for sustainable development, reconciliation and conflict prevention. Most of the activities within conflict prevention and peace building have a gender component, and crises have already an impact within the social structures, breaking and overturning them, bringing in new cross cutting elements. This strategy is framed within the context of recent legal international standards, including Security Council Resolution 1325 (SCR 1325, S/RES/1325) among others. The Security Council adopted SCR 1325 on women and peace and security on 31 October 2000. The resolution reaffirms the important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts, peace negotiations, peace building, peacekeeping, humanitarian response and in post-conflict reconstruction and stresses the importance of their equal participation and full involvement in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security.[70]

---

[68] UNDP Coordinator, Name withheld for security reasons

[69] Source: PP presentation Board/CPR

[70] Resolution 1325 urges all actors to increase the participation of women and incorporate gender perspectives in all United Nations peace and security efforts. It also calls on all parties to conflict to take special measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence, particularly rape and other forms of sexual abuse, in situations of armed conflict. The resolution provides a number of important operational mandates, with implications for Member States and the entities of the United Nations system.

There is evidence that the systematic abuse of women's rights directly contributes to, and is an outcome of, state fragility, and that post conflict societies witness dramatically increased levels of gender-based and sexual violence. UN SC Resolution 1325 (2000) specifically recognizes the under-valued and under-utilized contributions women make to conflict prevention, peacekeeping, conflict resolution and peace building. It also stresses the importance of women's equal and full participation as active agents in peace and security.

The section above on citizens security reviewed the role of gender mainstreaming as crucial for the success of programmes: as in the examples of activities with the IDP women in **Chiapas** as well as the Afro-Colombian and indigenous women in Narino, as well as women in **El Salvador** and **Chile** as good practices of gender mainstreaming.

In addressing gender in the CPPB window, it is critical to understand that women are vulnerable because of the context they live in and the vulnerabilities (inequity, poverty, discrimination) they share with other groups, such as children and youth. Another important element is security and protection of women in conflict and post-conflict settings is key, as we saw in the example of the **DR Congo**.

Another element is closing the economic gap between ethnic groups and the majority; as for example, between the ethnic communities and the Serbs, and between **South Serbia** and the rest of the country; and including women in the process is vital for economic recovery and peace building. Helping women to grow their businesses and expand to bigger markets provides an example to other communities.   Employment and self-employment are essential peace-building tools. Many of the world's conflicts are linked to questions of access to resources, including land and livelihoods.

Through the JP, for example, 27 women from the municipalities of Crna Trava and Vlasotince were able to open their own business and turned their family fruit-picking and baking activities into a collective business called the Vlasina Lake Housewives Association.   The Vlasina Housewives association presents a good example of how women can be empowered to jointly transform their family activities into income generating businesses, creating sustainable livelihoods, leading towards more inclusive and sustainable development of the region of South Serbia, and ensuring equal participation of women in their communities' political, economic and social life.

IV. Potential for Long-term Sustainability and Replication

Pursuant to the analysis of the preceding sections, including section III (Achievements and Results), following is an analysis of a few cases that, based on the research, have a good chance of being sustainable and, in a few of the cases, possibly be replicated. This section also discusses a few enablers for sustainability.

A few basic conditions make sustainability possible, including most importantly ownership by beneficiaries and communities themselves, as well as ownership of authorities at local and national levels.   Issues about what makes international aid most effective and sustainable (and possibly replicable) in the long-term are of concern to donors and key stakeholders, and are framed in discussions of good donorship and aid effectiveness.

The Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action, for example, are founded on five core principles, born out of decades of experience of what works for development, and what doesn't. These principles have gained support across the development community, changing aid practice for the better: it is now the norm for aid recipients to forge their own national development strategies with their parliaments and electorates (**ownership**); for donors to support these strategies (**alignment**) and work to streamline their efforts in-country (**harmonization**); for development policies to be directed to achieving clear goals and for progress towards these goals to be monitored (**results**); and for donors and recipients alike to be jointly responsible for achieving these goals (**mutual accountability**).

The conditions described here are necessary to creating an enabling environment for sustainability, replication and scale-up, as evidenced by a few of the studies reviewed—most notably those of

Mexico, Colombia, Serbia, FYR of Macedonia and Croatia. The analysis below will highlight a few of the key results of the JPs that have succeeded in making their results sustainable, and for what reasons.

IV.1 Promoting and Protecting the Rights of IDPs

Empowering beneficiaries is crucial in creating more equitable and safer communities. The Law on the Prevention of and focus on Internal Displacement in the State of Chiapas, in Mexico, is quite innovative in its approach to protect the rights of the most marginalized and vulnerable communities. By passing this law, the protection aims of the JP are now sustainable past the end of the Joint Programme's assistance. The law has now put displacement in Chiapas on the political agenda and it has now been owned by the regional government as well as the newly empowered beneficiaries.

The new law is also significant in the context of a growing internal displacement challenge at national level in **Mexico**, due --in other areas outside Chiapas – to narco-traffic. This new law protecting the rights of the displaced and most marginalized (including the protection of host communities) has a good chance of not only becoming sustainable in Chiapas, but also of being replicated in other regions of Mexico.

As part of this goal to replicate this law in other parts of the country, an academic institution, 'El Centro de Documentacion', has been established as the first monitoring center on displacement issues in Mexico. The center also focuses on sharing information about the law in Chiapas with other States that are experiencing problems of displacement, as is the current case of the State of Durango, for example.[71] Another result is the establishment of a Commission (12 members from various Ministries of the State of Chiapas) that will develop a protocol to ensure the sustainability of the law (work to be completed by November 2012).

The project in Chiapas goes beyond the law on displacement, as we have seen earlier in the report; other projects that are part of the JP have a good chance of becoming sustainable. Although the JP in Chiapas was too short (one needs five instead of three years to be able to show results), its secret to success was the JP focus at the **local community level** (first time in Chiapas). The results were possible because the JP was able through its projects to build trust among communities that had been in conflict for years.

The JP in **Colombia,** likewise, stresses community and government participation, including a network of focal points and a close interaction with civil society, and women and youth groups—this approach makes it a prime candidate for the sustainability of the programme and evidence of national and local ownership. Using tools of administration and planning by the ethnic communities --called "planos de vida"-- means that beneficiaries have 'ownership' of the process, giving the project a good chance to become sustainable. In addition, two other features -- new legislation protecting these ethnic communities as well as programmes mainstreaming gender-- give the JP a chance of becoming sustainable.

To make the process and project sustainable in **Narino**, **Colombia**, the work has focused on participatory efforts by the local government as well as beneficiaries in eight localities ('municipios'), resulting in the training of 259 women from three ethnic groups (the indigenous groups of Pastos and Eperara, as well as the Afro-Colombian community). This intervention is significant in its focus on empowering women as participants and leaders for the development of their communities through training on law and human rights, violence prevention (including GBV) and economic development. About 100 women are now empowered and trained and capable in turn to train other women in the community, thus making this effort more sustainable.

In Eastern Europe, another JP that focuses on marginalized minorities and their rights has a good potential of sustainability.   The reason for this success in **Southern Serbia**, is the close collaboration with the government on ownership, visibility of results and impact. In addition, through the multi-donor programme embedded within PBILD, the JP has created synergies among the four components: social cohesion and inclusion, public services, economic development and migration management.

PBILD briefs the Ambassadorial–level 'Friends of South Serbia' diplomatic group at its meetings every

---

[71] Conversations with UNDP and UN agencies officials in Narino (names have been withheld for security reasons).

other month. By bridging the development--political nexus, the JP is ensuring activities are not only having an impact on outcomes but are also positively influencing national level policy. [72]

A few of the programmes in Serbia have now been taken on budget by the municipal government. It is also expected that a second phase of the programme will start in 2013, upon completion of the current one. The work on integration (through the Fund) has been significant in terms of the support by the programme to the 'national minority councils', groups led by Albanians and Roma minorities in the areas of education and culture. These councils were created under national laws, thus making them sustainable, even after the Fund's support expires. [73]

One area that has been especially noteworthy is the work with youth on employment. (Unemployment is a serious challenge at about 50% in this region). A programme now in its second year focuses on 'twinning" a university from the Hungarian minority area of Serbia with the university in southern Serbia. The programme is successful (100 students graduated in its first year) as it also built trust, due to exchange between two minorities, with the advantage that the Hungarian minority is well integrated, and Albanians and Roma students found it easier to relate to them (as they are also minorities). Through the programme (which also included twinning with an Albanian-language university in the FYR of Macedonia) a multi-ethnic faculty was established, focusing on job skills, language skills (for access to jobs and services, Serbian language is essential). [74] This youth programme has a good level of sustainability built-in as the university has a good chance of retaining local talent (that might otherwise try to emigrate to Western Europe).

Regarding gender issues, this is a very conservative region, however, some progress has been made which is sustainable as for the first time (through the programme) gender issues are part of the political agenda, as municipalities now have 'gender action plans'. Other sustainable progress in gender equity is in regard to the successful businesses the JP helped create in the area. [75]

IV.2 Post-Conflict Peace Building and Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue

Increasingly, equity and discrimination are being recognized as drivers of conflict. Addressing them is a good approach to create the long-term peace and sustainability.

The root cause of conflicts in **Southern Serbia** is about issues of equity, discrimination and economics. The projects targeting youth and women have been successful as they do focus on economic opportunities for marginalized populations. The youth and gender programmes being carried out in the communities covered by the project have a good chance of being replicated across other vulnerable communities in Southern Serbia. Even if the Fund might not be extended, there is a good chance that a second phase (with funds from Norway, Sweden and Switzerland) might be funded and might absorb also these other projects currently under the Fund. In addition, some of the employment approaches –based on lessons learned from this project—might be scaled-up and also replicated in other vulnerable communities with the assistance of ILO. [76]

Another good practice emerged in the **FYR of Macedonia** through a participatory capacity assessment of all partners. The objective is for the UN to speak with one voice, building trust with national counterparts, and providing a clear set of recommendations to government counterparts. This new practice was endorsed by the government and the parliament thus paving the ground for sustainability of the programme and a good exit strategy.

IV.3 Citizens Security

Citizens security is a common concern in Latin America, and especially in Central America. **El Salvador** provides a good practice being replicated across the region; in an effort to build capacity of national partners and reduce violence, the programme has brought in the municipal committees, the armed forces, the police and the representative of the office of the mayor in San Salvador. This synergy and cooperation has led to the reduction of violence. What is also significant is that this good practice in citizens security is not only sustainable, but it also provided a good example to other

---

[72] Phone interview with UN official in Serbia (name withheld for security reasons).
[73] Ibid.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid
[76] Ibid

countries in Central America, who are now replicating this approach, such as **Panama and Costa Rica**.

El Salvador
A good practice on the role played by the Joint Programmes is is illustrated by El Salvador. In 2006, el Salvador registered a high demand for social security, leading to the decision to set-up a working group to address the problem collectively. The government, with the support of the United Nations, established the National Commission for citizen security and social peace, bringing together political parties, faith-based organizations, civil society, academia, NGOs. This commission prepared a document called 'Security and Peace', dealing with the main points of a strategy which was then used to improve security and social cohesion. [77]

This experience in El Salvador shows how social conflict cannot be addressed by using the same tools as other types of conflicts. Most every country in Central and Latin America faces social conflict, and in particular crime. Therefore, it is important to pay attention to conflict analysis. What makes El Salvador a successful programme, is the level of participatory and inclusive process used, especially with civil society.

IV.4 Preventing Conflict Targeting the Most Vulnerable Areas

The Ministry of Education in **Lebanon** has hired consultants to look at the programme's activities in schools and with youth, to be able to build enough capacity to take over and continue the activities of training and awareness initiated by the JP. Moreover, the People's Committes are now working closely with the Ministerial Committee, Lebanese and Palestinian Development Committee—a departure from the earlier situation when there was mistrust and absence of any communication or information-sharing.

IV.5 Joint Programmes: how to Create an Enabling Environment

There are a few features that enable good results in the field. Following are a few key ones:

> #### Integrated Multi-sectoral Approaches

Joint UN programming is about more than just coordinating parallel projects. It requires joint planning, common tools and lots of cooperation among the UN agencies both at HQ level and in the field. Joint Programme management is essential for planning, coordinating and implementing joint programme activities. Monitoring and Evaluation of a multi-agency programme requires thorough planning and agreement with all partners. Realistic mechanisms for regularly updating data on indicators are necessary to achieve solid monitoring of programme results.

Based on the review of the 20 Joint Programmes, despite challenges of the programme (short duration, small scale), there seems to be a '**value added**' in the methodology of using multi-sectoral approaches. For example, in terms of successful **integrated multi-sectoral approaches**, the case of **Serbia** stands out in the group of countries in the CPPB window as the JP has contributed in creating a good **synergy** among key stakeholders, leading to integrated results. The cases of **Mexico** and **Colombia** also provide good examples of the value added of this approach—being able to respond to the needs of beneficiaries in a multi-sectoral intervention.

> #### Local Level Approach and Empowerement

Key enabling factors at programmatic approach level include local ownership which starts with ensuring that peace building priorities, needs, as well as approaches are determined locally.
A lesson learned is that working closely with key stakeholders at the local level brings sustainable results. As in the case of **Chiapas, Mexico**, this approach leads to a better understanding of the local

---

[77] Phone Interview with Regional UN official as well as discussion with UNDP official in NY (names withheld for security reasons), October 2010.

context and needs of the beneficiaries. Moreover, as experience shows, civil society and community leaders can play a key role in conflict prevention systems.

> **Equity**

The approach also adds value in the area of addressing **inequalities across sectors and agencies**. As we have noted in the above analysis on results, the cases of **Chiapas/ Mexico, Narino/Colombia, and Southern Serbia** were particularly successful in addressing inequalities in marginalized communities –-focusing on IDPs/indigenous populations in Chiapas, IDPs/indigenous and Afro-Colombian beneficiaries in Colombia; and working with IDPs and Roma and Albanian minorities in Southern Serbia.

> Adhering to the **Paris Declaration's five core principles** of **ownership, alignment, harmonization, results and mutual accountability** helps create an enabling environment.

> Increased **access by vulnerable communities to social services and legal aid** is crucial as seen in many of the examples in the preceding sections. So is providing increased access and information about their rights to beneficiaries. The examples of Serbia, Mexico and Colombia showed how this approach helps vulnerable communities and ethnic minorities become less marginalized.

> Enabling factors within the programme approach include **outreach to communities**. Selection of capacity building and selection of trainees is crucial—it needs to be adapted to the local context and to beneficiaries. Multi-sectoral partnerships and dialogue are also important. Ensuring that programmes create mechanisms to bring local actors together for dialogue and co-operation helps build trust and social cohesion, and helps build the resilience of communities.

> Empowering and strengthening the capacities of individuals, communities, and institutions to manage conflicts is essential to peace building. Focus also at community level for sources of resilience in local institutions and civil society.

> The scale and multidimensionality of peace building demands collective engagement. This points to fundamentals (ensuring a holistic approach between national policy and grass roots work), creativity (using technology and local customs for new approaches), and new synergies (partnerships with community development organizations, South-South partnerships, and the private sector). Peace building requires unique approaches.

> The two-year programme cycle for most of the MDG-F programmes was too short to see significant changes at the outcome and impact level. A more long-term development approach would be needed to see any changes in socio-economic indicators. Based on the review of the JPs, it appears that results of the programmes would have been more sustainable and results more measurable if the programmes had been for a minimum of three/four years.

V. Key Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the review of the Joint Programmes in the CPPB Window of the MDG-F, following are a few recommendations to create an enabling environment at programmatic level, followed by a few key conclusions and recommendations. For most conclusions, a recommendation follows, even if the MDG-F might not be renewed in its present format. However, given the joint inter-agency approach of the JPs, these recommendations might also be useful (with slight modifications) for the continued work of the UN Country Teams with national governments and key stakeholders.

The recommendations below deal with the key issues discussed in the report, and how best to tackle them to achieve positive results and generate an enabling environment through the Joint Programmes and beyond.

V.1 Conclusions and Recommendations for the CPPB Window -- Generating an Enabling Environment

Recommendations for generating an enabling environment include the following: pursuing locally owned solutions and the principle of 'do no harm'; fostering trust, going local, developing local capacity for managing conflict and resilience. Experience shows that fostering community participation fosters ownership and accountability. Moreover, redressing inequalities is crucial to peace building, and so is strengthening gender mainstreaming in all peace building interventions, including gender disparities and GVB, and strengthening the peace building roles of women and girls.

Preventing Conflicts:
Conclusion: The interventions of the MDG-F cannot alone stop or prevent conflicts from reoccurring, but it is crucial that they support national efforts in strengthening prevention capacities, including national capacities for mediation.

Conflict Prevention and Mediation:
Conclusion: As we saw in the example of the border area between Sudan and South Sudan, the MDG-F funded peace building and conflict sensitivity training was successful. Moreover, the Mid-Term Evaluation pointed out how useful this had been for UN agencies and their programming, and mentioned it as a good example of good Inter-Agency collaboration through the Joint Programme. This is a positive result of how the UN can foster conflict prevention through joint programming.
Recommendation: Continue strengthening the UN and national expertise in prevention and mediation.[78]

Promoting Dialogue with Civil Society:
Conclusion: Effective dialogue at local/national levels with government and civil society supports peace building and helps ensure sustainability and ownership.

Expanding Capacity Building:
Conclusion: The UN system works closely in post-conflict settings with the Government, but often in parallel to the national public sector. The lesson of MDG-F interventions is to strengthen the capacity of the local government, making programmes more sustainable (less direct implementation).
Recommendation: continue to strengthen local capacity to increase ownership of local government and communities.

Gender Equity:
Conclusion: Empowering women in conflict and fragile settings brings peace dividends. As we saw in the case of Chiapas, or Guatemala, for example, giving women opportunities to participate in political and legal settings, increasing access to justice and education, empowers women and their communities.
Recommendation: Continue to include women, not just as beneficiaries/victims but also as active participants; continue to strengthen women security in conflicts and in citizens security; provide access to justice and services; expand their participation in politics and decision-making; promote gender equality.

Women' access to justice and services:
Conclusion: some of the JPs (i.e.Mexico, Colombia, Serbia) achieved some positive results in increasing women's access to justice and rights etc.
Recommendation: UN system and partners should continue to strengthen this area and have specific benchmarks and monitoring of specific indicators.

Citizens Security:
Conclusion: insecurity and crime affect many fragile countries, especially in Latin America.
Recommendation: continue capacity building of security sector at local and national levels.

Expanding Beneficiaries' and Communities' Ownership/Participation:
Conclusion: Establishing or strengthening local governance as part of peace building requires analysis of the root causes of conflict, and it also requires an assessment of the local capacities of the government, to ensure that reforms do not exacerbate conflict ('do no harm').

---

[78] UNDP Evaluation Office "Evaluation of UNDP-Assistance to Conflict-Affected Countries", 2012 (this consultant was also one of the two main evaluators/writers of this UNDP EO global analysis).

Monitoring Progress, 'Do no Harm'[79]
Conclusion: The JPs are interventions for change. Bringing change implies being aware of its implications. For example, how are the activities of the JPs having an impact on local communities? Especially in situations of conflict and crisis, even the processes and methodologies organizations apply during planning, implementation and evaluation phases can have an impact.
Recommendation: it is critical to respect the principle of 'Do No Harm', and this is why it is so important to establish a system for good risk/damage mitigation and control.[80] To this end, the involvement of national partners should begin from the outset, starting from the planning phase of a programme, targeting both national and local authorities and CSOs (civil society organizations). Colombia provides a good example.

Learning from Achievements:
Conclusion: UN agencies and the MDG-F often have weak assessment and monitoring mechanisms. There is no consistent practice of setting of baselines at the beginning of interventions in a crisis setting in order to track results. Good results happen when these tools are part of the project design: for example, the JP in Southern Serbia did have a well-planned assessment at the beginning of the intervention and one is planned at the end of the project.

Programming in support of conflict prevention and peace building:
Conclusion: The JP's broad programming in support of MDGs places it in a good position to successfully address cross cutting issues such as prevention, gender, and equity.
The JPs –even in crisis settings such as Afghanistan, Sudan and South Sudan, failed to do sufficient risk management and analysis (even not preparing for a likely—now reality—division into two Sudanese states.
Recommendation: The JP (and the UN in general) should increase their Conflict analysis and Risk Management planning.

Context-specific programming:
Conclusion: the JPs operated in very context-specific ways. Some of the best results recorded are in fact in countries like Mexico, Colombia and Serbia—where the JPs played a key support role at the local level, strengthening local government, civil society and the communities themselves.
Recommendation: The JPs should continue to strengthen local capacities –especially in the areas of equity, citizens security and inclusion.

Joint Programming and 'Delivering as One':
Conclusion: This approach is on the right track—and when the right planning and resources are in place, it can yield positive results.
Recommendation: but it needs to be scaled up, though ownership of national government and expansion of transition funding from other sources (i.e. best practice: Serbia).

National and Local Partners' Ownership
Conclusion: The degree of the involvement of national partners varies from context to context.
Recommendation: In addition to including partners, it would be a good practice to involve the UNCT and other entities more. Understanding how the JP fits within the overall picture of the UN and international community presence and activities in a given country is crucial for success and sustainability. Serbia is a good example of how to use this type of synergy across programmes.

Dialogue and Citizens Security:
Conclusion: Citizen Security and Conflict Prevention are central to the development challenges facing Latin America. After a quick review of the extensive work and the gaps that still exist, two general considerations emerge regarding the JP approach in citizens security:
• The **need for a comprehensive approach** to such programs, which requires addressing the structural causes of violence, such as inequality and/or the fragility of democratic institutions, without which the 'dividends of peace' and of preventive programs will be uneven, and their sustainability compromised.

---

[79] Please refer to Footnote number 21.
[80] UNDP/ BCPR/KM --based on discussions with UNDP –name withheld for security reasons.

- The relevance of **strengthening the work in both conflict prevention and dialogue**, **and Citizen Security**. The cost-effectiveness of such approaches, whose contribution to developing countries has been recognized in several independent evaluations in the region.[81]

Citizens Security at Regional level: Latin America:
Recommendations:
- Gain a better knowledge and understanding of citizen security issues, such as narco-traffic, and policy issues (both from technical and political perspective).[82]
- Improve the work with civil society on conflict prevention and working with civil society in several countries (i.e. Bolivia, Colombia)
- Improve knowledge of urban risk related issues.[83]
- On conflict prevention there is an expanding phenomenon of conflicts related to natural resource management, extractive industries and indigenous rights. If this is a growing area for the region, conduct analysis on what kind of instruments are needed to improve engagement.

Sustainability:
Conclusion: The success and sustainability of support to conflict-affected countries depends not only on the way local capacities are built, but also on the ability of the UN agencies/stakeholders to maintain international support for longer-term peace building activities once the crisis has passed.
Recommendation: Support the building of strong and inclusive local government for sustainability.

Exit Strategies:
Conclusion: UN in general is not very skilled in planning and executing exit strategies.
Recommendation: JPs should articulate clear exit strategies, especially in countries with protracted conflicts and/or fragility.

V.2 The Way Forward: Post-2015 and the MDGs

The post-2015 agenda has identified three broad sets of goals, which coincide with the three main pillars of the UN: Peace and security, including targets on personal security and democracy, and inclusive political participation. Cross-cutting issues include inequalities (often a conflict driver) –from socio-economic inequalities to political exclusion.

The United Nations Secretary General has named a 26-member panel to advise on the global development agenda after 2015 (August 2012) and following meetings at the General Assembly in September, the panel –which includes representatives of governments, the private sector, academia and civil society from rich and poor countries-- is expected to come up with recommendations in a paper by mid-2013.[84]

The MDGs, agreed at a UN conference in New York in 2000, helped galvanize anti-poverty efforts by setting out eight goals, including one to halve the proportion of people whose income is less than $1 a day and who suffer from hunger. But with less than three years from 2015, many of the goals will be missed, and social inequality is also becoming a pressing issue following the Arab spring.

A group of conflict-affected states (the "g7+"), together with development partners and international organizations, are advocating for the inclusion of a set of peace building goals into the post-2015 agenda. They come together in the International Dialogue on Peace building and State building. The International Dialogue has proposed the New Deal on Engagement in Fragile States at the fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan (29 November-1 December 2011), which consists of five Peace building and State building Goals (PSGs). The five goals are:

  ➢ Legitimate Politics - Foster inclusive political
  ➢ Security –Establish and Strengthen People's Security

---

[81] UNDP, Citizen Security in Latin America and the Caribbean, 2011
[82] These are part of the regional HDR under preparation (to be published in 2013), according to UNDP staff (name withheld for security reasons).
[83] In absence of resources for this matter, work has been focused on the urban risk issues in Haiti, DR and Cuba, emphasizing south-south exchange on this issue given common natural hazard on the matter.
[84] UN websites

- ➢ Justice - Address injustices and increase people's access to justice Economic Foundations
- ➢ Economic Foundations --Generate employment and improve livelihoods
- ➢ Revenues & Services - Manage revenue and build capacity for accountable and fair service delivery.[85]

These goals are an "important foundation to enable progress towards the MDGs" and the members of the Dialogue agreed to "work towards full consideration of the PSGs in the post- MDG development framework beyond 2015 and, after Busan, towards the consideration of the PSGs by the 2012 United Nations General Assembly and other fora." [86]

The New Deal outlines an agenda for more effective aid to fragile states based on the five Peace building and State building Goals, stronger alignment, mutual accountability through compacts, more transparency and investments in country systems, based on an increasingly shared approach to risk management. The New Deal will be implemented in initially seven self-nominated pilot countries (Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone, South Sudan and Timor-Leste) and was endorsed by 35 countries (including the g7+ and many donor countries) and six international organizations, including the United Nations Development Group and the World Bank.[87]

Another input into the process is the proposal of the Governments of Colombia and Guatemala on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for the Rio+20 Conference on Sustainable Development. One important disadvantage of the SDGs, however, is that they are limited to a fairly narrow set of social, economic and environmental issues.[88]

Conclusion: A coherent approach that integrates the three dimensions of sustainable development is needed in the quest to rejuvenate the global consensus on the Rio Principles, Agenda 21 and the Millennium Declaration.
Recommendation: This approach must also address new challenges such as climate change, resource constraint, and economic crises which hinder progress on tackling inequality and extreme poverty.

Conclusion: Discussions on both the SDGs and the post-2015 framework should continue to create momentum for the MDGs by galvanizing on-going efforts at accelerating the achievement of the MDGs, and developing a post-2015 framework that is holistic, inclusive, equitable and universal.
Recommendations: It should be based on recognized human rights principles, built on accepted human rights standards and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights.

Conclusion: One important lesson from the MDGs is that any new framework must be formulated transparently and inclusively, informed by the voices and knowledge of people living in poverty and exclusion.
Recommendations: The SDGs and MDGs must also be fully integrated into a global, overarching post-2015 development framework to avert the risk of developing them in isolation, which risks being both inefficient and counterproductive. A single unified process to define the post-2015 framework should be built upon multi-stakeholder participation including, most importantly, people living in poverty whose lives and livelihoods will be most impacted by such a framework.

VI. References and Annexes

Bibliography

Final Evaluations
Afghanistan: "Afghanistan: Joint Access To Justice at the District Level", JHRA
Bolivia: Conflict Prevention and Peace Building
Croatia: Closing the Chapter: Social Inclusion and Conflict Transformation in War Affected Areas of Croatia
FYR of Macedonia: Enhancing Inter-Ethnic Community Dialogue and Collaboration

---

[85] UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda, Peace and Security, PBSO, 2012
[86] Ibid
[87] Ibid
[88] Ibid

Mid-Term Evaluations
 ALL 20 Mid-Term Evaluations

Monitoring Reports
ALL Monitoring evaluations from all 20 Joint Programmes

Other References
Compendium of Lessons Learned, Knowledge management documents, September 2011.

ESTRATEGIA DE SOSTENIBILIDAD PROGRAMA CONJUNTO VENTANA DE PAZ, Colombia.

Report of the Training Workshop On Managing Knowledge for Conflict Prevention and Peace Building: "Youth Empowerment on the use of Social Media", May- July 2012

Power Point presentation Board/CPR on Latin America

Johan Galtung in his *Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking, and Peace building*, in Peace, War and Defense: Essays in Peace Research, Vol. II, ed. Johan Galtung (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers, 1976).

John Paul Lederach Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 1997).

MDG-F websites

PBild Results to Date, By PBILD Office UN, Bujanovac, Serbia, 2012.

PBILD, Newsletter, March-April 2012.

Power Point presentation Board/CPR on Latin America

Report of the Training Workshop On Managing Knowledge for Conflict Prevention and Peace Building: "Youth Empowerment on the use of Social Media", May- July 2012

UNDP Evaluation Office "Evaluation of UNDP-Assistance to Conflict-Affected Countries", 2012 (two main evaluators/writers of this UNDP EO global analysis: Jon Bennett, Gabriella Buescher; managed by Alan Fox).

UNDP, "A Decade of work on Citizens Security and Conflict Prevention in Latin America and the Caribbean, 2001-2010".

UNDP, Citizen Security in Latin America and the Caribbean, 2011.

UNDP SUDAN CO, 2011 DOCUMENTS AND PRESS RELEASES FROM CO

UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda, Peace and Security, PBSO, 2012.

World Bank *World Development Report 2011: Conflict Security and Development,* 11 April 2011.

Geneva Declaration, Global Burden of Armed Violence, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

World Bank, World Development Report, 2011.

List of People Met/Consulted

MDG-F Secretariat, NYHQ:
Sara Ferrer Olivella, Programme Advisor
Paula Pelaez, Programme Specialist

UNDP/BCPR/Knowledge Management, NYHQ:

Fabrizio Damiani, Programme Specialist

UNDP Regional Center, Panama (Skype)
Pablo Ruiz Hiebra, CPR Practice Leader,

JP Mexico (Skype)
Sonia Silva, JP
Elsa Barreda, UNODC

JP Colombia (Skype)
Flor Diaz (Coordinator)
Monica Mayerli Perdomo' (M&E)

JP Serbia (Skype)
Nicholas Hercules, Coordinator

JP Gautemals (Skype)
Hjalmar Calderon, Coordinator
Argelia Chilin (regional coordinator)

JP Haiti (Skype)
Maureen Mayne, Programme Specialist

ANNEXES:
Annex One: Definitions
Annex Two: Methodology and Scope

Annex One: Definitions[89]

Citizens Security   refers to a democratic civic order that removes the threats posed by violence in the population and enables secure and peaceful coexistence. It concerns, in essence, the effective safeguarding of a broad range of human rights, especially the right to life, to personal safety, and other inherent rights at the most deeply personal level (inviolability of residence, freedom of movement, the enjoyment of heritage).

Conflict-affected   refers to a country that has experienced in its recent past, is in the midst of, or demonstrates the risk factors for violent unrest between forces (both organized and informal groups) that generally emerge from disputes over the distribution of resources (financial, political, natural, etc.) in a given society.

Conflict Prevention: is action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur.

Conflict Sensitivity: is the capacity of an organization to understand its context, understand the interaction between its interventions and the context, and act upon this understanding to avoid negative impacts ("do no harm") and maximize positive impacts on conflict factors.**[90]**

---

[89] The consultant of this study was also one of the two senior evaluators on the UNDP EO Evaluation team of the "Evaluation of UNDP-Assistance to Conflict-Affected Countries"; I am using the same definitions here as they are applicable. FYI, The Report's title has been changed from original one from time of Inception Report, to: "UNDP Assistance to Conflict-Affected Countries in the Context of UN Peace Operations".

[90] *Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building: tools for peace and conflict impact assessment*, Conflict Sensitivity Consortium (www.ConflictSensitivity.org).

Do no/less harm   Although aid can become part of the dynamics of the conflict and may even prolong it, humanitarian organizations must strive to "do no harm" or to minimize the harm they may be inadvertently doing simply by being present and providing assistance. Humanitarian actors need to be aware of this and take steps to minimize the harm when, for example, aid is used as an instrument of war by denying access or attacking convoys; aid is an indirect part of the dynamics of the conflict because it creates jobs, gives incomes in form of taxes, leaves no or little responsibility on the state for social welfare, etc; or aid exacerbates the root causes of the conflict by securing rebel activities. To minimize possible longer term harm, humanitarian organizations should provide assistance in ways that are supportive of recovery and long-term development (UNICEF, OCHA documents/definitions).

Fragile States   those countries and territories experiencing armed conflict, emerging from armed conflict, or affected by acute political, social, and economic vulnerability, and susceptible to chronic forms of organized criminal violence.[91]

Nation-building: is action undertaken, usually by national actors, to forge a sense of common nationhood, usually in order to overcome ethnic, sectarian or communal differences; usually to counter alternate sources of identity and loyalty; and usually to mobilize a population behind a parallel state-building project. May or may not contribute to peace building[92].

Peace building   is action to identify and support structures that will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict.

Peacemaking   is action to bring hostile parties to agreement, essentially through such peaceful means as those foreseen in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations.

Peace dividend: Peace dividends are visible, tangible results of peace, delivered ideally by the state, but also by international partners, and also accessible beyond the political elite to communities throughout the state and in an equitable manner.[93] Peace dividends do not necessarily address the underlying causes of conflict, but are nonetheless vital actions that address the consequences of conflict. They help create incentives for non-violent behavior, reduce fear and begin instilling confidence in affected populations in their communities and in the legitimacy of their institutions that are delivering services. [94]

Preventive diplomacy   is action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur.

Rule of law   a principle of governance in which all persons, institutions and entities, public and private, including the State itself, are accountable to laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated, and

---

[91] UNDP (2012): 'Governance for Peace: Securing the Social Contract', BCPR/BDP, January 2012.

[92] Ibid. Confusingly equated with post-conflict stabilisation and peacebuilding in some recent scholarship and US political discourse.

[93] Adapted from *Report of the Secretary-General on Peacebuilding in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict* (2009), A/63/881–S/2009/304.

[94] (Definitions from UNDP Evaluation of UNDP Assistance to Conflict-affected Countries, UNDP Evaluation Office Independent Evaluation, Jon Bennett, Gabriella Buescher et al, 2012).

which are consistent with international human rights norms and standards. It requires, as well, measures to ensure adherence to the principles of supremacy of law, equality before the law, accountability to the law, fairness in the application of the law, separation of powers, participation in decision-making, legal certainty, avoidance of arbitrariness and procedural and legal transparency.

Stabilization is action undertaken by international actors to reach a termination of hostilities and consolidate peace, understood as the absence of armed conflict.

Annex Two

Methodology and Scope

This report is based on an extensive desk review (including all the Mid-Term Reviews of the 20 programmes and the 4 Final Evaluation reports available to date). It is also based on other UNDP, UN documents as well as conversations in NYC and on Skype with a few coordinators of a few projects and the Knowledge Management office of UNDP/BCPR (in addition to the Secretariat of the Fund). (For a list, please refer to the List at the end of this report). (For the Purpose and Objectives of the study: please refer to TORs in Annex One).

Since the establishment of the MDG-Fund, emphasis has been placed on the importance of systematically capturing best practices and lessons learned as key factors in the achievement of the MDGs. This explains why this report is not an evaluation of the JPs, but an analysis of what best practices have emerged from the different programmes. It is also not meant to be exhaustive and comprehensive. The consultant reviewed all JPs, but only focused on a few of the Joint programmes—those that due to more favorable conditions/contexts were able to achieve a few positive results. Special attention was also paid to a few countries that have achievements that have potential for sustainability, and possibly replicability.

Constraints of the Study

The fact that this is a thematic study based solely on a desk review obviously constrains the review. Field work to at least a couple of the countries reviewed would have been advisable. The Mid-Term Evaluations of the JPs in this window focused mainly on gaps, challenges and problems, and are very meager in examples of achievements, if any. The data available on results is limited. In addition, this is probably one of the more difficult windows to review as results cannot be quantified as for others types of programmes. Peace building and prevention and beneficiaries' behavior and attitude changes are also ephemeral. Lack of baseline data is also a factor, although a few of the JPs did good assessments at the beginning of the project, and some plan one at the end of the cycle (thus reinforcing M&E for future reviews).

Challenges of Measuring Achievements and Results

The Prevention and Peace building thematic Window of the MDG-F includes, as we have seen, several broad sub-thematic areas for which progress cannot always be measured, let alone connected with the progress made towards the achievements of the Millennium Development Goals. This challenge is compounded by the fact that most of the JPs are small programmes and of short duration –often within a context such as Sudan or Afghanistan of a protracted conflict, where the Joint Programme will not in any case change the situation on the ground in any radical way. In addition, there is not one single methodology to determine the indicators; and data on results varies from region to region and from country to country. Most analysts would agree that the Window on Conflict Prevention and Peace Building is inherently the most complicated to analyze as results are difficult to document and measure. Data in post-conflict countries or in vulnerable areas of even MI countries is often weak or nonexistent; Governments' Ministries and UN offices themselves have often have weak M&E capacities.