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Introduction

Why these tools?
Local Peace Committees (LPCs) have become an important strategy of development organizations to promote transitional justice in conflict-affected contexts. In practice, working with LPCs implies important strategic choices on local peace, justice, and the envisioned roles of LPCs in this. However so far, choices made tend to reflect the (implicit) assumptions and preferences of (international) intervening organizations. It remains difficult to assure the involvement and leadership of local stakeholders in these choices, and it is often unclear in what ways these choices are informed by context.

The project ‘Enhancing Local Peace Committees’ explored what these assumptions and preferences guiding the support to LPCs are, and how the evolving context is taken into account when working with LPCs; as well as how local stakeholders can be better engaged in the various strategic choices involved. To achieve this, the project engaged with (inter)national development organizations, local civil society, and local government in Cibitoke Province in Burundi, and Uvira territory in eastern DR Congo, to collect and popularise academic findings and reflection of practitioners on how to deal with these strategic choices. The results of this exploration are summarized in the report ‘Enhancing Local Peace Committees’, which is freely accessible on the website of ZOA.

On the basis of these findings and in collaboration with practitioner organizations, the project developed and tested two toolkits that visualize the programmatic choices involved in designing interventions around LPCs: a picture box, which is primarily meant for Local Peace Committees and other actors at community levels, and a series of video clips for staff of peacebuilding and development organisations. The tools present ten strategic questions, which may stimulate explicit discussions on the hypotheses, preferences and strategic choices concerning LPCs and their support, and so contribute to better local peacebuilding practices. The tools and this manual are also accessible on the website of ZOA.

How did we develop these tools?
To generate these tools, we organized two tool-building clinics with development practitioners, to specify the contents of the tools, aims and target groups, and tool outline. The tools were then designed by Burundian artists. Before finalization, the tools were tested by the Congolese and Burundian researchers involved in the project in two tool-testing exercises (1 in each area) with staff of (inter)national development organisations; and in ten tool-testing exercises (5 in each area) with local stakeholders, including representatives of local government, customay leaders, and local civil society (e.g. church representatives). The tool testing was meant to assess the contribution of the tools to generating discussion and providing inputs for intervention strategies, and so enable fine-tuning of the tools. The tools were also presented and discussed at the final workshop of the project in July 2016.
When designing the tools, the ambition was that they would:

- raise awareness of the assumptions underlying and dilemmas involved in interventions to establish or strengthen LPCs;
- enable discussion with different stakeholders – notably community members, representatives of peace committees, representatives of the justice sector, and government – on the possible choices and perspectives;
- and so help better informed decision taking on interventions around peace committees.

**How to use the tools?**

These tools are designed to facilitate discussion on a range of strategic questions that are important to consider when designing intervention strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees.

To be clear, the tools do not aim to prescribe how best to establish and support LPCs, provide means of how to do it better, nor identify ‘best practices’. Instead, the pictures and video clips rather aim at stimulating discussion about intervention strategies, and reveal diverse and opposing perspectives.

We hope that the examples included in this manual and in the reports of our research (see ZOA website) make clear that responses to strategic questions may substantially vary, depending on the stakeholders involved and the level at which their interventions take place. We start from the assumption that intervention strategies strongly depend on proper analysis and experience, but also on (hidden) assumptions, beliefs, expectations, and subjective prioritization about what should happen to achieve peace. Making these assumptions and prioritization explicit may actually help in fine-tuning or revising them, and so help to increase peacebuilding effectiveness. If the tools help to achieve this, we are satisfied.

We also consider that many of the responses to those strategic questions are actually compromises, often balancing ambitions and dreams with the local realities of what is possible and doable. Rather than soliciting for black-or-white answers, we consider that a range of options is possible. In this connection, it is important to underscore that opportunities and constraints for certain intervention strategies may alter significantly over the course of time, depending on the stages of conflict.

Further, rather than that each strategic question probes into a distinct topic, the strategic questions should rather be seen as complementary and partially overlapping, starting from different perspectives on what peacebuilding is about. For instance, questioning how to link up with the state may touch upon the question of the temporary or permanent nature of LPCs. Exploring the extent to which LPCs should deal with positive peace, or realize vertical integration may come close to exploring how to contribute to Peace-Writ-Large.
Finally, the strategic questions cover three grand themes:

- How to understand the nature of conflict and the envisioned peace:
  1. How to deal with the past?
  2. Ending violence or addressing underlying, structural issues?
  3. Local level peace or a peaceful society?
  4. Working on peace directly or through development?

- The methodology or approach to install the Peace Committees
  5. Which degree of vertical collaboration?
  6. Whom to include?
  7. To what extent may ‘best practices’ from elsewhere provide inspiration?

- Relationships with other institutions:
  8. How to deal with customary/traditional institutions?
  9. How to go about the state and the formal judicial system?
  10. A permanent or a transitional structure?

We consider that it is not always necessary to resolve all issues at the same time, or in the given order. However, our experience shows that the first two questions are often most suitable to initiate debate and create understanding of the purposes of the exercise.

**How to facilitate discussions with these tools?**

- The tools aim to help two target groups. The video clips are especially designed for intervening organizations (NGOs), while the picture box is mostly for stakeholders at the community level (LPC members, local authorities etc.) but may be useful for intervening organizations as well;
- To facilitate the discussion, first present the objectives of the exercise, which is “to facilitate debate on the strategic questions involved in establishing or supporting Local Peace Committees”;
- Mention that there are no correct or incorrect responses, and that there are several responses possible, depending on local circumstances, the people involved and the ambitions of the intervention strategy;
- Use the tools to start a discussion. The guide includes brief descriptions of the drawings in the picture box, which can help to guide the participants to the central idea. At the end of each video clip, there is one question to start the discussion. Below, for each video clip and picture we have included several considerations and specific questions;
- Carefully explain the dilemmas. The descriptions in this manual may help in his, as may the examples in our review of literature and practices in Burundi and DR Congo (see ZOA website);
- There is no mandatory order to discuss the questions, nor the need to examine each of them: several questions could result in more or less similar answers;
- Stimulate the participants to think about other strategic questions that are not mentioned in the tools!
How to deal with the wrongdoings committed during and after civil war? Peace and justice are often difficult to achieve at the same time. When the ambitions for peace and justice are conflicting, there are no easy answers on which one to prioritize.

Reconciliation and amnesty for violent acts committed may help bring a swift end to violence and bring stability, but may fuel a sense of impunity, compromise respect for human rights, and negatively affect the accountability and legitimacy of authorities in the longer run. To restore peace in the long-term requires some form of redress of wrongdoings. Prosecution of perpetrators might promote a sense of justice done, but might compromise stability and the willingness of antagonists to join the peace process. Actually, ‘justice’ may be arrived at in various ways, including through truth-finding, acknowledgement of wrongdoings and apology, or (symbolic) compensation, and the ways mentioned above.

Local and international views and expectations on dealing with past offences may strongly differ, while different choices may be required at different levels. People at the local level might consider that a different approach is needed in dealing with human rights violations committed by militia members as compared to national political actors that may have instigated such violence. Likewise, local communities might prefer development first, before both justice and peace.
The image in the picture box shows a moment of reconciliation. We see diverse participants: military or militia members, customary and state authorities, women and youngsters. The picture represents the final phase of a long process. What was necessary to reach this point?

To facilitate discussion with members of the Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- For you, what does reconciliation mean? What is necessary to reach it?
- For you, what does justice mean? With what values do you associate it?
- Should there first be justice before there can be peace? Or do you need peace before there can be justice?
- What conditions are necessary for reconciliation? Re-establishment of social relations? Truth-telling? Punishment of those whom are guilty? Compensation for the victims? Regular commemoration?

The video clips

Click here to watch the video: [https://vimeo.com/190064248](https://vimeo.com/190064248)

The video clip ends with the question:
Justice or peace, which one should be prioritized before the other?

To facilitate discussion on strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- What kind of peace or justice should LPCs envisage? To what extent should forgiveness, truth, compensation, or punishment form necessary components of the process?
- What are the perspectives of local communities on the appropriate balance between different elements of peace and justice? How to assure that they maintain trust in the approach adopted by the committees? In other words, what is needed to promote a feeling of ‘justice done’? What different expectations and aspirations exist among different stakeholders, including both victims and perpetrators, and at different levels?
- How to take into account the particular perspectives of and demands by women, youngsters, and other vulnerable groups?
- What peace and justice activities are feasible, taking into account the prevailing political context and security situation?
- If the state can provide justice, what additional roles can an LPC play?
To what extent should Local Peace Committees focus on ending direct, interpersonal violence and addressing its immediate effects, often referred to as ‘negative peace’? This would imply activities like reconciliatory and mediation meetings, peace conferences, establishing councils for local conflict resolution, or training local actors in (new) methods for dealing with local conflict in a non-violent way. Or should they also—or instead—endeavour to address the so-called ‘root-causes’ of conflict and structural violence? And thus aim to transform society to make it more ‘just’, and so establish sustainable peace, often referred to as ‘positive peace’? This would imply working on a wide range of activities, notably promoting equitable development and services provision, promoting equal public participation in policymaking, preventing discrimination, strengthening civil society etc.
The image shows an unfair sharing of food between the children. In this situation, even if there is no violence, the situation could still be improved, as animosity might erupt later. Working for a ‘just’ or sustainable peace would require structural and cultural changes, for example, to stop discrimination and achieve gender equality.

To facilitate discussion with members of the Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- What are daily forms of violence in the community? (discrimination of certain groups, gender, youth?)
- What can LPCs do to stop such violence? With what results?
- To what types of violence do LPCs have no answer?

The video clips

Click here to watch the video: https://vimeo.com/190068469

The video clip ends with the question:
What should be done to stop the violence? What can be done to eradicate the root causes of conflict?

To facilitate discussion on strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- What are the immediate priorities for consolidation peace?
- What type of violence should be treated? Direct and interpersonal violence; or structural violence (with structural causes)? Why?
- How can peacebuilding strategies of LPCs deal with both immediate effects and structural, deep causes of conflict at the same time?
- Under what conditions and when can an LPC start working on positive peace?
Should LPCs focus on working at the local level, and for instance try to address specific intra-family conflicts or intra-community issues? Or should they (also) aim to address the large antagonisms in society, such as ethnic and political divisions, and try to change the societal, political and economic order?

A concern for local level conflict and violence may make the work of LPCs more visible and effective, but risks to have limited impacts on society in general, as it may fail to affect ‘Peace-Writ-Large’.

A focus on larger antagonisms and divides is necessary to realize a more peaceful society, but such efforts require more complex interventions and expertise, and may not have a direct benefit for local stakeholders or for the individuals affected by current violent conflict. Nonetheless, often there are dynamics related to Peace-Writ-Large which can be addressed locally, like discrimination, corrupt governance practices, etc. However, to work on these requires a clear perspective on the bigger antagonisms and what is necessary to transform these, in other words: a well-elaborated ‘Theory of Change’.
The picture shows members of a community who are fighting for the land (on the right); at the same time, there is a large landowner observing them (left). To reach peace, should these community members be reconciled, or should one instead solve the issues of inequality, land grabbing, and irregular access to land; or improve security of land tenure? In general: should LPCs try to reconcile inter-personal conflicts or instead focus on larger processes such as inequality, political manipulation, and discrimination?

To facilitate discussion with members of the Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- How are particular local/daily/inter-personal conflicts related to more general conflicts in society and vice versa?
- What types of conflicts can be resolved locally? What are the challenges? And what are the kinds of conflict that an LPC can and cannot address?
- In what ways could an LPC also work on the more general conflicts in society?
- What types of conflict require intervention at a higher level? What support is needed to also involve stakeholders from outside the community?

The video clips

Click here to watch the video: [https://vimeo.com/190069643](https://vimeo.com/190069643)

The video clip ends with the question:
What are the relationships between local conflicts and the large antagonisms in society, and how to deal with these?

To facilitate discussion on strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- What is our ‘Theory of Change’ for LPCs: Which fundamental problems do you want to work on? And hence, what is the most appropriate approach?
- What does this mean for your focus: working on local level peace or working on Peace-Writ-Large?
- Are there ways and space to address more structural, fundamental issues? And to involve important leaders at other levels?
- How can we strategically link to other interveners who are capable to do what we cannot do?
Even if the objective of Local Peace Committees is to contribute to peace, the emphasis on peace in the approach may differ.

LPCs and their supporters might have the ambition to work directly ‘on’ conflict, that is, designing interventions that directly address violence, and its underlying causes, and search for ways to satisfy the contrasting interests of those in conflict, e.g. through mediation or promoting non-violence.

LPCs might also want to work ‘in’ conflict, which means to work more indirectly on conflict, for instance by mainstreaming peace in other development activities. This is notably done through working in a conflict sensitive way, or employing notions of Do-No-Harm (for instance, by assuring that interventions do not reinforce divisions, put participants in danger, or bolster structural violence), or through ‘strengthening local capacities for peace’ (for instance, by assuring that development activities connect people, or by partnering with institutions that maintain peace at community level).
The picture box

The picture shows the construction of a house. Often, such an intervention is not like mediation and reconciliation, which try to directly deal with the causes of conflict and misunderstandings. However, development activities can have a positive impact on peace. For example, if one tries to include all members of the community. A joint development activity could also reunite community members that have been divided by conflict, contribute to trauma-healing, or generate employment for former militias.

To facilitate discussion with members of the Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- What is the link between peace and development?
- Which one has the priority for the LPC?

The video clips

Click here to watch the video: https://vimeo.com/190265854
The video clip ends with the question:
Which one has priority: peace or development?

To facilitate discussion on strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- How do LPCs understand the conflict context: does it require working directly on conflict, or is there a need for other interventions that indirectly have a positive influence on the conflict?
- When working on conflict, should LPCs limit themselves to peacebuilding activities like mediation and conflict resolution, or should they work on other activities that nonetheless have an impact on peace as well, such as ‘development for peace’?
- When working in conflict, should LPCs try to assure to Do-No-Harm; or instead try to strengthen Local Capacities for Peace, for instance, by strengthening connectors and addressing dividers?
- Is the context ready for the kind of interventions envisaged? What political space is available for activities that address conflict directly, or is the context more suitable for development?
- When changing from working ‘on’ conflict to ‘in’ conflict, or vice versa, what does this require in terms of the internal organisation and capacities of an LPC?
Peacebuilding requires a focus on different levels of intervention simultaneously – top level political or military leadership, middle range leadership of civil society, and grass roots leadership. What should this imply for enhancing LPCs, which work at the local level mainly?

Interventions to enhance LPCs that concentrate on activities at the local level may have concrete, direct results at that level. Even then, it remains necessary to promote links between different actors at the local level, including other local peace structures, to prevent duplication and avoid competition.

Interventions to enhance LPCs may also focus on the character and quality of vertical integration: that is, promoting linkages from local, to provincial, national and international actors. This enables, for instance, advocacy at provincial and national level, which may reinforce local initiatives for conflict resolution and prevention. Such a strategy may have political risks, and requires a long-term vision, as well as different kinds of expertise.
The picture box

The image shows a peace process at the local level. One member is making a phone call to a political leader at the regional or national level. Often, to achieve peace, there is a need for linking and coordinating activities at different levels.

To facilitate discussion with members of the Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- What connections with actors at regional, national or international level are important to consolidate peace at local level?
- What support is necessary to reach these actors or leaders at higher levels?
- Who are important leaders / institutions to involve or address to achieve peace?
- If we are not capable to get in contact with those leaders ourselves, who else can do it?

The video clips

Click here to watch the video: https://vimeo.com/190266014

The video clip ends with the question:
What is the interaction between elites and the local community in the reproduction of violence on the one hand and conflict transformation on the other? And how to manage these two levels?

To facilitate discussion on strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- What linkages between actors at the local level are important for LPCs that aim to consolidate peace at the local level?
- Should there be a specific role for NGOs concerning interventions at different levels? Which?
- Which strategy is necessary to reach which level of actors or leaders?
- What linkages between the local, national and international level are important for an LPC to consolidate peace and contribute to peace at the national level?
- Who are the key leaders at each level that must be involved or included to achieve peace?
- What is needed to link these leaders? Who should do it? And why?
To what extent should Local Peace Committees include only those that are known for their capacities for reconciling people and that are accepted by everybody (the so-called ‘connectors’ or ‘doves’)? Or should LPCs also include those who are responsible for conflict (the so-called ‘dividers’ or ‘hawks’)?

The advantage of a mixed composition, including the dividers, is that it might contribute to the effectiveness and ‘weight’ and leverage of peace committees. Yet, LPCs organized in such a way risk to have limited legitimacy in the longer term.

LPCs composed of connectors only are likely to face less internal tension and struggle. At the same time, such an LPC might have less access to the parties in conflict, notably the dividers. It may also limit their profound understanding of certain stakeholders in conflict.
The picture box

The image shows a meeting of a certain group (maybe a political party?), from which one particular individual is excluded. The image raises the question whether a peace committee should be inclusive. The image also shows some participants that are included, yet hesitate to join. Are they perhaps involved in or responsible for the violence?

To facilitate discussion with members of the Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- What does the LPC represent?
- What categories of people should or can be members of the LPC? What are the selection criteria?
- What positive and negative experiences are there with the inclusion or exclusion of connectors and dividers?
- Has the LPC a mandate from the community? In what ways is it locally recognized?

The video clips

Click here to watch the video: https://vimeo.com/190266106

The video clip ends with the question:

At what moment and under which conditions should dividers be included in LPCs?

To facilitate discussion on strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- Is it essential to have both ‘doves’ (connectors) and ‘hawks’ (dividers) in LPCs to address conflict and be able to contribute to peacebuilding?
- How best to manage both ‘doves’ and ‘hawks’ in LPCs in addressing conflict and building peace?
- Should an LPC represent all the different groups in the community (ethnic, religious, political, gender, age, government)? Or may such inclusiveness instead paralyze the work of an LPC, as it results in too many members and internal political tensions?
To what extent may ‘best practices’ from elsewhere provide inspiration?

To what extent should interventions to support LPCs start from what is locally there, or might they also be inspired by best practices from elsewhere?

Local experiences and arrangements might be better embedded in the context. It is also more efficient and effective to work on the basis of existing structures and practices. However, sometimes local arrangements have eroded, are corrupted or are seen to have played problematic roles during conflict.

Best practices from elsewhere might be useful in case local arrangements have known shortcomings or lack local credibility. Yet, best practice from elsewhere may not fit or be adapted easily to local context.
The picture box

The image shows the meeting of a peace committee. One member wonders whether there might be other ways to organize the committee, and whether they might look for inspiration from elsewhere or even abroad.

To facilitate discussion with members of the Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- What are the ‘best practices’ imported by your LPC?
- How to acquire ‘best practices’ from elsewhere?
- In what situations, or for what conflicts, does your LPC need outside experience?

The video clips

Click here to watch the video: https://vimeo.com/190266240
The video clip ends with the question:
In which case do LPC’s need experiences from elsewhere?

To facilitate discussion on strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- In what situations, and based on what criteria, should LPCs incorporate best practices from elsewhere?
- How can best practices from elsewhere be incorporated by LPCs to strengthen local legitimacy and contribute to peace?
- Do you have examples of best practices from elsewhere that did or did not work in your context?
Should LPCs build on customary institutions and promote local, traditional and customary practices and norms to deal with disputes, or rather promote national or international norms and legislation? This has implications for the ways in which conflicts are dealt with; the compromises arrived at through mediation; and the character of justice done, mainly on the question of who wins and who loses from the outcome.

An important issue related to customary institutions and arrangements is their legitimacy and inclusiveness, and their sensitivity to international principles of human rights. Efforts to strengthen customary norms and procedures may effectively favour one group over the other and men over women. When promoting national legislation and or international human rights, the question is if norms and procedures have local legitimacy and are accessible to all.
The picture box

The image shows two institutions—a customary institution and the judiciary—that might be involved in resolving conflicts and maintaining social order at the local level. These institutions each apply their own rules and norms, and follow different procedures and strategies. Sometimes, customary and state institutions work together. Sometimes, traditional authorities apply national legislation.

To facilitate discussion with members of the Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- What are the limits of customary institutions? What are the limits of the judicial system?
- In their experience, what types of dispute LPCs manage to resolve with reference to custom?
- How do the two systems work together locally?
- Which of these structures manages to achieve reconciliation in a satisfactory way?
- Which types of conflict need to be referred to customary institutions, which to local tribunals, and why?
- Which elements of these two structures are appreciated by the community, and why?

The video clips

Click here to watch the video: https://vimeo.com/190266372

The video clip ends with the question:
What is the place of customary institutions in conflict resolution?

To facilitate discussion on strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- Why and when should LPC encourage local institutions and arrangements rather than national law or international human rights legislation, or vice versa?
- How can LPCs ensure that institutions and arrangements are fair, do not marginalize groups and/or do not contribute to discrimination against women, youth, disadvantaged, or disfavoured groups?
- Which solutions for particular conflicts are considered fair, and in what way do customary and state institutions promote these notions?
- What norms, values and conventions are considered important and legitimate by the local population? And how could these be disseminated among customary institutions?
- Do we want to promote customary norms and rules? Or rather the values, restorative character, and procedures of custom?
- What does ‘harmonizing customary and state institutions’ mean concretely? How can LPCs contribute to this process?
Should one work with civil society, and local non-state authorities as alternative providers of justice and governance, and bypass the state? Or is the ambition to eventually strengthen the state, or even integrate the LPC into the state (as part of the judiciary system or state administration)?

Independence of LPCs will contribute to their local legitimacy and neutrality. However, circumventing the state may be at the disadvantage of re-establishing the state. Setting up local justice and security arrangements may liberate the state of its responsibilities to provide access to justice to all its citizens. Independence of LPCs may not only compromise their legitimacy in the eyes of the state but also their sustainability.

Integration of LPCs into state institutions might strengthen the state, but result in loss of local legitimacy and neutrality of LPCs.
The picture box

The Image shows an LPC located next to the communal offices. Perhaps they work together, and maybe the Committee is already integrated in the office; but perhaps the committee tries to remain independent.

To facilitate discussion with members of the Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- Would we like a situation in which we work closely together with the state? Should the LPC finally reside within the communal office or should it stay within the community?
- Would it be possible to collaborate with state institutions?
- What support from the local authority do you need?
- If you are unable to resolve a conflict, what to do? Should you refer the parties in conflict to the state?

The video clips

Click here to watch the video: https://vimeo.com/190266562
The video clip ends with the question:
What are the modalities of collaboration between LPCs and state structures? What are the challenges and advantages?

To facilitate discussion on strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- To what degree should LPCs be independent from the state and judicial systems? What are the advantages and disadvantages of the two options (being independent or dependent)?
- How to prevent duplication/overlapping structures when the LPC remains independent?
- What conditions need to be met for LPCs to be integrated into state and judicial framework?
- To facilitate effective dialogue between the state and society, should the LPC be integrated or should it remain independent?
Local Peace Committees could be permanent structures; or transitional and thus temporal, that dissolve or integrate into state structures when the latter have been established and LPCs cease to play their distinct role.

If promoted as permanent structures, LPCs need to adapt to stay relevant to context. This has implications for their internal organisation, like procedures for membership and accountability towards the community. Moreover, permanent LPCs might contribute to legal ambiguity and a proliferation of institutions, which is likely to contribute to unclearness about who is in charge of resolving disputes and what rules apply.

A perception that Local Peace Committees are temporary structures assumes that state institutions (re)take responsibility for security provision and judicial services that are fair and accessible to all.
The picture box

The Image shows the passing of time, and the changing of context from a situation of violence, towards stabilisation and peace. We also see the development of peace committees: one continues to operate, while the other one ends its activities in light of the improving situation.

To facilitate discussion with members of the Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- How to assure sustainability if supporting organizations are no longer present?
- If context changes, how does the role of the LPC change?
- In different phases, what are preferred relationships with state authorities and customary institutions?
- Does a permanent structure require integration of the LPC into the local state administration?

The video clips

Click here to watch the video: https://vimeo.com/190267180
The video clip ends with the question:
What is the role of Peace Committees during conflict and in times of peace?

To facilitate discussion on strategies to establish or strengthen Local Peace Committees one could pose questions like:

- If permanent LPCs are considered necessary, how can their sustainability and their capacity to stay relevant in a changing local context be assured? If LPCs are seen as permanent structures, what should be the roles of LPCs eventually?
- To what extent, and based on what criteria, might LPCs be linked to the state?
- How can responsibilities of and peacebuilding roles fulfilled by LPCs be taken over by other institutions?
- How to prevent duplication of institutions at the local level?