

## PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/158305>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2020-11-25 and may be subject to change.

**GLOBAL  
PARTNERSHIP  
FOR THE  
PREVENTION  
OF ARMED  
CONFLICT**

# **Networking for peace: Opportunities for the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict**

Willemijn Verkoren



# **Networking for peace: Opportunities for the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict**

European Centre for Conflict Prevention/  
International Secretariat of the Global Partnership for the Prevention  
of Armed Conflict.  
Laan van Meerdervoort 70  
2517 AN Den Haag  
The Netherlands

Tel.: +31 70 3110970  
Fax: +31 70 3600194  
[info@conflict-prevention.net](mailto:info@conflict-prevention.net)  
[www.gppac.net](http://www.gppac.net)

© 2006 European Centre for Conflict Prevention  
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in  
any way without full attribution.

Production: Bureau M&O, Amsterdam  
Layout: MMS Grafisch Werk, Amsterdam  
Printed by Haasbeek, Alphen a/d Rijn

Cover photo: GPPAC Conference in General Assembly hall, New  
York, July 2005

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## **About this issue paper 7**

### **Summary 9**

Networks and peacebuilding 9

Strengthening the GPPAC network 11

### **Introduction 15**

The study 15

The paper 15

### **Methodology 17**

Literature study 17

Survey 17

Case studies 17

Collecting ideas during networking seminar 17

## **PART I: NETWORKING FOR PEACE: THEORIES AND LESSONS LEARNED**

### **Introduction 23**

#### **1. Networks and networking in the field of peacebuilding 24**

1.1 What are networks? Why networks? 24

1.2 Categorising networks 25

1.3 Conclusion 26

#### **2. Obstacles to optimal networking 28**

2.1 Intra-organisational obstacles 28

2.2 Difficulties with regard to the organisation of the network 30

2.3 Power relations, competition, and contested knowledge 33

2.4 Embeddedness, regimes, and discourse 34

2.5 Cultural issues 40

2.6 Conclusion 40

#### **3. Factors that influence the success of networking 41**

3.1 Concluding remarks 45

## **PART II: THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR THE PREVENTION OF ARMED CONFLICT**

### **Introduction 49**

#### **4. Overall positive and negative aspects of GPPAC 51**

4.1 Positive aspects 51

4.2 Negative aspects 52

#### **5. Functions of GPPAC 53**

- 6. Main challenges** 56
- 7. Capacity of the member organisations** 57
  - 7.1 Capacity of members 57
  - 7.2 Capacity building 58
  - 7.3 Time available for networking 59
  - 7.4 Constituencies 60
- 8. Relationship between the member organisations and the network** 62
  - 8.1 Added value 62
  - 8.2 Shared purpose 64
  - 8.3 Clarity 65
  - 8.4 Commitment and gains 66
- 9. Characteristics of the network** 67
  - 9.1 Flexibility 67
  - 9.2 Safe space 67
  - 9.3 Trust 68
  - 9.4 Openness to different perspectives 68
  - 9.5 Joint activities 68
- 10. Governance, legitimacy and organisation of the network** 69
  - 10.1 Democratic governance 69
  - 10.2 Ownership 69
  - 10.3 Legitimacy 70
  - 10.4 Power issues 70
  - 10.5 The International Steering Group 71
  - 10.6 Facilitation and secretariats 72
  - 10.7 Regular interaction 73
  - 10.8 Structure 74
- 11. Coverage and inclusiveness of the network** 77
  - 11.1 Coverage 77
  - 11.2 Balance between inclusiveness and focus 77
  - 11.3 Membership 78
- 12. Content of the network: knowledge sharing** 80
  - 12.1 Stimulating framework 80
  - 12.2 Tacit and explicit knowledge 80
  - 12.3 Content balance 82
  - 12.4 Outcomes of knowledge sharing 83
  - 12.5 Language and translation 84

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>13. Context of the network</b>	86
13.1 Embeddedness	86
13.2 Links with other networks	87
13.3 Enabling context	87
<b>14. Funding of the network</b>	89
14.1 Funding structure	89
<b>15. Monitoring and evaluation</b>	92
<b>16. Conclusions and recommendations</b>	95
16.1 Global, regional, national: the relationships between the levels of the Global Partnership	95
16.2 Increasing relevance and support	95
16.3 Governance and structure	96
16.4 Information and communication	98
16.5 Building networking and conflict prevention capacity	99
<b>Some overall concluding remarks</b>	101
<b>Issues for further research</b>	102
<b>Annex 1: Literature used</b>	103
<b>Annex 2: People interviewed</b>	109
<b>Annex 3: Global survey report version A</b>	115
<b>Annex 4: Global survey report version B</b>	139
<b>Annex 5: Programme and participants of GPPAC networking seminar, 10-11 October 2006</b>	153





# About this issue paper

This paper is the third in the series of studies into issues in conflict prevention and peacebuilding by civil society presented by the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC).

The paper is the outcome of a review of the Global Partnership and its regional networks. The review comprised a combination of surveys, interviews and discussions along with a literature study and the main conclusions of an expert seminar. It was undertaken with the purpose of helping strengthen the network. The paper has benefited from the insights and the practical experiences of the regional initiators of the Global Partnership.

The purpose of this network strengthening review is:

- to collect and share lessons learned and best practices on network strengthening;
- to gather views about the state of the global and regional GPPAC networks;
- to gather views about the best ways to strengthen the global and regional GPPAC networks;
- to arrive at recommendations to strengthen the global network and the regional networks in a participatory fashion.

This review is part of the ‘building national and regional capacity for prevention’ sub-programme of the Global Partnership.

The paper’s author, Willemijn Verkoren, is a political scientist (MSc) and historian (MA), who focuses on peace and conflict, development cooperation, organisational learning, knowledge sharing, and networking. Verkoren has worked for the University of Amsterdam in several capacities since 2003. In 2005 she began a PhD project on “learning and knowledge sharing by peacebuilding organisations” at the Amsterdam Institute for Metropolitan and International Development Studies (AMIDSt). In addition, Verkoren is a lecturer in conflict studies at the University of Amsterdam’s International School for Humanities and Social Sciences (ISHSS) and works as a freelance researcher and consultant. Projects have included an evaluation of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ funding of peacebuilding NGOs under the TMF programme, and a consultancy on the monitoring and evaluation of the Applied Conflict Transformation Studies (ACTS) programme for the organisation Responding to Conflict (RTC). Her publications include the book *Postconflict Development: Meeting New Challenges* (Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005). The author would like to thank Raphael Gonçalves Marreto for his work on the case study of GPPAC Latin America and the Caribbean, Kristel Maasen for her help in carrying out the case study of GPPAC Central Asia.

At ECCP Juliette Verhoeven was responsible for the overall coordination of this project. The paper has been made possible by the financial support of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.



# Summary

This paper reflects the findings of a review done of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), a worldwide network consisting of civil society organisations working in the field of conflict prevention and peacebuilding. The review was carried out through a combination of surveys, interviews, discussions, and a literature study, and was done with the purpose of contributing to the strengthening of the network.

## Networks and peacebuilding

A network is ‘a loosely structured form of cooperation, in which coordination is done through a horizontal exchange of information, lacking a clear hierarchy. It is composed of communication links between individuals or groups. The network notion stresses these linkages and allows participants to exchange information and attach meaning to it, thus transforming information into knowledge.’ (Box 2001) The members of a network can be individuals or organisations that are working toward a common goal, or whose individual interests are better served within a collective structure. Networks are formed to extend the reach and influence of members and to gain access to sources of knowledge that could improve practice.

Complementarity is an important element of networks, which profit from the diversity of their constituencies and bring together their various strengths. This is necessary in order to deal with the fact that the field of peacebuilding has few resources to spend. Networks may enable individual organisations to address global problems through joint action, based on the realisation that none of the organisations involved can address the issue at stake by itself. Such joint action may also strengthen the outreach capacity of the field as a whole. In this way, network participants can advance the work of their individual organisation and also promote the wider field of the network. Being a member of a network may thus add to an organisation’s credibility and influence and lead to new business opportunities. On a less material level, networks may be sources of inspiration, solidarity, unity and moral support. In addition, collaboration in networks may expose

organisations to new ideas and knowledge, enhance critical thinking and creativity, and help avoid competition and duplication of activities.

As an organisational form, networks provide more flexibility and openness than more formal organisations. This means that they are able to adjust in the process of cooperation. As a result, at least in theory, networks’ structures can facilitate constant learning from success and failure. The light structure of networks may allow them to respond quickly to new situations and take new initiatives without going through a heavy bureaucratic process.

Increasingly, networks are considered to be particularly suitable to deal with issues of conflict and peace, as these issues have a dynamic nature and tend to link together players in different parts of the world, characteristics which appear to favour loose and flexible organisational forms that connect actors in different places. In addition, the field of conflict prevention and peacebuilding is dispersed over a great number of mostly small organizations, making knowledge sharing and cooperation important activities.

Factors that influence the success of networking may be placed in the following categories.

- *The capacity of the member organisations.* The participating organisations have the capacity to contribute meaningfully to a successful network. They also have the capacity to learn and to use the network for some purpose. A successful network also contributes to the capacity building of its members. This helps to deal with issues of power and inequality, and ensures that members can get the most out of their participation in the network. The network also provides room for discussion and reflection upon actions. In addition, in a successful network, participants have time to engage in meaningful exchanges. It is also of importance that member organisations of a successful network represent a particular constituency, not merely their own organisational interests.

- *The relationship between members and the network.* A successful network has a clear added value for its members. There is a clear purpose; a shared vision and mission by all parties involved. From the outset, there is clarity about the aims, limits and possibilities of the network. Networks also require commitment on the part of those involved, because they require extra time besides the usual schedules of partners.
- *General characteristics of the network.* A successful network is flexible and capable of responding to changes in the environment. The network is also flexible in that room is created for self-organisation. There is an atmosphere of safety in which to express doubts and criticisms and manage uncertainties. There is trust among the members, as well as openness to different points of view, different values, and different interpretations of reality. In addition, a good network engages in joint activities.
- *Governance, legitimacy and organisation of the network.* A successful network is democratic and inclusive. It is not controlled by a single set of interests. Its structures are considered legitimate, and members have a sense of ownership. Successful networks strive to mitigate power issues. In addition, the role of the coordinator or secretariat should be clearly circumscribed, active, and empowering. Having a strong and capable secretariat at all levels is of vital importance. Regular face-to-face meetings are important to build personal relationships and achieve continuity. Finally, a good network structure contributes to increased legitimacy and ownership and ensures both flexibility and good coordination.
- *Coverage and inclusiveness of the network.* A successful network strikes the right balance has to be found between inclusiveness and diversity on the one hand, and focus and direction on the other. This goes for content as well as membership.
- *The content of the network.* A successful network does not strive to be an overall, comprehensive knowledge system, but aims to offer a stimulating framework that facilitates exchange and access to knowledge sources. Tacit as well as explicit knowledge is exchanged. There is sufficient focus in the context, but there is room for the discussion of diverse issues. Knowledge sharing may also generate ‘common products’. Finally, a successful network pays attention to issues of language and translation in order to make available knowledge accessible to as many within the network as possible. This goes for language differences in the narrow sense of the term, but also applies to the use of jargon versus more accessible language.
- *The context of the network.* Any network should be linked in an appropriate way to a wider environment, to its social and political context as well as to neighbouring communities and similar initiatives in other countries or regions. At the same time, the network should not be embedded to the extent that it cannot operate autonomously. A successful network establishes links with other networks in order to prevent duplication and maximise knowledge benefits. More generally, a successful network operates in an enabling context. It is not obstructed by governments, conflict parties or other organisations.
- *The funding structure of the network.* There is sufficient funding for networking and knowledge sharing activities, even if the direct impact of these cannot always be shown. At the same time, the network is accountable financially. The funding structure of a good network does not provide a position of power to one organisation at the funding interface or enhance competition between members, but ensures that the funds benefit the network as a whole. Donor agencies do not impose particular approaches or activities. Donors engage in knowledge exchange with the network and take the knowledge generated in the network seriously, making use of it in their policy formulation.
- *Monitoring and evaluation.* A successful network has good and working monitoring and evaluation (M&E) procedures in order to assess impact and to continue to learn and improve practice.

### Strengthening the GPPAC network

A number of positive points about the Global Partnership emerge from the survey and interviews held as part of the GPPAC network strengthening review. Despite criticism of the network, most people's expectations of GPPAC have been partly met. Nearly all stakeholders have benefited from their participation in GPPAC. The main benefits mentioned include access to knowledge and expertise in the field; the opportunity to exchange experiences with others; gaining contacts and partnerships; and raising the visibility and legitimacy of participating organisations through their membership of GPPAC. Other positive aspects of GPPAC include that it provides a sense of solidarity and moral support; its coverage of the world's regions and countries is quite good; and there is openness to different points of view within GPPAC.

Considerable achievements have been made at the global level, most notably the 2005 conference in New York and ECCP's lobby activities on behalf of the network, in particular those at the UN. At the regional level, the record varies. The regional networks remain relatively narrow and insufficiently rooted to realities and actors on the ground in conflict areas. The regions receive little time and resources from the International Secretariat in relation to the attention it pays to its global-level activities.

Other aspects with which members are less satisfied include the following. First of all, participants mention the loss of momentum since the global conference at UN Headquarters in New York in July 2005. The process leading up to that conference, in which the network was organised and regional and global action agendas were developed, was considered beneficial - and raised expectations about the implementation phase that would follow. However, people feel that implementation has not really commenced. Related to this, participants complain of a lack of concrete action and implementation of plans: 'too much talk, too little action'. In addition, there has been a lack of continuity in the process. There have been few and irregular meetings in most regions, and in between meetings there

has been little follow-up and interaction. Part of the reason for this is the lack of funds raised for GPPAC at its various levels. Fundraising is considered to be the responsibility of all who have a formal position within GPPAC. Some admit that they have not given sufficient priority to raising funds for GPPAC. This has several reasons, including the difficulty of finding funds for networking in a donor climate that emphasises 'direct-impact' activities, a lack of clarity on focus and strategy, and fatigue and a loss of momentum after the July 2005 conference in New York.

Another commonly identified difficulty has been a lack of focus. Participants feel there should be more common agreement and understanding on aims, priorities and strategies, in order to deal with the diverging expectations of members and the too broad and ambitious aims of the network. Such common agreement should lead to more focus in the profiling and programming of the network. In addition, an issue raised repeatedly is that of internal democracy within the network. This relates to a lack of transparency - about what the procedures are, why some are selected to attend meetings and others not, and what GPPAC is doing at the global level and on whose authority. Additional difficulties are the low capacity of some regional networks and of many participating organisations at national level, and the fact that GPPAC is not sufficiently linked to the grassroots in the regions. In many regions the network remains limited to a narrow circle around the regional initiator.

The main functions of GPPAC that emerge from the review are:

- High-level engagement to change the framework for conflict prevention and peacebuilding and to make the voice of local civil society heard. The work with the UN is particularly relevant. It is also important to link these high-level processes to actors and development at the regional, national and local levels.
- Generating and disseminating knowledge constitutes a second important function of the network. This includes doing research, gathering other research and information, and disseminating research results, working methods, and updates about the GPPAC

process and about developments in the field more broadly. The network should provide its members with access to experts and expertise, but also facilitate the building of expertise within the members and network, and help bring out the knowledge and experience that exists within the network. The network may facilitate the linking up of this expertise with policy formulation by donor agencies and international organisations.

- Related to this, an important function of the network is to facilitate the exchange of experiences among network members. Such experiences may include lessons learned and best practices. Other participants may learn from the successes and mistakes of colleagues and be inspired by others' stories.
- The network should support its members by helping them gain access to funds and training and capacity building opportunities.
- Finally, the majority of participants feel that the Global Partnership and its regional networks should engage in collaboration around concrete, joint activities. Although knowledge sharing is one of the most important functions of GPPAC, the Partnership should not limit itself to being a knowledge network. Collaborative activities may vary and suggestions range from joint high-level advocacy campaigns and lobby to joint grassroots peacebuilding projects.

GPPAC's global activities are not linked as much as would be desirable to what happens in the Partnership's regions - considering that a major added value of GPPAC lies in its potential ability to link people and activities from the local to the global. Making such links would give a global advocacy platform to local concerns and have lobbying efforts informed and strengthened by local priorities. It would also ensure that decisions made at the global level are carried by actors at regional and national levels. In order to achieve better linkages, strengthening the regional networks emerges as a priority for GPPAC. A first, basic, step in this direction would be for the International Steering Group (ISG) and International Secretariat (ECCP) to gain a better insight into the composition of the membership in the regions. In addition, support from the International Secretariat to the Regional Secretariats is important in order to

strengthen the regional networks. The Regional Secretariats need more funding and ECCP can help both by raising such funds itself and by building the capacity of the regions to raise funds. In addition, the regions may need advice and guidance in the running of a network, particularly when it comes to improving information flows and participatory processes.

In addition, in order to become more rooted and concrete, GPPAC needs to focus on the development of networks at the country level. It is not realistic to expect that national networks will be developed in each country in the short term, but the development of GPPAC processes at the national level could start in a few countries that are very large or face many conflicts. To facilitate these regional and national processes, the International Secretariat could itself become more rooted in the network. Internationalising ECCP staff could be one step in that direction, as could decentralising the functions of the secretariat to have more of a regional presence. This may entail dispersion of secretariat responsibilities to other capable organisations within the network. In this model there would still be a small staff at the global level, which would focus on fundraising and lobby at the UN.

Two conclusions emerge very clearly from the review. GPPAC needs to make sure, first, that its priorities and objectives are shared by all involved, and second, that these objectives are sufficiently focused, practical, and attainable. More clearly circumscribed but widely carried objectives and strategies would make the network more relevant and action-oriented. The development of concrete work programmes has been a big step towards making GPPAC more practical. However, that process has been relatively narrow and many members feel left out. In addition, the plans remain broad and are not everywhere feasible. Arriving at concrete, attainable, and widely carried plans is important in order to ensure that tangible outcomes are reached, something that would motivate members, draw in important players that are presently hesitant to join, and commit donors. An additional way to build support for GPPAC and to commit those who can help make plans a reality is to involve potential donors in the



## Summary

process of strategising. This is already starting to be done at present.

Other ways in which support may be gathered is by working on the network's message. Concrete suggestions for this include establishing a 'brand', for example by making the catchphrase People Building Peace more widely known. The network may also look for political or celebrity leaders, ask a famous band to produce a peace song, and make International Peace Day a platform for awareness raising and activities around the world. In addition, the message to potential donors and the larger public could be more convincing. Central to the message should be that conflict prevention is not a luxury, as global security is in everyone's interest. Potential supporters also need to be convinced that civil society is able to make a real contribution to the prevention of armed conflict. A better, and shared, understanding within the network of the concept and role of civil society would therefore help to improve the message.

Focus may be needed not only in terms of GPPAC's programming but also with regard to its membership. Although inclusiveness is an important value, members will not contribute to the network if they are not committed to its vision and mission, do not have credentials in conflict prevention, and/or have little capacity to contribute to the network's agendas. More thought may be given to how, and by whom, such criteria may be used.

Well-organised institutions and clearly circumscribed representative structures are important for a network's legitimacy and its ability to take decisive action. In addition to developing clear structures that improve democratic governance and transparency, strengthening the coordinators and secretariats at the various levels is a priority. At the same time, the network should not be so centralised that people passively look towards the centre for action. A degree of flexibility and looseness is at the very essence of networking. A network is more relevant to individual members if it provides them with a framework within which they may organise and find solutions to concrete problems than if it establishes

overall joint processes and issues that it thinks ought to be relevant to all involved.

A model that makes it possible for participants to join in activities that they find useful but stay out of others, and to take initiatives and organise in sub-groups around particular issues or activities, may bring the network closer to local realities. Such flexibility could help increase participants' commitment as their participation in network activities is based on a conscious choice. A framework that can allow and support such flexibility would provide members with information, communication tools, and contacts. It may also entail programmes to build the capacity of members and member networks. There may be some network-wide activities, such as the collection of stories and best practices for the benefit of lobby, advocacy and awareness raising activities at the global level. In addition to this, however, there should be room for different and varying regional- and national-level activities as well as cross-regional ones. Some of these activities may be carried out by task-oriented working groups which would unite individuals and organisations already engaged with a thematic issue. Such groups may link up electronically and meet as necessary. The ISG has already set up some thematic working groups but these consist only of ISG members and do not have any concrete objectives.

A charter, in which the main vision and overall aims of the network are made explicit and which outlines the criteria and procedures for representation and decision-making, may also be part of the framework. The current draft charter is suitable for this, but it is very little known and carried by the broader membership of the network. In order to increase the ownership and legitimacy of the structure of the network, a bottom-up visioning process around the charter may be organised. This could be done largely online. At the same time, this process should not stop the Partnership from starting concrete activities at various levels in order to prove its relevance and added value, providing an overarching framework while giving space for varying initiatives.

The importance of an ISG consisting mainly of representatives of the regional networks is affirmed by

the review. International NGOs and networks, donor agencies, and some national representatives may also play a role in the policy formulation of the network. However, such people would be better placed not in the ISG itself but in a broader meeting, adjacent to the ISG, in which not the regular governance of the network but broader issues and strategies would be discussed. Also as part of improving its governance, GPPAC may pay more attention to developing mechanisms that can help mitigate power issues and regulate conflict within the network. This may include integrity standards, ground rules for engagement, and internal conflict transformation mechanisms. These may also help the network to become more decisive and make it easier to make difficult choices that not all may agree with.

There is a need to improve information flows about what is happening with GPPAC. The communication bottleneck appears to be at the level of the Regional Secretariats, which do not have the time and resources to process all the information they receive from ECCP, forward relevant information to the regional networks, and elicit inputs and information from the regional networks to be linked to activities at the global level. Strengthening the Regional Secretariats' capacity and resources to be communication hubs is therefore an important priority. This includes, vitally, the funding of translation activities. At the same time, attention may be given to creating alternative communication tools that do not depend on the Regional Secretariats. Such decentralisation of information flows may also be applied to the process of collecting stories and best practices, which at present is hampered by ECCP's inability to get members to contribute. The website [www.peoplebuildingpeace.org/thestories](http://www.peoplebuildingpeace.org/thestories) is a good tool for this and may be expanded upon.

Rather than trying to jointly determine what items should be on the network's knowledge sharing agenda, the network may want first to give thought to the conceptualisation of knowledge sharing as such,

developing a knowledge sharing framework based on a participatory needs-assessment among members. Such a framework might include databases of members, web forums, websites, and regional clearing houses, and act as an umbrella under which groups of members could set up their own knowledge sharing communities.<sup>1</sup>

Although GPPAC advocates a bigger role for civil society, CSOs cannot always deliver due to low capacity. GPPAC needs to recognise this issue and pay attention to it by conducting research on the capacities and needs of civil society organisations in the various regions. In terms of capacity building, GPPAC and its regional networks may set up standards, develop plans of action to meet these, and monitor progress. M&E and learning will be helpful in this regard. M&E is not an extra activity but it is integral to the aims of GPPAC. M&E of GPPAC could build on the various produces that are already in place and learn from the good practices that are available in the regions.

In addition to paying attention to the monitoring and learning of the network itself, GPPAC should promote M&E and broader action learning skills among the membership. Organisations that have functioning learning and monitoring mechanisms in place are better able to make information gained through training and exchange locally relevant and to apply it in their work. It would be an additional - and important- contribution to capacity building if GPPAC could make it possible that training programmes become more widely offered. Members mentioned various training needs, not only in the area of conflict prevention, but also in the realm of practical organisational skills such as documentation, proposal writing, fundraising, ICT, staff development, and M&E. Not all of these skills need face-to-face training to be transferred. GPPAC may begin creating a toolkit on its website. Concrete recommendations in this area - and others - are provided in chapter sixteen.

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the GPPAC knowledge sharing task force aims to do this.



# Introduction

This paper reflects the findings of a review done of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), a worldwide network consisting of civil society organisations working in the field of conflict prevention and peacebuilding. The review was carried out through a combination of surveys, interviews, discussions, and a literature study, and was done with the purpose of contributing to the strengthening of the network. This introduction discusses the aims of the network strengthening review and outlines the remainder of the paper.

## The study

The Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) has entered a new phase since the highlight of its successful global conference in July 2005. According to GPPAC's stakeholders, this phase is characterised by the need to be further strengthen the network in order to begin implementing the action plans that have been created, and in order to strengthen civil society in the field of peacebuilding more generally. Such a process of network strengthening would include building the capacities of the Global Partnership and its regional networks to:

- raise funds
- create a better structure
- increase skills and knowledge of networking
- lobby and advocate
- document work
- exchange experience
- gain muscle for civil society through joint action and coordination

In order to establish a base-line for this strengthening process and gather the views of network members about the needs and priorities for that process, GPPAC's International Steering Group (ISG) and International Secretariat (hosted by the European Centre for Conflict Prevention, ECCP) commissioned a network strengthening review of GPPAC and its regional networks. This network strengthening review aimed:

1. to collect and share lessons learned and best practices on network strengthening;
2. to gather views about the state of the global and regional GPPAC networks, including

- the capacity of the member organisations,
  - the relationship between members and the network,
  - general characteristics of the network,
  - governance, legitimacy, and organisation of the network,
  - coverage and inclusiveness of the network,
  - the content of the network,
  - the context of the network, and
  - the funding structure of the network;
3. to gather views about the best ways to strengthen the global and regional GPPAC networks;
  4. in a participatory way, to arrive at recommendations to strengthen the global network and the regional networks;
  5. to improve the structure and transparency of the Global Partnership, and the legitimacy of its representation;
  6. to improve the networking within the Global Partnership;
  7. to improve the International Secretariat's support to the regional networks.

As the Methodology section of this paper elaborates, the review has been carried out by a combination of a survey sent to people involved in GPPAC around the world, a literature study, and a number of case studies of regional GPPAC networks.

## The paper

After outlining the methodology used for the network strengthening review, this paper maps the most important theories and lessons learned about networking in the first three chapters. This is done in Part I. Chapter one introduces the concepts of networks and discusses ways in which networks may be understood and categorised. Chapter two maps the main obstacles to optimal networking and ways in which these obstacles may be addressed. Building on this, the third chapter lists a number of factors that influence the success of networking. This final chapter of Part I is central to the paper, and the study of GPPAC in Part II will build on it.

In Part II, the paper zooms in on the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC),

presenting the main findings of the survey and conversations held with people involved in the network. In chapter four the overall positive and negative aspects of the Global Partnership are listed. In the chapters that follow, these aspects are further elaborated. Chapter five discusses the main functions of GPPAC, while chapter six addresses the most important challenges the network is seen to face.

From chapter seven onwards, the findings of the review are related to the success factors that were introduced in chapter three. Chapter seven starts by looking at the characteristics of GPPAC members, such as their organisational capacity and the time and priority they are able to give to the network. In connection to this, chapter eight looks at the way the members relate to the Global Partnership. This includes the extent to which they are committed to it and the added value which the network brings to them.

Moving on to the network itself, chapter nine addresses a number of characteristics that affect its functioning, including its flexibility, the level of trust among its members, and its openness to different points of view.

Chapter ten zooms in on GPPAC's structure and governance, while chapter eleven addresses the coverage and inclusiveness of the Partnership. The content of the network - the knowledge that is exchanged within it - is discussed in chapter twelve. In chapter thirteen, the report discusses the relationship of GPPAC to its context - to the social and political reality in the regions, for example, and to other organisations and networks in the field. Chapter fourteen looks at the crucial aspect of funding and the network's funding structure, and finally, chapter fifteen addresses the issue of monitoring and evaluation.

The sixteenth chapter of the paper aims to give a number of concrete recommendations that emerge from the preceding chapters and that may present a starting point for the process of further network strengthening. Consistent with the objectives of the review, the paper aims not only to present the state of the global and regional GPPAC networks as seen by the members, but to place these in a wider context of thinking about networking and to supply concrete ideas that may lead to the strengthening of the network.

# Methodology

The network strengthening review consisted of five main elements:

1. a drawing together of relevant theory on networking and of information on the functioning of other networks
2. conversations with the staff of ECCP (the International Secretariat)
3. a survey sent to all people and organisations involved directly or indirectly in GPPAC worldwide
4. case studies of four regional GPPAC networks
5. collecting ideas during networking seminar

A number of members of the International Steering Group (ISG) of GPPAC participated in the development of the network strengthening review's terms of reference, planning, and questionnaires during and after the ISG meeting in Nairobi in March 2006. In addition, a wide discussion on an interim version of this paper took place during a seminar on networking that was organised by the International Secretariat of GPPAC. In this seminar, all members of the International Steering Group plus about fifteen additional experts participated.

## Literature study

As planned, a review of relevant theory on networking was carried out. Annex 1 contains a list of sources used. The results of the literature study were integrated into this overall paper. Combined with general networking lessons formulated by people consulted for the review, they led to the formulation of a number of factors that influence the success of networking, included in chapter three of this paper. These factors were taken as the starting point for the organisation of the findings in chapters seven to fifteen.

## Survey

A written survey was developed in close consultation with the International Secretariat, in two versions: version A for people directly involved in GPPAC, and version B for people indirectly involved. It was sent to 623 people around the world. The minimum response of 25% was achieved for most regions. The global survey statistics are depicted in table 1.

Number of surveys sent out:	Number of surveys returned:
- total: 623	- total: 199 (32%)
- version A: 261	- version A: 84 (32%)
- version B: 362	- version B: 115 (32%)

Table 1. Global survey statistics

The statistics for each region are depicted in table 2.

Two regions did not meet the threshold of 25 per cent of the surveys returned: Southeast Asia (SEA) and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). In the SEA region 24 per cent of the surveys were returned, which is very close to the threshold. In addition, 29 people were interviewed in this region as part of the case study (see below). In the LAC region only two out of 87 surveys were returned. These two surveys cannot be assumed to be representative of the larger population of GPPAC members in this region. However, other information about the LAC region has been consulted, notably the preliminary report of an evaluation that was carried out on behalf of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of a programme of the organisation *Coordinadora Regional de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales* (CRIES), the GPPAC Regional Initiator for the LAC region. The evaluated programme, 'The Role of Civil Society in the Prevention of Armed and/or Violent Conflict in Latin America and the Caribbean', is essentially GPPAC LAC.

## Case studies

The following regional GPPAC networks were selected as case studies by the ISG and International Secretariat: Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), Central and East Africa (CEA), West Africa (WA), Southeast Asia (SEA), Central Asia (CA), and the Middle East and North Africa (MENA). The following criteria were used for the selection of the case studies:

- Regional spread
- The need to include both longer-established and newly created networks
- The regional and national initiators in the regions selected had to be willing to assist in receiving researchers and in finding and guiding local researchers

GPPAC region	Survey type	Surveys sent	Surveys completed and returned	% of surveys completed and returned
Central and East Africa	A	21	12	57%
	B	36	17	46%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>51%</b>
West Africa	A	21	6	29%
	B	35	12	34%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>32%</b>
Southern Africa	A	13	8	62%
	B	21	3	14%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>32%</b>
Middle East and North Africa	A	12	2	17%
	B	8	4	50%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>30%</b>
Western Europe	A	29	8	28%
	B	28	15	54%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>40%</b>
The Balkans	A	11	9	82%
	B	52	9	17%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>29%</b>
Western Commonwealth of Independent States	A	11	3	27%
	B	0	0	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>27%</b>
The Caucasus	A	7	4	57%
	B	24	14	58%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>58%</b>
Central Asia	A	0	0	-
	B	19	15	79%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>79%</b>
Northeast Asia	A	12	8	67%
	B	21	1	5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>27%</b>
Southeast Asia	A	26	4	15%
	B	24	8	33%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24%</b>
South Asia	A	14	4	29%
	B	24	9	38%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>34%</b>
The Pacific	A	24	11	46%
	B	12	3	25%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>39%</b>
North America	A	16	3	19%
	B	15	5	33%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>26%</b>
Latin America and the Caribbean <sup>2</sup>	A	44	2	5%
	B	43	0	0%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>

Table 2. Regional survey statistics

2 All were sent both versions so that they could choose which one they wanted to fill out. For the purpose of the calculations of totals, here the surveys sent are listed as half A's and half B's.

## Methodology

Unfortunately, the MENA case study had to be cancelled due to the war breaking out in Lebanon and Israel. The LAC case study remained incomplete, but has been complemented by information from the IDRC evaluation mentioned above.

As part of each case study, two countries per region were visited, one of which being the country in which the regional initiator is based. Interviews were done with the regional initiators (except in the LAC region), regional steering group members in two countries, and others directly or indirectly involved in GPPAC. Annex 2 contains a list of interviewees. Separate case study reports have been produced; these are currently under review by the Regional Initiators of the regions in question.

### **Collecting ideas during networking seminar**

During a seminar on networking organised by the GPPAC International Secretariat on 10-11 October 2006, an interim version of the network strengthening review report was discussed and additional lessons and inputs were gathered. The seminar also paid attention to follow-up strategies for dealing with the recommendations that emerged from the review. Annex 5 gives the programme of the seminar and list of participants.



PART I

**NETWORKING FOR PEACE:  
THEORIES AND LESSONS LEARNED**





# Introduction

Part I of this paper aims to give an overview of the main theories and lessons learned on networking, particularly by civil society, in the fields of conflict and development. Sources consulted for this general part of the paper include a range of literature on civil society networking, lessons learned documents of relevant networks, and conversations with people involved in networks, particularly the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC). This is done in order to provide a background for the findings of the network strengthening review of GPPAC, which are presented in Part II.

The number of networks in the peacebuilding field has risen dramatically in recent years. Part I takes a closer look at networking in this field, mapping recent thinking about networking and exchange. It assesses some of the main characteristics, obstacles and conditions of successful networks. The first chapter discusses the aims and nature of networks and looks at ways of categorising them. The second chapter focuses on a number of obstacles to networking that have been identified by researchers and practitioners. Finally, the third chapter draws these issues together into a number of factors that influence the success of networks and networking in the field of peacebuilding.

# 1. Networks and networking in the field of peacebuilding

## 1.1 What are networks? Why networks?

A network is ‘a loosely structured form of cooperation, in which coordination is done through a horizontal exchange of information, lacking a clear hierarchy. It is composed of communication links between individuals or groups. The network notion stresses these linkages and allows participants to exchange information and attach meaning to it, thus transforming information into knowledge.’ (Box 2001) The members of a network can be individuals or organisations ‘that are working toward a common goal, or whose individual interests are better served within a collective structure’. (Van Deventer 2004, 1) Networks are formed to extend the reach and influence of members and to gain access to sources of knowledge that could improve practice. They may exist locally, nationally, regionally or globally. Some observers consider networks to be particularly suitable to deal with issues of conflict and peace:

*‘Networks are becoming a favored organizational form wherever a broad operational field is involved (e.g. where links are being made between different regions, or between grassroots to international levels), where problems are so dynamic that rigid structured are not suitable, and where loose ties are preferable to formal organizational bonds. All these features are well known in areas or violent conflicts.’ (Van Deventer 2004, 1-2)*

A 2001 conference on lessons learned by peacebuilding practitioners formulated the importance of networking in the following way. The conference participants concluded that ‘[n]etworking has a large role to play in pulling together an expanding, but dispersed field’, and went on to state that

*‘[t]he field of conflict prevention and peace building is expanding rapidly. [...] However, the field is dispersed over a great number of mostly small organizations. In order to pull all these efforts together and identify gaps in the field, the sharing of information and co-operation is becoming more and more important. [...] Networking can help to avoid a duplication of activities. Also, a broad network is the*

*best guarantee against one-sided approaches to the complex issues involved in peacebuilding and conflict resolution.’ (Galama and Van Tongeren 2002, 34)*

Another advantage of networking noted during this conference was that it enables complementary partnerships, which are necessary in order to deal with the fact that the field of peacebuilding has few resources to spend (Galama and Van Tongeren 2002, 34). Other observers agree that complementarity is an important element of networks, which maintain and profit from the diversity of their constituencies (Benner et al. 2004, 197).

By networking, participants can advance the work of their individual organisation and also promote the wider field of the network. Collaboration in networks may expose organisations to new ideas and knowledge, enhance and deepen critical thinking and creativity, and help avoid competition and duplication of activities. Networks may also enable individual organisations to address global problems through joint action, based on the realisation that none of the organisations involved can address the issue at stake by itself. Such joint action may also strengthen the outreach capacity of the field as a whole. (Åhäll 2006, 4-7; Galama and Van Tongeren 2002, 34; Benner et al. 2004, 196-197)

As an organisational form, networks provide more flexibility and openness than more formal organisations. This means that they are able to adjust in the process of cooperation. As a result, at least in theory, networks’ structures can facilitate constant learning from success and failure. (Benner et al. 2004, 196)

Being a member of a network may also add to an organisation’s credibility and influence and lead to new business opportunities. On a less material level, networks may be sources of inspiration, solidarity, unity and moral support. The light structure of networks may allow them to respond quickly to new situations and take new initiatives without going through a heavy bureaucratic process. (Åhäll 2006, 4-7; Galama and Van Tongeren 2002, 34; Benner et al., 196-197)

# 1. Networks and networking in the field of peacebuilding

## 1.2 Categorising networks

A common type of network is a knowledge network. According to Stone, a knowledge network has two main functions: first, it coordinates the communication and dissemination of knowledge, acting as an intermediary between intellectual communities in different places. It provides ‘a space for discussion, setting agendas and developing common visions regarding ‘best practices’, policy or business norms and standards’. This helps to avoid duplication of effort and synchronises ‘communication codes’. This enables the network to speak with a collective voice, leading to its second main function: it can have a greater ability to ‘attract media attention, political patronage and donor support than an individual or single organisation’. (Stone 2005, 93)

Research on knowledge networks has often focused on scientific networks. However, in practice, and particularly in the world of conflict and development, the academia do not monopolise knowledge networks at all.

‘[F]or a variety of reasons - such as government cutbacks and funding formulas founded on tuition incomes - universities and their research institutes are rarely in the vanguard of identifying or prioritizing ‘global issues’. Instead, major think tanks and leading NGOs with their own innovative policy departments [...] are taking greater prominence [...]. Hence, the growing salience of national to global knowledge and policy networks.’ (Mbabazi, MacLean and Shaw 2005, 157)

Many networks however combine their knowledge exchange function with other, more action-oriented functions. In the field of peacebuilding this often means joint lobby and advocacy; research projects, or the joint fundraising for, and implementation of, programmes on the ground.

Networks can be categorised in various ways. The following dimensions will be elaborated in more detail in this section: the degree of cooperation and organisation; a network’s focus and objective; issues

related to coordination, ownership and accountability; and the level of network exclusiveness.

### 1.2.1 Organisation

One way to look at networks is along the dimension of the way networks are organised. Depending on their degree of cooperation, objectives, and history, networks may be organised in various ways. At one extreme of the organisational spectrum, an organisation may look like a spider web: a strong centralised network consisting of a central board and secretariat, surrounded by circles of members in various levels of involvement from full to partial membership. In this type of network the secretariat coordinates the exchange of knowledge and selects and edits knowledge based on standards of quality and focus. Strong centralised networks are usually found in formalised environments in which sufficient means can be generated to pay for the relatively high coordination costs. They tend to be exclusive in that not everyone can become a member.

At the other extreme is the fish-net or cell-structured network, which often exists in informal societies or contexts that are threatening. Such a network is characterised by low organisation and coordination. It is inexpensive but it depends on the commitment and activity of its members. Most networks will fall somewhere in between these two forms. (Van Deventer 2004, 7-8)

### 1.2.2 Degree of cooperation, focus and objective<sup>3</sup>

Another way to distinguish between networks is to look at their activities and objectives: do they limit themselves to the knowledge exchange component or do they also aim to engage in common advocacy or even common project implementation? The degree of cooperation is often related to the activities the network engages in. Some activities, like joint lobby or campaigning, require more cooperation and organisation than, for example, knowledge exchange.

The area of focus of a network is another facet which distinguishes one network from another. The content

<sup>3</sup> This section is based in part on an earlier publication by the author with Gerd Junne (Junne and Verkoren 2005).

## 1. Networks and networking in the field of peacebuilding

area on which a network focuses may be too narrow or too broad. If the area of discussion is too narrow

- it will not stimulate a broad enough flow of information
- the interaction may be less creative since creative ideas often result from the combination of hitherto uncombined elements
- a too narrow content would only attract the ‘usual suspects’ who already know each other pretty well; little cross-fertilization would take place.

If the subject matter is too broad (‘Conditions for peace on earth’), however, then

- the interaction remains too vague and becomes uninteresting for serious people,
- it attracts, on the contrary, people with lunatic ideas, and
- it becomes very difficult to arrive at common products which bind the group together.

Some networks have a very specific objective. They may have been created to prepare a specific event or the next annual report, to elaborate a new strategy, or to coordinate a specific project. ‘Common products’ could be joint publications containing lessons learned or recommendations, joint projects or programmes, the organisation of an event, a broadening of the community, or the start of a new one in a different field or region. Aiming for such a specific outcome can make a community more attractive and active, as participants feel they are working towards something concrete that will serve their interest. Being too specific about the intended outcome of the exchange, on the other hand, severely limits the creativeness of the process and the possibility for arriving at unexpected conclusions.

Networks working toward a specific outcome often function very well, because they have a clear focus, their activity is time-bound, and the participants have an obvious common interest. The problem is very often that the knowledge generated during the project is not captured and not passed on to future teams with a similar task. There is also little exchange with other teams that perform similar tasks at the same time. For such an exchange, the community should be broader,

but as a consequence, the objective then becomes more diffuse.

To harness the great potential of project oriented task forces, it can be envisaged that a larger community organises itself as a task force which sets itself a series of challenging objectives with a specified time schedule. It can also accommodate different projects, carried out by different subgroups, at the same time.

Without a specific aim, interaction quickly becomes spurious. But with a too narrowly defined objective, a community may not survive its own success. It may fall apart once the aim has been realized, without making sure that the accumulated insight is passed on.

In some cases a common product is way beyond what a community aims to achieve. Many communities are created for the exchange of knowledge and experience per se. But there is always an implicit assumption that this exchange will lead to better results, if not through joint activity, then through the improved functioning of the individual participants who are enriched by the exchange.

Van Deventer draws attention to the fact that the two dimensions described so far - activities/objectives and organisation - are often interrelated. Networks formed with high expectations on the benefit side (ranging from merely gaining information to increasing the impact of activities, obtaining resources and gaining collective legitimacy) are likely to carry out more pro-active functions (ranging from knowledge exchange to advocacy and collective interventions) and, as a result, need a higher degree of institutional formalisation. (Ibidem, 6-7)

### 1.3 Conclusion

To conclude, networks can be quite different. Some limit themselves to knowledge exchange, while others are more action-oriented. Some have high levels of coordination and organisation, while others are more loose and informal. A network may be highly focused in terms of content, or be a platform for the exchange of just about everything.

## 1. Networks and networking in the field of peacebuilding

Overall, networks are increasingly recognised as an important way to extend the reach and influence of organisations and to gain access to sources of knowledge that could improve practice. However, they are not always successful - far from it. Stone and

Maxwell (2005, 1), for example, have concluded that 'access can be unequal, transaction costs high, and sustainability problematic'. The next section will address some of the obstacles that prevent networks from being efficient and effective.

## 2. Obstacles to optimal networking

In order for networks to function successfully, a number of important obstacles need to be overcome. This chapter looks at these obstacles. The chapter starts with a number of obstacles at the level of the individual organisation that is a member of a network in paragraph 2.1: organisational (learning) capacity; work pressure, time management and cost; organisational routine and structure; and work culture. In paragraph 2.2 some organisational issues at the level of the network are addressed: the role of the coordinating body; legitimacy, accountability and transparency; and exclusiveness. Paragraph 2.3 deals with power relations, competition, and contested knowledge inside the network. In paragraph 2.4, the place of the network in its wider context is discussed by looking at issues relating to embeddedness, regimes, and discourse. This includes a discussion of funding regimes, dominant discourse, and the issue of donor-driven projects. NGOs' local and political context is also addressed. Finally, paragraph 2.5 discusses cultural issues that may affect a network's functioning.

In addition to discussing challenges for networks, the chapter also pays attention to ways of overcoming these obstacles. Combined with the above discussion of ways to categorise networks, this will lead to a number of success factors for networks, which are formulated in chapter three of the paper.

### 2.1 Intra-organisational obstacles

This section discusses a number of obstacles to networking that lie within the borders of the organisations that participate in networks.

With regard to the knowledge exchange component of networks, the main intra-organisational obstacle is an organisation's learning capacity. Knowledge networking may function well, and organisational members may participate actively and come across useful new knowledge, but if the organisation's learning capacity is limited, so will its ability to make use of this knowledge. Some of the conditions that promote organisational learning include space and time for interaction, reflection and discussion; an atmosphere of safety in

which to discuss feelings, uncertainties and assumptions; organisational flexibility that leaves room for individual initiatives and experiments; and exposure to external parties and ideas. (Verkoren, forthcoming) This section looks at the factors that make it difficult to achieve these conditions: organisational capacity, work and time pressures, organisational structure and work culture. These same factors also make it more difficult for organisations to successfully engage in other aspects of networks, such as joint activities beyond knowledge sharing.

#### 2.1.1 Organisational capacity

Among Southern NGOs and grassroots organisations, the level of organisational capacity varies widely. Organisations with low capacity face a lack of funds, are understaffed, have a lack of skills, and have insufficient access to infrastructure such as the internet. Language issues also play a role, as does a lack of proficiency in 'technical' terminology. These issues present a serious obstacle for learning and knowledge exchange. For this reason, capacity building is an increasing priority among Northern and Southern players alike.

Networking can itself contribute to capacity building by making available tools, training and access to donors. The knowledge exchanged in a network might include information about whom to go for what, how to frame messages in order to draw attention, and how to raise funds. Where capacity of participants or potential participants is an issue, networks would do good to explicitly include the transfer of this kind of process knowledge. This includes the translation of documents into local languages and and jargon-free versions<sup>4</sup> and building the learning capacity of participating organisations by raising awareness of the importance and requirements for learning and making available instruments for learning and M&E.

Intimately related to organisational capacity, funding is a big constraint for networking. The results of

<sup>4</sup> The Central and Eastern African organisation Peace Tree Network (PTN) has begun to do this (source: conversation with Frederic Kama Kama, Peace Tree Network, Nairobi, 28 November 2005).



## 2. Obstacles to optimal networking

EFFICIENCY	LEARNING
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Apply standard procedures</li><li>• Concentrate on large scale projects</li><li>• Keep gender, environmental etc. impacts in mind</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adapt to local circumstances</li><li>• React in a flexible way</li><li>• Give local staff larger role</li><li>• Take political situation into account</li><li>• Show experimental attitude</li></ul>

Table 3. *Contradictory pressures on the staff of international aid agencies*

networking are long-term, indirect and difficult to measure, making donors reluctant to fund it given their emphasis on direct-impact, measurable activities.<sup>5</sup> In addition, the need for organisations to have a clear profile vis-à-vis donors limits their incentive to cooperate with others. More general financial constraints on the part of Southern NGOs lead to another challenge for networking: the loss of qualified personnel to better-paying international NGOs and government agencies, particularly after they have ‘upped their value’ through training. This is an issue that is mentioned again and again by local NGO staff. They plead for donors to make room for higher salary payments (which are usually considered as ‘overhead’ anyway by donors and often not funded) in order to retain staff.

### 2.1.2 *Work pressure, time management and cost*

An often-mentioned obstacle to networking is work pressure and a lack of time. NGO staff see the importance of networking and are willing in principle to engage in exchanges, but practical time issues often prevent them from doing so. This is problematic since time for reflection and interaction is one of the conditions that promote successful exchange and learning.

The problem is compounded by the increasing emphasis by donors on ‘direct-impact’ activities. Things like networking and reflection are not considered to have a direct impact on development and peace and are thereby effectively discouraged. There is a pressure to limit overhead and minimise resources not spent directly on projects. Particularly organisations that are dependent on project financing find that there is very little room to take a step back from the daily practice of project management and reflect on lessons learned.

At the same time, as we saw above, attention to the importance of learning is increasingly recognised in the development field. This means that the staff of international NGOs face contradictory pressures: see table 3.

Time is money, and networking and learning are often considered as an extra cost to the organisation: ‘the more information is available, the more essential it is to have pathways through it via summaries [...] [and] reviews. There is a major cost to this kind of editing.’ (King 2005, 76) The same goes for the maintenance of regular cross-organisational contacts, participation in discussion meetings, and the like: they are time-intensive and therefore costly. Although it is recognised that the benefits from such an investment may well be worth the cost, these potential benefits are still vague and ambiguous. This is inevitable: the whole point of learning is that the outcome will be new and unknown.

The situation is compounded by the fact that for people working on conflict, there is always a sense of urgency and a need to respond to rapidly changing circumstances. In addition, the issues dealt with are often political in nature, adding politics to the pressures that bear upon staff members and managers. More so than in the private sector, the work of managers in the public sector, be it governments or NGOs, is to a large extent politics- and incident-driven (Noordergraaf 2000, 262).

To an extent, these obstacles are such that they will never be fully removed. However, two types of efforts could help limit them. The first is working to gain recognition of the fact that in the long term, learning

<sup>5</sup> Based on conversations with peacebuilders in Kenya, Ghana, Liberia, and Sierra Leone.

and efficiency are not contrary but mutually beneficial. Lobbying donors with this message could be one important step in the right direction. The second effort is trying to devise organisational structures that limit these problems and stimulate learning. The next section will pay attention to this.

### *2.1.3 Organisational routine and structure*

An often-heard obstacle to knowledge sharing is work pressure and a lack of time. Added to this is the fact that networking is usually not the core activity or organisations involved in networks. As a result, they are likely to prioritise other activities (Åhäll 2006, 19). A solution that has been suggested is for knowledge sharing to be ‘included in the normal policy cycle and integrated into the regular work schedule.’ (Hivos 2003, 4) How can this be achieved?

For one thing, making contributions to networking and learning could be made part of job descriptions and performance appraisals. A recent *Economist* publication about innovation puts it as follows: ‘It is not enough to have original thinking. It must be recognised, valued and put into practice. [...] A lack of innovation usually indicates that managers at all levels lack the awareness or motivation to spot the potential of the ideas floating around their organisation. They may see original thinking as a threat and therefore discourage it.’ (Syrett and Lammiman 2002, 37-38)

As characteristics of an innovative organisation the *Economist* publication mentions a diverse workforce, opportunities for casual exchanges, and an encouragement to share information. These facets should be reflected in personnel policy as well as the shaping of organisational structure and routines. Overall, organisational flexibility is vital: management needs to be open to changes in direction as a result of learning and suggestions from staff. In the present field of analysis, this bears also upon the donors: demands for rigid planning and strictly holding aid recipients to their earlier plans can limit flexibility and learning.

Regular exposure to external parties and ideas could also be integrated into work routines. Opportunities for the

training of staff could be increased and they might be encouraged to engage in action research. In addition, exchanges with academics, policy makers and representatives of other organisations could be facilitated.

### *2.1.4 Work culture*

Structural changes cannot be the whole story. At least as important is an organisation’s work culture: rules, habits, consultation styles, language, communication, the use of symbols, and definitions of reality (Boonstra 2004, 3). Adjustments to organisational routines can create space for changes in work culture, but it is these latter changes that eventually make the difference. ‘Research [...] provides further support for an emphasis that is less on devising management systems to ‘control’ learning or to ‘manage’ knowledge, more on finding new ways to encourage people to think creatively and feed their thoughts back into the organisation’ (Kessels and Harrison 2004, 2). Changing culture is difficult, however. Uncertainty and a resistance to change are a facet of every organisational member. People desire certainty and stability, and fear the unknown (Boonstra 2004, 4).

As we saw above, a culture that stimulates learning is one that fosters an atmosphere of safety in which to discuss feelings, uncertainties and assumptions. A culture of cooperation and exchange, rather than one of competition, contributes to this. Trust is a central concept: without trust, people will be unwilling to share doubts, question assumptions, and make innovative suggestions. There may also be a fear that openness will be taken advantage of by intra-organisational competitors. To put it differently, free speech is a basic precondition for sharing knowledge and learning. Trust, a cooperative culture, the rewarding of knowledge sharing, and an atmosphere tolerant of mistakes are a part of this (Sauquet 2004, 382-3).

## **2.2 Difficulties with regard to the organisation of the network**

### *2.2.1 The role of the coordinating body*

A coordinating party is required for a network to function well. This can range from one person spending



## 2. Obstacles to optimal networking

a few hours a week on the network to an entire fulltime network secretariat. The coordinating party moderates online interaction, processes information, and facilitates direct contact between members by putting them in touch with each other and by organising face-to-face meetings. In more action-oriented networks, coordinators may also raise funds for the network, initiate common programmes, and take the lead in lobby and advocacy.

The role of the coordinator is crucial. A network needs one or more persons who feel a special responsibility about the forum which they have joined or created, who facilitate exchange, organise events, and start discussions on governance matters where necessary. At the same time, the role of the coordinating body or secretariat can also be problematic. First of all, financing a secretariat is often difficult, because donors are often unwilling to provide anything other than project funding. In addition, it often happens that a secretariat has difficulty finding the right balance between the interests of the network members and their own organisational interest. For example, a secretariat may be tempted to use funds attracted for the network to implement its own programmes. Another issue may be that an organisation acting as secretariat fears losing its profile vis-à-vis donors and other potential partners, as NGOs are under continuous pressure to demonstrate their unique contribution to the field. (Galama and Van Tongeren 2002, 35)

The selection of a coordinator can also present problems. There may be competition over this position, particularly when the coordinating party is also the recipient of external funds for the network. Experience shows that the NGO selected to coordinate the network acquires a power position from being the recipient of donor funds for the network. This can have an adverse effect: the coordinating NGO may be reluctant to jeopardise its newfound power and start monopolising rather than sharing knowledge as a result. More generally, the position of power that individuals and organisations derive from being at the funding interface is recognised by practitioners<sup>6</sup> and researchers (Hilhorst 2003) alike. This makes democratic governance of networks a priority - but not always a reality.

### 2.2.2 Legitimacy, transparency and accountability

This leads us to more general questions of power and domination (see also the sections on power and discourse below). When a network is analysed, the question of who dominates it — and what that means for the character of the knowledge that is exchanged, the granting of access to potential members, and the use the network has for participants — cannot be ignored. Networks can be Northern dominated and donor-driven, but they can also come into existence from the bottom up, as a result of Southern organisations coming together to meet a shared need. As one donor representative pointed out in a conversation, donor-initiated is not necessarily the same as donor-driven; what matters is who sets the agenda. Indeed, some donor-initiated networks are perceived to be very useful by the participants<sup>7</sup>.

Related to coordination and ownership is the issue of accountability. Because networks are relatively fluid and consist of many different actors, it is difficult to hold them accountable for their actions and the way they use the resources of donors and participants. In other words, ‘networks as diffuse, complex and weakly institutionalized collaborative systems are neither directly accountable to an electoral base nor do they exhibit clear principal-agent relationships. Therefore two traditional mechanisms of accountability are not applicable in networks: electoral accountability and hierarchical accountability’. (Benner et al. 2004, 198)

Nevertheless, networks do devise their own mechanisms of accountability. Often they introduce democratic elements, electing representative bodies of governance. Codes of conduct or constitutions are sometimes developed. Financially, networks are usually accountable to donor organisations that demand transparent practice and reporting. In many cases, the coordinating organisation is asked to conduct monitoring and evaluation, but the way this is carried out still depends on the cooperation of the partners.

6 Based on conversations with researchers and practitioners.

7 Such as the ICCO partner network in Liberia.

## 2. Obstacles to optimal networking

A related issue is legitimacy. Many networks face internal and external discussions on the legitimacy of the network's leadership and representative structures. Sometimes, the way in which representatives are selected is subject to criticism. Network secretariats' position at the interface of the internal network and external stakeholders presents them with more general issues of legitimacy and representation as well. On the one hand they represent the interests of their members; on the other, they strive to maintain a particular reputation externally.

The West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP) can serve as an example: it consists of a number of national networks. These networks lend the WANEP secretariat its legitimacy and the secretariat exists to support them. However, the secretariat also demands a certain measure of quality from the national networks in order to maintain its reputation and retain donors. The national networks on their part obtain legitimacy from being a part of the wider WANEP network. Ensuring quality is something they have to do in return for this. The WANEP secretariat is constantly struggling to find the right balance between maintaining the autonomy of the national networks and ensuring a bottom-up decision making structure on the one hand - and making sure that the national networks live up to the quality standards and principles of WANEP on the other.<sup>8</sup> The Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) of which WANEP is a part faces similar issues at the global level.<sup>9</sup>

### 2.2.3 Exclusiveness

A related dimension is network exclusiveness. An issue that has been raised with regard to networking initiatives is that many of them have been too exclusive. Often, for example, they have not crossed the North-South border. According to King many development agencies have been more concerned with 'improving their own capacity rather than with improving the quality of engagement with the South'. The first circle of sharing is usually within the organisation, the second is with other players in the North, and only third are the Southern partners and other groups outside the North:

'it could be suggested that the new assumptions of 'genuine partnership' between North and South would have made it mandatory to start the explorations of knowledge sharing with the primary actors in the so-called recipient countries. [...] [Instead,] a good deal of the initial knowledge management and knowledge sharing in the agencies has actually taken place behind the protection of an intranet, reinforcing the view that it is the agency's own staff development that is the primary objective.' (King 2005, 72-75).

Even when networks do cross the North-South border, or when they are South-South networks, exclusiveness can be an issue. Unequal access by different parties who could benefit and contribute may be the result of different organisational capacities, including time issues but also things like access to internet. It may also be a consequence of politics, particularly in conflict areas where some organisations or individuals may not want to engage with others because they are considered to be allied with one or another of the conflict parties.

Inclusiveness and the broadening of a network are not necessarily positive, however. There is a balance that needs to be found. One needs a certain critical mass to start a lively, sustained interaction, and it is undesirable to exclude important actors - but the group of people which is brought together can be too large as well as too small. If the group is too small, the chance is great that

- There will be little exchange, because there are too few people to participate. Participants' positions will be quickly known to each other and no longer surprising, so the interest to participate will rapidly decline.
- If only people with a similar background participate, opinions may not differ sufficiently to generate creative ideas.
- If only a small fraction of the potential constituency participates, people will turn to other fora where these people do meet.

<sup>8</sup> Based on interviews with WANEP members in Ghana, Liberia, and Sierra Leone, February 2006.

<sup>9</sup> Based on a conversation with ECCP staff members on 25 April 2006.

## 2. Obstacles to optimal networking

- Importantly, the network may lose legitimacy due to unequal access (Junne and Verkoren 2005)

On the other hand, the community can also be too inclusive. By asking too many people with different backgrounds to join, communication could falter. The reasons are that

- Chances increase that individual contributions are beyond the interest of the majority of members;
- People hesitate to engage themselves because they do not see a common denominator which brings participants together;
- The larger number of people may generate so many messages that they will no longer be read by the other members of a community. A community would then drown in its own flow of information, if not skilfully channelled into different subgroups and discussion threads. (Junne and Verkoren 2005)

The issue of exclusiveness also relates to the extent to which a network provides access to other networks. If a Southern, grassroots network is able to link up with international, often donor-driven networks, then this can be a vital function for its members.

### 2.3 Power relations, competition, and contested knowledge

Power issues can present another set of obstacles to networking. The workings of networks may be limited by people possessing political power, who feel threatened by the network. This can be because of the network's independent links to donors and other external groups, which run counter to a government's desire to monopolise such connections. Power may also be exercised by donors who impose conditions upon recipients and thereby determine the course adopted by a network. As we saw above, individuals or organisations that are assigned to coordinate a network and receive funding to do so also obtain a power position. Powerful actors may also support and strengthen networking initiatives, and networks often aim to influence the agendas of those holding power actors in order to get their objectives met. Networks may themselves be 'empowered' by gaining access to policy

channels or by building their capacity to act more effectively.

The possession of knowledge itself also constitutes power. McNeill (2005, 57-58) writes that 'inter-institutional rivalry is common within the multilateral system, and institutions gain international prestige partly by having good ideas. Ideas are thus an important source of power.' He gives as an example the extent to which the economics discipline combined with multilateral institutions such as the World Bank acquire both the power of ideas and the power over ideas. This happens through the *framing* of the discussion in an economic discourse. 'An effective frame is one that makes favoured ideas seem like common sense, while unfavoured ideas are unthinkable' (McNeill 2005, 58).

For knowledge to provide power, it needs to be the kind of knowledge that is desired by others: translatable and useful. The need to make knowledge translatable and accessible is the reason why its packaging is important. In the words of Ivanov (1997), 'the importance of the players in global and even regional networks depends primarily on their ability to provide an essentially *local* knowledge input to policy formulation and implementation, but in such form as to make it compatible with the dominant networking discourse' (emphasis in original). The risk of this is that all network participants will end up adopting the dominant terminology and rhetoric irrespective of their perspective, leading to a 'sterile globalistic cosmopolitanism, which leaves no room for multifaceted vision of the community discourse, making it utterly biased in relation to the resolution of practical problems.'

Power also produces and influences knowledge. Those who possess power determine to a large extent what is considered true. Dominant discourse coalitions or hegemonic projects exercise the power to impose their definitions and interpretations of reality upon others. In the words of Hardy and Phillips (2002, 10),

'actors exercise power by 'fixing the [...] meanings that create a particular reality and by articulating

## 2. Obstacles to optimal networking

meaning in ways that legitimate their particular views as ‘natural’ and ‘inevitable’; link the actions and preferences of other actors to the achievement of their interests; and make particular socially constructed structures take on a neutral and objective appearance.’

Some network participants may be more vocal, or have better developed positions, than others, and therefore influence the course of action that a network adopts. Particularly when such groups form a coalition with other influential players, they may succeed in imposing their discourse on the community.

What arises from this is that those who have the capacity, means, experience, and legitimacy to impose their preferred solution upon others determine to a large extent what happens in a network. In general, Northern participants will be better positioned to do so than Southern participants, and better-funded actors will be more likely to have power than less well-off ones. This means that opportunities to get the most out of knowledge networks are unequal. To understand a network it is important to take this dimension into account by putting the network in its political and cultural context (see the next section) and by asking questions like: ‘who benefits from the network?’ and ‘who is seeking to influence the network?’.

Competition among civil society groups plays a role as well. It has the effect of constraining knowledge exchange initiatives, as it may lead to unwillingness to share for fear of giving away one’s competitive advantages. The will to work together, and the acknowledgement that networking is important, is not always there. Within networks competition over sources of funds often plays a role, as does a fear of losing one’s profile.

In situations of conflict transformation, even more so than in ‘normal’ circumstances, knowledge is never uncontested. Post-conflict development involves not only ‘technical’ questions but certainly also political ones. The analysis of the conflict that lies at the basis of proposed solutions will be different depending on the allegiances of the analyst. This insight relates to the

concept of ‘discourse coalitions’ that we saw in part one of this paper. Different groups are continuously at odds with each other, trying to impose their own understanding of the situation on others. When one discourse coalition becomes dominant it can be understood as a hegemonic project.

Contested knowledge can present a severe obstacle to successful exchange and networking. On the other hand, it may also lead to fruitful discussions about the different points of view. The network could then function as a forum for dialogue as well as of exchange. Whether this occurs depends on the willingness of the participants to open up to other points of views and on the skill of the coordinator to guide the discussion in the right direction. It may be necessary to start off by simply acknowledging and comparing the different understandings of reality of the participants<sup>10</sup>, before any further interaction can be undertaken.

### 2.4 Embeddedness, regimes, and discourse

Any network should be linked in an appropriate way to a wider environment, to neighbouring communities and similar initiatives in other countries or regions. If this is not the case, a network remains quite isolated. Insights generated in similar networks might not be taken into account, resources will not be pooled, results cannot be compared, and ideas will remain less widespread. Moreover, the chance that insights generated or transferred in the network will actually be used by policymakers or practitioners will be limited.

On the other hand it is also possible that a network is too embedded in one particular region, political stream, discourse community, regime or hegemonic project, in which case it loses credibility and becomes part of a political project rather than a more neutral vehicle for knowledge exchange between participants from different backgrounds and with different points of view.

<sup>10</sup> The Split Screen project of the Network University is an example of this. The project facilitated an online process involving Netherlands-based Palestinian and Jewish youth who compared their different interpretations of the history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. (<http://www.netuni.nl/splitscreen/>)

## 2. Obstacles to optimal networking

Although not much has been written about the embeddedness of networks, the literature on NGO embeddedness provides some insight into the issue, particularly considering the fact that NGOs are crucial participants in knowledge exchange networks in the field of peacebuilding. The literature on the embeddedness of NGOs has focused particularly on the funding regimes and discourse coalitions of which they are a part.

### 2.4.1 Funding regimes

‘Follow the money’, informant *Deep Throat* said in the film *All the President’s Men* in order to point journalist Bob Woodward, who was about to uncover the Watergate scandal, in the right direction. The quote is often used to signify that whoever has control of the resources determines to a large extent what takes place: not only the direction of policy and practice, but also working methods and even the language that is used. In the business of development and peacebuilding, it is the donors who dominate the working environment. A term that is often used in this context is ‘funding regime’.

A regime is a set of ‘implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge’ (Keohane 1991, 108). These norms, rules and procedures prescribe certain actions and imply obligations - even though these obligations are not necessarily legally enforceable. (Keohane 1991, 110) The norms, rules and procedures in funding regimes are created and maintained largely by the actors that subsidise NGOs: state ministries, multilateral funding agencies, and intermediate agencies such as large Northern NGOs that themselves receive donor money and pass this on to Southern partner NGOs.

Over the past decades there has been a trend for donor money to be increasingly channelled through NGOs rather than through governments in developing countries. Co-financing schemes were implemented in which large Northern NGOs became vehicles for spending donor money in cooperation with partner NGOs in the South. This profoundly changed the position of NGOs vis-à-vis the state.

In addition, NGOs face an increasing need for resources due to the internationalisation of the field and the rapid growth of the number of NGOs and other agents operating in the market, such as consultancy firms. Competition for funds becomes stronger. As a result, NGOs have begun adopting business-like practices and professionalized staff and operations, sometimes at the expense of their content and autonomy. This loss of independence is compounded by the forced adjustment to the policies and conditions of resource holders. (Krieger 2004)

As a result of these developments, observers began to discern a new closeness between funding agencies and NGOs. Already in 1996, Edwards and Hulme identified funding regimes as a threat to NGOs independence in an article entitled ‘Too Close for Comfort?’, noting that official funding was becoming increasingly important for NGOs, and fearing that this would politicise them (Edwards and Hulme 1996). Government funding appears to have come with increased conditionality, forcing NGOs to work in particular countries and demanding an increased focus in poverty impact - at the expense of other social change goals (Mitlin et al. 2005, 2).

The trend of increasing embeddedness of NGOs in funding regimes may also lead to a development where NGOs that were focused idealistically towards the achievement of a particular societal goal, even if this meant engaging in political opposition and advocacy, become less political and more opportunistic, doing whatever donors are willing to fund in order to secure the continuation of their organisation. Indeed, most observers agree that NGOs have grown more distant from social movements as they became closer to government agencies as a result of their increased dependence on official subsidies. From organisations working for social change they become project deliverers for donors. As a result NGOs may become less pronounced and more similar to one another. Rather than political actors with their own social agendas, they become donor subcontractors.

In addition, official donors increasingly emphasise direct-impact activities at the expense of NGO



performance in areas like institutional development and advocacy (Edwards and Hulme 1996). In the words of Britton (2005, 6),

‘[d]onors, whilst increasingly requiring evidence of impact and learning, still use the delivery of outputs and financial probity as the bottom line measure for their ‘return on investment’. Most donors require the use of the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) as a planning framework and there is significant evidence that this acts as a constraint to learning at least at the project and programme level. The constant pressure for NGOs to demonstrate results generates an understandable concern about publicising or even sharing lessons learned and programme experience.’

This is also related to the competition for funding:

‘The reluctance to be open about learning may be particularly strong where a programme has not achieved what was promised in funding applications for fear of the repercussions that may result.’

This trend towards demanding concrete, measurable results appears to have continued in the years that followed, making the work of NGOs engaged in peacebuilding, which is often hard to quantify, more difficult. It also potentially makes networking difficult because this type of activity is also difficult to measure.

A related issue that is mentioned by the staff of Southern NGOs is a dependency on short-term funding. Donor funds are often tied to time-bound projects with specific objectives. Activities like reflection, discussion, networking, and improving organisational capacities for long-term M&E and learning are often not part of these projects. They are considered ‘overhead’ and are often not financed.

### 2.4.2 Discourse

As was mentioned above in this paper, discourse plays an important role in networking. ‘By privileging certain visions of society and discarding others, discourses frame and construct certain possibilities for thought and subsequent action’ (Van Grasdorff 2005, 31). Discourse

becomes dominant through a combination of *coercion* (peer pressure, wanting to remain part of a group), *conviction* (people find the discourse convincing), and *seduction* (it is attractive for people to be part of the discourse coalition). (Hilhorst 2003, 75)

These elements of conviction and seduction characterise the interaction among researchers, national donors, multilateral donors, politicians, and NGOs that has led to the rise of a particular ‘development’ discourse. The background of the discourse of ‘development’ is formed by the idea that ‘social change occurs according to a pre-established pattern, the logic and direction of which are known’, and that the West is leading the way in this evolutionary process, ‘exhibiting the most advanced stance of human perfectability’ (Van Grasdorff 2005, 34)<sup>11</sup>. This discourse has been adopted by funding agencies and become part of funding regimes. It is characterised by a specific language, in which concepts like ‘development’, ‘empowerment’ and ‘ownership’, but also ‘accountability’, ‘output’ and ‘impact’, figure prominently.

One possible consequence of this dominant discourse is that it hides the political nature of development activities by casting them in a neutral, technical language. Development interventions inherently lead to social and political change, both intentionally and unintentionally, but this facet of development is obscured by the used of seemingly technical terms. This development is what Ferguson calls the ‘anti-politics machine’ (Ferguson 1994). By way of illustration, Mitlin et al. (2005, 13) note that where NGO staff in the 1970s and 1980s were well familiar with the radical writings of Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich, writers who focused on underlying structures of oppression, today the bookshelves in NGO offices often display more sector-specific, less political and more technical texts.

As a result of their embeddedness in funding regimes, NGOs are less able to put forward alternative discourses, and concerns grow that ‘becoming public

<sup>11</sup> An interesting description of the invention and spread of this concept is provided by Eric Von Grasdorff (2005, 42-47).

## 2. Obstacles to optimal networking

service contractors [...] [is] tying NGOs into mainstream approaches to a greater extent than ever before' (Mitlin et al. 2005, 8). Recent trends in these mainstream discourses and approaches include the increasing dominance of the neoliberal agenda, the hegemony of the poverty reduction agenda in international aid, and most recently the prominence security agenda and attempts to tie it to the poverty agenda. (Mitlin et al. 2005, 8-12)

When one hears representatives of Southern grassroots organisations speak, their fluency in the discourse of development is sometimes striking. To explain why they have adopted it, one merely has to 'follow the money'. It is the language of the donors, and to qualify for funding local actors have to use it in funding proposals, in monitoring reports, and at partner conferences. Thus, the adoption of 'development speak' has a strategic undertone (Hilhorst 2003, 57). More generally, dominant discourses reflect the gap between North and South in terms of knowledge generation. Most of the well-resourced institutes and well-trained researchers are in the North and many members of Southern elites study there, making it inevitable that much of the discourse is driven by Northern perspectives and perceptions. Writing about Africa, Van Grasdorff (2005, 50-54) notes that the debt crisis and structural adjustment programmes starting in the 1980s have cut off funding for African universities and publication structures, and describes how this combined with a Western control of media to lead to a 're-colonisation' of knowledge transmission, production and dissemination.

In addition to the general phenomenon of 'development' discourse, donors also impose more particular discourse trends, often following the political preferences of the moment. To Southern actors it is usually known that particular donors have certain preferences, and in anticipation of this, fund-seeking organisations frame activities in a particular way in their funding applications.

One example in the peacebuilding field is what has been called the 'securitisation' of peacebuilding and

postconflict development. Since September 11, 2001, there is an increasing emphasis on security at the expense of other facets of peacebuilding work. Like the 'development' discourse, this is directly related to funding regimes; the discourse shapes and is shaped by the activities that donors are willing to fund. Within the field of peacebuilding US and other Western donors have shifted their focus towards activities like security sector reform, at the expense of other initiatives. Southern organisations argue that security sector reform can only be addressed if the underlying issues that cause the insecurity in the first place are dealt with as well — if not, then it can even strengthen authoritarian regimes. The same is true for disarmament: people carry arms because they feel insecure; disarming them doesn't solve the whole problem. These arguments are now not usually taken up.<sup>12</sup>

At the same time, local actors do have a role to play in the use and the shaping of discourse. Discourses get reinterpreted at the local level, at the interface with other discourses that exist locally and internationally, drawing together fragments from both modernity and tradition. Local actors master multiple development notions and use them for their own ends. They 'reshuffle, circumvent, and accommodate' discourses (Hilhorst 2003, 81).

NGO leaders, through whom development activities and funding enter a locality, are often the actors that find themselves at the interface of international and local discourses. In that capacity they function as 'brokers of meaning', mediating between different knowledge systems. (Hilhorst 2003, 189-191) These actors also derive power from the knowledge of international discourse, seeking to make parties dependent on their brokerage services and being able to manipulate development discourse to fit their own local political agendas. (Hilhorst 2003, 100)

Discourses, then, are used and reproduced both unintentionally and intentionally. What is important

<sup>12</sup> Based on a conversation with Ms. Jebiwott Sumbeiyo (programme officer), Africa Peace Forum (APFO), in Nairobi on 29 November 2005.

about this is that in both cases they shape reality in a very direct way. Discourses have unintended consequences for ‘confirming, accelerating or altering social change’ [...] It is through actors’ use of multiple discourses that social patterns are negotiated, power distributed and development shaped’. (Hilhorst 2003, 100-101)

### 2.4.3 Donor-driven projects

Of course, the discourse that dominates relates to the activities that are predominantly carried out. Northern-dominated discourse goes hand in hand with donor-driven projects. According to Southern NGO staff interviewed by the author, donors often announce ‘we have money for this and that’, instead of asking ‘what is needed’. This ties organisations down. They are in no position to turn down money and thus have to go along. As a result, structures are created that are not used because the community was not involved in them. This reflects a lack of recognition of insider expertise. External experts are brought in that do not really understand the situation. Often they miscalculate, assume, generalise, or do not know the local context. The analysis of people on the ground is often not taken seriously, in part because they do not have university degrees. When a donor-financed programme is evaluated, donors usually do not look for an expert within the country, someone who knows the terrain, implications, practices, and (political) obstacles, and who might as a result use the right indicators to determine success or failure. An external evaluator once asked why staff did not commute more between regions, showing a complete lack of understanding for the condition of infrastructure.

Someone who is thoroughly familiar with a situation will feel it when change begins to occur. This may not always be tangible and will go unnoticed by external observers, and donors’ reporting formats usually do not capture it. NGO staff nonetheless try to translate these kinds of changes into the necessary format, but part of the knowledge gets lost in the translation process.

According to some Southern NGO staff, donors condition local counterparts to say what the donors want

to hear. For example, when they talk of capacity building they first tell you what it is not, according to them: salaries, offices, and vehicles. So all you can then ask for is training, which is what they want you to ask for. When you bring up the need for a vehicle they treat you as being selfish. They do not understand that it is a basic necessity in a country without reliable public transport. It is not just the direct counterparts that cause this but the whole financing system from governments via Western NGOs. Priorities and assumptions are passed on. Donors should come in with an open mind to understand the situation and needs.

Southern partners are also sometimes to blame, for taking the easy road of saying what the donors want to hear in the hope of getting their money. Or they simply take donors’ claims for granted and do not study the situation themselves. According to Southern NGO workers, their colleagues should be more assertive in making clear what is wrong with donor’s demands. They sometimes have to be strong to resist donor policy preferences. A thorough knowledge of the community provides such strength as it makes arguments better-founded and convincing.

One reason why Southern NGOs are not more assertive may be, in the words of Mawdsley et al., ‘a deep lack of self-confidence within Southern NGOs, inhibiting them from advancing their own agenda more openly and positively.’ They suggest that this may be explained by ‘older colonial and postcolonial/ developmentalist hierarchies, and the systematic ways in which Northern, ‘formal’ (scientific and management) ideas have been privileged over local ways of seeing and doing things.’ Formal, documented, and scientifically tested knowledge has been presented to Southern actors as the new definition of ‘legitimate’ knowledge, discarding more traditional types of knowledge. Mawdsley et al. add that the lack of self-confidence of Southern NGOs ‘also reflects the relative lack of access that Southern NGOs have to certain forms of information and knowledge, such as university research.’ (2002, 12-13)

Another problem may be that some NGOs have little interest in challenging the accepted wisdom. According



## 2. Obstacles to optimal networking

to Mawdsley et al (2002, 12-13), many of them were created not out of a particular need or ideology but in response to funds becoming available in the 1980s and 1990s. As a result they do not have a particular agenda to advance, apart from self-preservation, and ‘acquiesce to working only or mainly at their paymasters rather than their clients demand’. As a result, ‘Northern NGOs may be committed to listening to their Southern partners, and through them to the voices of the poor, but many of their Southern partners are prepared to tell them whatever they want to hear.’ (ibidem, 5)

An additional factor that may play a role in the domination of Northern discourse and priorities is the ‘professionalisation’ of Southern partners: ‘[a]s Northern NGOs have withdrawn from their previous levels of direct development work, and the number of Southern NGOs has exploded, they have had to find appropriate ways of working together. This has tended to mean that these Southern NGOs have to conform to certain organisational practices’ (ibidem, 15). These practices include financial accounting procedures and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems. Such procedures demand time and skills, and are often considered by Southern NGOs to be inappropriate - this is particularly true for the demand for direct and measurable impact in M&E and reporting. All this leads Southern NGOs to attracting and building technical knowledge (ICT, Western management procedures, financial accounting, English language skills, development jargon) at the expense of local knowledge. (ibidem, 17-18)

### 2.4.4 NGOs’ local and political context

NGOs are ‘both *part of* and partially *apart from* broader processes of development’. They should ‘always be understood in terms of their relationships to the state and market, as well as by historical changes *within* civil society, such as processes of citizenship formation and new/declining forms of popular mobilization’ (Miltlin et al. 2005, 3 and 4, original emphasis).

NGOs are involved in interventions to change societies, but they are also part of those societies. Their actions have intentional and unintentional consequences for the

context in which they operate - and vice versa. Hilhorst writes that ‘everything happening in and around NGOs has a bearing on the politics of power within the organizations, the politics of organizational legitimation and, finally, the politics of (local and global) development.’ (Hilhorst 2003, 4)

Local actors’ room for manoeuvre, or the social space available to them to fulfil their projects, is restricted by the presence of other actors in development. It is also limited by the memory of previous interventions, which shapes the scope of actors’ demands and aims.

Associational patterns also play a role: state-society-NGO relations make up the context of NGOs’ actions. Family standing and tribal affiliation often cut across and determine these relations. Finally, NGOs are fitted into local politics; local constituents shape NGOs’ identity and goals. All this modifies the idea of a linear, step-by-step policy and implementation model: in reality actions are shaped by personal perspectives, social relations, and everyday politics. (Hilhorst 106-119)

Achieving an active interplay between groups and organisations is difficult in conflict areas due to high levels of mistrust between groups and individuals. In addition, such regions are often plagued by a scarcity of resources, low security and weak or bad governance, none of which provides an enabling environment for networking. Fear may prevent people from speaking freely, and practical issues such as low internet connectivity and bad physical infrastructure limits exchanges.

Next to that, people working in war-torn areas often have a high sense of urgency and work overload, and a tendency to engage only in ‘direct impact’ activities. It is perceived that the people need to see a ‘peace dividend’ in the form of direct physical progress in order to build support for peacebuilding processes. Networking activities appear to be of secondary importance. Nonetheless, local NGO workers recognise the importance of learning from own experience as well as knowledge and lessons from other places, and the added strength that linking up with other organisations can provide.

Capacity building is a central strategy towards improving the context for networking in conflict-affected parts of the world. Improving the learning and working capacity of Southern organisations and individuals will upgrade their position as full-scale participants in networks. Networks themselves can play an important role in this capacity building exercise. Better developed participants can share their experience and assist others as they develop their capacity.

### 2.5 Cultural issues

Following from the view of knowledge networks as discourse communities or hegemonic projects is the recognition that the world has dominant and less dominant knowledge systems. Knowledge is power and, since the 'North' or the 'West' are politically and economically dominant, their concepts of knowledge dominate as well. Perhaps networks by their very nature emphasise 'Western', rationalistic knowledge over other types of knowledge:

'the expansion of knowledge networks as 'sites of authority' potentially accelerates 'normalisation of the dominant discourses of power' [Rai 2005]. Networks systematise knowledge generated by diverse individual and organisational knowledge actors and impose a rationality that gives precedence to a particular conception of knowledge - usually of a codified, technocratic, secular, westernised society. Participation is informally restricted through boundary drawing discourses by the network to exclude or devalue indigenous knowledge that does not conform to techno-scientific criteria.' (Stone 2005, 99)

It is important to recognise this. Efforts to exchange tacit knowledge through direct interaction might be less prone to this type of rationalisation. However, such exchanges will be very difficult across cultures as there is less of a shared context that makes the tacit knowledge explainable and understandable. More generally, expectations and realities of knowledge and information sharing are likely to be very different in different circumstances and cultural settings:

'in some situations where specialist knowledge is a very scarce commodity, there may well be strong temptations to retain rather than share. In other settings, where age is an important marker of status, hopes of knowledge networking across the boundaries of seniority may prove to be naive [...]. Equally in civil service structures, such as Japan's, where the generalist is regarded more highly than the specialist professional or technical personnel, it may also be problematic to install a culture of networking and knowledge sharing.' (King 2005, 75)

These and other cultural issues are impossible to resolve entirely, but it helps to recognise them and make them explicit during exchanges.

### 2.6 Conclusion

The obstacles to successful networking are numerous. However, this chapter has attempted to not only describe the obstacles but also give suggested solutions. These suggestions will not remove the obstacles entirely, but they might make them easier to deal with. More generally, it is important that networks make the obstacles explicit and take them into account in their design and mode of operation.

# 3. Success factors and networking lessons learned

Based on the ideas presented so far, the following factors that have a bearing on the success of networking can be identified. They are to be understood as general lessons learned about networks. Part II of this paper will relate these factors to the findings of the survey and interviews held in the framework of the GPPAC network strengthening review.

## Capacity of the member organisations

- The **participating organisations have the capacity** to contribute meaningfully to a successful network. They also have the capacity to learn and to use the network for some purpose. They are able to apply the knowledge gained from network participation in their own work. This requires both a will and space to change work methods and try new things. The members also have a work culture that stimulates learning. The network supports learning processes within member organisations.
- More generally, a successful network contributes to the **capacity building** of its members. This helps to deal with issues of power and inequality, and ensures that members can get the most out of their participation in the network. The network also provides **room for discussion and reflection** upon actions
- In a successful network, participants have **time** to engage in meaningful exchanges.
- Member organisations of a successful network represent a particular **constituency**, not merely their own organisational interests.

## Relationship between the member organisations and the network

- A successful network has a clear **added value** for its members. The membership has a **need** for the network and participants are motivated to participate actively. The network does not exist in isolation but has sustainable links to activities carried out in reality.
- There is a clear **purpose**; a shared vision and mission

by all parties involved. This has been translated into a clear set of objectives. Without a specific aim, interaction quickly becomes spurious. However, with a too narrowly defined objective, a community may not survive its own success. It may fall apart once the aim has been realised, without making sure that the accumulated insight is passed on.

- From the outset, there is **clarity** about the aims, limits and possibilities of the network. There has been sufficient discussion about what a network can do, and expectations are not unrealistic. Similarly, there is clarity about the process. Lines of communication and dissemination are clear and systematic (but flexible).
- Successful networks require **commitment** because they require extra time besides the usual schedules of partners. Networking is time and energy consuming. There have to be **gains** for members: participants should know what they are getting out of participation - otherwise there will be no commitment. A network should make its members more effective.

## Characteristics of the network

- A successful network is **flexible** and capable of responding to changes in the environment. The network is also flexible in that room is created for **self-organisation** - participants who link up can start all kinds of initiatives together. This fosters creativity and learning.
- There is an atmosphere of **safety** in which to express doubts and criticisms and manage uncertainties; in other words the network constitutes a safe setting for knowledge exchange.
- There is **trust** among the members and between participants and donors. Without the confidence that everyone is in it for the larger good there will be a tendency to withhold knowledge in order to strengthen one's position.
- There is **openness to different points of view**,

### 3. Success factors and networking lessons learned

#### Lessons learned from the Central Asian Dolina Mira network

The Dolina Mira ('Valley of Peace') network is a cross-border network of local CSOs in the conflict-stricken Ferghana Valley on the borders of Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Dolina Mira aims to address a variety of cross-border issues relating to ethnic tension, resource conflicts, vulnerable populations, customs regulations, legal issues and border crossings in the region. The Dolina Mira network comprises of thirty CSOs and has a paid membership. Member organisations often carry out joint activities, such as constructive dialogue and awareness raising activities and training and tolerance building in relation to conflicts originating from border crossing. There is also a small grants programme through which grassroots organisations can carry out socio-economic projects. Through this programme organisations did a border monitoring project. Lessons from Dolina Mira include:

- The way it was established was truly bottom-up. It was created by locals (instead of due to the availability of funds). A concept paper was produced, and a donor found. 'Dolina Mira is our baby, which found a tutor'.
- The donor is not dominating; the decisions are made by the network's coordinators and General Assembly. There is mutual respect.
- There is a strong and competent secretariat, with resources. This plays a large part in the success of a network.
- The coordination board is competent and professional, consisting of well-known and intelligent persons.
- Money is available, which makes possible regular meetings, activities, planning, and implementation in clusters of NGOs.
- State officials are engaged. They have come because they know that we have the resources to resolve the problems. They need Dolina Mira.
- The members are real partners in daily work; they are working together practically.
- The members do more for less money because they like the network.
- Dolina Mira is more just and fair than other networks:
- the work of secretariat and coordination board is transparent; the members can always ask for reports
- members can criticise and defend their opinions and ask questions at the General Assembly
- grant distribution is fair
- democracy is at work - the main goal of a network is changing values and mentality, and providing members with freedom. The way the network is organised gives the right example
- Dolina Mira is heavily dependent on the funding and staff time of the donor. This is not sustainable.

Dolina Mira works mainly on concrete socio-economic projects. Some feel that this is not the role a network should be playing and that it should instead aim to change politics and politicians in the Ferghana Valley. However, the members have low capacity and are afraid of upsetting politicians.

different values, and different interpretations of reality. A successful network's knowledge exchange function is not hampered by the constraints of a particular discourse or political project. The network may engage in advocacy but its 'common voice' does not prohibit the coexistence of different opinions.

**Cultural issues** are recognised and discussed in the network.

- **Joint activities:** a major challenge of each network is

to keep the momentum and prevent discouragement. This can't be achieved unless there are joint activities. Such activities also show the value of membership.

#### **Governance, legitimacy and organisation of the network**

- A successful network is **democratic and inclusive**. It is not controlled by a single set of interests. Members may have unequal capacity and strength but they have

### 3. Success factors and networking lessons learned

an equal voice. Those who coordinate the network are accountable to the members.

- A successful network strives to **mitigate power issues**. It has mechanisms in place that regulate conflict and prevent personal issues from taking the foreground. The stronger members have a genuine desire to contribute to open exchange and facilitate the capacity building of other members. They inevitably influence the network more strongly than weaker members do, but they do not impose their own views at the expense of openness and diversity.
- **Facilitation and moderation**: sustaining networks requires considerable time, effort and resources. There should be at least one person who is enabled to spend time on the facilitation of the network. Some kind of secretariat is needed that coordinates and organises the flows of knowledge, preventing information overload and scatter. It follows that funding is required. However, a network can also be overmoderated, if a moderator has a narrow view of the purpose of the group, takes decisions in an authoritarian way and stifles discussion rather than stimulating it. There is only a narrow space between channelling a discussion smoothly into a constructive direction and pressing people into a straightjacket which would exclude any spontaneous detours, exchanges or personal remarks. The role of the moderator is crucial, since all the other dimensions depend on a moderator who assures that the group avoids the many possible pitfalls.
- The **role of the coordinator or secretariat** should be clearly circumscribed, active, and empowering. Having a strong and capable secretariat at all levels is of vital importance.
- **Regular face-to-face meetings** are important to build personal relationships and achieve continuity. Knowledge sharing needs to occur on a regular basis, otherwise information provided may already be outdated. Strategies working today may not work in a few months' time, particularly given the dynamics of conflict situations.
- The participating organisations have a sense of

**ownership**. It is their process and not something that has been imposed by other organisations, donors or governments.

- A successful network's representative structures are considered **legitimate** by the members as well as by external parties.
- A successful network **structure** contributes to increased legitimacy and ownership and ensures both flexibility and good coordination.

#### Coverage and inclusiveness of the network

- A successful network strikes the right **balance** has to be found between **inclusiveness** and diversity on the one hand, and **focus** and direction on the other. This goes for content as well as membership.
- **Membership balance**: if only people with a similar background participate, opinions may not differ sufficiently to generate creative ideas. Moreover, if only a small fraction of the potential constituency participates, people will turn to other forums where these people do meet. On the other hand, by asking too many people with different backgrounds to join, cooperation could also falter. The reasons are that the added value of the network is not so clear; chances increase that individual contributions are beyond the interest of the majority of members; people hesitate to engage themselves because they do not see a common denominator which brings participants together; and there may be an information overload - unless the information is skilfully channelled into different subgroups and discussion threads.

#### Content of the network

- A successful network does not strive to be an overall, comprehensive knowledge system, but aims to offer a **stimulating framework** that facilitates exchange and access to knowledge sources.



### 3. Success factors and networking lessons learned

- **Tacit as well as explicit knowledge** is exchanged; a successful network brings people into contact with each other who can share experiences in an open setting, but it also attempts to draw experiences together into codified knowledge that can be distributed more easily. Most observers agree that a combination of face-to-face and online interaction is the best way to achieve this.
- **Content balance:** if the field of discussion is too narrow, it will not stimulate a broad enough flow of information and interaction may be less creative since creative ideas often result from the combination of hitherto uncombined elements. In addition, a too narrow field would only attract the ‘usual suspects’ who already know each other fairly well; little cross-fertilization would take place. If the field is too broad (‘Conditions for peace on earth’), however, then the interaction remains too vague and becomes uninteresting for serious people, and it becomes very difficult to arrive at common products which bind the group together.
- **Results:** knowledge sharing may generate ‘common products’. These could be joint publications containing lessons learned or recommendations, joint projects or programmes, the organisation of an event, a broadening of the community, or the start of a new one in a different field or region. Many communities are created for the exchange of knowledge and experience per se. But there is always an implicit assumption that this exchange will lead to better results, if not through joint activity, then through the improved functioning of the individual participants who are enriched by the exchange.
- A successful network pays attention to issues of **language and translation** in order to make available knowledge accessible to as many within the network as possible. This goes for language differences in the narrow sense of the term, but also applies to the use of jargon versus more accessible language.

#### Context of the network

- **Embeddedness:** any network should be linked in an appropriate way to a wider environment, to its social and political context as well as to neighbouring communities and similar initiatives in other countries or regions. At the same time, the network should not be embedded to the extent that it cannot operate autonomously.
- A successful network establishes **links with other networks** in order to prevent duplication and maximise knowledge benefits. If this is not the case, a network remains quite isolated. Insights generated in similar networks might not be taken into account, resources will not be pooled, results cannot be compared, and ideas will remain less widespread.
- A successful network operates in an **enabling context**. It is not obstructed by governments, conflict parties or other organisations. The basic infrastructure is present and there is some level of safety and security. The political environment fosters free speech and freedom of movement. If the context is not so enabling, creative ways are found to deal with constraints, such as bad infrastructure, illiteracy, and a hostile political context.

#### Funding of the network

- The **funding structure** of a successful network has the following characteristics:
  - There is sufficient funding for networking and knowledge sharing activities, even if the direct impact of these cannot always be shown.
  - At the same time, the network is accountable financially.
  - Donors do not impose particular approaches or particular activities.
  - It does not provide a position of power to one organisation at the funding interface, but ensures that the funds benefit the network as a whole.
  - It does not enhance competition between members.
  - Donors engage in knowledge exchange with the network, thus contributing to the knowledge

### 3. Success factors and networking lessons learned

processes inside it and linking it up to other networks.

- Donors take the knowledge generated in the network seriously and make use of it in their policy formulation as much as possible. This will increase the relevance of the network and give participants an incentive to continue contributing to it.

#### Monitoring and evaluation

- A successful network has good and working **monitoring and evaluation (M&E)** procedures in order to assess impact and to continue to learn and improve practice.

#### 3.1 Concluding remarks

The factors presented in this chapter together make up quite a list. It should be emphasised that it is never possible for any network to live up to all of them.

Rather, the list should be viewed as an ideal situation that is worth striving for but that will never be fully achieved. In addition, different networks may deem different factors important for their particular purpose and make different choices regarding some of them.

Thus, the factors listed in this chapter may serve more as a set of principles that can help networks see how they are doing and what kind of choices may need to be made. In line with this, Part II of this paper takes the factors as a starting point. In particular, chapters six to fifteen are organised along the lines of the factors presented here. This helps place the findings of the review in a broader perspective and to relate them to the networking theories and lessons learned that were used as the basis for this chapter.





PART II

**THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR  
THE PREVENTION OF ARMED CONFLICT**



# Introduction

The Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) is an international network of organisations working in conflict prevention and peacebuilding worldwide. It was initiated by the Netherlands-based organisation European Centre for Conflict Prevention (ECCP) in response to a call by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan in his 2001 'Report on the Prevention of Armed Conflict' in which he urged 'NGOs with an interest in conflict prevention to organise an international conference of local, national and international NGOs on their role in conflict prevention and future interaction with the United Nations in this field.'

Annan supported the ensuing proposal of ECCP for the formation of a Global Partnership which would work towards a common action agenda and a global civil society conference on conflict prevention. In a letter written in 2002 the Secretary-General stated that 'I support wholeheartedly your initiative to organize regional preparatory meetings leading to an international conference of local, national and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the area of conflict prevention... Your initiative is a timely and important contribution to engaging civil society in the task of developing a culture of prevention in the international community.'

The Global Partnership was organised into fifteen regional networks, each with a Regional Initiator or lead organisation, also called Regional Secretariat, which steers the regional process of network-building. The global process is led by the International Steering Group (ISG), composed of Regional Initiators a number of representatives of international NGOs and the of the GPPAC International Secretariat. The ISG meets twice a year. From its midst, an Executive Committee has been selected which deals with the governance of the network in between meetings. ECCP acts as the International Secretariat of the Global partnership.

The Regional Initiators brought together conflict prevention and peacebuilding organisations in their regions and formed Regional Steering Groups (RSG) with representatives from the various countries. Each

region went on to organise a conference with civil society representatives and, in most cases, government actors. These conferences formulated Regional Action Agendas, which in turn served as the foundation for GPPAC's Global Action Agenda of 2005.

The Global Action Agenda focuses on promoting human security and making a shift from reaction to prevention through effective partnerships, with guiding principles and values that should be at the core of practice. It gives recommendations for addressing the conditions that give rise to violent conflict and for systems and practices to respond to it more effectively if it emerges. The Action Agenda concludes with suggestions for specific mechanisms, activities and resources needed to enhance the capacities of civil society organisations (CSOs), governments, the UN and regional organisations to pursue prevention and build more just and peaceful societies.

The Global Action Agenda served as an input for the Global Conference on the Role of Civil Society in the Prevention of Armed Conflict which took place at UN Headquarters in New York from 19 to 21 July 2005, in response to the initial call made by Kofi Annan in 2001. The conference brought together over 900 people from 118 countries to launch an international civil society movement to prevent armed conflict. It was a remarkable achievement and sent an important signal, even though participation by UN representatives was much more limited than had been hoped.

The global conference and the process leading up to it gave many CSOs around the world an important boost; it was inspiring and valuable to be part of such a joint process through which CSOs hoped to be able to make a lasting impact on global policy and practice. CSO staff also gained useful contacts and knowledge about conflict prevention and the work of others in the field. However, after the global conference, many people were left with a feeling of 'now what?'. ECCP had managed to raise funds from many different sources for the process leading up to the conference, but these were beginning to run out. People felt it was time to begin implementing the Action Agendas, but weren't sure

where to start and how to find the necessary funds. Six months after the conference, many involved people felt that the momentum that had been so strongly felt in the run-up to the global conference had been lost.

Since then, the Global Partnership has taken important steps, most notably with the development of regional and global work plans. In addition, engagement with the UN has continued, and on behalf of GPPAC ECCP has been involved in activities such as the process around the creation of the UN Peacebuilding Commission and its implementation. Despite these steps, there is a sense within the network that it needs to be strengthened further in order for it to be able to move towards implementation of the plans and make a real contribution to the prevention of armed conflicts worldwide.

Part II of this paper presents the main findings of the network strengthening review that was carried out in order to establish a baseline for this further strengthening process, as well as in order to gather the views and recommendations from people involved in the network about the way this process should be given shape. Part II builds on the findings formulated in Part I and takes the success factors presented at the end of Part I as a starting point for the analysis of the GPPAC network.

# 4. Overall positive and negative aspects of GPPAC

Based on the survey and interviews held as part of the review (see the chapter on Methodology at the beginning of the paper), a number of positive and negative points about the Global Partnership emerge.

## 4.1 Positive aspects

Despite criticism of the network, most people's expectations of GPPAC have been 'partly' met. Moreover, nearly all stakeholders say they have benefited from their participation in GPPAC. That is quite an accomplishment - although it must be added that it seems like sometimes people have listed what they see as *potential* benefits. The main benefits mentioned are

- Access to knowledge and expertise in the field
- Opportunity to exchange experiences with others (lessons learned, best practices)
- Gaining contacts and partnerships with others in the field; knowing who is doing what; identifying opportunities for cooperation
- A new sense of partnership and solidarity (see the text box on Central Asia below)
- The potential for collaboration and joint activities
- The potential for capacity building
- Raising the visibility and legitimacy of participating organisations through their membership of GPPAC

### Impact of GPPAC in Central Asia

Central Asian NGOs didn't have a culture of cooperating with government and each other. Now, thanks to GPPAC, they are thinking more in terms of partnership. People begin to see more possibilities for complementarity and cooperation. The Regional Initiator, the Foundation for Tolerance International (FTI), has begun to use the idea of partnership also in other programmes.

Other positive aspects of GPPAC include that:

- People have gained many useful contacts and acquired important new knowledge through the networks
- The networks provide a sense of solidarity and moral support

- People think GPPAC's coverage of the world's regions and countries is 'quite good'
- There is an openness to different points of view within GPPAC
- In particular at the global level, GPPAC has been lobbying to gain recognition for the paradigm of conflict prevention and the role of civil society in this. This has yielded some results (see text box below). Particularly the fact that GPPAC is working to engage the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission (UN PBC) and other UN bodies is considered important by the people who participated in the review.

### Lobby and advocacy achievements at the global level

- A Group of Friends on Conflict Prevention was created through intensive lobbying by ECCP. The group consists of 31 states. It produced an input paper for the Millennium +5 Summit at the UN.
- The July 2005 global GPPAC conference at UN headquarters brought together over 900 people from 118 countries to launch an international civil society movement to prevent armed conflict. This was a remarkable achievement and sent an important signal. On the downside, participation by UN representatives was limited.
- Making use of the global network, ECCP has contributed to the Departments of Peace initiative that aims to establish peace ministries in the governments of various countries. See the text box on page 63.
- On behalf of GPPAC, ECCP has been closely involved in the development of UN Peacebuilding Commission, successfully lobbying for the inclusion of civil society representatives. See the text box on page.

## 4. Overall positive and negative aspects of GPPAC

### Lobby and advocacy achievements in Central and East Africa

- The regional GPPAC network in Central and East Africa contributed recommendations to the inter-governmental Great Lakes conference in 2004, some of which were adopted. See text box on page 59.
- The regional GPPAC network in West Africa, WANEP, has established a liaison office at headquarters of the regional organisation ECOWAS.

### 4.2 Negative aspects

People are less satisfied with a number of aspects of the network. First of all, participants mention the loss of momentum since the global conference at UN Headquarters in New York in July 2005. The process leading up to that conference, in which the network was organised and regional and global action agendas were developed, was considered beneficial - and raised expectations about the implementation phase that would follow. However, people feel that this phase has not really commenced. Related to this, participants complain of a lack of concrete action and implementation of plans: 'too much talk, too little action'.

In addition, there has been a lack of continuity in the process. In most regions there have been few and irregular meetings. In between meetings there has been little follow-up and interaction.

Another commonly identified difficulty has been a lack of focus. Participants feel there should be more common agreement and understanding on aims, priorities and strategies, in order to deal with the diverging expectations of members and the too broad and ambitious aims of the network. Such common agreement should lead to more focus in the profiling and programming of the network. This issue will be addressed in more detail in sections 8.2 and 11.2 of this paper.

Nearly everyone involved mentioned the lack of funds raised for GPPAC at its various levels. Under 'challenges' (chapter six) and 'funding structure' (chapter fourteen) this issue is examined in more detail.

Finally, an issue raised repeatedly is that of internal democracy within the network. Although stakeholders understand that the process could never have started in a purely democratic way and that the way Regional Initiators were selected, for example, was only logical, they feel that it is now time to establish more democratic procedures in order to enhance the legitimacy of the network's structures. In addition many people complain of a lack of transparency - about what the procedures are, why some are selected to attend meetings and others not, and what GPPAC is doing at the global level and on whose authority. There is insufficient communication about such matters. Chapter ten will expand on these issues.

## 5. Functions of GPPAC

GPPAC's main functions as drafted by the International Steering Group<sup>13</sup> are:

- 1. Promoting Acceptance of Conflict Prevention:** GPPAC supports regional efforts to raise awareness regarding the effectiveness of conflict prevention, and undertakes parallel efforts at the global level.
- 2. Mobilising Civil Society Early Response Actions to Prevent:** GPPAC supports civil society organisations in developing their capacity to contribute to early warning systems and to intervene effectively in impending crises/conflicts. In response to regional requests, the global network will seek to a) mobilise coordinated civil society responses, based on early warning of impending conflict escalation; and b) pressure governments, regional organisations, and the UN system to respond to early warning information.
- 3. Promoting Policies and Structures for Conflict Prevention:** GPPAC generates ideas for improving policies, structures and practices of interaction among civil society organisations, governments, regional organisations, and UN agencies for joint action for conflict prevention.
- 4. Building National and Regional Capacity for Prevention:** GPPAC strives to enhance the capacity of its regional networks and global mechanisms to undertake collective actions to prevent violent conflict.
- 5. Generating and Disseminating Knowledge:** GPPAC engages in processes of knowledge generation and exchange, by learning from the experience of regions and developing mechanisms for regular communication/exchange of such information. GPPAC activities aim to improve our mutual understanding regarding important methodologies and mechanisms for action.<sup>14</sup>

In the draft Global Work Plan, these functions have been categorised into two programmes. Programme 1 is called *Building Consensus to Prevent Violent Conflict*

<sup>13</sup> Source: draft GPPAC charter prepared for ISG meeting in Nairobi from 27-31 March 2006.

<sup>14</sup> Peace education was chosen as the first pilot topic to focus on when setting up this process of collaborative learning.

<sup>15</sup> Source: draft Global Work Plan for ISG meeting in Nairobi from 27-31 March, 2006.

and consists of lobbying and awareness raising. Programme 2 is entitled *Joint Action to Prevent Violent Conflict* and contains early warning and early response, knowledge sharing, and network building.<sup>15</sup>

### **GPPAC and the UN Peacebuilding Commission**

In discussions of the International Steering Group of GPPAC, the UN Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) emerged as an important issue to focus GPPAC's lobby on. GPPAC acknowledges that within the UN system the Peace Building Support Office (PBSO) will become the main focal point on peace related issues. Therefore it is crucial to monitor the start of the commission and its support office. The ISG decided to focus on the link between the UN headquarters and the field, and on the involvement of civil society. Furthermore, GPPAC sees it as a task to develop proposals and updates on situations in countries relevant for the commission and its support office. ECCP, as the international secretariat for GPPAC, plays an active role in coordinating these processes, in the following ways.

#### *New York*

ECCP has developed a plan together with the World Federalist Movement (WFM) to conduct several monitoring activities, produce briefing papers and organise seminars. The first seminar took place in July 2006 in New York, co-organized with the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. The focus of this seminar was on the country specific working groups, and interaction with civil society. Also, WFM has developed, together with New York-based NGO's a synopsis with recommendations for civil society engagement with the PBC. This input is currently being discussed with people involved in the PBC.

#### *Regional*

Parallel to this effort in New York, GPPAC's regional partners are engaged in setting up meetings with key civil society actors in countries that might be selected by the PBC (Burundi, Sierra Leone, Liberia,

***Box continued on page 54***

*Continued from page 53*

Timor-Leste). The aims of these meetings are to discuss recommendations from civil society to the PBC, and deliver structured input.

*Brussels*

GPPAC co-organised a seminar with SaferWorld in July 2006 on the EU's contribution to the PBC. A larger meeting will be held in September involving representatives from the countries selected by the PBC.

*Geneva*

Several Geneva-based organisations are discussing how to ensure better coordination between Geneva and New York in regard to the activities of the PBC. Several meetings are taking place, which are part of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy project 'The United Nations Peacebuilding Commission and International Geneva'. A workshop on the results of the meetings in Geneva is planned for the International Security Forum in Zurich in October.

Source: [www.gppac.org](http://www.gppac.org)

Largely in line with the functions decided by the ISG, the main functions of GPPAC that emerge from the review are:

- High-level engagement to change the framework for conflict prevention and peacebuilding and to make the voice of local civil society heard. The work with the UN is particularly relevant. It is also important to link these high-level processes to actors and development at the regional, national and local levels. The text box below illustrates this.

**Bridging the gap between Central Asian civil society organisations and global civil society**

Central Asian civil society organisations need to be integrated into international civil society that is working on the same issues. If that is achieved then we can begin to pressure Central Asian governments from two sides: from civil society within the country, and from outside. Experience shows that this is the most effective way to achieve changes. In order to achieve such global cooperation, Central Asian actors should participate in global conferences and make the issues of the region known to others. If Central Asian civil society remains isolated, then the governments are free to do whatever they want.

- Generating and disseminating knowledge constitutes a second important function of the network. This

includes doing research, gathering other research and information, and disseminating research results, working methods, and updates about the GPPAC process and about developments in the field more broadly. The network should provide its members with access to experts and expertise, but also facilitate the building of expertise within the members and network, and help bring out the knowledge and experience that exists within the network. The network may facilitate the linking up of this expertise with policy formulation by donor agencies and international organisations, as is illustrated by the text box below.

**Locally-driven analysis and strategy development - suggestion from Central Asia**

The network may facilitate the involvement of local and national NGOs in studying regional problems in the field of conflict prevention, because they are in the best position to provide accurate analysis and steer global processes. It is necessary that international organisations coordinate and consult with local CSOs, set priorities together and find out which mechanisms are most suitable to the local context.

- Related to this, an important function of the network is to facilitate the exchange of experiences among network members. Such experiences may include



## 5. Functions of GPPAC

lessons learned and best practices. Other participants may learn from the successes and mistakes of colleagues and be inspired by others' stories.

- The network should support its members by helping them gain access to funds and training and capacity building opportunities.
- Finally, the majority of participants feel that the Global Partnership and its regional networks should

engage in collaboration around concrete, joint activities. Although knowledge sharing is one of the most important functions of GPPAC, the Partnership should not limit itself to being a knowledge network. Collaborative activities may vary and suggestions range from joint high-level advocacy campaigns and lobby to joint grassroots peacebuilding projects.

## 6. Main challenges

- Too much talk and too little action. It is time GPPAC starts to prove its relevance and make an actual contribution to armed conflict prevention.
- Funds, funds, funds. Fundraising is the responsibility of all who have a formal position within GPPAC. Some admit that they have not given sufficient priority to raising funds for GPPAC. This has several reasons:
  - *difficulty of finding funds for networking in a donor climate that emphasises 'direct-impact' activities*
  - *lack of clarity on focus and strategy*
  - *in some regions, lack of clarity about the potential role of a civil society network more generally*
  - *fatigue and loss of momentum after the July 2005 conference in New York*
- Capacity of participating organisations at national level (see section 7.1).
- There is a lack of clarity on the aims, priorities, and strategies of GPPAC among stakeholders at the regional and national levels (see section 8.3). Since work plans have been developed, better communication about these plans may in part solve this. However, it is also a matter of ownership and transparency: to the extent that objectives and strategies have been developed, many of the people involved in this review were not consulted and do not know about the process that took place.
- Related, GPPAC is not sufficiently linked to the grassroots in the regions. In many regions the network remains limited to a narrow circle around the regional initiator. (See section 7.4)
- The momentum is gone. There is no strong leadership for peace in the world. Everyone is waiting for each other. There is no strong coalition or joint agenda. GPPAC is running uphill.

# 7. Capacity of the member organisations

## 7.1 Capacity of members

Most respondents to the survey indicate that they have sufficient capacity to meaningfully participate in the network and to use the results of networking. As evidence they quote having knowledge of and experience with conflict prevention, having the same aim as GPPAC, having experience with networking, being a network organisation or in some other way being able to mobilise other organisations, and being present in many GPPAC regions.

Nonetheless, the capacity of participating organisations in GPPAC is a challenge, particularly at the national level. Among the regional networks, the disparity in capacity levels is extreme: ‘in Latin America, [civil society] can topple governments, while in [regions like] Uzbekistan, authoritarian regimes more or less stamped out independent activism’ (Matveeva and Van de Veen 2005, 8). There is also much variety *within* regional networks. It is a difficult endeavour to try and bridge the gap between strong and weak network members. Many local peacebuilding organisations have little funding and trained staff. Some organisations have only just picked up the theme of peacebuilding, sometimes simply because there appeared to be money in it.

Infrastructure also represents an obstacle in many places. This includes the bad condition of the roads, a lack of cars available, limited or no access to internet, high telephone costs, high electricity costs (generators) and high office rents. High staff turnover is another issue that makes networking difficult. Many organisations have lost staff, sometimes after having invested in their training. Often these staff members, who have become ‘worth’ more as a result of the training, leave for better-paying international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) or government or UN jobs. Staff turnover makes it difficult for organisations to retain knowledge gained through GPPAC and keep contacts going.

The Regional Secretariats tend to be strong regional players - which is the reason why they were selected. Nonetheless, they struggle to deal with the demands that

come with their position at the interface of the global and regional networks. They tend to have too little time and resources to give the coordination of the networks the attention it requires. Both national-level members and the International Secretariat at the global level complain that they receive too few inputs from the regional level. The International Secretariat (ECCP) itself also has limited capacity in terms of staff hours, experience, and resources. ECCP staff themselves say that they do not have enough capacity to really help push the regions along. The International Secretariat would also like to learn more from the regions about the kind of support that they need.

It appears that the ambitious plans developed by GPPAC at the various levels do not take sufficient notice of the limits of the capacity of the networks and their members at all levels. Indeed, a member of the International Secretariat noted that while ECCP and GPPAC advocate a bigger role for civil society, CSOs cannot always deliver due to low capacity. This is a dilemma that requires more thought. Objectives of the network could be made more realistic and attainable from this perspective. GPPAC may do more in terms of analysing the capacities and possible role of civil society in the conflict prevention field, and adjusting its strategies to the findings of such an assessment. ‘A sober analysis of strengths and weaknesses may be a more effective advocacy tool than an uncritical belief’ (Matveeva and Van de Veen 2005, 9).

Also part of organisational capacity is the capacity of an organisation to learn. This learning capacity is determined by their ability to change their operations in response to changing circumstances or newly gained knowledge. Part of this is the capacity to do research about needs and circumstances among an organisation’s constituency. Learning capacity also entails having monitoring procedures that enable an organisation to see in how far its aims are being reached and what can be changed in order to become even more effective. Such procedures enable an organisation to draw lessons, retain them, and use them to improve practice.

Some of the stronger organisations in GPPAC - in many cases, these are the organisations hosting the Regional

Secretariats - have good learning, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place. The Regional Secretariat for Central and East Africa, the Nairobi Peace Initiative Africa (NPI-Africa), is a particularly good example of an organisation that has given a lot of thought to the development of locally sensitive, learning-oriented M&E procedures. However, the weaker network members have usually not progressed very far in the development of such mechanisms beyond the donor accounting formats they have to fill out. Promoting Action Learning skills among the membership and helping members develop M&E procedures are important activities if knowledge gained through networking and sharing is to be put to use in the field.

### 7.2 Capacity building

As a result of the low capacity of many members, strengthening these organisations emerges as a priority area for GPPAC. As additional capacity needed for organisations to be able to contribute to the network and optimally benefit from it, respondents to the survey and case study interviewees most often mentioned training programmes in conflict prevention and peacebuilding methodologies. More generally people hope to gain access to expertise and knowledge through the network. Expertise and methodologies are wanted not only when it comes to conflict prevention but also with regard to practical working skills, such as documentation, proposal writing, fundraising, ICT, staff development, and M&E. In addition to skills and knowledge, many organisations say they need financial support, partly in order to be able to travel to network meetings. Additional staff is also identified as a need.

It would be a remarkable achievement if GPPAC could make it possible that training programmes become more widely offered, particularly at the regional and national levels where the content of trainings could be more sensitive to regional and local circumstances, knowledge, methods, and traditions. Some regions, such as West Africa, already pay a lot of attention to such training programmes for national and local civil society organisation (CSO) staff, and may provide positive

#### Issues relating to the capacity of CSOs in Central Asia

According to some, the networking concept is not really understood in the region. Central Asian CSOs are said to lack the knowledge and skills to develop a network. Problems mentioned include that

- Central Asian CSOs are relatively weak
- Most CSOs don't develop their own policy but depend on the policy of donors; they are 'grant-hunters'. Asian CSOs are dependent on foreign, particularly US, funds.
- Most CSOs engage in multiple tasks instead of specialising in one area (such as conflict prevention); as a result they offer less quality.
- Even if CSOs try to engage governments, they are not sure what their message should be. CSOs have little self esteem and organisations from different Central Asian countries do not easily agree on the right message, because they all have a different focus.
- There is little thinking in Central Asia about the role of civil society beyond the implementation of technical projects. There is also no sense of global solidarity, for example with regard to events in Lebanon - although this may also be related to the dependency on US funds.
- Not all CSOs consider conflict prevention to be the responsibility of civil society. Instead they tend to focus in implementing concrete, 'technical' socio-economic projects in a project-driven way. Conflict prevention however is more than a project. It is a large and political undertaking. It is also still quite vague and unclear.
- There is an absence of moral motivation; as a result networks work ad hoc, namely only when there is funding.

examples for other regions. However, even in those regions, many people are not yet reached by the training programmes, and there is some discussion as to the procedures for selecting participants, which in some cases are not very transparent and tend to occur via personal networks.

## 7. Capacity of the member organisations

Members may also make more use of each other's expertise, not only by knowledge sharing but also by using each other's services as experts or resource persons when CSOs need outside consultants or facilitators (Matveeva and Van de Veen 2005, 7). The regional networks could more explicitly address issues of inequality and differences in capacity within regions and find the best ways to deal with these. They may set up standards, develop plans of action to meet these, and monitor progress. M&E and learning will be helpful in this regard.

### **CSOs in Central and East Africa aim to improve their own functioning**

In the GPPAC Regional Action Agenda for Central and East Africa, in addition to making recommendations to policy makers the participating CSOs resolved to work on themselves as well. The following focus areas were identified in this context:

- self-regulation and code of conduct
- gender inclusion and sensitivity
- promoting collaboration and networking among CSOs
- enhancing capacity for research and informed analysis
- engaging governments and intergovernmental bodies
- promoting a culture of peace
- lobbying policy makers at various levels for the implementation of the recommendations of the action agenda

Another way in which networks can contribute to the capacity of their members is by providing room for discussion and reflection upon actions. Local CSO staff are constantly pressed for time and in daily practice they find little opportunity to take a step back and reflect on their work. Such reflection would entail researching the needs of constituencies, studying the results of programmes, relating activities back to aims, questioning underlying assumptions and theories, and comparing experiences and outcomes with the theories and practices of others. A network can facilitate this by providing a space in which members meet, reflect, and

discuss. This can take place during training courses but also in conferences and seminars. Indeed, the GPPAC conferences that have been organised tend to be evaluated positively as opportunities for reflection and exchange.

Learning, reflection and capacity building are related to M&E because, as explained in the previous section, M&E affects the learning capacity of organisations and thereby their ability to absorb and use new information gained through the network. Only if organisations have additional learning capacity, M&E activities have a concrete value and can lead to changes in the organisation. Without the ability to learn and to change, M&E activities are only an additional burden to fulfil external requirements. In addition, M&E enables organisations to better assess the effectiveness of their work and the additional capacity that they need in order to improve it. As a result, organisations that have functioning learning and monitoring mechanisms in place are better able to make information available through training and exchange locally relevant and to apply it in their work.

### **7.3 Time available for networking**

In order for such processes of reflection and exchange to be possible and fruitful, participants need to have time to engage in meaningful exchanges. Many staff of CSOs that are involved in GPPAC say they do not have a lot of time to participate in networks. They are paid by the organisation they work for and naturally give the work for that agency more priority.

This suggests that for networking to be successful, organisations need to make it an integral part of their work by recognising that it is part of the toolkit that will help the organisation achieve its mission. Indeed, some organisations say that networking is already part of their mission and therefore GPPAC is not an 'extra' activity. However, with most peace CSOs participating in GPPAC this is not yet the case. Donor agencies also need to be convinced so that networking is not done in extra time, or eats up part of an organisation's overhead budget, but is part of donor grants.

However, for CSOs and donors to prioritise networking and make it part of regular work, they also need to be convinced of its (potential) benefits. As we can read in other sections of this paper, this is an area in which some work is still needed. Many participants do not yet see concrete benefits and call for more concrete activities. They do not yet ‘own’ the objectives and strategies of the network and feel that more focus is required.

### 7.4 Constituencies

Many stakeholders raise the issue that GPPAC is not sufficiently linked to the grassroots in the regions. In many regions the network remains limited to a narrow circle around the Regional Initiator. According to International Secretariat staff, there is a tendency among Regional Initiators to protect their position (although it should also be said that in many cases the Regional Initiators are anyway the only organisation around able to carry out such a task). The fact that the networking process has only gone so far is also due to the limited capacity and resources in the regions. The political context also plays a role in the limited broadening of the regional networks, as do personal relations. A lot depends simply on who is available and happens to have heard of GPPAC.

This raises important legitimacy questions. In addition, in most cases only one staff member (often the director) of an organisation is involved in GPPAC - instead of the organisation as a whole. Membership is thus not necessarily carried by the whole institution, as is illustrated by the text box below.

#### **Constituencies: the Cambodian GPPAC members**

Two Cambodian people participated in GPPAC on behalf of their organisations, which they later left to go work elsewhere. When the organisations in question were visited as part of the review, it became clear that their current management had no knowledge of GPPAC at all, even though their organisations were on a list of Cambodian GPPAC members.

At the level of the individual GPPAC members, additional questions may be raised with regard to their constituencies: are the CSOs that are part of GPPAC acting on behalf of communities or do they mostly represent their own organisational interests? Have they been created as a result of a need arising out of communities, or have they been founded in response to funds becoming available? Do they mostly implement projects determined by donors, or do they set priorities through participatory processes among the beneficiaries of their work?

The picture varies so much among regions, countries, and organisations that it is impossible to give an overall response to these questions. In some countries, particularly those emerging from large-scale violence that has destroyed many of the societal structures that may have been present before, many CSOs lack a real constituency. This is something that has for example been noted in Liberia. In other countries, such as the Philippines, there is a strong tradition of a well-organised, interest-based civil society - although even there doubts have been raised about the extent to which these organisations represent the grassroots.

Speaking more generally, a few things can be said with regard to the constituency of member organisations. In many parts of the world, a particular trend can be discerned with regard to relations between donor agencies and local CSOs. Despite the popular language of capacity building and ownership, local partners are often treated as subcontractors that implement the policies set by donors. There is little room for local partners to contribute to policy development by making clear what the local needs and priorities are. Funding is mostly available on a project basis and activities like research into the situations of communities, reflection on work, or networking, are often not financed.

Many donors have a bias towards particular activities, including those that may have a ‘direct impact’ and activities that focus on ‘hard’ security. Local CSOs on their part are often not sufficiently proactive in trying to convince donors of a particular need and in refusing to

## 7. Capacity of the member organisations

accept funds for less relevant activities. All this limits the extent to which CSOs represent local communities; in some cases they seem rather to be acting as outposts of donor agencies. Of course, this is a very generalised description of affairs and there are many exceptions to the rule. Thankfully, genuine, two-way partnerships between funding agencies and local CSOs also exist.

Section 10.3 continues on the issue of constituencies, linking it to questions about the legitimacy of the network.



# 8. Relationship between the member organisations and the network

## 8.1 Added value

For a network to be successful, there has to be a need for it in the first place. Networks are being created all around, sometimes around issues that may just as well be addressed by individual organisations or one-off coalitions, or might better be solved by governments or international organisations rather than civil society networks. In other cases networks are formed around

issues that are already covered by other networks or institutions.

Positively for GPPAC as a whole, however, nearly all the people involved see a need for a global and regional civil society network focusing on conflict prevention and peacebuilding. Reasons include that civil society organisations are stronger together than when they act alone. The conflicts they face cannot be dealt with as

### Relevance of GPPAC for the Central Asian region

Political situation:

- Governments don't act in many instances of local conflicts; NGOs need to act.
- Because of the difficult circumstances for civil society in the region we need international partners.
- Our voice becomes louder if we speak on behalf of a hundred or even a thousand NGOs, making it more likely that our lobby and advocacy efforts are successful.
- Uzbek interviewees emphasised that GPPAC is potentially important for them because 'it is connected to the UN institutions'. The UN is very much respected by the Uzbek government, which does not consider UN agencies to be spies or traitors - as it does other international organisations. If the UN in Uzbekistan knew about GPPAC then it might help convince the government that civil society organisations are important and necessary partners.

Unite strengths and work jointly:

- GPPAC may unite the strengths and resources of the organisations involved, and help them to engage in conflict prevention activities in a coordinated or joint way. Now, there is much duplication of activities.
- GPPAC might enable CSOs to jointly address common issues. Globally as well as regionally, conflicts are interrelated and therefore require a joint response. Countries and people of the region tend to have similar conditions, a common mentality, and face similar conflict issues. They know each other's problems and the best ways to find a resolution.

Through a network they can help each other and jointly deal with problems. Not only do we face similar issues, we also face some of the same issues. Cross-border problems in Central Asia include the conflicts in the Ferghana Valley and religious radicalism.

- A network could decrease competition between NGOs.

Extend reach:

- Because GPPAC is relatively high level it can increase the reach of grassroots networks like Dolina Mira in the Ferghana Valley and help improve their quality.
- A global network may broaden CSOs' horizon and make their problems known to more people. It is important to get our voices heard, our issues recognised, and our lessons learned by others. We have gained some valuable experiences, for example in the Tajik peace process, that others might benefit from.

Access to knowledge:

- GPPAC may provide access to knowledge and ideas. It could facilitate that we generate new ideas, exchange knowledge and contacts, keep each other informed about our conflicts, and educate ourselves in peace building. Networks give the possibility to combine grassroots experience and knowledge of local conditions on the one hand, and a range of knowledge, information and other resources of global scope. The exchange of experience could also mean that strong CSOs support weaker ones in their development.



## 8. Relationship between the member organisations and the network

individual CSOs. Many conflict issues cross borders. Conflict in one place can have a negative impact on the stability of the region or even the world. Everything that is done in one corner of the globe has an impact at the other end. As a result, a united, international response is needed. By way of illustration, the text box below describes the potential relevance of GPPAC as seen in Central Asia. Similar points were mentioned in other regions as well.

A network may unite the strengths of organisations engaging in conflict prevention and increase the voice of civil society as a whole. The latter is needed to bring participants' issues to the attention of global actors and to achieve successful advocacy and lobby. A large coalition of CSOs has a stronger position vis-à-vis governments and international organisations. Stakeholders also identify a need for a platform in which to share experiences and learn from others. A network may generate ideas, exchange information and contact and educate people in peace building. It may bring people into contact with each other who could form important partnerships, as is illustrated in the text box below. In addition, a network like GPPAC might help coordinate between CSOs' activities and facilitate joint projects.

The extent to which GPPAC actually meets the needs identified in this section, and thus provides the added value it potentially could, varies according to the perspective of the respondent. Overall it can be said that GPPAC's potential to fulfil these needs has been met partly, but not yet fully. Major benefits have included the fact that GPPAC is providing access to knowledge and expertise in the field and presents an opportunity to exchange experiences with others. In addition, participants have gained contacts and partnerships with others in the field. It is important to know who is doing what and to identify opportunities for cooperation; GPPAC has begun to make this possible. People also feel that their membership of GPPAC raises the visibility and legitimacy of participating organisations. In these areas, GPPAC is meeting the needs of stakeholders and providing added value.

### **Departments of Peace initiative and GPPAC**

Organisations in the USA, the United Kingdom, and Canada started initiatives to have Departments of Peace or Ministries for Peace established that would sit alongside existing government Departments. These Departments would operate in the realm of foreign affairs as well as at home. Their work abroad would include monitoring the world scene for signs of conflict and taking pre-emptive measures as appropriate in partnership with other nations and world bodies, helping with the nonviolent resolution of conflicts that exist, and assisting with rehabilitation and reconciliation work after the cessation of conflicts. Their work at home would involve fostering a culture of peace at all levels of the community by transforming conflict in the home, the workplace, the school, and in all aspects of government.

In October 2005 three organisations, the US Peace Alliance, the Canadian Federal Working Group for a Department of Peace, and the UK ministry for peace, organised the first People's Summit for Departments of Peace in London. This was done to share information and experience within existing groups and also to begin working with those considering setting up similar initiatives in other countries. Forty people from twelve countries attended the two day Summit. These countries were Australia, Canada, Israel, the occupied Palestinian territories, Italy, Japan, Spain, the Netherlands, Romania, the United Kingdom, Jordan, and the United States.

As ECCP - the GPPAC International Secretariat - heard about the initiative, it came up with the idea to bring in the expertise and perspective of Departments of Peace that already exist in postconflict countries such as Fiji, the Solomon Islands, Costa Rica, and Liberia. Through the Global Partnership ECCP was able to put the initiators of the Departments of Peace project in touch with relevant people from the countries mentioned. As a result representatives of the existing Departments of Peace attended an international conference on the initiative. ECCP will do research to find out what other similar government departments exist in the world and hopes that a government level network can be created.

## 8. Relationship between the member organisations and the network

However, there are other expectations that have not yet been met. Most often mentioned is the need to become concrete and begin implementing all the plans that have been made. As part of this it would be beneficial for the network to reach out to the grassroots and organise capacity building activities for local organisations. In addition, more transparency and democracy would increase the constituency behind, and legitimacy of, regional- and global-level activities.

GPPAC could have a particular added value when it engages in activities that mobilise and link the various levels at which it is organised. In the case of lobby, for example, GPPAC's added value could be in exercising pressure on decision-makers from two or more sides. Lobby at the UN is important, and is also probably more effective because of the global network that is behind these efforts than it would have been if ECCP had acted on its own. However, this high-level lobby could be linked more to engagement with UN offices in conflict-affected countries.

### **Added value may differ depending on the level: The Philippines**

In the Philippines there have not been any national GPPAC meetings for some time, because the national coordinator has not received funding from the global or regional secretariat and has not prioritised fundraising for GPPAC, having many other things to do. The low priority accorded to GPPAC is also related to the fact that there are already many other networks in the country and the added value of the network is seen more at the regional level.

National-level UNDP offices, for example, are often not aware of GPPAC, even despite a recent letter about GPPAC sent by UNDP director Mark Malloch Brown to the organisation's Resident Representatives in the countries. GPPAC members at the national level could be more active in drawing attention of the UNDP country offices to this letter and discussing the proper follow-up to it. However, most national-level members do not know about this letter, which draws attention to the need for better communication to which we will return later on in this paper.

### **8.2 Shared purpose**

The network's overall vision, to achieve a shift from reaction to prevention, is adhered to by most GPPAC members (although some, notably in Central Asia, raise doubts about whether the prevention of armed conflict is not more a government than a civil society function). Nonetheless, beyond this vision, many people note a lack of a clear, shared purpose, of a focus area and set of objectives commonly arrived at. This had already been formulated as an issue by a 'mid-term review' done during the global conference in July 2005:

*'[n]etworking without a clear strategy and vision may become meaningless, distract energy and resources and undermine credibility of civil society in the eyes of governments and international organisations. [...] In future, more realistic objectives should be established, for which appropriate capacity in human and financial resources is available. Lobbying should have clear landmarks and concrete targets. Effectiveness of the network is key - it should achieve some real goals.'* (Matveeva and Van de Veen 2005, 3; emphasis in original)

The repeated mentioning of this issue by people consulted for the review contrasts somewhat with the fact that over the past year, GPPAC's Regional and International Steering Groups have developed work plans in which objectives, planned activities and impacts are formulated. The fact that participants still note the absence of clear and shared common objectives appears to be explained by several aspects:

- Participation in the development of objectives and plans has been relatively narrow and many people feel left out of the processes; as a result, there is limited ownership of the plans.
- The aims and objectives that have been formulated are broad and the step from there to concrete action is still a large one. More focus is needed (see section 11.2 for more on this).
- Some people are concerned about the viability of the action agendas and work plans, which are very ambitious. The International Secretariat makes it clear that it is unlikely that funds can be raised for all

## 8. Relationship between the member organisations and the network

of the plans formulated. In addition, the action agendas contain many recommendations to governments, over which CSOs have only limited influence.

As a result of all this, expectations vary to some extent about the kinds of activities GPPAC should engage in. One discussion emerged particularly clearly out of the data gathered for the review. It concerns the extent to which the network should engage in activism. In how far should a network like GPPAC play a politically activist role and act like a solidarity, human rights-oriented movement? At present only part of the ‘peace movement’ is interested in GPPAC because its consensus, engagement, relationship building approach means that it is not very outspoken.

### Opinions about activism in Southeast Asia

In Southeast Asia, expectations and priorities differ with regard to the extent to which the network should engage in activism. The Regional Initiator is an activist, human rights-oriented, solidarity organisation. In part this reflects a strong tradition in Filipino civil society, which has long engaged in political activism. However, others have different priorities. In Cambodia some say that this activist, rights-oriented approach does not match with their own, which focuses more on dialogue and long-term peacebuilding processes by engaging people, building relationships and finding joint solutions. The difference becomes clear when approaches toward Burma are compared: boycott and human rights advocacy versus engaging all actors to achieve joint transformation.

Is GPPAC credible if it does not take a position on the ‘War on Terror’, for example? Or would taking such a position jeopardise its relationship with powerful governments and the UN, which is also important? Where is the balance between activism and building relationships with policymakers? In the GPPAC network in Southeast Asia this discussion was given a cultural dimension: people said that while Philippine CSOs have a political and activist tradition, Cambodian CSOs tend

to focus more on consensus, engagement, and achieving subtle change (see text box below). This dichotomy reflects a broader tension between human rights advocates and peacebuilders<sup>16</sup>. In Central Asia a similar discussion takes place, but here it centres more on fears to make CSOs’ situation worse by upsetting already oppressive governments. More subtle and cooperative engagement is preferred by most in this region, although this risks jeopardising one’s principles. These discussions also apply to the role of civil society more generally. What is the position of GPPAC on this? Should it have one?

It is suggested as a possible solution to separate the network into two: first, a loose and open People Building Peace movement that would provide a forum for activism and ad hoc coalitions, and second, GPPAC, which would be a professional organisation.

### 8.3 Clarity

There is insufficient clarity on the aims, priorities, and strategies of GPPAC among stakeholders at the regional and national levels. Since work plans have been developed, better communication about these plans may

#### Uncertainty and disagreement: Liberia

For the WANEP network in Liberia, uncertainty and disagreements about objectives led to diverging expectations and dissatisfaction. Some members are not clear of their purpose as a member. Some are in it only as a way to get funds and have no interest in the objectives of the network. There was also uncertainty and disagreement about the role of the secretariat, in particular about whether it should engage in the implementation of programmes itself or merely function as coordinator and facilitator. WANEP Liberia does carry out programmes, and in the opinion of most members interviewed this runs counter to its aims and in fact brings it into competition with its own members.

<sup>16</sup> The ‘peace or justice’ debate — such as can for example also be seen in Northern Uganda where the ICC’s prosecution of Kony is considered by some to endanger the peace process.

## 8. Relationship between the member organisations and the network

in part solve this. However, it is also a matter of ownership and transparency: to the extent that objectives and strategies have been developed, many of the people involved in this review were not consulted and do not know about the process that took place. This points to the fact that there is also insufficient clarity with regard to the structure and processes of the network. Lines of communication and information dissemination could be much more clear and systematic, and communication itself more frequent.

### 8.4 Commitment and gains

Despite all this, people consulted for this review tend to be committed to the network - at least verbally. The extent to which people are actually committed in practice is difficult to say and it probably varies. Some organisations - including Regional Secretariats - place GPPAC higher on the list of priorities than do others. Although all the Regional Secretariats appear to be committed, most of them do not give GPPAC the attention which they themselves admit it would need. This is related to a lack of funding but also to doubts about the extent to which GPPAC can really make a difference in the regions. As mentioned, the network is considered to be insufficiently concrete and action-oriented. In addition, in a region like Central Asia where

#### **Gaining visibility: Kenya**

Being a part of the network has increased organisations' visibility and legitimacy. For example, for grassroots organisations like the Rural Women Peace Link in Eldoret, Kenya, GPPAC represented an important opportunity to gain visibility for the insights and results gained in their work. It is considered crucial that the voices of local stakeholders can be heard more widely, and GPPAC has made this possible.

political authoritarianism is a major issue, people question whether a civil society network could play any meaningful role at all in the prevention of armed conflict.

To the extent that people are committed to the Global Partnership, this commitment is naturally related to the hope of gaining from the network. Expected benefits include training and funding opportunities and raising the visibility of organisations. As mentioned, benefits that are already experienced include increased contacts, access to information, and opportunities to share experiences. At the same time there is some impatience with the lack of concrete action so far, and this may endanger the future commitment of participants.

# 9 Characteristics of the network

## 9.1 Flexibility

The fact that the GPPAC's focus area is so broad also has an advantage: at least in theory it makes the network able to respond to changes in the environment, adjusting its policy or starting new initiatives around these.

Indeed, the International Steering Group (ISG) has the mandate to take far-reaching decisions. However, in practice the consensus structure and consensus-oriented nature of the people involved means that radical decisions are not easily taken and difficult choices tend to be postponed, for example with regard to the activism issue described in section 8.2. In addition, communication in between ISG meetings does not always run smoothly, with ISG members in the regions giving priority to other pressing matters and with the International Secretariat sending so much information that it becomes difficult to decide what is important.

As a result of all this, GPPAC has not always been able to respond to current events. Many inside the network are critical about the fact that GPPAC remained silent during the recent war in Lebanon, for example. On the other hand, where it concerns more gradual relation-building and lobbying processes at a high level, GPPAC has kept apace with new developments - such as the creation of the UN Peacebuilding Commission with which it has been closely involved. In part this may be explained by the fact that ECCP (the International Secretariat) already had experiences with this kind of work.

At the same time, participants should not be too passive in waiting for decisions to come from the centre. Flexibility also means that network members can organise themselves in varying combinations around varying issues as the need arises. Other networks have learned the lesson that a loose set-up, in which there is no defined membership and people can or cannot participate in activities as they please, appears to be more effective where there is low capacity and high time pressure.

Indeed, in a region like Southeast Asia, campaigns and programmes carried out by the Regional Secretariat are

reinforced by using the name of GPPAC as a way of showing the worldwide constituency that is behind the activity undertaken, without first soliciting the agreement of the International Steering Group for doing so. That, after all, would take too long. In this way, participants at national or regional levels could be more pro-active in organising activities loosely under the banner of GPPAC. Of course, global and regional decision-making structures of the Partnership should also provide the room to do this, and the risk is that initiatives are undertaken that do not match the overall vision of GPPAC.

It is difficult to find a balance between central steering (at the regional and global levels) to ensure that the vision is adhered to on the one hand, and ensuring flexibility, local relevance and ownership on the other. The GPPAC/WANEP network in West Africa is an example of a network that struggles to find this balance in its relationship to its national networks. The suggestion to separate GPPAC into a flexible movement and a professional organisation, referred to in section 8.2, could help find a solution for this dilemma.

## 9.2 Safe space

All involved agree that within GPPAC's networks there is an atmosphere of safety in which people can express doubts and criticisms and manage uncertainties. Participants are not afraid to speak freely and therefore the network constitutes a safe setting for knowledge exchange. That said, there is one limitation: language. Not everyone involved is fluent in English. At the ISG that presents difficulties for at least one of the Regional Initiators. At the regional level, more people experience difficulties due to language, particularly in the regions where English is the language used in the regional network. The people who are less fluent in the dominant language feel disadvantaged and do not speak as freely as others. This language barrier also represents an obstacle when it comes to the dissemination of information by the International Secretariat. This information is usually in English, and the Regional Secretariats do not have budgets for translation.



### 9.3 Trust

Overall it appears that there is trust among the members of GPPAC. Generally there is confidence that others are in it for the larger good. However, some participants do note competition over funding, particularly at the national level, as a constraining factor for networking, cooperation and sharing. In addition, the lack of transparency with regard to procedures and representation also gives rise to some distrust at the national and regional levels. In some countries, there is even some suspicion of power games, of personal disputes playing too strong a role, and of nepotism on the part of people claiming to represent the network. Nonetheless, the large majority is positive about the level of trust among GPPAC members.

### 9.4 Openness to different perspectives

Within GPPAC there is openness to different points of view, different values, and different interpretations of reality. The network's knowledge exchange function is not hampered by the constraints of a dominant discourse or political project. The Partnership engages in advocacy but its 'common voice' does not prohibit the coexistence of different opinions. Cultural issues are recognised and discussed in the network.

### 9.5 Joint activities

There is almost universal agreement that GPPAC should engage in more regular and concrete activities. More

#### **Activities of the West African GPPAC network (WANEP)**

Over the past few years, WANEP has accomplished the following things. Peacebuilding trainers are committed and available; trainings and exchange meetings are organised; awareness of people of the network's existence is growing, as is the number of organisations involved; and contacts and relationships are established with people outside the network, such as governments and the regional organisation ECOWAS.

concrete joint work at the various levels of the Partnership would increase the value of the network to its participants and thereby contribute to their commitment. Such collaborative projects would also make the network more sustained and continuous. In addition, they would help to show the value and impact of the Partnership to external parties. The kinds of activities wanted differ somewhat across regions, but many people point to the action agendas that were created and make clear that these need to be implemented. Some common priorities for concrete activities that emerge are capacity building and engaging governments and international organisations through campaigns and lobby.

# 10 Governance, legitimacy and organisation of the network

## 10.1 Democratic governance

Formally, the Global Partnership is democratic and inclusive. However, there are some questions about the criteria and procedures for selecting representatives to the International Steering Group (ISG) and, in particular, the Regional Steering Group (RSG), and the ways in which these representatives can be held accountable by other members.

So far representatives have been selected in a rather informal way. The ECCP asked organisations they were already working with to become Regional Initiator. In most regions, these Regional Initiators organised initial meetings with a limited number of organisations from their personal and professional network. Either all present at these meetings became the RSG, or the meetings selected a number of RSG members from amongst themselves. In most cases, these initial meetings also jointly confirmed the position of the Regional Initiators. In some regions, the Regional Steering Group members became National Initiators or Focal Points and were asked to carry the process forward at the national level. In other cases, additional people were approached to become National Focal Points. In several regions, such as West Africa and Latin America, a pre-existing regional network became the regional GPPAC network; these networks kept their existing structures intact.

People involved in these processes make it clear that it was only natural to them that those who had initiated the Partnership would be asked to carry it forward. Indeed, it seems difficult to envision a network starting up in a more democratic way. However, now that the network is moving towards implementation people are starting to ask questions about the legitimacy of procedures and representatives. In particular those who do not have a representative position within GPPAC are increasingly critical. Their criticism also relates to a lack of transparency: to the extent that criteria and procedures do exist for the selection of representatives and for holding them accountable, they are unknown to most members. Particularly at the regional level, it is difficult to know exactly what happens and how representatives

to the regional and international steering groups are selected there.

In recognition of these issues, the International Steering Group is in the process of drafting a GPPAC charter. Unfortunately, this is done with minimal or no input from the regional networks and few people know about it. It is important to make the charter as public as possible to network members. It would be even better if people were able to comment on it. This could be done by placing it online and creating a web-forum attached to it (the existence of which would be made known to as many members as possible). Of course it will not be possible to integrate all concerns and priorities into the charter, and it may even be necessary to take hard decisions that leave out some but that benefit clarity and focus. It would have to be made clear therefore that the forum is a consultative one while the ISG takes the final decisions.

## 10.2 Ownership

The process through which the Global Partnership has been created and developed has been largely top-down. The ECCP took the initiative to respond to the call by the UN Secretary General to organise a civil society network and conference, and began involving its partners in various regions, who in turn mobilised other players. In at least one region (Southeast Asia), a consultative study was done prior to the creation of the regional GPPAC network in order to determine whether there was interest in the region to start such a network. In at least two other regions (West Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean) a pre-existing network joined GPPAC; however, it was unclear how broadly carried this decision has been in those regions. For example, West African national-level network members interviewed were not familiar with GPPAC or the Regional or Global GPPAC Action Agendas.

It has only been three years since the network has begun to develop and in many regions it has not yet expanded much beyond the Regional Steering Group and a small group of other organisations that have some kind of relation with one or more of its members (often mainly in the country in which the Regional Initiator is based).



## 10 Governance, legitimacy and organisation of the network

Community-level organisations and other grassroots actors are not yet involved in most regions.

Consultations that led to the establishment of regional networks, the development of regional and global action agendas, and most recently, the elaboration of regional and global work plans, have been relatively narrow. Many organisations have been involved in some stages of these processes (for example, they have attended one or two conferences), but not in all of them. Others have not been involved at all, even though they would have wanted to be. Often the reasons behind this have been financial: available funds allowed only for a limited number of participants in conferences.

### Ownership in Central and East Africa

In the eyes of NPI-Africa, the Regional Initiator for Central and East Africa, different levels of ownership can be distinguished. For ECCP, GPPAC is its major activity and ownership is therefore high. For NPI-Africa, it is one of many activities, although the sense of ownership is still strong. At the national level, participants often need to be pushed in order to act, although interest usually rises in the run-up to a major event. This is unless GPPAC helps an organisation meet its own objectives, as is the case with network organisations.

All this means that the sense of ownership of the network itself, and of the priorities and strategies it has formulated, remains limited to a relatively narrow circle of people. However, it should be noted that this circle — those who did participate in conferences and planning sessions — tend to be rather positive about the open and participatory nature of these meetings. They feel they were genuinely able to give inputs which were used - although some add that their inputs were limited by language barriers or a sense on their part that they did not have enough knowledge and skills to contribute.

### 10.3 Legitimacy

The concept of legitimacy has various elements. It includes the extent to which external parties consider a

network to be genuinely representing the people and interests it claims to be, as well as the extent to which people and groups within the network consider their own interests to be represented by it. Legitimacy can be intrinsic, in that people value the network's aims, actions, and structures as good *in principle*. But legitimacy can also be affected by the performance of the network: it delivers, so it is accepted and supported. (Diamond et al. 1996, 9-16)

At one level, legitimacy refers to the extent to which decisions made on behalf of the network are carried by all of its members or stakeholders. This relates to the extent to which the selection of representatives of decision making bodies is done in a democratic manner, something that was discussed in section 10.1. More broadly, the legitimacy of a network is influenced by the breadth and depth of the network's membership and the extent to which its members (and the representatives in its decision making bodies) represent a particular constituency. As we have seen in section 7.4, the constituencies of the networks as well as their members are limited in many of GPPAC's regions.

For the regional GPPAC networks, what all this means is that when admitting organisations to the network and/or to its representative structures it is important to make sure that member organisations represent the interests of communities affected by conflict and do not act only for their own organisational survival. More clearly circumscribed and better-known criteria for the admission of members, and for the meaning of membership more generally, may help. Section 11.3 discusses this in more detail.

### 10.4 Power issues

Inequalities, personal rivalries, competition, and power games are omnipresent and they can even be found in peace networks. CSO are not necessarily politically neutral and competition over resources can stifle cooperation. Indeed, issues that GPPAC's regional and national networks have dealt with include accusations of nepotism (West Africa) and networks competing for the status of regional GPPAC network (Caucasus). More

## 10 Governance, legitimacy and organisation of the network

generally, many stakeholders mention competition among CSOs (over funding, projects, contacts) as an important obstacle to cooperation and networking and as creating a potential for conflicts within the networks of the Global Partnership.

As a consequence, it is important for a network to strive to mitigate power issues and to have mechanisms in place that regulate conflict and prevent personal issues from taking the foreground. This is an area that would merit more attention inside GPPAC. Integrity standards, ground rules for engagement, and asking potential members and representatives to adhere to the network's vision could be steps in this direction. Creating internal conflict prevention and transformation mechanisms may be another. A kind of code of conduct for CSOs' engagement and cooperation could be a significant contribution to the field (see also Matveeva and Van de Veen 2005, 9).

Positively, the majority of the stronger members have a genuine desire to contribute to open exchange and facilitate the capacity building of other members. They inevitably influence the network more strongly than weaker members do, but they generally do not impose their own views at the expense of openness and diversity.

### 10.5 The International Steering Group

At the global level the structures appear to be working relatively well, in particular the Executive Committee (ExeCom) in which the discussions are deemed open-minded as well as focused, and which is better able to make decisions than the broader International Steering Group (ISG). In the ISG there is also a good and open atmosphere and the members are capable. However, because of the consensus-based decision making structure as well as possibly the consensus-oriented nature of members, there is a tendency to avoid or postpone difficult decisions which risk entailing disagreement and having to disappoint members. This may have contributed to the lack of focus and clarity about priorities identified by many GPPAC members. The draft charter addresses this issue by introducing procedures for majority voting in some cases.

Another difficulty has been communication between ISG meetings, when the members of the ISG (Regional Initiators/Regional Secretariats) are back in their regions swamped with other work. Most ISG members feel that the International Secretariat is expecting too much in relation to the limited resources available to the Regional Secretariats. Expectations about the time needed to respond to communications differ between the International Secretariat and the ISG members. The International Secretariat sends so much information that it is difficult for ISG members to distinguish between important and less important communications and issues.

In line with what has been discussed in this chapter so far, more transparency and accountability are desirable with regard to the role and responsibilities of the ISG and its members. First of all, criteria and procedures for their selection and the term they serve need to be made explicit and to be agreed across the network. The draft charter begins to outline this process, but it is yet little known outside of the ISG itself.

As for the composition of the ISG, there is general agreement among the membership of GPPAC that the core members should remain the Regional Initiators. There is no uniform view about who else should have voting power or observer status. People feel that international NGOs and other networks should be involved, but are not clear about the way in which this should be given shape. When a particular conflict is on the agenda of the ISG, representatives from the country in question may be invited to meetings. Other resource persons, including politicians and prominent peace-makers, might be invited depending on the issues to be discussed.

However, other forums besides the ISG would perhaps be more appropriate to involve some of the actors suggested for inclusion in the ISG. Resource persons or representatives of other networks should not be part of discussions about practical formalities but talk only about policy and strategy. There could be a broader meeting adjacent to the ISG that would be open to others, and in which not the regular governance of the

network but broader issues and strategies would be discussed. Such a meeting would also be a good place for the participation of (potential) donors; involving them in strategising could help build up longer-term funding relationships.

### 10.6 Facilitation and secretariats

Sustaining networks requires considerable time, effort and resources. A network needs people who are enabled to spend time on the facilitation of the network. The role of the coordinating body is crucial, since all the other dimensions depend on a moderator who assures that the group avoids the many possible pitfalls. A secretariat is important in order to coordinate and organise the flows of knowledge, prevent information overload and scatter, raise funds or coordinate fundraising efforts, and organise and facilitate planning, meetings and events.

On the other hand, a network can also be over-moderated or over-coordinated. A certain looseness and flexibility are at the core of the concept of networking. Thus, if a secretariat plays too large a role in decision-making, rather than facilitating the work of the members, then there may be a problem. Channelling information flows in the right way is also a challenge for a secretariat or coordinator. There is only a narrow space between channelling a discussion smoothly into a constructive direction and pressing people into a straightjacket which would exclude any spontaneous detours, exchanges or personal remarks. Below we will return to this question and see in how far it is a danger for GPPAC's International Secretariat.

People involved in GPPAC consider the following activities to be most important for the International Secretariat:

- Fundraising
- Providing information
- Coordinating between regions
- Capacity building and training

The activities carried out by the International Secretariat, ECCP, extend beyond this list. This is because ECCP is also an organisation in its own right. It

has been the initiator of the GPPAC network. It has a specific expertise with regard to networking, conflict prevention, and lobbying, and it employs about ten full-time staff who are able to work almost full-time on the organisation's role as GPPAC International Secretariat. In addition, ECCP is based in Europe and has relatively good access to many donor agencies and policymakers. All this gives the International Secretariat a considerable advantage over the Regional Secretariats and many of the members of GPPAC.

As a result, ECCP's function is more than that of a 'classical' network secretariat. It plays an important role in knowledge and strategy development and lobbies on behalf of GPPAC at Northern and international forums. This is not necessarily a negative thing. ECCP is able to use the experience and expertise it has gathered to the advantage of the global network. Network members generally do not consider its role to be too dominant. Nevertheless, the special role of ECCP has implications for the ownership and accountability of the network's decision making structures, and it is possible that issues with regard to its role could arise for the future. For these reasons, the network may start to think about clarifying and formalising the role of the secretariat in a transparent way, and discussing the role it should play in the future.

In some years' time GPPAC may grow into a different system in which the ISG will be more of a democratic political decision making body, facilitated by a strong executive secretariat. If ECCP became a more 'classical' secretariat, funded through the network, then global network representatives may also gain a say in the policy of ECCP, for example with regard to who is hired. (In networks with paid membership members have a higher stake in the way things are run at the secretariat.)

The members are generally happy with the way ECCP is carrying out the task of International Secretariat. There appears to be no other organisation within the network which would be capable of doing as good a job. ECCP's staff tend to be relatively inexperienced but they are able to work full-time on GPPAC and are enthusiastic and

## 10 Governance, legitimacy and organisation of the network

hard-working. Nonetheless, ECCP is overburdened because of all the roles it is performing. There are not enough staff members to carry out all the tasks as well as could be. ECCP faces frequent turnovers and a lack of resources. There is too little time to actively support the regions. Relatively a lot of time and resources have been spent on activities at the global level (including the global work plan).

Indeed, support from the International Secretariat to the Regional Secretariats and networks emerges as a priority area. However, it is not so clear exactly what this support might look like. ECCP makes it clear that it would like to learn more from the regions about the kind of support that they need. Certainly, the Regional Secretariats need more funding and ECCP can help both by raising such funds itself and by building the capacity of the regions raise funds. In addition, the regions may need advice and guidance in the running of a network, particularly when it comes to improving information flows and participatory processes.

There have been some discussions about whether the International Secretariat should rotate between regions and organisations in the future. Within the Global Partnership, there is no agreement about this. Arguments in favour are that this would strengthen the democratic nature of the network, increase the ownership felt of the global network in the regions, bring GPPAC closer to regional realities, and make more use of the variety of experiences and expertise available within the network. However, there are some serious risks. The above described special expertise and position of ECCP would no longer be an asset for GPPAC, as transferring knowledge and responsibilities to other organisations would not be possible without losing some of it. Relationships with donors and other partners might be discontinued. The function of lobbying, fundraising and relationship building with internationally influential actors is more easily carried out by an organisation that is positioned in the North.

Two (not mutually exclusive) solutions that would bring together the best of both options would be, first, for some functions (fundraising, lobby) to remain with the

ECCP, while other functions (coordination, research, specific programmes) are transferred to regional secretariats with a specific expertise in a particular area (such as WANEP with regard to early warning and early response). Second, staff exchanges among the International Secretariat and the Regional Secretariats would help strengthen the ties within the network, exchange expertise, and bring the International Secretariat closer to local realities.

In other words, people feel that the staff of ECCP should be internationalised, and the secretariat decentralised to have more of a regional presence. This would also make it easier to support undertakings at the national level, which is important because, as one interviewee said, ‘this is where the network starts’. Combined with the dispersion of secretariat responsibilities to other capable organisations within the network, this would make the network more rooted. In this model there would still be a small staff at the global level, which would focus on fundraising and lobby at the UN.

### 10.7 Regular interaction

Communication and knowledge sharing need to occur on a regular basis, otherwise members of a network do not feel involved and there is no sense of continuity. Also, information provided may already be outdated. Strategies working today may not work in a few months’ time, particularly given the dynamics of conflict situations. This is an area that could be improved within GPPAC. Many people involved complain that they are not kept up to date about what goes on between meetings and are not consulted when decisions have to be made. They are insufficiently aware of the structures and strategies of the network. This is despite the fact that the International Secretariat sends a lot of information to the regions, as was mentioned before.

The bottleneck appears to be at the level of the Regional Secretariats. They do not always forward information to member organisations in the regions and are not forthcoming with information towards the International Secretariat. For some regions, ECCP even has difficulty

## 10 Governance, legitimacy and organisation of the network

to obtain the contact details of the Regional Steering Group members. The Regional Secretariats consider the information they receive from the International Secretariat to be too much and as a result do not always act upon information sent to forward it to members in the region. Regional Secretariat staff often spend time in the field and when they return to the office to find ten or twenty urgent GPPAC e-mails then they do not know where to start.

In addition, the information sent by ECCP is mostly about activities taking place at the global level such as lobby by ECCP at the UN and preparations for ISG meetings. Some Regional Secretariats consider this kind of information to be too far removed from regional and national actors and therefore do not forward it or consult people in the region about it. This is unfortunate, because it should be precisely the role of a network like GPPAC to link up global processes with local realities, for example in the following ways:

- giving a global advocacy platform to local concerns
- having lobbying efforts informed, and the message strengthened, by local priorities and stories
- making sure that decisions made at the global level are carried by actors at regional and national levels

For this, a two-way information flow is needed, but the regions are often not forthcoming with information about developments in their part of the world. This would have to be prioritised more, and possibly better funded. On its part, the International Secretariat could devote more attention to what happens in the regions. At present, much of its attention (and finances, see chapter fourteen below) are directed to activities at the global level. For the network to become truly rooted in the regions, this will have to change.

At the regional level, the quality of information and communication flows varies. In Southeast Asia, members tend to be most positive about the regularity with which they are informed by the Regional Secretariat. The Regional Initiator, the Philippine organisation Initiatives for International Dialogue (IID), regularly forwards information it receives and collects about issues and conflicts in the region to a mailing list

of GPPAC members in Southeast Asia. This is much appreciated. People are inspired by the stories of other countries and organisations and their sense of solidarity has increased. However, the information provided concerns mainly conflict developments and solidarity events in the region, and less information about GPPAC's networking activities.

### 10.8 Structure

This review has identified a need for more ownership and commitment on the part of members. It appears that this would be achieved via two avenues: first, by gearing the network towards more concrete action and implementation, and second, by creating a framework for joint, bottom-up visioning and strategising in order to deal with the current legitimacy deficit. Both of these have implications for the network's structure.

The optimal structure for GPPAC depends on the network's aims, and more specifically, the extent to which it decides to adopt a particular focus. A professional organisation is likely to have a different structure than a loose umbrella or movement. Roughly speaking, two extremes are:

- a 'light foot-print' network, in which there is little steering, a lot of flexibility for initiatives by varying groups of members, and decentralised decision-making. An extreme version of this is the 'fish net model' in which there is no central secretariat and every participant maintains and coordinates relationships within its own immediate environment. This type of network tends to occur in informal societies or contexts that are very threatening. It can only exist if all the members are strongly committed to the objective or subject matter.
- a more formal organisation, in which day-to-day management decisions are taken at Secretariat level and decision-making by the membership is mostly focused on policy and strategic issues. This model is centralised, with a board and a secretariat at the centre, surrounded by circles or levels of members: the 'spider web model'.

(Robert 2006; Van Deventer 2004, 7-8)



## 10 Governance, legitimacy and organisation of the network

	Decentralised network	Structured network
<b>Pros</b>	Ownership of decisions by members Flexibility: participation in activities is elective Lower cost as less is spent on coordination and secretariat	Systematic coordination & consultation Increased capacity building potential Enhanced visibility/strength of network Clearer lines of accountability
<b>Cons</b>	Small and less 'noisy' members not heard Agenda of individual organisations may take over the network Rights and responsibilities of members may be unclear	Expense of running a secretariat Frustrations linked to more complex procedures Need to select a location: risk of regional bias

SOURCE: ROBERT 2006, 4

The advantages and disadvantages of either approach are summarised in the table above.

It seems that GPPAC is moving towards the second model: a structured, professional network. Based on the responses of people consulted for the review this also seems to be what most of the members would prefer. This is understandable considering that it would be difficult to imagine a pure 'fish net model' yielding effective action and results, as the degree of organisation would be too low for any coordinated action. Without a central decision making body and secretariat, it would be difficult to envision a process of joint strategising and reaching all of the members would be a challenge. The common goal may become jeopardised as all sorts of activities are done under the banner of GPPAC. By contrast, the 'spider web model' enables coordination and the creation of common agendas - something that can be important from a lobby and advocacy perspective. A centrally coordinated network makes it possible to prove to external parties that a large number of organisations are behind a particular programme.

That said, some thought may be given to a structure that combines the positive elements of the fish net model with those of the spider web model against the background of the two aims that were identified at the beginning of this paragraph: gearing the network towards more concrete action and creating a framework for bottom-up strategising. From the perspective of taking decisive action, effective central coordination is clearly important. This perspective requires decision-making structures and internal conflict management

procedures that make it possible for the network to take difficult decisions.

At the same time, the need for broader consultation and joint visioning and strategising that includes the people actually working in the midst of conflict means that these structures need to be opened up. Too centralised a structure would not meet this particular need and would not lead to wider ownership of the Partnership. It is important for the regional and global networks to work actively to involve a broader group of people in decision-making and strategising. This may mean that the documents that have been developed so far would be revisited based on the realities of others as they become involved. However, trying to develop all-encompassing agendas that meet the priorities of every participant would go too far; a balance needs to be found in this regard. Section 11.2 will expand on this issue.

Some degree of flexibility may be needed in order to meet the interests of the various members. A model that makes it possible for participants to join in activities that they find useful but stay out of others, and to take initiatives and organise in sub-groups around particular issues or activities, may bring the network closer to local realities. Some activities are simply more relevant to some regions than they are to others. Such flexibility could help increase participants' commitment as their participation in network activities is based on a conscious choice. It would also ensure that less motivated members, or participants that give too little priority to the network, do not slow down activities too much: work could still continue with temporarily limited participation on the part of one or more members.

Most members agree that in order to become more rooted and concrete the network should focus on the development of networks at the country level. Much of the work needed is after all at that level, for example with regard to lobbying governments or developing school curricula. The development of GPPAC processes at the national level could start in a few countries that are very large or face many conflicts, for example, Indonesia and India. Once GPPAC becomes organised at the national level, national representatives from different regions could also come together in varying coalitions to discuss a particular issue in which their countries are involved.

### **Organisation at the national level: National Focal Points in Central and East Africa**

The national focal points (NFPs) function quite well, although they need more support. The structure works particularly well if an NFP is itself a national network that is easily able to mobilise people for GPPAC. These national networks should be enabled to work on GPPAC as an integral part of their own activities and for their activities to become an integral part of GPPAC. In this way GPPAC would not be an additional activity for them. It is important that GPPAC brings added value to the NFPs. Some see a need to create a national steering group just like the one at the regional level. This could help strengthen ownership from the grassroots.

### **Organisation at the national level: WANEP's national networks**

Organisation at the national level is the most developed in West Africa. Other regions may learn from WANEP's experience with the creation of national networks. It is important that these have national ownership and are created by national organisations coming together rather than being established top-down. Nevertheless the creation and support of national networks requires a lot of time and guidance on the part of the regional secretariat. National level-members in West Africa emphasise that the existing national networks need to get more support. In particular there is a need to improve the information flow; build more capacity; and to create enabling environment for national and regional levels to meet, learn and share, and undertake joint initiatives. WANEP is now creating a fulltime position of a coordinator for network development who will support the national networks.



# 11 Coverage and inclusiveness of the network

## 11.1 Coverage

GPPAC has grown organically and as a result is not spread completely equally over the regions and countries of the world. Some regions are much larger (and/or conflict-prone) than others, but all have the same representation and support. That said, a completely equal spread would never be entirely possible. Indeed, most people consulted for the review consider the coverage of the global and regional GPPAC network (i.e. its spread over the globe; the countries and regions that are part of it) to be quite good as it is.

Nonetheless there are important countries that are not represented, including Israel, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, North Korea, Taiwan, Southern and Eastern Europe, and Turkey. These regions are important from the perspective of global conflict and peace. They need to be brought in as far as possible (in the case of North Korea, no real civil society exists so it would be difficult to include it in the network). In the cases of Israel and Taiwan, this may mean that representatives of the global GPPAC have to confront regional networks that are keeping some players out. In practical terms, expansion to the regions mentioned could be achieved by inviting organisations in these countries to become a part of the network, by identifying a strongly established organisation as initiator, and by helping to set up national networks. It is also important to increase information on GPPAC, also by using the media.

There are also members who caution against too much expansion. They feel that the Global Partnership should first get its own house in order and become geared for decisive and concrete action and implementation. To them, further expansion is not the highest priority. Becoming more effective will in time make GPPAC better known and attract participation from other areas.

Even within well-represented countries and regions important players are still left out of the network, as the interim review of July 2005 pointed out:

‘In Latin America, for instance, interviewees [...] expressed a view that well-known and respected

organisations were not included in the process and raised doubt regarding the capacity of those that were represented. The same refers to the Caucasus and partly to the Western CIS. The India-led network appeared quite academic, while more activist organisations and networks from Sri Lanka were not on board. Some UNDP representatives from [...] Country Offices noted that they [...] recommended their local partners to be invited to the UN conference, but their participation was declined by GPPAC. This made them raise more doubts about the quality of organisations represented [...].’ (Matveeva and Van de Veen 2005, 6)

Indeed, a number of Regional Initiators admit that there are important organisations in their region that are not yet on board. In some cases these organisations have not been invited, while in others, they did not see a value in the process and declined to get involved. It has also occurred that people wanting to join did not get a response from the Regional Secretariats. The International Steering Group and International Secretariat cannot really see how often this happens. There is no reporting mechanism about membership. Competition (shown most clearly in the Caucasus where two networks compete) and personal relations are issues that play a role in these processes. Particular problems regarding organisations that want to join exist in Africa, where there are quite a few ‘fake’ NGOs.

It is difficult to find out in how far organisations from different backgrounds are represented in the regional networks. For example, the networks in South Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean are relatively academic in nature; it is not so clear to what extent also more grassroots organisations are represented. Sorting these issues out ought to get a high priority. After all, how can the Steering Group and secretariat speak in the name of a network without knowing who the members of the network really are?

## 11.2 Balance between inclusiveness and focus

The right balance has to be found between inclusiveness and diversity on the one hand, and focus and direction

on the other. This goes for content as well as membership. Many people involved in GPPAC fear that with too broad an aim it will be difficult to continue to rally people around the network and its activities. Experience has shown that networks tend to function well when they come together around a specific, concrete issue. Examples include the Campaign to Ban Landmines and the Campaign against Small Arms and Light Weapons. By contrast, GPPAC is huge, has a wide aim, and consists of organisations with a variety of specialisations and objectives. This makes it quite a task to come up with workable plans. Even the functions that have now been agreed on are still very broad.

As a result, many people feel the network should try to focus on a smaller number of achievable aims. This would make it more effective as its goals would be obtainable and its members committed. It would make the network more concrete (something which nearly all the people consulted for the GPPAC review would like to see) and enable it to make a visible impact. This would lead to more motivation and commitment of members. Finding a focus area would also help GPPAC to find a 'niche' and create a GPPAC 'brand'. This also goes for the message that the Partnership aims to send in its lobby and advocacy efforts; indeed, the 2005 mid-term review stated that 'the messages GPPAC sends should become more focussed, clear and tackle more tangible issues' (Matveeva and Van de Veen 2005, 4).

However, achieving such focus would not be an easy matter in the case of GPPAC because it would entail some very hard choices. There would be disagreements on priorities, and some would lose out. Some members may even have to be left out because they are too far removed from the central aims of the network, as is discussed in the next section. A choice is to be made here. Does GPPAC want to become more focused, like many members ask, or is its strength precisely in its size and coverage, broadness, and general message? Should it perhaps do the opposite: stay broad and general and leave the specifics to the regions or even countries? In other words, should it provide a kind of general umbrella for all sorts of specific initiatives to emerge? If GPPAC does decide to become more focused, that does

not necessarily mean that the same focus is chosen for every region. Different regions may have different priorities.

### 11.3 Membership

As mentioned, getting an updated overview - and creating a database - of the current membership is a priority for GPPAC's International and Regional Secretariats. After this has been done, the network can make more conscious decisions with regard to expansion strategies in the various regions. However, it is not clear exactly what membership of GPPAC entails. It is not necessarily a bad thing to leave this open for different kinds of members and contributions; however, to the extent that this is the preferred solution it has not been a conscious decision. A 'Statement of Commitment' has been devised, but it is not very clear about what network membership requires of an organisation. To what extent does joining the network commit an organisation to information-sharing, action, or advocacy, for example? Clearly, the discussion about criteria and procedures for membership is not finished. Particularly at the national level, people may be interested but it is as of yet unclear exactly what they would join and what membership would entail.

#### Membership in Central Asia

There is no defined number of GPPAC members in Central Asia. Quite a number of people participated in national and regional conferences (most of which also included high level government people), but not all of these consider themselves part of GPPAC or are even clear about what the network entails. The General Assembly of the grassroots Dolira Mira network in the Ferghana Valley voted to become part of GPPAC after the Regional Initiator gave a presentation about it - but this presentation is the only experience the Dolina Mira members have with GPPAC so far. Some interviewees made it clear that the lack of a formalised membership (like in the Dolira Mira network, where members sign an agreement and pay a fee) is not necessarily a bad thing, and that GPPAC should remain more loose and open.

## 11 Coverage and inclusiveness of the network

The network may also think more explicitly about the optimal balance between a diverse membership and a focused one. If only people with a similar background participate in a network, opinions may not differ sufficiently to generate creative ideas. Moreover, if only a small fraction of the potential constituency participates, people will turn to other fora where these people do meet. On the other hand, by asking too many people with different backgrounds to join, cooperation and interaction could also falter. The reasons are that chances increase that people see a lack of focus and the added value of the network is not so clear; individual contributions are beyond the interest of the majority of members; people hesitate to engage themselves because they do not see a common denominator which brings participants together; and there may be an information overload - unless the information is skilfully channelled into different subgroups and discussion threads.

Right now many organisations involved in GPPAC do not work on conflict prevention and peacebuilding as such, but are active in related fields such as human rights, democratisation, or development. As without progress in those fields, peace cannot become a reality, it makes sense to cooperate with these organisations. But should they be part of the network? An alternative could be for a more focused Global Partnership to cooperate with other networks which bring together organisations from other fields.

Another issue, also discussed in section 7.1, is that not all members have the capacity to meaningfully

### **Membership in Southeast Asia**

Membership is based implicitly on the expectation that everyone sticks to the guiding principles of GPPAC. There is no formal agreement. This is in accordance with Asian ways of doing things, although it can sometimes also lead to problems. The challenge for the regional secretariat is to find the balance between mobilising local traditions and introducing non-Asian ways of doing things that can also be helpful.

contribute to the network. In addition, some may be in it for the wrong reasons. Although building the capacity of weak CSOs should be part of the mission of GPPAC, it should not allow itself to be slowed or watered down by low-capacity members.

Reflecting these issues, the draft GPPAC Charter states that '[a]spiring members of the Regional Networks must demonstrate their commitment to the Global and Regional Action Agendas; credentials in the area of peacebuilding and conflict prevention; and capacity to contribute to regional and global agendas.' However, more thought may be given to how this is done. How can one demonstrate commitment to an Agenda, show credentials in the area of peacebuilding, and what will be the minimum capacity that organisations will have to have? Who is going to apply these criteria? Who is deciding about the acceptance of aspiring members?

# 12 Content of the network: knowledge sharing

## 12.1 Stimulating framework

The literature on knowledge networking emphasises that a knowledge network should not strive to build an overall, comprehensive knowledge system, but instead aim to offer a stimulating framework that facilitates exchange and access to knowledge sources. This has implications for GPPAC's approach to knowledge sharing. Rather than trying to jointly determine what items should be on the network's knowledge sharing agenda, the network may want first to give thought to the conceptualisation of knowledge sharing as such: for what purpose do we want to exchange knowledge? What end products does this imply, if any? Are the purposes the same in each region? And how can we create a framework conducive for knowledge sharing within the Global Partnership?

The approach towards knowledge sharing that has been decided upon by GPPAC's knowledge generation and sharing task force, and later by the ISG, does not contradict this approach. The approach is to use one topic as a 'pilot' for knowledge sharing and use it to develop a structure for knowledge sharing and collaborative learning. The topic selected is peace education (see section 12.3). A peace education reference group has been set up and a series of conferences and meetings planned. The aim is for this process to lead to the establishment of a knowledge generation and sharing framework that could be used for other topics as well.

It is considered important by members of GPPAC that such a framework for knowledge sharing pays particular attention gathering and mobilising the knowledge that is available at the regional, national, and particularly, the local level. There is a Northern bias with regard to the types of knowledge that are recognised and used by actors worldwide. Local communities and organisations often have unique experiences and mechanisms for dealing with conflict, but they have difficulty in making this known to others. Promoting (action) research, reflection and documentation skills among the membership would make sense from that perspective. In addition, a knowledge sharing framework should be

based on a broad and participatory needs-assessment among members. Depending on what comes out of this, such a framework might for example include

- regional databases of members and their activities and a global database which links the regional databases together
- web forums
- one or more websites
- regional clearing houses which give regional actors the possibility to document their experiences and collect inspiring stories and lessons learned<sup>17</sup>
- a schedule of meetings (such as the series of conferences now planned on peace education)
- training opportunities in the regions for action learning and documentation<sup>18</sup>

Under this umbrella, groups of members could then set up their own knowledge sharing communities. These groups may adopt various aims and methodologies<sup>19</sup> for their exchange.

## 12.2 Tacit and explicit knowledge

A distinction that is often made in the literature on knowledge and knowledge sharing is between explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge. Explicit knowledge can be processed in a way that makes it accessible to others and tacit knowledge cannot, or less easily. Explicit knowledge can be codified or written down. It can consist of anything from the formal procedure for application to an EU fund to the way a copy machine works. Because it can be recorded, it can be passed onto others who can add it to their own body of knowledge. The challenges concerning explicit knowledge relate to codification and recording processes (how can I process this knowledge in such a way that it is of the most use to others?) as well as dissemination (how can I ensure that this knowledge reach the people who might need it?).

<sup>17</sup> This suggestion is taken from the Global Work Plan, which also plans for a liaison person to be hired in each of the regions. If such liaison persons can indeed be funded, the collection of stories will be one of their tasks.

<sup>18</sup> The programme Applied Conflict Transformation Studies (ACTS) is an interesting example. See <http://www.globalacts.org/>.

<sup>19</sup> Such as collaborative learning: see [http://www.cdainc.com/cdas\\_approach.php](http://www.cdainc.com/cdas_approach.php).

## 12 Content of the network: knowledge sharing

The two facets are interrelated: to be able to reach the intended recipient, the knowledge has to be recorded in such a way as to make it attractive and accessible to this recipient.

The term ‘tacit knowledge’ is less straightforward and has been used with different meanings. It usually refers to knowledge based on a person’s unique experience: knowing how to do something. According to some, it can be shared through communication. It may be possible to codify or write down part of it, for example in a manual or report. But there are also components of tacit knowledge that cannot be exchanged in written form. It may be possible to transfer such knowledge through face-to-face interaction such as training. As an example one might think of learning how to ride a bike. Although it might be possible to write down some principles, it is only through direct interaction that the skill can be taught.

There are also types of tacit knowledge that cannot be shared at all because they are too closely related to their possessor’s unique set of experiences and perspectives. Another category of tacit knowledge could in theory be shared, but the knower does not realise that he has it at all, or if he does, he does not recognise it as a valuable commodity for others because it seems natural to him. Thus, a recent book about the transfer of ‘internal knowledge and best practice’ has been entitled *If Only We Knew What We Know* (O’Dell et al., 1998). If a person doesn’t realise that (s)he possesses valuable knowledge, the only way for it to come to the surface is through interaction with people who might need it. This makes clear the importance of face-to-face interaction for knowledge exchange.

Knowledge sharing is more valuable when in addition to explicit knowledge (e.g., manuals, research reports), tacit knowledge (e.g., a person’s or organisation’s experience) is also exchanged. Thus, a good knowledge sharing network brings people into contact with each other who can share experiences, but it also attempts to draw experiences together into codified knowledge that can be distributed more easily and widely. Since explicit knowledge can be disseminated electronically and tacit

knowledge is better exchanged face-to-face, a combination of ‘live’ and online interaction is the best way to achieve this.

GPPAC could do more in the area of electronic knowledge sharing. Some of the information that now is sent in the form of emails, but which, as has been discussed above, floods the Regional Secretariats and is usually not forwarded by them, may be better placed on a website. This would decrease the number of links in the chain of communication. It would also enable people to access the information at a time that is good for them and select the items that are of interest to them. Of course, it would also risk that people do not respond to important requests, and more urgent information would probably still have to be sent via email. Creating regional GPPAC websites would help increase transparency and provide more information to members than they receive at present. It would be good if such websites were open to messages and information being contributed by all members, although some level of moderation would probably be needed.

At the same time, face-to-face meetings remain important in order to access and mobilise the tacit knowledge that only comes out during direct interaction. It is the kind of knowledge that people do not even realise they possess and that comes out in brainstorming or during a chat over coffee. ‘Live’ interaction is also necessary to build the relationships that keep online communication going afterwards. Finally, meetings enable members who do not have regular internet access to gain from the network as well. The meetings that have been organised in the framework of GPPAC have generally been considered useful; however, they are irregular. Members would like to see more meetings and better communication and follow-up in between meetings. Importantly, the series of conferences scheduled on peace education are intended to build on each other to prevent organising one-off events. The intention is to start a chain of conferences in different regions, in which the outcomes from one conference are carried over to the next.



### 12.3 Content balance

The need to find a balance between focus and inclusiveness also goes for the content of knowledge sharing within a network. If the field of discussion is too narrow, it will not stimulate a broad enough flow of information and interaction may be less creative, since creative ideas often result from the combination of hitherto uncombined elements. In addition, a too narrow field would only attract the ‘usual suspects’ who already know each other fairly well; little cross-fertilization would take place. If the field is too broad (‘Conditions for peace on earth’), however, then the interaction remains too vague, and it becomes very difficult to arrive at common products which bind the group together.

Fortunately for GPPAC, its members identify a relatively clearly circumscribed list of issues around which they would like to exchange knowledge and experiences. The main priorities for knowledge sharing in the network are the following:

- Conflict prevention and peacebuilding knowledge (research results, theoretical knowledge, lessons learned) and methods (tools, experiences, skills) in general.
- Specialised issues and methods, such as peace education, human rights, and early warning and early response.
- Experiences in the field.
- Information about GPPAC: goals, action plans, developments - including follow up to UN activities. Members are not kept sufficiently up to date on developments in the network.
- Activities undertaken by other members - it is important to know what others are doing because this could lead an organisation to identify opportunities for cooperation or to be inspired by activities taking place in other regions.
- Lobbying and advocacy methods, in order for members and national and regional networks to become more effective in this area.
- The role of civil society: in some regions, there is a lot of unclarity and disagreement over the role civil society in general, and a network such as GPPAC,

should play. For example, how political should it be, and how should it relate to governments?

- Networking methodologies and lessons, in order to more effectively develop and operate networks at the various levels.
- Capacity building methods, so people within the network can support each other’s skills training and organisational development for more effective operation.

At the same time, and as can be expected, there are also some differences between the priorities of regions and organisations with regard to knowledge to be shared. These are differences in both the knowledge demand and supply. Some of the regional networks possess expertise of a particular issue (such as the West African network does with regard to early warning and early response), which they could share with other regions that need it.

As mentioned in section 12.1, it has been decided by the ISG to focus knowledge sharing initially on the issue of peace education and conflict resolution in schools. It was the issue most ‘alive’ among organisations, and indeed, many respondents in the framework of the review mention it. Moreover, peace education activities

#### **Bottom-up peace education initiatives: Southeast Asia**

A large conflict resolution education conference is being organised in the Balkans that will bring together civil society and ministries of education. Similar initiatives are undertaken in several other regions. In Southeast Asia, the Centre for Peace Education at Miriam College in Quezon City, Philippines is taking the lead on the theme. The aim is to have three or more trainers per country who would receive training in the Philippines, and to make this group a Southeast Asian peace education network. GPPAC Regional Steering group members would identify the participants in their countries. This would make GPPAC more alive and concrete. At present the Centre for Peace Education is looking for funds. The target is to have the first training in 2007.

## 12 Content of the network: knowledge sharing

are mentioned in eleven out of the fifteen Regional Work Plans. In addition, as the below text box shows, initiatives in this field already exist in at least one of the regions.

The idea is to use the experiences with knowledge sharing around peace education at a later stage when other issues are adopted. However, some (including several, but not all, staff of the International Secretariat) are disappointed with the choice. Conflict resolution education is rather long-term oriented and little operational. They would have preferred it if

- More attention would be paid to urgent and concrete issues: what do we do about Lebanon?
- Knowledge sharing would also focus on concrete activities taking place in the network, sharing stories for inspiration - and legitimation of the network. The stories database on [www.peoplebuildingpeace.org/stories](http://www.peoplebuildingpeace.org/stories) has this ambition, however, and a member of GPPAC's knowledge sharing task force points out that the focus on peace education has not removed the concurrent aim to expand this database.
- More generally, the wealth of knowledge inside the network would be better mobilised.
- Knowledge sharing with outside actors had also been prioritised. For example, a Secretariat staff member points out that although about half the members of GPPAC are also members of IANSA, little knowledge is shared with that network. That said, the group working on peace education has linked up with both the International Network for Conflict Resolution in Schools and Peace Education (INCREPE) and the Hague Appeal for Peace Global Campaign on Peace Education. Both of these networks have representatives in the peace education reference group.
- More thought would be given to conceptualising knowledge sharing and thinking about the best way to approach it. The GPPAC knowledge sharing task force is working on this through the peace education pilot, but many involved appear to be unaware of this.

This leads to the conclusion that it may be better to allow knowledge sharing priorities to differ according to

the region and type of organisation, and that the Global Partnership could be more flexible in allowing for different groups and coalitions operating simultaneously without deeming it necessary to get the entire network involved. Flexible and open discussion groups could be created which operate through a combination of online interaction and meetings at various levels. This would make it possible to exchange around more specific issues, since topics no longer have to be broad enough to be relevant to the entire global network. Such focused exchanges may be more relevant to participants, who could go more in-depth in their discussion of experiences and lessons learned.

Reflecting this conclusion, GPPAC's International Steering Group has set up task forces on specific issues. However, representation in them does not really penetrate the regions (the task forces are composed only of ISG members and in some cases outside experts) and most of them have not set concrete objectives, making it unclear what participants may expect to gain from the exchange.

### 12.4 Outcomes of knowledge sharing

An interviewee in Central Asia remarked that 'knowledge exchange meetings can be a waste of time. Often boring meetings are held in which everyone just sums up what they have been doing, without a clear aim for something to come out of the meeting. A meeting needs to have a clear thematic focus, and clear objectives.' Participants may be more willing to invest in knowledge sharing if it generates common products. These could be joint publications containing lessons learned or recommendations, joint projects or programmes, the organisation of an event, a broadening of a discussion group around a particular topic, or the start of a new one in a different field or region. As was mentioned above, with regard to GPPAC's pilot theme, peace education, the intention is indeed to go beyond knowledge sharing alone: a chain of conferences building on each other and the development of a system for collaborative learning are outcomes aimed for.

ECCP has compiled two *People Building Peace* books in which stories of civil society peacebuilding efforts



are documented, as well as a number of region-specific books. The first *People Building Peace* book was developed before the Global Partnership came into existence, while the second was compiled making use of the global network to gather stories. According to ECCP, the second *People Building Peace* book has become much richer in terms of the range of experiences and the quality of stories it contains, and this is due to the Global Partnership providing access to people and their stories around the world. Thus, in this sense, the publication of *People Building Peace II* represents a very real and concrete outcome of the GPPAC network.

Indeed, the book, which was distributed at the global GPPAC conference in July 2005, is considered useful by the network members, particularly for inspiration: the stories of others bring the moral support of knowing that others all over the world are working for the same goal. Recognising that translation is an issue and dissemination of the book a challenge - it is relatively heavy to send or carry - the book has been translated into French and Spanish and placed on CD-rom. In addition to the book, however, there are many more stories to tell. Stories such as those documented in *People Building Peace II* could not only help and inspire other members but are also an important external resource: they provide practical examples for peace and conflict studies students, and in that sense can also be made of financial benefit by selling publications to an academic public. In addition, the collection of field stories helps the lobby, advocacy and fundraising efforts of GPPAC by providing concrete examples of what happens inside the network and of the positive roles that civil society organisations can play.

ECCP would like to collect stories from the field and best practices on a more regular basis for the purposes mentioned above. Its staff regularly ask the Regional Secretariats to collect stories from their region, making use of National Focal Points and others within the regional networks. However, the International Secretariat finds it difficult to get people to submit stories. This may be because people are not sure exactly what is expected of them. It may also be due to other pressing issues getting priority. Supplying stories to a

far-away institution without much certainty about what will happen to them is not first on most people's to-do list.

This difficulty may be reduced by making it clearer what will be the use of the materials provided; by involving people in the collection and editing process; and as much as possible by involving them also in the dissemination of the resulting products. Regional publications could be done by regional actors rather than by the International Secretariat itself. Indeed, regional *People Building Peace* books are planned for Latin America and the Caribbean and Southeast Asia.

An even more potent tool than books, a website that documents stories is more accessible to people inside and outside of the network than a book and can be alive and constantly changing and growing. The website [www.peoplebuildingpeace.org/thestories](http://www.peoplebuildingpeace.org/thestories) is a good tool for this and should be expanded upon. Drawing more attention to this website would give potential story contributors an example and would have great publicity value. Of course, funds would be needed to create, maintain, moderate, and update such a website. Using *wiki*-software could be a cheap alternative, as this would make the entire GPPAC membership base the joint editor of the website (see [www.wikipedia.org](http://www.wikipedia.org) for an example of this).

Other products may be created around specific issues and based on the needs of members. Such products could for example be tailored lessons learned booklets, bibliographies, online, low-graphic discussion forums, and importantly, (online) directories of people and organisations working on specific issues in order to facilitate the exchange of tacit knowledge.

### 12.5 Language and translation

Language barriers limit the extent to which information from and about GPPAC can penetrate the regions. Most of the available information is in English, but a lot of people do not speak this language. This leads, first, to entire regional networks feeling starved of information. Some regional networks do use a language other than

## 12 Content of the network: knowledge sharing

English for their regional activities, such as Russian or Spanish. As a result, exchanges within these regions do not face significant language barriers, but it is the interaction with the global level that presents difficulties in both directions.

Second, language barriers lead to inequalities *within* regional networks, where some countries are English-speaking and others are not. In West Africa, for example, the Francophone participants in the network

feel like they are getting less out of it than their Anglophone colleagues. Third, there are regions where English is the language used as a *lingua franca* by the regional network, but many people in the region do not speak it well, limiting participation to those who do. Southeast Asia is an example of this. In order to meet all of these challenges, funding translation activities (particularly by the Regional Secretariats) deserves priority.

# 13 Context of the network

## 13.1 Embeddedness

The extent to which participants consider the GPPAC network to be sufficiently linked to its social and political context in their region, differs per region. In some regions good relations have been established with governments, while in other regions this is more difficult (see section 13.3 below). Within regions, it also depends on the country: on the willingness of governments to cooperate as well as on the skills of the National Focal Point. Many people also state that GPPAC is not yet sufficiently linked to its context because it is still in an early phase. The regional networks should maintain more regular contacts with members at the national level in order to keep up to date with events happening in the countries. More fundamentally, the issue of the limited constituencies of some members and representatives (see section 10.3) rears its head again in this context, leading one survey respondent to write that ‘GPPAC is personality-centred rather than socially or politically oriented’.

### Relating to the context in a region: the network in Western Europe

In the Western European GPPAC network, which consists mostly of organisations working on conflicts outside of Europe, some feel that not enough attention has been given to conflicts within members’ own societies. Partly this is explained by the lack of funding available for activities within the developed world. Nonetheless, it made the network vulnerable to critique: how can you speak about conflicts elsewhere if you ignore what is happening at home?

Having said all of this, the Global Partnership certainly does not exist in isolation of reality. After all, current issues are the *raison d’être* of GPPAC. In the consultations that took place at the regional level, the context played a prominent role. In addition, most regional GPPAC networks work to involve policymakers from governments and regional and international organisations as regularly as possible and to build relations with them as part of a broad perception of lobby and advocacy. For example, the West African

GPPAC network, WANEP, has established a liaison office at the headquarters of the West African inter-governmental organisation ECOWAS. In another part of the world, the Southeast Asian GPPAC network has made lobbying with the regional organisation ASEAN a priority issue. Added to this, the constituency-issue mentioned above certainly does not apply equally to all members, and in many places the members provide links to various constituencies, including chieftaincy, religious leaders, youth, women, human rights organisations, and the media.

### Engagement with governments: examples from Central and East Africa

The Central and East African GPPAC regional consultation conference in 2004 drafted a recommendations document for the heads of state conference on the Great Lakes Region that was held at the same time, and presented the document there. Some recommendations were adopted.

A Kenyan assistant minister who attended the New York conference is now actively in favour of peacebuilding, even taking the initiative to reconcile the opposing cabinet members during the recent political crisis in Kenya.

In various countries of the region people have used the action agendas to advocate and lobby towards governments.

From the perspective of early warning for early prevention, a lot is still to be done in terms of building the kinds of relationships that lead policymakers to respond to early warning by civil society. As one respondent formulated it, ‘we have to develop the capacity to prevent rather than react, and that means reading the signs of the times, being closely in touch with issues of power and structural violence, and always looking for new and effective means to pre-empt and prevent violence.’

Another area in which more embeddedness is desirable is GPPAC’s link to the grassroots in conflict regions. As

## 13 Context of the network

has been mentioned before in this paper, the network is insufficiently rooted at the base. In this context members also mention that GPPAC could lend more benefit and inspiration from local customs and practices in the regions.

### **Relating to the International Financial Institutions (IFIs)**

According to a Tajik NGO, GPPAC should involve the international financial institutions (IMF, World Bank, Asian Development Bank) because they have a huge leverage over the Tajik government, which is heavily indebted. The IFIs push for reform, and use CSO information in order to form their opinions. By supplying information (such as an alternative audit report on the situation in the country) and by engaging more directly with the IFIs, we can use the leverage they have over the government to achieve the right reforms.

Finally, at the global level it is difficult to be linked to the social and political context. Issues are often considered too region-specific to be addressed at the global level. But many regional issues do need to be addressed at Western or global forums. For example the European Union (EU) plays a role in the Middle East, and therefore GPPAC globally could lobby the EU, or facilitate that Middle Eastern members do so. GPPAC's global bodies could also write reports about regions to be supplied to policymakers at the UN, EU, or donor governments. As of yet the network is not playing this role - in part because the regions provide little inputs.

### **13.2 Links with other networks**

In order to prevent duplication and maximise joint impact, networks may establish links with other networks. If it does not do so, insights generated in similar networks may not be taken into account, resources will not be pooled, results cannot be compared, and ideas will remain less widespread. Depending on the focus of other networks, cooperation may be structural or be organised around specific issues or events. Networks working in the same field, whether

at the national, regional, or global level, could be brought into GPPAC or linked to it so as to increase its coverage. However, the issues mentioned in this paper regarding focus and inclusiveness should be kept in mind, and if it looks as if another network might water down the focus of GPPAC a different form of cooperation may be preferred.

In line with this, GPPAC's approach towards other networks appears to be open and flexible, assessing possibilities for cooperation at the appropriate level and on a case-by-case basis. However, many more connections can still be established, and people within the network are aware of that. The International Secretariat (ECCP) in particular notes that GPPAC could make more strategic alliances with other networks and actors - also those operating in different but related fields like human rights and development cooperation. The big Dutch (and other) development NGOs have a lot of partners in the field, many of whom are part of GPPAC, but there is no cooperation between them and ECCP.

### **13.3 Enabling context**

An enabling context can help networks to function. This has several aspects. If the political context in a region tends towards repressing civil society, then civil society organising and networking may be seen as a threat by governments. In Central Asia, for example, CSOs tend to stay out of activities relating to conflict because this is seen as too political and therefore as risking government opposition. Instead, many organisations prefer to carry out 'technical' socio-economic projects, in the hope that by doing so they may slowly win the confidence of governments and build relations with them. Via that avenue they hope to be able to subtly influence government policy regarding conflict at a later stage.

Conflict itself may also inhibit networking. CSOs are not necessarily neutral organisations and they may well be more or less closely affiliated to one of the warring parties, making it difficult for them to cooperate with organisations on the other side of the divide. GPPAC's

Middle East and North Africa network consists of Arab organisations whose opposition to allowing Israeli CSOs to join has led to the exclusion of the latter. Among Israeli peace organisations there is considerable bitterness about this: how can such an important conflict region<sup>20</sup> have such unbalanced representation in a network working for peace?

Bad infrastructure can be another obstacle presented by a network's context. For example, many of the recommendations done in this paper to improve knowledge sharing and communication would be useless for many national-level members in West Africa, which have limited access to internet and electricity and cannot move around easily due to bad roads and a lack

of available cars. Although the network should probably not allow itself to be slowed down by this, finding creative ways to involve these members may still be important, particularly if GPPAC wants to become more rooted at the grassroots. A dual strategy of capacity building (helping members find ways of increasing their access to the internet, for example) and creating alternatives (face-to-face meetings at grassroots level) could be a way to go. GPPAC could also try to find out how other networks deal with these constraints.

---

<sup>20</sup> Important in that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a high-profile one and has an impact on conflicts in other parts of the world as well.

# 14 Funding of the network

## 14.1 Funding structure

As we have seen in this paper, a lack of funds is a major challenge for GPPAC. Particularly the work in the regions is severely hampered by it. There is a lack of commitment among donors to support GPPAC for the longer term. Short-term grants are extremely time-consuming for the Regional and International Secretariats because they require constant proposal writing and reporting. In May 2005, GPPAC received funds from fourteen governments and eight non-governmental donors, all requiring different accountability procedures.

### Spending funds in the region: Central and East Africa

The biggest portion of the Regional Initiator (NPI-Africa)'s funding for the GPPAC process has come from ECCP; in addition it raised some funds on its own. Most of the money was spent on communication and administration, the organisation of meetings, and transport and accommodation for participants. In addition, two national focal points, which faced a small gap in their budget, were supported financially by NPI-Africa. The other focal points were able to incorporate the programme into their own structures. It would have been ideal to give some seed money to all the focal points, but there were not enough funds. But importantly the money made it possible for all focal points to attend meetings.

Below, a number of characteristics of a good network funding structure are discussed with regard to GPPAC.

- *There is sufficient funding for networking activities, even if the direct impact of these cannot always be shown.*

This is obviously an issue for GPPAC. The International Secretariat estimates that it will be very difficult to get the global and regional work plans funded and fears that activities may have to be scrapped. Donors are difficult to persuade to give the longer-term institutional support that is needed. In addition, Regional Secretariats and

coordinators at the national level admit that they have not given sufficient priority to raising funds for GPPAC. This has several reasons:

- difficulty of finding funds for networking in a donor climate that emphasises 'direct-impact' activities
- lack of clarity on focus and strategy (already discussed in several places in this paper)
- in some regions (e.g. Central Asia), lack of clarity about the potential role of a civil society network more generally - this relates to the discussion on activism described in section 8.2
- fatigue and loss of momentum after the global conference in New York in July 2005

In addition to working to solve these issues, a number of other recommendations are made to increase the success of fundraising.

- Working on a clear set of priorities and strategies, which can be used for fundraising
- Prioritising fundraising at all levels
- Integrating GPPAC into the work plans (and funding structures) of organisations that are part of the network
- GPPAC should show results in order to get funds
- GPPAC should pay attention to establishing a 'brand'. People Building Peace seems to be a good catchphrase for this. The network may also look for political or celebrity leaders to create momentum and gain support. The production of a peace song by a famous band is another suggestion made. In a similar vein, GPPAC could appropriate International Peace Day (September 21st) as a platform for awareness raising and other activities.
- GPPAC should work on its message to potential donors. This message could be that conflict prevention is not a luxury, as global security is in everyone's interest. For this message to be effective, potential donors also need to be convinced that civil society is able to make a real contribution to the prevention of armed conflict. '[S]ympathetic donors [...] need ammunition and arguments against hard-liners in their own governments who insist that NGOs achieve nothing and conflict prevention should be better done by security structures [...]' (Matveeva and Van de Veen 2005, 8). A better, and shared,



understanding within the network of the concept and role of civil society would therefore improve the message.

- *The network is accountable financially.*

GPPAC is accountable to its donors, but less so towards its members. Procedures for fundraising within the network are vague. People in the regions do not have a clear picture of funds raised and spent under the banner of GPPAC. There are no procedures for what a member or group of members should do if it wants to be eligible for funding within the framework of GPPAC. A simple explanation for that last point is that there is hardly any money available for anything except a few fixed activities of the Regional Secretariat.

- *Donors do not impose particular approaches or activities.*

Donors do not appear to be significantly involved in the content of the network, although they do to some extent set the larger framework for discussions and determine what activities the members carry out — and thereby influence the range of issues that are discussed.<sup>21</sup> Donor organisations tend to have specific lists of activities that they are willing to fund and it is up to the network applying for a grant to fit its activities into these priorities. In that sense, GPPAC's work is certainly influenced by its donors, which to a large extent determine how funds are spent. This is the case especially with project funding.

The International Secretariat of GPPAC presently hopes to move away from project funding by various donors towards broader investments into the strengthening of the network. A strategy is being implemented to try and build longer-term relationships with potential donors, also around content. This would not only help feed knowledge from GPPAC into policy formulation processes, but also help the Global Partnership to build a sustainable financial base and move away from project funding. A joint strategy seminar with the participation of potential donor agencies is planned in October 2006. If successful, such joint strategising would also improve

coordination among donors and prevent that the International Secretariat spends many staff hours on extensive proposal writing and accounting towards a large number of different donors, as has been the case so far.

- *The funding structure does not provide a position of power to one organisation at the funding interface, but ensures that the funds benefit the network as a whole.*

Global issues are everyone's concern and therefore they have received a lot of attention and funds. The balance between the financing of global activities (the International Secretariat, fundraising, lobby and advocacy in the 'North', and the organisation of International Steering Group meetings) and regional activities is about fifty-fifty. However, the fifteen regions are assumed to be the foundation of GPPAC, and should get a larger piece of the pie, as the International Secretariat itself notes. A devolution of responsibilities from the centre to the regions, as discussed in section 10.6, may accompany such a change.

No clear division of labour and distribution of funds have been agreed upon so far. In practice ECCP has raised most of the funds. The aim is for the regions to become entirely responsible for raising their own funds. ECCP would make contacts and pass them on to the regions, which would agree on funding and report directly to the donors.

Most of the people involved in GPPAC consider fundraising to be the responsibility of all who have a formal position in the network: the International Steering Group, the International Secretariat, the Regional Secretariats, the Regional Steering Groups, and the National Focal Points. Given its capacity, its position in the global 'North', and the time it is able to spend on the Partnership, members expect the International

<sup>21</sup> For a more extensive discussion of donor dependency and discourse, the reader is referred to other articles by this author (may be requested via [w.m.verkoren@uva.nl](mailto:w.m.verkoren@uva.nl)).



## 14 Funding of the network

Secretariat (ECCP) to play a particularly central role in fundraising. Depending on the activities to be financed and the potential donor, the various levels of the network could raise funds in a complementary way.

- *The funding structure does not enhance competition between members.*

Because there is not much money available for activities in the framework of GPPAC in the regions, there are not yet any procedures for members or groups of members to apply for funding under GPPAC. As a result, there has not been competition over GPPAC funding. If more funds become available in the future, thought should be given to making sure that the way in which funds are distributed enhances cooperation rather than competition among members.

- *Donors engage in knowledge exchange with the network, thus contributing to the knowledge processes inside it and linking it up to other networks. Donors take the knowledge generated in the network seriously and make use of it in their policy formulation as much as possible. This will increase the relevance of the network and give participants an incentive to continue contributing to it.*

The above-mentioned strategy to develop longer-term policy and funding relationships with donors fits well with these requirements. If successful, it will promote cooperation around content and help feed knowledge from the network into policy formulation processes by governments and other donor organisations, and vice versa.

# 15 Monitoring and evaluation

As we have seen, GPPAC's stakeholders agree that it is time the network starts to prove its relevance and make an actual contribution to armed conflict prevention.

Good M&E procedures are indispensable in this regard: otherwise how can we know if GPPAC has made a contribution? M&E is not only a tool for reporting to donors, but also a method to facilitate organisational learning and knowledge exchange. It helps to test assumptions, learn from activities, and feed these lessons back into activities in a cyclical learning process. M&E can support the following activities:

- *knowledge generation and sharing* (good ways to monitor and assess what the network is doing will generate lessons learned and contribute to the development of theory and methods)
- *lobby and advocacy* (by better knowing what the results of the Partnership are, these can be used to persuade policymakers of the relevance and importance of its approach)
- *more effective action* (good M&E makes it possible to see how effective a programme is and how it may be improved - although in order to make such improvements, a network also needs to be open-minded and flexible enough to question its assumptions and change its way of working - in other words, it needs to have a learning capacity)
- *accountability* (by showing what happens with resources and energy invested—internally, towards members, and externally, towards donors)
- *legitimacy* (working M&E procedures lead to increased transparency and accountability, which contribute to internal and external legitimacy of a network and its structures)

A lot has been said and written about M&E methods for networking and for peacebuilding and conflict prevention. It is beyond the scope of the current paper to cover this discussion. Instead, this chapter will limit itself to portraying the views of the network members with regard to, first, the aims and purposes of M&E for GPPAC, and, second, some initial recommendations for what characteristics an M&E framework might have.

Although in the survey and interviews held there was only limited space to make recommendations for the

further development of an M&E system (and one respondent suggested to make another questionnaire in order to gather more ideas in this area), a number of suggestions were still made. All agreed that the lack of a mechanism for M&E is a shortcoming of GPPAC and that there is a need for a mechanism to capture the impact of the process. The aims of M&E for the Global Partnership might be the following according to the participants.

- To assess the performance of the network and determine whether its programmes are achieving their objectives. To track and improve implementation and progress, making sure that all programmes adopted by GPPAC are effectively implemented and avoiding problems during the implementation of the programmes. To establish criteria, benchmarks or standards to improve the networking system, so that we can see whether we are making progress. To improve effectiveness.
- To assess the impact of the network (for example, to find out how much policy has been informed and influenced by GPPAC, and to assess the level of awareness and skills in conflict prevention and transformation at various levels as a result of GPPAC initiatives).
- To draw lessons and to apply them in future activities.
- To identify the needs of members and their beneficiaries.
- Transparency in management
- Publishing outcomes and results of GPPAC.
- To contribute to the development of theory and the improvement of mechanisms for conflict prevention.
- To keep defining, and relating to, strategic goals.
- To improve M&E skills within the network.
- Accountability and transparency in the use of funds raised.
- To assess the relevance of the network to its members.
- To understand the real picture of the capacity of the networks and their members, and to know on what level they are. (What makes a network strong?)

Different planning, monitoring, evaluation and learning systems are in use by the various partners in GPPAC. Creating an alternative system for all to adopt in replacement of existing procedures is not necessarily the

## 15 Monitoring and evaluation

way to go. Indeed, one survey respondent wrote that ‘instead of looking to a certain model, we should see how the different models in use could be connected.’ This might include agreeing on some kind of ‘minimum standard’. A Regional Initiator interviewed similarly stated that ‘the regions have systems of M&E in place that seem to work for them; these should not be replaced, but GPPAC globally could find the common elements of these systems and build on those.’

Some Regional Secretariats indicate that it would be a good start if the International Secretariat develops a uniform reporting format for the regions to feed into. The procedures for reporting should not be too time intensive but should bring out the impact the network has had. Thus, Regional Secretariats should submit brief regular reports in a predetermined format that shows how impact can be demonstrated. At least in the first stage this system would then be used in addition to those of Regional Secretariats and others within GPPAC. At a later point, a better integration of parallel systems could be attempted.

There are some good practices in the regions that GPPAC might learn from. For example, the Regional Secretariat for Central and East Africa, NPI-Africa, has been involved in a project that aims to develop suitable indicators to measure the impact of peacebuilding work. Together with the National Council of Churches of Kenya Community Peace Building and Development Project (NCCCK-CPBD project), NPI-Africa developed a *Community-based Monitoring and Evaluation System* in 2001 that includes both quantitative ‘output’ indicators and qualitative ‘impact’ indicators that require a longer narrative.

Thinking about what should characterise an M&E system for GPPAC, various suggestions are made. Most importantly, an M&E system for GPPAC should:

- start by setting realistic, attainable, meaningful objectives that are directly related to the prevention of violent conflict;
- involve all the members to ensure ownership and a collaborative learning process;

- be an ongoing internal monitoring system complemented by regular external evaluations;
- be clear about the responsibility of the various network levels in monitoring; and
- pay attention to building a strong capacity for M&E at all levels

Concrete recommendations include

- creating an M&E desk in each of the regional secretariats or at least having a fulltime staff member at the regional coordinator’s office who monitors and analyses the implementation of the network’s strategies and documents deviations and success stories;
- making sure that the Regional Secretariat spends 25% of its time on planning, monitoring and analysis;
- establishing an autonomous M&E unit that reports directly to the general membership; and
- asking a university or research institute to take up the task of M&E.

Obviously, all of this would require additional funding.

The International Secretariat favours adopting the Outcome Mapping method, at least at the global level where it could complement the various systems in place at other levels. Outcome Mapping is seen to be especially appropriate for networks because relationships and behaviours are central to it. The Secretariat introduced this method at a recent International Steering Group meeting and hoped to immediately apply it to joint planning during this meeting. However, this went a little too fast for the ISG members, who had not been sufficiently consulted about this method and had various questions about it. In the end, Outcome Mapping was only partially used in the planning process.

One ISG member felt that some thinking steps had been skipped: ‘first, we should think about what exactly we want to assess: the network itself or its results?’ The same member emphasised that M&E for GPPAC should be implemented in stages: ‘at present there are not many activities to monitor. As GPPAC starts implementing, then it will take a few years before the first impact can

be seen. M&E should start from the impact and then look at the systems and mechanisms that made it possible.’

Whatever the approach adopted and the timeframe chosen to develop a system, it is likely to include the development of indicators for success. Indeed, respondents note a need for the Regional and

International Steering Groups to jointly develop qualitative and quantitative indicators. Wider consultation with other stakeholders in the region should be a part of this. Indicators may differ among the regions depending on the specific aims and activities and the measure of impact considered possible in a given context.

# 16 Conclusions and recommendations

Five areas emerge out of the review as particularly important: first, the links and relationships between the various levels of the Global Partnership; second, increasing the relevance of and support for the network; third, structure and governance; fourth, communication and information; and finally, building capacities for networking and conflict prevention. Below, each of the issues is elaborated, and recommendations are provided. As will become clear, the five issues are interrelated, and the recommendations intertwine.

## 16.1 Global, regional, national: the relationships between the levels of the Global Partnership

Considerable achievements have been made at the global level, most notably the 2005 conference in New York and ECCP's lobby activities on behalf of the network, in particular those at the UN. At the regional level, the record varies. The regional networks remain relatively narrow and insufficiently rooted to realities and actors on the ground in conflict areas. The regions receive little time and resources from the International Secretariat in relation to the attention it pays to its global-level activities. Moreover, those global activities are not linked as much as would be desirable to what happens in the Partnership's regions - considering that a major added value of GPPAC lies in its potential ability to link people and activities from the local to the global. Making such links would have the following effects:

- giving a global advocacy platform to local concerns - something that is mentioned by most GPPAC members as something they hope to get out of the network
- having lobbying efforts informed, and the message strengthened, by local priorities and stories
- making sure that decisions made at the global level are carried by actors at regional and national levels

In order to achieve better linkages, strengthening the regional networks emerges as a priority for GPPAC. The International Secretariat may learn more from the Regional Secretariats about exactly the kind of support that they need. One certainty is that the Regional Secretariats need more funding and ECCP can help both by raising such funds itself and by building the capacity

of the regions to raise funds. In addition, the regions may need advice and guidance in the running of a network, particularly when it comes to improving information flows and participatory processes. More concretely, it is important to strengthen Regional Secretariats' institutions as well as their staff member's time, skills and capacities for coordination and fundraising. The current work plans aim to establish a fulltime GPPAC liaison person in each of the regional offices; if this can be funded, it will indeed be a step in the right direction. In order for the Regional Secretariats to begin strengthening the network in their region, gaining a better insight in who the members in the regions are ought to get a high priority.

In addition, in order to become more rooted and concrete the network needs to focus on the development of networks at the country level. Since it is not realistic to expect that national networks will be developed in each country in the short term, the development of GPPAC processes at the national level could start in a few countries that are very large or face many conflicts, such as Indonesia and India. Once GPPAC becomes organised at the national level, national representatives from different regions could also come together in varying coalitions to discuss a particular issue in which their countries are involved.

To facilitate these regional and national processes, the International Secretariat could itself become more rooted in the network. Suggestions go in the direction of internationalising ECCP staff and decentralising the functions of the secretariat to have more of a regional presence. This may entail dispersion of secretariat responsibilities to other capable organisations within the network. In this model there would still be a small staff at the global level, which would focus on fundraising and lobby at the UN.

## 16.2 Increasing relevance and support

Two conclusions emerge very clearly from the review. GPPAC needs to make sure, first, that its priorities and objectives are shared by all involved, and second, that these objectives are sufficiently focused, practical, and

attainable. Without a widely agreed purpose and focus, it is difficult to decide on anything else, as all other decisions should follow from it. What is GPPAC's 'niche'? For example, does the network aim to build coalitions and structures for peace in the long term, or to respond to current issues, or both?

Focus may be needed not only in terms of GPPAC's programming but also with regard to its membership. Although inclusiveness is an important value, members will not contribute to the network if they do not have a 'commitment to the Global and Regional Action Agendas; credentials in the area of peacebuilding and conflict prevention; and capacity to contribute to regional and global agendas', in the words of the draft charter.

More clearly circumscribed but widely carried objectives and strategies would make the network more relevant and help it move away from the image of 'talk but no action'. People within the network are asking to make it more practical. A big step has been taken in that direction through the development of concrete work programmes. However, that process has been relatively narrow and many people within the network feel left out. In addition, the plans remain broad and are not everywhere feasible. It remains to be seen how their implementation will go. A lot depends of the support of members and donors. In addition, for concrete implementation the network's national level may have to be more developed.

However, arriving at concrete, attainable, and widely carried objectives and plans is important in order to ensure that tangible outcomes are reached, something that would motivate members, draw in important players that are presently hesitant to join, and commit donors. The challenge, then, is to find ways to facilitate a broadly carried process of visioning and strategising that would make the network more rooted and relevant to the realities on the ground, while at the same time not allowing itself to be slowed down by this and moving towards the concrete action that the members of GPPAC so desire. In the sections below - particularly sections 16.3 on structure and section 16.4 on communication - some pointers are given for addressing that challenge.

Before doing so, an additional way to build support for GPPAC and to commit those who can help make plans a reality is mentioned, namely, to involve potential donors in the process of strategising. This is already starting to be done at present. Other ways in which support may be gathered is by working on the network's message. Some concrete suggestions for this are:

- Pay attention to establishing a 'brand'. People Building Peace seems to be a good catchphrase for this. The network may also look for political or celebrity leaders to create momentum and gain support. It may ask a famous band to produce a peace song. International Peace Day may become a platform for awareness raising and other activities around the world.<sup>22</sup>
- The message to potential donors and the larger public should be that conflict prevention is not a luxury, as global security is in everyone's interest.
- Potential supporters need to be convinced that civil society is able to make a real contribution to the prevention of armed conflict. A better, and shared, understanding within the network of the concept and role of civil society would therefore improve the message.

### 16.3 Governance and structure

This report does not provide clear and unequivocal recommendations for the exact structure to be developed. This is because decisions on structure need to follow from agreement about the purpose and focus of the network. Nevertheless, a few general guidelines can be formulated regarding a good network structure for GPPAC. First of all, we are not starting from scratch. A network structure already exists. One clear priority that emerges from the review is to make this structure more widely known among the membership. Suggestions made in this regard include developing a pocket guide on GPPAC that includes frequently asked questions, and drawing an 'organogram' to be placed online.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Not all members feel comfortable with this type of strategies. Some say: we should build credibility and this will lead to visibility.



## 16 Conclusions and recommendations

Well-organised institutions and clearly circumscribed representative structures are important for a network's legitimacy and its ability to take decisive action. The members of GPPAC identify a need to improve democratic governance, transparency and ownership of the network. Indeed, such clear structures should be a priority, as should strengthening the coordinators and secretariats at the various levels. At the same time, the network should not be so centralised that people passively look towards the centre for action. A degree of flexibility and looseness is at the very essence of networking. A network is more relevant to individual members if it provides them with a framework within which they may organise and find solutions to concrete problems than if it establishes overall joint processes and issues that it thinks ought to be relevant to all involved.

A model that makes it possible for participants to join in activities that they find useful but stay out of others, and to take initiatives and organise in sub-groups around particular issues or activities, may bring the network closer to local realities. Some activities are simply more relevant to some regions than they are to others. Such flexibility could help increase participants' commitment as their participation in network activities is based on a conscious choice. It would also ensure that less motivated members, or participants that give too little priority to the network, do not slow down activities too much: work could still continue with temporarily limited participation on the part of one or more members.

A framework that can allow and support such flexibility would provide members with information, communication tools, and contacts. It may also entail programmes to build the capacity of members and member networks. There may be some network-wide activities, such as the collection of stories and best practices for the benefit of lobby, advocacy and awareness raising activities at the global level. In addition to this, however, there should be room for different and varying regional- and national-level activities as well as cross-regional ones. As the interim review of 2005 suggested, some of these activities may be carried out by task-oriented working groups which

would unite individuals and organisations already engaged with a thematic issue. Such groups may link up electronically and meet as necessary. In this way, a network as a community of practice can generate issue-based responses. The ISG has already set up some thematic working groups but these consist only of ISG members and do not have any concrete objectives.

A charter, in which the main vision and overall aims of the network are elaborated and which outlines the criteria and procedures for representation and decision-making, may also be part of the framework. The current draft charter appears to be rather suitable for this; however, it is very little known or carried by the broader membership of the network. In order to increase the ownership and legitimacy of the structure of the network, a bottom-up visioning process around the charter may be organised. This could be done largely online. At the same time, this process should not stop the Partnership from starting concrete activities at the same time. Indeed, it is important that the network simply starts doing things, large and small, global, regional, and national, in order to prove its relevance and added value. As discussed, a guideline for these activities could be for GPPAC to provide an overarching framework while giving space for varying initiatives.

The importance of an ISG consisting mainly of representatives of the regional networks is affirmed by the review. Others, such as international NGOs and networks, donor agencies, and some national representatives may also play a role in the policy formulation of the network. However, such people should not be part of discussions about practical formalities but talk only about policy and strategy. There could be a broader meeting adjacent to the ISG that would be open to others, and in which not the regular governance of the network but broader issues and strategies would be discussed.

It is important for a network to strive to mitigate power issues and to have mechanisms in place that regulate

<sup>23</sup> These suggestions were made on 11 October 2006 during the GPPAC networking seminar.



conflict and prevent personal issues from taking the foreground. This is an area that would merit more attention inside GPPAC. Integrity standards, ground rules for engagement, and asking potential members and representatives to adhere to the network's vision could be steps in this direction. Creating internal conflict prevention and -transformation mechanisms may be another. These may also help the network to become more decisive and make it easier to make difficult choices that not all may agree with. More broadly, a code of conduct for CSOs' engagement and cooperation could be a significant contribution to the field.

In sum, while the structure should provide for some joint activities, such as global-level lobby land gathering and exchanging stories, it should also leave considerable space for initiatives and exchanges of varying groups of members. Indeed, beyond leaving space for such initiatives, a good network structure provides a stimulating framework for them. Such a framework may include the availability of information, communication tools, and directories of organisations and contact details. Section 16.4 will expand on these issues. A framework conducive for networking probably also includes activities to develop the capacity of networks and members; see section 16.5. In addition, the framework should be such that members are able to influence it (internal democracy) and include methods to regulate conflicts.

#### 16.4 Information and communication

There is a need to improve communication and information flows about what is happening with GPPAC. The communication bottleneck appears to be at the level of the Regional Secretariats, which do not have the time and resources to process all the information they receive from ECCP, forward relevant information to the regional networks, and elicit inputs and information from the regional networks to be linked to activities at the global level. Strengthening the Regional Secretariats' capacity and resources to be communication hubs is therefore an important priority. This includes, vitally, the funding of translation activities.

At the same time, attention may be given to creating alternative communication tools that do not depend on the Regional Secretariats. This would prevent Regional Secretariats abusing or protecting their position by including only their own relations in a region. In addition, the creation of more accessible forums for information exchange is important from the perspective - outlined above - of providing a framework for flexible organisation and exchange by varying groups of members.

Such decentralisation of information flows may also be applied to the process of collecting stories and best practices, which at present is hampered by ECCP's inability to get members to contribute. Regional publications may be done by regional actors rather than by the International Secretariat. In addition, [www.peoplebuildingpeace.org/stories](http://www.peoplebuildingpeace.org/stories), the website that has been set up to document stories from the field, is a very good initiative. It is more accessible to people inside and outside of the network than a book, gives potential contributors an example, and has great publicity value. It is therefore important to expand this website and make it more widely known. Of course, funds are needed to create, maintain, moderate, and update the website. Using *wiki*-software could be a cheap alternative, as this would make the entire GPPAC membership base the joint editor of the website.

Rather than trying to jointly determine what items should be on the network's knowledge sharing agenda, the network may want first to give thought to the conceptualisation of knowledge sharing as such: for what purpose do we want to exchange knowledge? What end products does this imply, if any? Are the purposes the same in each region? And how can we create a framework conducive to knowledge sharing within the Global Partnership? From this perspective, developing a knowledge sharing framework based on a participatory needs-assessment among members would be the first priority. It is hoped that the current initiative around the pilot theme of peace education - the organisation of a chain of conferences with the aim to develop a collaborative learning structure that could be used for other themes as well - takes such a bottom-up view into

## 16 Conclusions and recommendations

account. The framework that results from this might for example include web forums, websites, and regional clearing houses. In addition, good and updated directories of members are indispensable in order to enable people to get in touch with each other directly. For that purpose, an online structure may be created in which people can themselves submit and update information about their contact details and activities.

Under this umbrella, groups of members could then set up their own knowledge sharing communities, setting varying aims and using varying methods for their exchange.

### 16.5 Building networking and conflict prevention capacity

An ECCP staff member remarked that ‘GPPAC advocates a bigger role for civil society, but NGOs can’t always deliver due to low capacity’. This important dilemma points to two conclusions. First, GPPAC needs to recognise this issue and pay attention to it by conducting research on the capacities and needs of civil society organisations in the various regions. To reiterate the passage from the 2005 mid-term review quoted in chapter seven of this paper, ‘[a] sober analysis of strengths and weaknesses may be a more effective advocacy tool than an uncritical belief’ (Matveeva and Van de Veen 2005, 9).

Thus, GPPAC and its regional networks need to more explicitly address issues of inequality and differences in capacity within regions and find the best ways to deal with these. They may set up standards, develop plans of action to meet these, and monitor progress. M&E and learning will be helpful in this regard. Indeed, as was argued, in chapter fifteen, M&E is not an extra activity but it is integral to the aims of GPPAC. In the introduction it was written that ‘at least in theory, networks’ structures can facilitate constant learning from success and failure’. This cannot be done without monitoring. M&E of GPPAC could build on the various procedures that are already in place and learn from the good practices that are available in the regions.

In addition to paying attention to the monitoring and learning of the network itself, GPPAC should promote M&E and broader action learning skills (researching the needs of constituencies, studying the results of programmes, relating activities back to aims, questioning underlying assumptions and theories, and comparing experiences and outcomes with the theories and practices of others) among the membership as part of capacity building. This would enable local organisations to learn and document their experiences more explicitly and thereby contribute to knowledge sharing in a more equitable way. In addition, organisations that have functioning learning and monitoring mechanisms in place are better able to make information gained through training and exchange locally relevant and to apply it in their work.

This leads us to the second, and more obvious, conclusion with regard to CSOs’ capacity: capacity building is a major area for GPPAC to focus on. This is also emphasised by nearly all of the people consulted for the review. It would be a remarkable achievement if GPPAC could make it possible that training programmes become more widely offered, particularly at the regional and national levels where the content of trainings could be more sensitive to regional and local circumstances, knowledge, methods, and traditions.

Members mentioned various training needs, not only in the area of conflict prevention, but also in the realm of practical organisational skills such as documentation, proposal writing, fundraising, ICT, staff development, and M&E. Not all of these skills need face-to-face training to be transferred. Fairly good websites exist on many of these subjects. GPPAC may begin creating a toolkit on its website, consisting of brief introductory texts on each of these topics, followed by links to existing websites. This could be done in cooperation with universities<sup>24</sup>. Other items for which such manuals may be created include reflection and action learning, and organising capacity building activities for grassroots organisations that do not have access to

<sup>24</sup> Such as the Universiteit van Amsterdam. It could be part of a course for students.

internet. Such a toolkit would also give members an additional reason to visit the GPPAC website. The new rubric could be posted online in stages, for example one topic a week, and members could receive email alerts

once a new item is available. This would help address the complaint that 'regular' members receive too little information from GPPAC.

# Some overall concluding remarks

Part I and Part II of this paper are relatively separate parts. Some may be more interested in the overview of general networking theories and lessons learned in Part I, while others have a particular interest in the case study of GPPAC. However, the GPPAC study also builds on and deepens the networking lessons of Part I. Many of the factors influencing the success of networking put forward in chapter three are illustrated by the practical experiences of the Global Partnership and its regional networks.

For example, the need to find a balance between focus on the one hand and inclusiveness and diversity on the other is seen very clearly in GPPAC. Beyond that, the GPPAC case shows the difficulty of finding such a balance, of taking clear decisions of direction in a

network whose value is that it brings together many different kinds of people and organisations.

The GPPAC case study shows one value that networks may bring, that does not come forward so clearly in the literature on networking: a sense of solidarity, of moral support, of knowing that there are others struggling with the same issues. Being part of one and the same global movement can not only yield practical results (such as increased visibility of one's organisation and issues, access to global forums, and the exchange of information and lessons learned) but may also boost one's morale. Holding on to such a feeling as a network develops and practical governance issues abound is a challenge for all networks.

# Issues for further research

A comparative study of other networks would be a valuable addition to the study presented in this paper, even though the literature used is based in part, if not largely, on experiences with networks, and lessons learned from other networks have been taken into account to some extent. Nonetheless, it would be valuable to more explicitly and extensively relate the lessons and experiences of other networks to the findings presented in this paper and see which of the issues described present the most challenges to other networks, and why. Other questions that such a comparative approach may address include: What

balance have other networks found, for example, in the focus vs. diversity/inclusiveness discussion? What is the range of solutions available with regard to network structures? What are best practices?

In addition, additional study on the capacities and roles of civil society in the various regions of GPPAC would be beneficial in order to establish a baseline for capacity building and to be better able to develop strategies and objectives that are realistic with a view to what CSOs are able to accomplish.

# Annex 1: Literature used

## *GPPAC documents*

Adjusted Budget Networking for Peace Programme 2005

Annan, Kofi, Endorsement letter of GPPAC dated 8 August 2005

Annual Plan 2005 Networking for Peace Programme

Annual Plan 2006 Networking for Peace Programme

Bartlett, Amy, 2005, 'Working group report on civil society networks' (report of working group during global GPPAC conference in July 2005)

Budget Networking for Peace Programme 2006

Contract between ECCP and Nairobi Peace Initiative - Africa

*Civil society networks for prevention and peacebuilding.* Input paper for working group on civil society networks during global GPPAC conference in July 2005

Draft GPPAC Charter prepared for ISG meeting in Nairobi from 27-31 March 2006

Draft GPPAC Global Work Plan for ISG meeting in Nairobi from 27-31 March, 2006

Draft GPPAC Regional Work Plans for ISG meeting in Nairobi from 27-31 March, 2006

*Dublin Action agenda on the prevention of armed conflict*

ECCP discussion paper: *the Future of the Global Partnership*

ECCP application to the Dutch government programme Thematische Medefinanciering (TMF)

ECCP Annual Report 2002

ECCP Annual Report 2003

E-mail in which President of the General Assembly invites an ECCP representative to his civil society task force

Explanatory Notes to the Annual Plan 2006

Flyer 'People Building Peace', based on Global Action Agenda

Goncalves Marreto, Raphael, 2006, 'GPPAC Case Study Research: Strengthening the Network in Latin America and the Caribbean region'. Draft, 28<sup>th</sup> August 2006.

GPPAC Central Asia network, 2005, 'Civic Society for Partnership in Peacebuilding and Conflicts Prevention in CENTRAL ASIA. Materials of Central Asian Conference, May 26-27, 2005, Kyrgyzstan'.

GPPAC East and Central Africa network, 2005, '10 Recommendations to the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region'

GPPAC newsletters

GPPAC Reader: UN, Regional Organisations and Civil Society Organisations

GPPAC Regional Action Agenda Reader

Information sheet on International Network for Conflict Prevention and Peace Education

Information about Second Annual Conference on Conflict Resolution Education to be held in Ohio in Sept-Oct 2005

International Development Research Centre, Preliminary Evaluation Report of the program 'The Role of Civil Society in the Prevention of Armed and/or Violent Conflict in Latin America and the Caribbean' of the *Coordinadora Regional de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales* (CRIES). October 2006.

- List of GPPAC donors, 31 May 2005
- Matveeva, Anna and Hans van de Veen, 2005, 'Mid term review of the 'Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict'.
- MD+5 Summit: Input from the Group of Friends on Conflict Prevention*
- Meijer, Guus, 2005, Report of Attendance of the Global Conference in New York
- Networking for Peace programme - report January - June 2005
- New York Global Conference Programme
- People Building Peace: A Global Action Agenda for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (final version pre-conference)
- Preventing Armed Conflict: Responses to the Secretary-General's Report, *In Larger Freedom*, and recommendations for the High-Level Plenary Meeting, 29 April 2005
- Report of GPPAC International Steering Group meeting 2-5 October 2005
- Robert, Pierre, 'Monitoring and evaluation, network assessment and structure. Note on GPPAC for ECCP.' 18 February 2006.
- Statement of commitment to GPPAC, to be signed by organisations
- Tjønneland, Elling N. and Ingrid Samset, 2005, 'Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflicts: Assessment and Reflections'. Chr. Michelsen Institute report commissioned by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Verkoren, Willemijn, 2006, 'Central Asia case study for the network strengthening review of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC)'. Draft, 17 August 2006.
- Verkoren, Willemijn, 2006, 'Central and East Africa case study for the network strengthening review of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC)'. Draft, 28 August 2006.
- Verkoren, Willemijn, 2006, 'Networks and networking in the field of peacebuilding. Literature study for GPPAC network strengthening review'. Final version, 2 May 2006.
- Verkoren, Willemijn, 2006, 'Southeast Asia case study for the network strengthening review of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC)'. Draft, 24 August 2006.
- Verkoren, Willemijn, 2006, 'TMF Evaluation for the peacebuilding theme: ECCP report'. Final version, 6 January 2006.
- Verkoren, Willemijn, 2006, 'West Africa case study for the network strengthening review of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC)'. Draft, 29 August 2006.
- Williams, Sue, 2003, 'Thoughts On Networks In Conflict Prevention'. Paper written for GPPAC.



## Annex 1: Literature used

### Other literature

- Åhäll, Linda, 2006, 'The Power of Networks. An Overview of Material on Networks and Networking from an CSO Perspective', unpublished paper, European Centre for Conflict Prevention.
- Ballantyne, Peter, 2001, Investing in Knowledge: Managing and Exchanging Research and Policy Knowledge in Africa through ICTs, paper prepared for IICD workshop in Dakar, Senegal in April 2001.
- Barakat, Sultan, Margaret Chard and Richard Jones, forthcoming, 'Attributing Value: Evaluating Success and Failure in Post-war Reconstruction, to be published in *Third World Quarterly* 26 (5).
- Baud, Isa, 2002, 'North-South Partnerships in Development Research: an Institutional Approach.' *International Journal of Technology Management and Sustainable Development* 1 (3), December.
- Benner, Thorsten, Wolfgang H. Reinicke and Jan Martin Witte, 2004, 'Multisectoral Networks in Global Governance: Towards a Pluralistic System of Accountability', in *Government and Opposition*.
- Boonstra, J.J., 'Introduction', in Ibidem (ed.), 2004, *Dynamics of organizational change and learning*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Brock, Karen, Andrea Cornwall and John Gaventa, 2001, 'Power, knowledge and political spaces in the framing of poverty policy', Institute of Development Studies Working Paper 143.
- Britton, Bruce, 2005, 'Organisational Learning in CSOs: Creating the Motive, Means and Opportunity', INTRAC Praxis Paper No. 3.
- Bush, Kenneth, 2003, *Hands-on PCIA: A Handbook for Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment*. Federation of Canadian Municipalities.
- Clarke, Sarah and Lyn Squire, 2005, 'Creating the Global Development Network: an exercise in institutional theory and practice' in Diane Stone and Simon Maxwell (eds.), *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Creech, Hester, 2001, 'Measuring while you manage: planning, monitoring and evaluating knowledge networks', Winnipeg: International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD).
- Deventer, Fulco van, 2004, 'Understanding Networks', Issue paper, Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict.
- Diamond, Larry, Juan J. Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset, 1995, 'Introduction: What Makes for Democracy?', in Ibidem (eds.), *Politics in Developing Countries. Comparing Experiences with Democracy*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Earl, Sarah, Fred Carden and Terry Smutylo, 2001, *Outcome Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs*, IDRC, <http://web.idrc.ca/evaluation>.
- Edwards, Michael and David Hulme, 1996, 'Too Close for Comfort? The Impact of Official Aid on Non-Governmental Organisations', *World Development*.
- Ferguson, James, 1994, *The Anti-Politics Machine: 'Development', Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fischer, Martina and Oliver Wils, 2005, 'Ploughing Through the Field: An Introduction to the PCIA Handbook Debate' in *Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment: Critical Views on Theory and Practice*. Berghof Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management.

- Francis, Diana, 2004, *Action Learning*, paper prepared for Applied Conflict Transformation Studies curriculum development.
- Galama, Anneke and Paul van Tongeren, 2002, *Towards Better Peacebuilding Practice. On Lessons Learned, Evaluation Practices and Aid & Conflict*. Utrecht: European Centre for Conflict Prevention.
- Grasdorff, Eric Van, 2005, *Africa Renaissance and Discourse Ownership in the Information Age. The Internet as a Factor of Domination and Liberation*. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Guijt, Irene and Woodhill, Jim, with Julio A. Berdegue and Irene Visser, 2002, 'Learning through E-networks and Related M&E Issues', paper jointly commissioned by Grupo Chorlavi and FIDAMERICA.
- Hajer, Maarten, 1995, *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: ecological modernization and the policy process*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hardy, Cynthia and Nelson Phillips, 2002, 'Discourse and Power', in D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Oswick, N. Phillips, and L. Putnam (eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Discourse*. London: Sage.
- Hilhorst, Dorothea, 2003, *The Real World of CSOs: Discourses, diversity and development*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Hivos Knowledge Sharing Strategy*, Dec. 2003.
- Huysman, Marleen, 2004, 'Communities of Practice: Facilitating Social Learning while Frustrating Organizational Learning', in Haridimos Thoukas and Nikolaos Mylonopoulos (eds.), *Organizations as Knowledge Systems: Knowledge, Learning and Dynamic Capabilities*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- ICCO and ECDPM, 2004, 'Networking for learning: What can participants do?' Zeist: ICCO.
- Ivanov, Anton, 1997, 'Advanced Networking. A Conceptual Approach to CSO-based Early Response Strategies in Conflict Prevention', Berghof Occasional Paper no. 11, Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.
- Junne, Gerd, 1992, 'Beyond regime theory', in *Acta Politica* 1992/1.
- Junne, Gerd and Willemijn Verkoren (eds.), 2004, *Postconflict Development: Meeting New Challenges*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Junne, Gerd and Willemijn Verkoren, 2005, 'The Multiple Balancing Act of Virtual Communities in Peace and Development', *KM4Dev* 1(1) 2005, 41-56.
- Keohane, Robert O., 1991, 'Cooperation and International Regimes', in Richard Little and Michael Smith (eds.), *Perspectives on World Politics*, second edition. Oxford: Routledge.
- Kessels, J.W.M. and Harrison, R. (2004). 'Researching knowledge productivity'. Paper presented at the Fifth International Conference on HRD Research and Practice across Europe. International, Comparative and Cross-Cultural Dimensions of HRD. 27th-28 May 2004. University of Limerick, Republic of Ireland
- King, Kenneth, 2005, 'Knowledge-based aid: a new way of networking or a new North-South divide?' in Diane Stone and Simon Maxwell (eds.), *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Krieger, Kristian, 'CSOs in the Global Political Economy: Resource Dependency and the Precarious Sustainability of Political Legitimacy', paper for Irmgard Coninx Stiftung Workshop on Civil Society and International CSOs, 2-10 January 2004.

## Annex 1: Literature used

- Mawdsley, Emma, Janet Townsend, Gina Porter and Peter Oakley, 2002, *Knowledge, Power, and Development Agendas: CSOs North and South*. INTRAC CSO Management & Policy Series, No. 14. Oxford: INTRAC.
- Maxwell, Simon and Stone, Diane, 2005, 'Global knowledge networks and international development: bridges across boundaries' in ibidem (eds.), *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Mbabazi, Pamela K., Sandra J. MacLean and Timothy M. Shaw, 'Research for reconstruction in Africa: challenges for policy communities and coalitions' in Diane Stone and Simon Maxwell (eds.), *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- McDowell, Caesar L., Andrea Nagel, Susana M. Williams and Claudia Canepa, 2005, 'Building knowledge from the practice of local communities', in *KM4Dev* 1(3).
- McNeill, Desmond, 2005, 'Power and ideas: economics and global development policy' in Diane Stone and Simon Maxwell (eds.), *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Mitlin, Diana, Sam Hickey and Anthony Bebbington, 2005, 'Reclaiming development? CSOs and the challenge of alternatives', IDPM, School of Environment and Development, University of Manchester.
- Nairobi Peace Initiative-Africa and the National Council of Churches of Kenya Community Peace Building and Development Project, 2001, *Strategic and Responsive Evaluation of Peacebuilding: Towards a Learning Model*. Report of the Second Action-Reflection Seminar Convened by NPI-Africa and the NCKK-CPBD Project.
- Noordergraaf, Mirko, 2000, *Attention! Work and Behavior of Public Managers amidst Ambiguity*. Delft: Eburon.
- O'Dell, Carla, C. Jackson Grayson Jr, and Nilly Essaiades, 1998, *If Only We Knew What We Know. The Transfer of Internal Knowledge and Best Practice*. New York: The Free Press.
- Perkmann, Markus, 2002, 'Evaluating the impact of knowledge projects', conference report, conference on Measuring Knowledge Value, London, July 24-25 2002, Ark Group.
- Pfaffenholz, 2005, 'More field notes: Critical issues when implementing PCIA', in David Bloomfield, Martina Fischer, Beatrix Schmelzle (eds.), *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation: New Trends in PCIA*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.
- Rip, A. (2001), 'Utilisation of research: a sociology of knowledge perspective', in RAWOO, *Utilization of Research for Development Co-operation, Linking Knowledge Production to Development Policy and Practice*, Publication no. 21, RAWOO, The Hague.
- Rive Box, Louk de la, 2001, 'Over en weer: internationale samenwerking in onderzoek en onderzoek naar internationale samenwerking', Inaugural lecture Universiteit Maastricht 12 October 2001, downloaded from <http://www.unimaas.nl/media/um-layout/um/opmaak.htm?http://www.pers.unimaas.nl/arc.h.persb/2001/01-063.htm> on 3 May 2005.
- Salomons, Dirk, 2004, 'Security: An Absolute Prerequisite', in Gerd Junne and Willemijn Verkoren (eds.), *Postconflict Development: Meeting New Challenges*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Sauquet, Alfons, 2004, 'Learning in Organisations. Schools of Thought and Current Challenges' in Jaap J. Boonstra (ed.), *Dynamics of Organisational Change and Learning*. Chichester: Wiley.

- Schmelzle, Beatrix, 2005, 'New Trends in Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA): Introduction'. Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.
- Smid, Gerhard and Ronald Beckett, 2004, 'Learning and Sustainable Change: Designing Learning Spaces', in Jaap J. Boonstra (ed.), *Dynamics of Organisational Change and Learning*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Stone, Diane, 2005, 'Knowledge networks and global policy' in Diane Stone and Simon Maxwell (eds.), *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Syrett, Michel and Jean Lammiman, 2002, *Successful Innovation: How to Encourage and Shape Profitable Ideas*. Profile Books.
- v. Tongeren (eds), 2005, *People Building Peace - Successful Stories of Civil Society*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Verkoren, Willemijn, 2006, 'Development Knowledge: Types and characteristics of knowledge in development - and implications for its use', AMIDSt Working Paper. Amsterdam: AMIDSt, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Verkoren, Willemijn, 2006, 'Learning by NGOs: Retaining and Using Knowledge for Development', AMIDSt Working Paper. Amsterdam: AMIDSt, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Verkoren, Willemijn, 2006, 'Networks and networking in the field of peacebuilding. Literature study for GPPAC network strengthening review'.
- World Bank Operations Evaluation Department, 2003, *Sharing Knowledge: Innovations and Remaining Challenges*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

# Annex 2: People interviewed

## Netherlands

Annelies Heijmans (Head of Programmes), Guido de Graaf Bierbrouwer (Lobby and Communication; Europe), Adriana Franco (GPPAC regional desks for Latin America & Caribbean, Africa, Asia), Juliette Verhoeven (Publications; Lessons Learned), and Paul van Tongeren (founding director), European Centre for Conflict Prevention (ECCP) - *Utrecht, 31 August 2005*

Guido de Graaf Bierbrouwer, ECCP - *Utrecht, 6 January 2006*

Paul van Tongeren, Guido de Graaf Bierbrauwer and Adriana Franco, ECCP - *The Hague, 18 July 2006*

## Central Asia

Ms. Raya Kadyrova, Director, Foundation for Tolerance International, GPPAC Regional Initiator - *Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, 23 July 2006*

Ms. Anara Eginalieva, Foundation for Tolerance International, National GPPAC coordinator Kyrgyzstan - *Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, 23 July 2006*

Mr. Japar Birimkulov, Foundation for Peace in Central Asia - *Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, 24 July 2006*

Mr. Dolot Nusupov, President's Administration, Department on Relations with Civil Society - *Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, 24 July 2006*

Mr. Ravshan Abdukarimov, Ministry of Interior Affairs, Head of General Staff - *Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, 24 July 2006*

Ms. Charlotte Niklasson, UNDP Kyrgyzstan - *Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, 24 July 2006*

Mr. Adylbek Ismailov, Executive Director, Ferghana Valley Lawyers without Borders - *Osh, Kyrgyzstan, 25 July 2006*

Three Uzbek NGO representatives and members of the Dolina Mira network<sup>25</sup> - *Osh, Kyrgyzstan, 25 July 2006*

Ms. Toktokan Mambetova, Omur Bulagi (Source of Life; Women's NGO) - *Batken, Kyrgyzstan, 26 July 2006*

Ms. Nazgul Aldasheva, Programme manager in Batken office, Foundation for Tolerance International, informal conversation - *Batken, Kyrgyzstan, 26 July 2006*

Mr. Farrukh Tyuryaev, ASTI - *Khudjand, Tajikistan, 27 July 2006*

Mr. Abdusamad Sultonov, Executive Director, Social Institute 'Youth & Civilization' - *Khudjand, Tajikistan, 27 July 2006*

Mr. Muzaffar Olimov, director, Sharq Research and Analysis Center - *Dushanbe, Tajikistan, 27 July 2006*

Ms. Manzura Djuraeva, Public Committee for Democratic Processes - *Dushanbe, Tajikistan, 28 July 2006*

Mr. Ahad Mahmudov, Programme Manager Communities Programme, UNDP - *Dushanbe, Tajikistan, 28 July 2006*

Mr. Faredun Hodizade, Tajikistan Dialogue Project, National GPPAC Coordinator for Tajikistan - *Dushanbe, Tajikistan, 28 July 2006*

Mr. Achmedov Said Achmedovich, Advisor to the Tajik President on relations with society - *Dushanbe, Tajikistan, 28 July 2006*

Ms. Inessa Frantz, Institute of Cooperation for Development (IDC), GPPAC National Coordinator for Kazakhstan - *Utrecht, The Netherlands, 8 August 2006*

<sup>25</sup> For reasons of personal security related to the political situation in Uzbekistan, these interviewees asked not to be mentioned by name in this report.

<sup>26</sup> Also present: board member Ms. Rahimova Fizuza Marufjonovna and staff members Mr. Farhat Khusainov and Mr. Karl Höhn



**Southeast Asia**

Mr. Augusto Micalat, Initiatives for International Dialogue (IID), GPPAC Regional Initiator - *Amsterdam, Netherlands, 9 April 2006*

Ms. Farhariza Ajir, Initiatives for International Dialogue (IID), informal conversations - *Davao City, The Philippines, 14-15 May 2006*

Ms. Mary Ann Arnado, Initiatives for International Dialogue (IID) - *Davao City, The Philippines, 15 May 2006*

Ms. Myla Leguro, Catholic Relief Service - *Davao City, The Philippines, 15 May 2006*

Father Bert Layson, Pikit parish / Mindanao People's Caucus - *Marbel, The Philippines, 16 May 2006*

Mr. Sammy P. Maulawa, Secretary General, Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society (CBCS) - *Cotabato, The Philippines, 17 May 2006*

Ms. Tarhata Maglangit, Bangsamoro Women's Solidarity Forum (BWSF) - *Cotabato, The Philippines, 17 May 2006*

Ms. Samrah Karon, United Youth of the Philippines (UNYPHIL) - *Cotabato, The Philippines, 17 May 2006*

Mr. Rahib L. Kudto (national president), Mr. Mahdie C. Amella (Secretary General), Mr. Ebrahim L. Kuelto (chief Islamic Daawah in Education), Mr. Anwar Z. Saluwang (VP for internal affairs), United Youth for Peace and Development (UNYPAD) - *Cotabato, The Philippines, 17 May 2006*

Mr Jose Akmad, Mindanao People's Caucus (MPC) - *Cotabato, The Philippines, 17 May 2006*

Ms. Karen Tanada, director, Gaston Z. Ortigas Peace Institute (GZOPI) - *Manila, The Philippines, 18 May 2006*

Dr. Loreta Castro, Centre for Peace Education (CPE), Miriam College - *Quezon City, The Philippines, 18 May 2006*

Mr. Thanak Sovutha, Alliance for Conflict Transformation (ACT) - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 22 May 2006*

Ms. Huot Thavory, previously WGWR and Church World Service - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 22 May 2006*

Mr. Prak Tep Vichet, Working Group for Weapons Reduction (WGWR) - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 22 May 2006*

Mr. Soth Plai Ngarm, Alliance for Conflict Transformation (ACT), informal conversation - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 22 May 2006*

Ms. Prak Sokhany, Australian Catholic Relief - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 23 May 2006*

Ms. Mark Channasitha, World Vision Cambodia, informal conversation - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 23 May 2006*

Mr. Dr. Raymond Leos, Pannasastra University of Cambodia - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 24 May 2006*

Ms. Chhiv Kimsrun, Youth Star - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 24 May 2006*

Mr. Long Khet, Youth for Peace (YFP) - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 24 May 2006*

Ms. Emma Leslie, Alliance for Conflict Transformation (ACT) - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 25 May 2006*

Mr. Vuth Heng, Cambodian Defenders Project - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 25 May 2006*

Ms. Prok Vanny, UNIFEM / ACT Steering Group - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 26 May 2006*



## Annex 2: People interviewed

Ms. Yim Nimola, Khmer Women Voice Center - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 26 May 2006*

Mr. Sem Peng Sean, Khmer HIV/AIDS NGO Alliance (KHNA), previously with Commune Council Support Project and Oxfam - *Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 26 May 2006*

### Central and East Africa

Mr. Frederic Kama Kama, Peace Tree Network (PTN) - *Nairobi, Kenya, 28 November 2005*

Mr. Michael Ouko (peace programme manager), New Sudan Council of Churches (NSCC; GPPAC national focal point for Southern Sudan) - *Nairobi, Kenya, 28 November 2005*

Ms. Susannah Jambo (coordinator), Mr. John Ahere (lobby and advocacy officer) and Ms. Justa (surname?), (nutrition and gender mainstreaming officer), New Sudan Indigenous Network (NESI) - *Nairobi, Kenya, 28 November 2005*

Ms. Jebiwott Sumbeiyo (programme officer), Africa Peace Forum (APFO) - *Nairobi, Kenya, 29 November 2005*

Mr. Singo Mwachofi, Security Research Information Centre (SRIC) - *Telephone interview from Nairobi, 29 November 2005*

Ms. Florence Mpaayei and Mr. George Wachira (director), Nairobi Peace Initiative (NPI-Africa; GPPAC Regional Initiator) - *Nairobi, Kenya, 29 and 30 November 2005*

Mr. Fred Nyabera (director) and Ms. Abebe Berhe, Fellowship of Christian Councils in the Great Lakes region and Horn of Africa (FECCLAHA) - *Nairobi, Kenya, 30 November 2005*

Rev. Felicien Nemeyimana (Executive Director), Peacebuilding, Healing and Reconciliation Programme (PHARP; GPPAC national focal point for Rwanda) - *Nairobi, Kenya, 30 November 2005*

Ms. Selline Korir, SNV Kenya North Rift Portfolio and Rural Women Peace Link - *Eldoret, Kenya, 1 December 2005*

Two representatives of Rural Women Peace Link - *Eldoret, Kenya, 1 December 2005*

Mr. Gerard Duijfjes, Netherlands Embassy in Nairobi - *Email correspondence*

Ms. Florence Mpaayei, Acting Director, Nairobi Peace Initiative Africa (NPI-Africa) and Regional Initiator of GPPAC for Central and East Africa - *Telephone interview from Amsterdam, 15 August 2006*

### West Africa

Mr. Emmanuel Bombande, director, West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP) and GPPAC Regional Initiator - *Accra, Ghana, 6 February 2006*

Mr. Varpilah Tornolah, National Network Coordinator, WANEP Liberia - *Monrovia, Liberia, 8 February 2006*

Rev. Christopher Toe, Secretary General, Inter-Religious Council of Liberia - *Monrovia, Liberia, 8 February 2006*

Mr. Lorma Bayseh, Rural Human Rights Activist Program (RHRAP) - *Monrovia, Liberia, 9 February 2006*

Mr. Peter Z. N. Kamei, National General Secretary, and Mr. E. Timotheus Kamaboakai, Information Officer, Young Men's Christian Association of Liberia (YMCA) - *Monrovia, Liberia, 9 February 2006*

Mr. Mohammed Nassir and Mr. George Jacobs, National Association of Palaver Managers (NAPAM) - *Monrovia, Liberia, 10 February 2006*

## Annex 2: People interviewed

- Rev. Robert Mawlue Karloh, Acting National Program Coordinator, Foundation for International Dignity (FIND) - *Monrovia, Liberia, 10 February 2006*
- Mr. James Makor, Save My Future Foundation (SAFMU) - *Monrovia, Liberia, 13 February 2006*
- Mr. Dan T. Saryee, Sr., Liberia Democratic Institute (LDI) - *Monrovia, Liberia, 13 February 2006*
- Mr. Tom Kamara, chief editor, *New Democrat* - *Monrovia, Liberia, 13 February 2006*
- Mr. Aloysius Toe, Executive Director, Mr. Senyon Kieh (assistant director), and Mr. S. Herron Gbidi (program director), Foundation for Human Rights and Democracy - *Monrovia, Liberia, 14 February 2006*
- Mr. Edward Jombla, National Network Coordinator, Network on Collaborative Peacebuilding (NCP-SL) (WANEP Sierra Leone) - *Freetown, Sierra Leone, 15 February 2006*
- Mr. Abdulai D. Swaray, National Coordinator, Pikin-To-Pikin - *Freetown, Sierra Leone, 15 February 2006*
- Mr. James Hallowell, Peacelinks - *Freetown, Sierra Leone, 16 February 2006*
- Ms. Shellac Sonny-Davies (regional coordinator) and Mr. Dixon Psio Gblah (national coordinator), FIND - *Freetown, Sierra Leone, 16 February 2006*
- Mr. Alphonsus BM Gbanie, Organisation of Development and Human Rights (ODHR) - *Freetown, Sierra Leone, 16 February 2006*
- Ms Fatima Koroma, Women for International Peace Arbitration (WIPA) - *Freetown, Sierra Leone, 17 February 2006*
- Mr. James M. Lahai, Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE) - *Freetown, Sierra Leone, 17 February 2006*
- Mr. Mohamed Foday Kamara, ABC-Development - *Freetown, Sierra Leone, 20 February 2006*
- Mr. Foday Kaibenji, Evangelical Fellowship of Sierra Leone (EFSL) - *Freetown, Sierra Leone, 20 February 2006*
- Mr. John Abu, Kiss 104 FM radio - *Bo, Sierra Leone, 21 February 2006*
- Mr. Gibril Maada Bassie, Cordiation for Active Peace and Empowerment (CAPE SL)<sup>27</sup> - *Bo, Sierra Leone, 21 February 2006*
- Mr. Senesie D. Amara, National Coordinator, Initiatives for Community Development (ICOD) - *Bo, Sierra Leone, 21 February 2006*
- Mr. Paul Koroma, Network for Justice and Development, board member of NCP-SL - *Bo, Sierra Leone, 21 February 2006*
- Mr. J.K. Lansana and Mr. Siladdee Thuray, Lutheran World Federation (LWF) - *Kenema, Sierra Leone, 22 February 2006*
- Mr. Mohamed J. Mansaray, Every Youth Empowerment Forum - *Kenema, Sierra Leone, 22 February 2006*
- Mr. David L. Kallon (Coordinator) and Mr. Joseph Momoh (Kailahun coordinator), Society for Integrated Development and Human Rights (SIDAHR) - *Kenema, Sierra Leone, 22 February 2006*
- Attended NCP-SL (WANEP Sierra Leone) network meeting for the Eastern region - *Kenema, Sierra Leone, 22 February 2006*. The following people were present:
- Lutheran World Federation (LWF, host):
  - J.K. Lansana, Trauma Healing, Reconciliation and Peacebuilding (THRP) Trainer
  - Silladee Turay, THRP Trainer
  - Issa Koroma, THRP Trainer (intern)
  - Alhaisi B. Seday, THRP Trainer (intern)

<sup>27</sup> Formerly Youth Alliance for Peace and Rural Development (YARPARD)

## Annex 2: People interviewed

- *Every Youth Empowerment (EYE) Forum:*
  - Mohamed Mansaray, Planning and Programming Officer
  - Augustine Sewesie, District Secretary NCP-SL (Kenema district)
  - *Conciliation Resources:*
  - David Turay, Change security officer
  - *FIND Sierra Leone:*
  - Leounis Reuny, Administration
  - *Society for Integrated Development and Human Rights (SIDAHR):*
  - Joseph Momoh, Kailahun coordinator
  - David L. Kallon, Coordinator
- Mr. Emmanuel Bombande, director, West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP) and GPPAC Regional Initiator - *Telephone interview from Amsterdam, 11 August 2006*



# Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

Integrated in this report are the following regions:

- Southeast Asia
- South Asia
- Northeast Asia
- West Africa
- Central and East Africa
- Southern Africa
- Northwest Europe
- The Balkans
- The Caucasus
- The Pacific
- North America
- Western Commonwealth of Independent States

Not included are the following regions:

- Latin America and the Caribbean<sup>28</sup>
- Middle East and North Africa<sup>29</sup>
- Central Asia<sup>30</sup>

**Number of version A surveys sent: 261**

**Number of version A surveys returned: 84 (32%)**

*In the multiple choice sections, the total number of times people have checked each option is provided. In the narrative sections, answers have been summarised and clustered, and some singular or region-specific remarks left out. The numbers between (brackets) represent the number of times an answer was given. Please refer to the regional survey reports for a more complete and detailed portrayal of the answers given.*

28 Only two surveys were returned from this region, or 2% of the surveys sent. This means that the surveys cannot be considered representative of the region.

29 From the Middle East and North Africa only 2 partly filled-out version A surveys were returned and no regional version A survey report was made.

30 In Central Asia no version A surveys were sent out.

## I. YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR THE PREVENTION OF ARMED CONFLICT (GPPAC)

### 1. What has been your involvement with GPPAC (you may also check more than one box)?

Regional Initiator	National initiator	Attended national GPPAC meeting(s)	Attended regional GPPAC meeting(s)	Attended global GPPAC conference in New York	Other
13	36	39	59	54	21

### 2. Does your organization have the capacity to meaningfully participate in the network and to use the results of networking?

Yes	No	Don't know / not applicable
63	10	24

- **Knowledge and experience with conflict prevention (9)**
- **Have same aim as GPPAC (9)**
- **Experiences with networking (7)**
- **Network organization (6)**
- **Expertise (5)**
- **Organization is able to mobilize other organizations (3)** at the national and local levels or is itself a network
- **Present in many GPPAC regions (1)**

No:

- **Lack of time, staff and resources (9)**
- **Different nature of European NGOs (3)**, usually not dealing with conflicts in their own region, but supporting organisations in other parts of the world. It is also difficult to get funding for working on own region
- **Lack of priority (2)**; related to fact that other networks may be more useful to organisation or to different focus of organisation

### What additional capacity is needed? Can the network play a role in building this capacity?

- **Staff development (23)**: training programmes (research skills, peacebuilding methodologies), experience exchange
- **Financial support (12)** also for travel
- **Contacts (8)** with other organisations, experts
- **Organisational development (6)**
- **Staff recruitment (5)**: networking coordinator
- **Translation of GPPAC documents**
- **Dedicated staff**: this can only be achieved if the network is doing demonstrably meaningful, results-oriented activity that justifies funding to staff a position or two
- **Identification of expertise**

### 3. What, if any, are the benefits of the global GPPAC network for your organization?

No benefits (answer with 'X')	Benefits (specify)	Don't know / not applicable (answer with 'X')
3	see below	2

- **Access to knowledge and expertise (35)** in the field; increased understanding of issues - particularly those at global level
- **Exchange of experiences and learning (32)** collect and share lessons learned and best practices
- **Contacts; expansion of network and partners (30)**; partnerships; meeting people at conferences; links with other regional networks
- **Collaboration (24)**; provides potential for truly regional and global action. Joint projects, including peace education.
- **Capacity building (12)** - strengthen organisation, provide training
- **Visibility/legitimacy (11)** of our organisation through GPPAC
- **Lobby and advocacy (11)**; more advocacy power through the power of numbers and links with influential players; bridging the gap between governments and civil society; lobbying with UN, especially around the peacebuilding commission, of particular value
- **Raising awareness (8)** conflict prevention and the role of civil society
- **Mutual assistance (10)** and practical and moral support
- **Access to funds (6)**
- **Unity of civil society (5)**; bringing CSOs together
- **Provides a focus on the concept of conflict prevention (4)** and a way to both clarify and promote concrete actions and policies in support of that idea.



## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

- **Create bridges (2):** Link local initiatives for conflict prevention with (sub)regional mechanisms for influencing political decision-making
- **Acknowledgement of women’s organizations (2),** sharing, cooperating with women and women’s organizations working with 1325
- **An ‘honest’ agenda (2):** ‘the agenda is set by the regions, through the ISG. I can clearly see that this agenda differs from a, for example, pure European agenda. The wide spectrum of opinions, cultures, and knowledge makes it possible to deal with such complex issues such as conflicts and wars in an equally complex way’

### 4. What, if any, are the benefits of the regional GPPAC network for your organization?

No benefits (answer with ‘X’)	Benefits (specify)	Don’t know / not applicable (answer with ‘X’)
5	See below	2

- **Exchange of experiences and learning (40)** collect and share lessons learned and best practices
- **Provide access to knowledge and expertise (28)** in the field
- **Collaborative work and joint activities (22)** ; provides potential for truly regional action. This could deepen the cultural and economic integration of countries and people in a region. Peace education could be a joint programme.
- **Gaining contacts and partnerships (18)** with other players in region; networking
- **Lobby and advocacy (14);** more advocacy power through the power of numbers and links with influential players; bridging the gap between governments and civil society
- **Capacity building (10),** also increasing our understanding of the context in which we work
- **Coordination (6)** of activities to prevent duplication
- **Visibility/legitimacy/influence (5)** of our organisation has increased
- **Raised awareness (3)** of the importance of working on peacebuilding and conflict prevention issues
- **Mutual understanding and support (3)**
- **Fundraising (3)**
- **Local and national issues can be raised at regional and global levels (2)**
- **Provides a focus on the concept of conflict prevention (2)** and a way to both clarify and promote concrete actions and policies in support of that idea.
- **Use of the conclusions and recommendations of Regional and Global Action Agenda (2)**
- **Strengthening our networks (2)**
- **Regular meetings (2)**
- **Engaging regional, national and local authorities (1)**

## II. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NETWORK

### 5. What, in your view, are the most important functions of the global GPPAC network?

- **Lobby and advocacy (31)** towards international policymakers, particularly the UN.
- **Exchange of experiences (26)** and information
- **Generating and disseminating information, research (26)**
- **Implementing joint programmes (17)** and the Global Action Agenda (although some feel it is too broad and needs more focus)
- **Facilitator and coordinator (16):** of interaction and cooperation among NGOs and between NGOs, governmental bodies and international organisations. Facilitate meetings among regional GPPAC in order to plan activities and set common agendas. Harmonise peacebuilding activities at global level.
- **Fundraising (14)** and supporting members' fundraising
- **Raising visibility and awareness (13)** of nonviolent strategies of preventing armed conflicts and of the role, activities and issues of civil society. Linking the global to the local.
- **Partnerships and contacts (12)**
- **Capacity building (11)** of members
- **Acting as an interface (7)** between universal civil society on the one hand and the United Nations and other official (regional) organisations on the other.
- **Building solidarity and unity (6)** among the members of the network; form a common front. Mutual support.
- **Providing global leadership (5)** - direction and guidance
- **Advisor (5)**
- **Global conferences and meetings (4)**
- **Political activism (2):** on global issues such as War on Terror, Middle East, North Korea
- **Enlargement of the network (2)**
- **Evaluation (2)** of the results of conflict prevention initiatives
- **Bring civil society peacebuilders together (2)**
- **Vehicle for developing policy and practice (2)** that potentially will have a positive impact in emerging conflict situations.
- **Supporting the regional networks (2)**
- **Connect civil society and the UN (2)** in efficient, concrete mechanisms that can empower a global civil society network to work for human security.
- **Early warning and early response (1)**
- **Mediating in conflicts (1)**

### 6. What, in your view, are the most important functions of the regional GPPAC network?

- **Exchange of experiences (19)**
- **Generating and disseminating information, research (17)** including analyses of the functioning of organizations in the field of conflict prevention; Mapping of conflict, actors, CSO roles and contributions

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

- **Lobby and advocacy (17)** towards governments and regional policymakers; changing national legislation; establish partnerships with the peacekeeping institutions
- **Joint activities and campaigns (17)** including the implementation of the regional action agendas
- **Coordinate (14):** harmonise peacebuilding activities, prevent duplication of work
- **Connections and contacts (12)**
- **Joint strategising (11)** - incl. the regional action agenda and work plan
- **Capacity building (8)** of members - esp. training. Empower civil society.
- **Mobilize and unify civil society (7)** and build a common understanding of conflict and conflict prevention
- **Building solidarity (6)** among the members of the network
- **Bring to the fore regional and national concerns (5)** that need to be addressed at the global level; provide a place for different groups to recruit support for their ideas
- **Raising awareness (5)** of nonviolent strategies of preventing armed conflicts and of the role of civil society
- **Meetings (4)**
- **Building relationships between civil society, governments and regional and international organisations (4).** Promote dialogue.
- **Facilitating dialogue (3)** and communication between various players in the field
- **Strengthen and support national networks (3)** and help them to become linked regionally and globally
- **Fundraising (3)** and helping members raise funds
- **Early warning and early response (2)**
- **Monitoring and Evaluation:** continuous monitoring and regular impact evaluation. Define methodologies of implementation towards expected results and indicators.
- **Political activism** on critical peace issues in the region.

### 7. What are your expectations with regard to these functions?

This question was interpreted in a variety of different ways. Mostly, the answers were a reiteration of the functions mentioned above: people expect that the network will carry out these functions.

### 8. To what extent to have these expectations been met so far?

Fully	Partly	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
4	45	14	3	7

**Please explain:**

**Partly/ Not really:**

- **Too little focus on action (6);** plans not yet implemented. ‘There is no real sense of collective purpose, nor of urgency, to act - rather than just to understand and to learn’
- **GPPAC still in early phase (6) and has few resources**
- **Too little information about process (5)** - we should have been involved more
- **Too little communication (4)**
- **Lack of continuity / follow-up (3)**

- **Different priorities (2)** between members
- **GPPAC provided contacts with others in the field (2)**
- **Gained information and materials (2)**
- **No financial support to national focal points (2)**
- **Too little donor support (1)**
- **GPPAC too little known (1)**
- **More to be done (1)**
- **Not enough meetings (1)**
- **Many challenges in regions (1)**

**Not at all:**

- **Nothing concrete yet (2)**
- **GPPAC too little known (1)**
- **No presence at national level (1)**

**9. What are the main challenges faced by GPPAC and/or the regional network?**

- **Low financial resources (24)**
- **The difficulty of proving its value by moving towards implementation and concrete activities (18).** There is lack of clarity on way forward post-New York. GPPAC needs to prove of practical value in actually preventing violent conflict-as opposed to ‘holding endless meetings and conferences to talk about it’<sup>31</sup>. This may also require a different leadership that is more action-oriented.
- **Finding a focus and developing a clear strategy (11).** Focus on a few achievable goals and then doing those well
- **Unfriendly political environment (9)** in some regions and countries makes it difficult for civil society to work freely; bad governance; corruption; lack of political will of powerful states; lack of security.
- **Insufficient information flow / communication (8)**
- **Coordination (7)**
- **Low commitment (5)** on the part of some actors. Persuading people to be actively involved is a challenge. Members have to deal with competing demands on their time and energy.
- **Demonstrate relevance to prominent conflicts (3)** - Middle East, Iraq, Darfur, North Korea, war on terror - as well as less prominent conflict situations and trends
- **Keeping the momentum (3)**
- **Little coverage (3)** in the countries of the region ; enlarging the network
- **Sustainability (3)**
- **GPPAC is little known (3)**

<sup>31</sup> One respondent even goes so far as to say that ‘We should stop being a network! A network is per se a framework/structure for sharing of information, analyses and understandings. Unless it becomes a coalition or alliance for action - it could be an action network, but perhaps needs to be more than that - it will remain principally academic, learning, sharing information and analyses, but essentially responsive, not active, interventionist, preventative.’

- **Too few members (3)**; important actors left out
- **Supporting weak members (2)**
- **Language barriers (2)**
- **The reality of armed conflicts (2)**
- **Poverty (2)** and related issues
- **Ownership and decision making (2)** - lack of transparency
- **Making it a two-way process (1)**: for GPPAC to be a network there would have to be some form of a two-way communication and a transparent decision-making process. I cannot see that that is the case right now
- **Tackling the roots of conflict (1)**
- **Being too far removed from the grassroots level (1)** - this goes for the participants and also for the information exchanged, which is rather high level and it is difficult to apply it in grassroots work
- **Little anchoring in organisations (1)**; people involved as individuals
- **Finding ways to engage political leaders while staying neutral (1)**
- **Evaluation (1)**: should develop indicators of studying evaluation of goals and objectives; qualitative indicators should be created

### 10. What are your recommendations for strengthening the functions mentioned under questions 5 and 6?

- **Raise funds (22)**. Find more stable and constant fundraising basis. Make more use of the media to raise profile.
- **Improve information flows (16)**: establish research and documentation centre; regional websites; brief electronic newsletter; activate the GPPAC website and make it a marketplace of ideas, initiatives, projects.
- **Build capacity (13)** of members; provide (online) trainings
- **Plan and implement concrete joint activities (11)**. Establish working groups to work on common activities. Start implementing the action agendas.
- **Improve democratic governance, transparency and ownership (8)**
- **Strengthen global, regional and national secretariats/coordinators (8)**
- **More regular meetings (6)**
- **More focus (4)**; also in order to create the GPPAC 'brand'
- **Expand the network (4)**, engaging as many institutions as possible at all levels
- **Establish better links to local level (2)**
- **Set up Monitoring and Evaluation methods (2)**
- **Develop an early warning for early response system (2)**
- **Focus on peace education (2)**
- **Work in close collaboration with UN Peacebuilding Commission (2)**
- **Create and strengthen secretariats at global, regional and national level (2)**
- **Better PR (2)** of GPPAC and of conflict prevention

### III. GOVERNANCE, REPRESENTATION, INCLUSIVENESS, AND ORGANISATION

#### 11. To what extent do you consider your organization to be represented in the global GPPAC network?

Fully	Partly	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
19	26	16	3	5

**Please explain:**

**Fully:**

- Mostly people with a **formal function in GPPAC (10)** (Regional Steering Group, national focal points/coordinators, regional initiators) give this answer
- **Participated and informed (3):** we participate in regional activities and are informed of their outcomes

**Partly / not really:**

- **Involvement with GPPAC is limited (10);** would like to be more involved. ‘We are consulted only when there is a perceived need for views of broader membership of GPPAC. We are not consulted on issues of our expertise’
- **No consistency (3);** felt represented at NY conference but not afterwards. ‘We are startlingly absent in the follow-up, and perhaps symptomatically, the workshop run by us in New York is not even recorded in the final report.’
- **Lack of transparency and accountability in the decision-making process (3)** and unclear procedures
- **National focal points want to be directly represented in GPPAC (2)**
- **Able to attend conferences (2)**
- **Too broad (1):** the network is too broad at the global level so its not easy for it to represent every organization and its needs
- **We are not a peace organisation (1)**

**Not at all:**

- **Not represented at all in network (6)** or not kept up to date. ‘Is there a global network?’ and: ‘Taiwan representatives were refused to enter the UN building at the Global NY conference’

#### 12. To what extent do you consider your organization to be represented in the regional GPPAC network?

Fully	Partly	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
34	19	4	5	5

**Please explain:**

**Fully:**

- **I have a formal function in GPPAC (14)** (Regional Steering Group, national focal points/coordinators, regional initiators)



## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

- **Participated and informed (10):** we participate in regional activities and are informed of their outcomes
- **Our views are represented (2)** in Regional Action Agenda

### Not really:

- **Not invited, kept up to date (4).** Opinion not considered.

### Not at all:

- **Is there a regional network in Europe? (1)** If so, what happened to the European Platform on Conflict Prevention and Transformation? Is it the same?

### 13. Do you consider the network to be sufficiently democratically organised?

Fully	Partly	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
28	17	11		15

### Are you happy with the procedures for selecting regional and global representatives?

Fully	Partly	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
17	25	7	2	15

### Please explain:

#### Fully:

- **Representatives were elected at national conferences (4)** in our region
- **Regional Initiator/secretariat is a good choice (3);** selection was based on merit
- **Balanced and well done (1)**

#### Partly / not really:

- **Not familiar with procedures (10)** and criteria for selection. Procedures seem to be informal. This also goes for the drawing of borders between the regions.<sup>32</sup>
- **Dissatisfaction with selection procedures of representatives (7)** - they are un-transparent and not sufficiently participatory. In one case this even caused an organisation to leave GPPAC. At a minimum the national focal points should be involved in the selection of regional representatives.
- **Need charter (2)** or other more formal procedures. The selection of regional and global representatives was done when the structure was being created and key roles naturally belonged to the initiators of this process. In time a transition to more formalized general approaches for selecting regional, national and global representatives is necessary.

<sup>32</sup> Geographically some regions seem to fall out. In Europe for example Southern and Eastern Europe - Czech republic, Slovenia, Poland, Slovakia, France, Spain, Portugal, etc - is underrepresented.

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

- **Need more information & communication (1)** Between ISG meetings, we don't get enough information about their activities. This needs to be improved.
- **Regional network is democratic but global one not (1)**

### Don't know/ not applicable:

- **Not been very involved so can't say (10)**

### 14. Who should be represented in GPPAC's International Steering Group (ISG)?

#### a. Regional Initiators?

Voting member (answer with 'X')	Observer status (answer with 'X')	Not represented (answer with 'X')	Otherwise (please specify)	Don't know/ not applicable (answer with 'X')
63	9	1		3

#### b. International organisations?

Voting member (answer with 'X')	Observer status (answer with 'X')	Not represented (answer with 'X')	Otherwise (please specify)	Don't know/ not applicable (answer with 'X')
41	31	2	1	3

### If yes, do you have examples of international organisations which might be included?

Many suggestions made; see regional survey reports

#### c. Other networks?

Voting member (answer with 'X')	Observer status (answer with 'X')	Not represented (answer with 'X')	Otherwise (please specify)	Don't know/ not applicable (answer with 'X')
16	38	2	2	7

### If yes, do you have examples of networks which might be included?

Many suggestions made; see regional survey reports

#### d. Donor organisations?

Voting member (answer with 'X')	Observer status (answer with 'X')	Not represented (answer with 'X')	Otherwise (please specify)	Don't know/ not applicable (answer with 'X')
11	43	8	1	7

### If yes, do you have examples of donor organisations which might be included?

Many suggestions made; see regional survey reports

### Otherwise:

- **Donor meetings (1)** - every two years
- **We have to be clear what the purpose of donor participation would be (1)**-and the function that would be served by their inclusion. We need interaction with the donor

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

community-but I am not sure that this is best achieved by their participation in ISG meetings! Let's invite them to participate in specific discussions of mutual interest, rather than confuse people with representation issues!

### e. In some cases, national representatives?

Voting member (answer with 'X')	Observer status (answer with 'X')	Not represented (answer with 'X')	Otherwise (please specify)	Don't know/ not applicable (answer with 'X')
26	27	4	1	9

#### If so, in what cases?

- **Representatives from countries in conflict (7)**, those who are experienced in conflict resolution; Russia by all means, because there are a lot of problems here.
- **As resource persons (5)** - outstanding people, who have been involved in peace processes
- **If ISG decisions would have an impact in a particular country (3)** then national representative should be included
- **Where there is no regional structure to represent them (1)**
- **Should fund themselves (1)** - would be good if national representatives can attend if they fund themselves. Likely to happen if the meetings are close to home, so meeting venues should be moved from region to region.
- **The Charter provides the criteria and process (1)** for deciding when national reps should be fill voting members of the ISG

#### If yes, do you have examples of national representatives which might be included?

- **Politicians (4)**
- **National initiators (3)**
- **Leading peacemakers (3)**
- **Countries where PBC will concentrate activities (3)**
- **National networks working on conflict issues (2)**
- **Government security agencies (2)**
- **NGO umbrellas (1)**
- **Faith based institutions (1)**
- **Experts (1)**

For specific suggestions see regional survey reports

### f. Other?

#### Are there any other agencies or individuals that should be represented?

Yes	No	Don't know / not applicable
25	6	14

#### If so, which ones?

- **Governmental officials (5)**, particularly those involved in negotiation processes

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

- **Individual experts (5)** including leading peacemakers
- **Youth organisations (3)**
- **Prominent persons (3)**, who can contribute to GPPAC with their names - including leading peacemakers
- **United Nations agencies (3)**
- **Local governments (2)**
- **Religious representatives (2)**
- **The private sector (1)**
- **Gender organisations (1)**
- **Rebel movements and other known parties to conflicts (1)**
- **The regional steering committees (1)** -which ‘ should be called regional councils and should be the decision making and oversight bodies for the regional secretariats’.
- **Others (1):** It is necessary to give one vote to the GPPAC secretariat and one vote to a working group or other structure that focuses on interaction with the UN and other international organizations. Give one vote for a potential honorary network president, if the agreement about this is reached.
- **We should develop criteria to decide this (1)**

For specific suggestions see regional survey reports

### In what way?

Voting member (answer with ‘X’)	Observer status (answer with ‘X’)	Not represented (answer with ‘X’)	Otherwise (please specify)	Don’t know/ not applicable (answer with ‘X’)
5	15	2	* Resource Person or Advisor (1)	7

### 15. Do you consider the structures and representation of the global and regional GPPAC network to be sufficiently transparent?

Fully	Partly	Not really	Not at all	Don’t know/ not applicable
20	19	15	2	10

#### Please explain:

##### Fully:

- **Broad consultation (1):** all decisions are made after broad discussions on the basis of open dialogue and consensus
- **Appreciated the process of organisation of the regional and international conferences (1).** Before making any decision, we were asked for our opinions.
- **Being flooded by documents (1)** with little time to read, digest and to act on them does not necessarily equal transparency and can cause considerable frustration. Greater selectivity and synthesis of information would be appreciated

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

### Partly/ not really:

- **No information forthcoming from global and regional level (6).**
- **National focal points involved too little in governance (5)**
- **Global processes not very transparent (5).** Need to keep its membership abreast with updated information. Even regional steering group members are not aware of what is happening at the global level. There should be clear regulations.
- **Lack of clarity and accountability (3)** to the general membership on the decision-making and governance of the process. It would be good if the rules and structures would be available on the web. People and organizations should know how to apply for membership and representative positions.

### 16. Do you consider the regional and global GPPAC network to be sufficiently open and inclusive?

Very inclusive	A little inclusive	Not very inclusive	Not at all inclusive	Don't know/ not applicable
21	24	13		9

#### Please explain

##### Very inclusive:

- **All organizations can be member (4);** regional and global processes were open
- **.. and it should be (1)** if GPPAC is a movement
- **GPPAC is made up of people from all regions, colours, and cultures (1)**
- **Too inclusive (1):** the effect has been a too unfocused network, with too little attention for follow up and follow through of initiatives.

##### A little/Not very inclusive

- **Too little representation of players in region (15).** The regional initiators selected organizations which are already members of their network to form the regional group. We can do more to bring others on board. Too little representation of community groups, youth organisations, international organisations.
- **The gatekeeper role (1)** of some of the regional 'initiators' has posed some problems. These 'should really become regional secretariats answerable, and implementing the decisions of, regional councils or working groups (not regional 'steering committees')'.

### 17. Can the network be strengthened by the inclusion of additional partners in your region?

Yes	No	Don't know / not applicable
52	5	12

#### Please explain:

##### Yes:

- **Inclusion of more members will increase strength and legitimacy (12)**
- **Important players are still left out (8)**

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

- **Resources (4)** New members may also provide assistance measured in human and financial resources
- **Will bring in different point of view (3)**
- **Depends on the capacity and resources of the secretariat (2)**
- **Increases visibility (2)** of the network

### No:

- **It's better to strengthen what exists (3)**; network may become too big to manage
- **First assess organisations' capacity and relevance (2)**

### If yes, do you have suggestions for partners that could be included?

- Women Groups (2)
- Youth Groups (4)
- Disability Groups (1)
- Religious leaders
- Chiefs/traditional leaders/elders (3)
- Grassroots groups (2)
- Representatives of like-minded governments (2)
- Companies (1)
- The media (1)

For specific suggestions see regional survey reports

### 18. What is your opinion about the coverage of the global and regional GPPAC network (i.e. its spread over the globe; the countries and regions that are part of it)?

Very good	Quite good	Not very good	Not good at all	Don't know/ not applicable
10	43	4	1	9

**Underrepresented: Israel, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, North Korea, Southern and Eastern Europe, Turkey, Romania**

### How should GPPAC deal with the fact that some regions and countries are not covered?

- **Invite (16)** potential groups to become a part of the network; identify a strongly established organisation as initiator; helping to set up national networks
- **Increase information on GPPAC (4)**, also by using the media
- **Don't hurry (4)**: Further expansion is not the highest priority; we need to focus on action-which will attract participation from other areas. Create a long term strategy to guide expansion.
- **Focus on key countries (4)**
- **Financial limits (2)**: Perhaps it is impossible because of limited material resources
- **All regions should be included (1)** as they have to be represented by at least one member.
- **Conflict zones (1)** should be represented particularly well.



- **Linking up with other networks (1)**
- **Efficient resource use (1)** for instance the cost of delegate packages to conferences could have been greatly reduced and the money used to bring more delegates from developing countries
- **Consolidate (1):** Strengthen what it has been achieved until now and leave the enlargement issue open
- **Twinning (1)** explore the possibility of twinning regions: Europe - part of Africa
- **On-line consultations (1)**
- **Leave this to the discretion of participants (1)** of the regional process. But there should be adequate representation of all participants in the regional process.
- **Creating a Regional Managing Group (1)** consisting of the heads of appropriate national associations

### 19. How should GPPAC deal with large differences and inequalities within regions, in terms of representation, organizational capacity, and the situation on the ground? <sup>33</sup>

- **Capacity building (10)**
- **Mutual support (8);** link up weak and strong members; create working groups; create more opportunities for sharing and learning
- **Affirmative action (4)**
- **Assess the capacities of the members (3)**
- **Finance the regions/organisations in need (3)**
- **Valuing pluralism and diversity (2)** and do not strive for equality
- **Depends on GPPAC's long term goals (2);** needs to be further discussed
- **Make sure all regions are represented (2)**
- **Gender inclusiveness (2)**
- **Do research (2)** on national networks and organizations in conflict prevention and peacebuilding that work in these regions
- **Include particularly conflict-affected areas (1)**
- **Strengthen national networks (1)**
- **Conduct personal exchanges (1)** among members in various organizations
- **Improve region-region cooperation (1).** Create a mid-level structure between the regional and international.

### 20. How should GPPAC become organized at the national level? What should be the relationship between the regional and national levels?

- **Strengthen national focal points (10)**
- **Mutual support (10)** and close interaction between national and regional level. The national level should be able to support the regional level and vice versa.
- **Create national steering group (7)**
- **Build national networks/coalitions (6)**

<sup>33</sup> Note from North America: the differences and inequalities are not as obvious as you might imagine. For instance, in North America, we have had tremendous difficulty raising funds for US activities for GPPAC- whereas, if we represented a Southern conflict region, we would be much more appealing to potential donors.

- **No universal organizational scheme (1)** for all regions
- **We shouldn't insist on a national-level structure (1)** because conflict is so often within nation and between-nations. As far as possible, we should focus across borders.
- **Mobilise and integrate existing national networks (1)**
- **Decentralised system (1)** with functional autonomy at national level
- **Do not prioritise this (1)** - there are other important issues; GPPAC's members are already overburdened
- **Build capacity of weak members (1)** - strong members support weak ones
- **Advocate (1):** Regional level should pick up advocacy issues coming from national partners
- **Nation - problematic term in Northeast Asia (1)** and a cause of conflict (the case of Taiwan, for example) and so we prefer to organize and call our focal points by city, rather than 'nation' name

### 21 What kind of staff and support is needed for this?

- **Recruitment of staff (29)** with an ability to coordinate; establish national secretariats with staff (estimates range between 1 and 4 staff needed at the national level)
- **Resources (15)**
- **Training of staff (12)**
- **Experts / information (4)**
- **Logistics to support communication (4)**
- **Volunteers (1)**
- **Global GPPAC should support the regional (1)** Only through regional processes it is possible to realize global objectives.

## IV. THE CONTENT OF THE GPPAC NETWORK

### 22. What are your priorities for knowledge sharing within the global and the regional GPPAC network? What knowledge do you think should be shared?

- **Conflict prevention and peacebuilding knowledge and methods (19)**
- **Specialised conflict prevention/peacebuilding issues and methods:**
  - i. **Peace education (13)**
  - ii. **Human rights (5)**
  - iii. **The arms market; SALW; disarmament (4)**
  - iv. **Early warning and early response (4)**
  - v. **Good governance (2)**
  - vi. **The role of religion (1)**
  - vii. **Grassroots experiences and traditions (1)**
  - viii. **Postconflict reconciliation (1)**
  - ix. **Link between development and conflict (1)**
  - x. **Innovative peacebuilding methods (1)**
  - xi. **Types of conflict and root causes (1)**
  - xii. **Human security (1)**
  - xiii. **Negotiation skills (1)**

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

- **Experiences (9)** in the field
- **Information about GPPAC (7):** goals, action plans, developments - including follow up to UN activities
- **Activities undertaken by members (8) and by the network.** Information on how programs in various regions are carried out. Understand the formula of success.
- **Lobbying and advocacy methods (4)**
- **Information about what is happening in regions (3)**
- **The role of civil society (2)**
- **Networking methodologies and lessons (2)**
- **Capacity building methods (2)**
- **Information about global issues and processes (2)**
- **Strategic planning (1)**

### 23. Is there an openness to different points of view within the network?

Very much	To some extent	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
24	31	1		8

#### Please explain:

\* **Open discussions (5)** all participants have an opportunity to express their vision and approach; they are openly expressed and discussed - particularly in process leading up to action agenda: very participatory and open

## V. THE CONTEXT OF THE GPPAC NETWORK

### 24. Do you consider the regional GPPAC network to be sufficiently linked to its social and political context?

Very much	To some extent	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
16	34	5	1	12

#### Please explain:

##### Very much:

- **We are reality-focused (8):** All programmes and interactions deal with current issues. It is the raison d'être of GPPAC. Conflicts have political roots and we are very much aware of that.
- **We are linked to political institutions (2)** and try to influence them
- **The formation of national networks would not have been possible if they were not effectively linked to their socio-political context (1)**
- **Responding to current events (1):** after DPRK's recent missile launch NEA Regional network immediately issued a Statement.

##### To some extent:

- **GPPAC is new (3)** ; improvement still needed
- **Too few links with governments (3)**
- **The members of the network provide links (2)** to various constituencies as they are

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

from diverse backgrounds (including chieftaincy, religious leaders, youth, women, human rights organizations, and the media).

- **Depends (2)** on the country and whether the government is willing and also if the focal point is strong enough to be listened to
- **Local realities ignored (1):** in Europe we did not give enough attention to conflicts within our own society, making us vulnerable for critique: how can you speak about conflicts elsewhere if you ignore what is happening at home?
- **Specific issues not part of GPPAC (2)** e.g. disarmament

### Not really:

- **GPPAC is personality-centered (1)** rather than socially or politically oriented
- **Regional network should be in constant touch with national networks (1)** in order to keep up to date with events happening in countries

### 25. Are there sufficient links to other networks, organisations, and governments?

Very much	To some extent	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
8	39	6		13

#### Please explain:

##### Very much:

- **We are involving policymakers at various levels (8);** successful cooperation with governments and UN
- **Invitations are extended to key non-GPPAC actors (1)** and stakeholders to participate in network workshops and meetings.
- **GPPAC is mentioned in other actors' information sources (1)** - newsletters, websites

##### To some extent:

- **Links to governments are weak (5)**
- **GPPAC is still a baby (3);** this has to evolve
- **Important networks already connected with GPPAC (2)**
- **Political realities influence network relationships (2):** Nationalism and unsolved political issues influence the relationships between networks, organisations and governments.

### 26. Should the network become more or less embedded in its context?

More	Less	Stay as it is	Don't know / not applicable
30		6	20

**Please explain:** this question was unclear to many people.

##### More:

- **Closer to power structures (3):** 'We have to develop the capacity to prevent rather than react, and that means reading the signs of the times, being closely in touch with issues

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

of power and structural violence, and always looking for new and effective means to pre-empt and prevent violence.’

- **Local customs and practices (2)** can inspire and be of profit for GPPAC
- **We want to root the network (2)** at the base

### VI. THE FUNDING STRUCTURE OF THE NETWORK

#### 27. What is your opinion about the current procedures for fundraising and the distribution of funds?

Very good	Quite good	Not so good	Very bad	Don't know/ not applicable
2	9	21	1	32

**Please explain:**

**Quite good:**

- **More delegation to regions (1)**
- **More efficient use of resources (1)** - save on costs like conference packs
- 

**Not so good:**

- **Little funds raised (10)**
- **No funds for national focal points (6)**
- **No transparency (4)** - what are the procedures? How can one become applicable for access to funding opportunities?
- **Promises for financial support were made (1)** but in vain
- **More focus on the regional (1)**. Fundraising is directed to global activities. But key long-term objectives of GPPAC are the realization of the regional action programs. Therefore, more efforts should be made to develop fundraising for the support of activities in the regions.

**Don't know/ not applicable:**

- **More engagement (1)**: We helped fund-raising for several representatives from Europe as well as our partners in the global South to come to New York. Maybe such efforts could have been encouraged by more organizations and can be encouraged in the future?

#### 28. Who should be responsible for fundraising and the distribution of funds within the global network?

ECCP / international secretariat (please answer with 'X')	Regional initiators (please answer with 'X')	National initiators (please answer with 'X')	Other (please specify)	Don't know/ not applicable (please answer with 'X')
48	30	19	10	3

**Please explain:**

- **All three levels should be responsible (9)**
- **International and regional secretariats (8)**
- **ECCP is the central coordinating body (4)** and should have the greater responsibility in fundraising and distribution of funds

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

- **ISG/RSG decide priorities; ECCP raise funds (2)**
- **The regional initiators could be empowered (1)** to raise funds locally to support their activities
- **Focus on creating sustainable direct links between donors and regions (1)**
- **Others - interested organizations and their supporters (1)**

### 29. Who should be responsible for fundraising and the distribution of funds within the regional network?

ECCP / international secretariat (please answer with 'X')	Regional initiators (please answer with 'X')	National initiators (please answer with 'X')	Other (please specify)	Don't know/ not applicable (please answer with 'X')
31	53	30	7	4

#### Please explain:

- **All three levels should be responsible (12)** for fundraising
- **International and regional secretariats (5)**
- **Regional secretariat (3):** Regional steering committee to plan, oversee, review and Regional secretariat to implement.

## VII. THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT'S SUPPORT TO THE REGIONAL NETWORKS

### 30. What support from the Secretariat do you think is needed?

Fundraising (please answer with 'X')	Provide information (please answer with 'X')	Coordinate between regions (please answer with 'X')	Other (please specify)	Don't know/ not applicable (please answer with 'X')
47	32	28	6	9

#### Please explain:

- **Capacity building and training (4)**
- **Expert support and advice (2)**
- **Facilitator (2)** to develop planning and monitoring tools
- **Technical assistance (1)**
- **Help in lobbying (1)** local initiatives at the regional and international levels
- **Advocacy (1)**
- **Play a leadership role (1):** visible, active, and in support of the regions
- **Allocate most resources to regional actions (1)**
- **Regional initiators as a bridge (1)** between international and national organizations.
- **Monitoring and evaluation (1)**

**31. Should the International Secretariat rotate among organizations?**

Yes	No	Don't know / not applicable
23	19	16

Why or why not?

**Yes:**

- **Increases internal democracy (5)** and guarantees the involvement and ownership of all regions and organisations
- **To benefit from the rich and varied experience (3);** provide new and fresh thinking
- **Builds capacity (2)** of institutions taking on secretariat
- **To remove Northern domination (2)**
- **Should stay with an organisation for a reasonable amount of time (1)** for continuity and efficiency. Changing secretariat host organization after every year would be confusing to say the least

**No:**

- **Effectiveness (8);** need stable and professional staff
- **May create logistical difficulties and confusion (6)**
- **If the job is done well there is no need (6)** and ECCP has been doing OK
- **Transmitting accumulated knowledge (2)** to new secretariat is time-consuming, thus hindering the effectiveness of work.
- **May obstruct ongoing contacts (2)** including relationships with donors

**Yes and no:**

- **Rotating people rather than the secretariat (4).** International secretariat should be decentralized, with staff in all regions from regions and countries. This may be more effective, provide greater global representation and cross-fertilization and certainly be less costly, than rotating the Secretariat.
- **Some functions could move or rotate (2)** in order to make the International Secretariat relevant, embedded in certain contexts, for capacity building and exposure etc. Other tasks could remain with ECCP. ECCP is doing much more than just pure secretariat tasks. The pure secretariat tasks could be done from elsewhere as well, which would be good for the legitimacy of the Global Partnership. Some matters, such as lobbying and raising funds, can be done more easily from the ‘north’.

**VIII. MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E)**

**32. What, in your opinion, should be the aims and purposes of M&E for GPPAC at the regional and the global level?**

- **Track and improve implementation and progress (26):** To make sure that all programmes adopted by GPPAC are effectively implemented and avoid problems during the implementation of the programmes. Improve effectiveness.
- **Draw lessons (12)** and apply them in future activities
- **Improve mechanisms (7)** for implementation of the conflict resolution agenda
- **Keep defining, and relating to, strategic goals (6)**



- **Improve M&E skills (3)** within the network
- **Distribute information about GPPAC (3)** and show our achievements
- **Accountability and transparency (2)** in use of funds raised
- **Assess impact (2)**
- **Identify needs (1)**
- **We should discuss it (2)** - there is not enough space in this survey
- **Assess relevance of network to members (1)**

**33. Do you have recommendations for GPPAC as a whole in terms of M&E?**

- **System should have an internal and an external aim (2)**
- **Participatory mechanisms (2)**, involving all members
- **Create an M&E desk (1)** in each of the regional structures
- **Audit the accounts (1)** of regional GPPAC
- **Need to build strong capacity (1)** at all levels so that this becomes an inbuilt process during the life of a project
- **Agree on a minimum standard (1)** Instead of looking to a certain model, we should see how the different models in use could be connected.
- **Outcome Mapping (1)**, because relationships and behaviours are central to this system. Networking is all about that
- **Focus on clear objectives (1)**: The ISG, Secretariat, regions and national partners should focus on setting realistic, attainable, meaningful objectives that are directly related to the prevention of violent conflict.
- **Be critical and constructive (1)**: be thorough and self-critical in assessing flaws in design, programming failures and planned and inadvertent successes.
- **Measure the change in prevention discourse (1)** in global-level policymaking and by member states
- **Learn from members (1)** and not repeat their M&E mistakes
- **M&E unit should be autonomous (1)** and report directly to the general membership
- **Academy or research institute to take the role of M&E (1)**
- **Less talk more attention to realities (1)** in every region
- **Establish International Expert Group (1)** to work in regions if necessary.

**IX. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES ON NETWORKING AND NETWORK STRENGTHENING**

**34. What are the main lessons you have learned, and/or best practices you are familiar with, when it comes to networking and network strengthening?**

- **Importance of clear structure/transparency/openness/democratic values/good governance (10)**
- **Clear common focus, vision and objectives (9)** make a network more likely to survive. Work towards a set of commonly understood, simple, achievable/ambitious action goals
- **Gains for members (6)**: participants should know what they are getting out of participation - otherwise there will be no commitment. A network should make its members more effective.

## Annex 3: Global survey report version A - for people directly involved in GPPAC

- **Joint activities (5):** the biggest challenge of each network is to keep the momentum and prevent discouragement. And this can't be achieved unless there are joint activities. This would also show the value of membership.
- **Without a secretariat a network dies (4);** a network only lasts as long as there is enough staff and time
- **Need for capacity building of network members (3)** in more practicable and context-specific techniques in conflict prevention
- **A network that exists for its own sake dies (2)**
- **Networks require commitment (3)** because it requires extra- time besides usual schedules of partners. Networking is time and energy consuming. Proper commitment can be achieved only when people identify with, internalize and take ownership of the process.
- **Face to face meetings (3):** It is very important to meet the people in the network. Internet is not enough to keep a network alive. The main problems is that this is always very expensive and it is very difficult to get funds for that. The best thing it to identify different concrete projects around them you keep the network.
- **Constant M & E (1)** is needed for networks to remain relevant **International conferences (1)** are important tools for coalition building
- **Networking requires discipline (1)**
- **Networking requires respect (1)** of others' values and thoughts
- **The strength of a network depends on the strength of its members and structures (1)**
- **Start small:** Better to start with a few interested NGO and resource them first before expanding the network

### X. ADDITIONAL REMARKS

#### 35. Do you have any other comments or remarks you would like to share with us?

- This survey was too long (3)
- Translate GPPAC materials in the working languages of the various networks, with the aim of training and informing all the members of the networks (2)
- Would like to be more actively involved (2)
- There is a need to clarify to GPPAC members what is GPPAC currently doing, what is the purpose of regional and national networks, what is the role of individual organisations within GPPAC, how are they expected to contribute to GPPAC etc. And, definitely, GPPAC needs to work on its visibility in the public and generate global response to severe human rights violations, organise campaigns, etc. (apart from policy making and advocacy).
- Note from Taiwan: Regarding the global process, I really feel disappointed about the experience of participating New York global meeting. I regret that International secretariat has surrendered to dishonest political pressure, which leads to Taiwan participants' incomplete and humiliated participation. We are all belong to CSO networking, no body has rights to refuse and block our fully participation.



# Annex 4: Global survey report version B - for people indirectly involved in GPPAC

Integrated in this report are the following regions:

- Western Commonwealth of Independent States
- The Caucasus
- Central Asia
- South Asia
- Southeast Asia
- The Pacific
- West Africa
- Southern Africa
- Northwest Europe
- The Balkans
- North America
- Central and East Africa
- Middle East and North Africa

Not included are the following regions:

- Latin America and the Caribbean<sup>34</sup>
- Northeast Asia<sup>35</sup>

**Number of version B surveys sent: 362**

**Number of version B surveys returned: 115 (32%)**

*In the multiple choice sections, the total number of times people have checked each option is provided. In the narrative sections, answers have been summarised and clustered, and some singular or region-specific remarks left out. The numbers between (brackets) represent the number of times an answer was given. Please refer to the regional survey reports for a more complete and detailed portrayal of the answers given.*

<sup>34</sup> Only two surveys were returned from this region, or 2% of the total. This means that the two surveys cannot be considered representative of the region.

<sup>35</sup> From Northeast Asia no version B surveys were returned.

## I. GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT NETWORKING AND NETWORK STRENGTHENING

**36. Do you see a need for a regional and/or a global network in the field of conflict prevention and peacebuilding?**

Yes	No	Don't know / not applicable
109	2	2

**Why or why not?**

- **Stronger together (63):** The conflicts we face cannot be dealt with on our own. A network unites the strengths of organisations and engaging in conflict prevention. It also increases the voice of civil society as a whole.
- **Sharing experiences and learning from others (31):** a network generates ideas, exchanges information and contacts and is able to educate people in peace building
- **Coordinating activities (16),** facilitating joint projects and activities
- **Joint advocacy and lobby (10)** to strengthen commitment to peacebuilding
- **Multidimensional approach (3):** Conflict prevention and peacebuilding requires multidimensional approach with concrete action at grassroots level as well as simultaneous response in national and international level. In some cases, we see clearly a close relation between local and national condition.

- **To bring our issues to the attention of global actors (8)**
- **International dimensions of conflict (7):** Many conflict issues cross borders. Conflict and one place can have a negative impact on the stability of the region or even the world. Everything that is done in one corner of the globe has an impact at the other end. As a result, a united, international response is needed.
- **Conflict prevention is important (6)**
- **Similar issues (4):** Countries and population of a region usually have similar conditions, common mentality, and face similar conflict issues. They know very well each other's problems and the best ways to find a resolution.
- **Promote understanding and awareness of conflict prevention (4)**
- **Link to UN Peacebuilding Commission (3)**
- **Reduces duplication of efforts (2)**
- **Solidarity (1)** and mutual support
- **For early warning and early response (1)**
- **To avoid too many parallel structures (1)**
- **Trust (1):** working in a network can create more trust
- **To strengthen and build on existing networks (1)** as there are already many

**37. Is your organisation part of a regional and/or a global network in the field of peacebuilding or another field?**

Yes	No	Don't know / not applicable
91	11	3

**If yes, which network(s)?**

Many networks were mentioned; see regional survey reports

**38. What are the main lessons you have learned, and/or best practices you are familiar with, when it comes to networking and network strengthening?**

- **Networks should provide access to knowledge (44):** exchange information, and of experience, participation in training programs, ongoing partnership projects, exchange of resources, regular meetings, having a set of analytical materials related to the network activities - all these should be accessible to each network member.
- **Flexible, democratic and transparent structure (15):** The coordination of network activities should be flexible, have little hierarchy, and be accessible to all. The network should be transparent and democratic. Decision-making structures should be clear to all and ownership shared.
- **Face-to-face meetings (15)** are indispensable. They enhance follow-on virtual networking efforts.
- **Effective regular communication (10)** is essential for networks to work well
- **Joint activities (8)** - be practical
- **Networks are a way to build bridges (8)** people from different sides of a conflict divide, different ethnic groups etc.

## Annex 4: Global survey report version B - for people indirectly involved in GPPAC

- **Have clear shared aims and objectives (5)** and regularly revise them jointly. Have clarity about member's expectations and responsibilities
- **Need commitment from members (4)**
- **Funding (4)** networks is needed but difficult
- **Good coordination (4)** is crucial - role of secretariat cannot be overestimated
- **Enlargement (4)** so the network can be strengthened.
- **Build on strengths (4)** of the members rather than tarrying on the weaknesses (adopt appreciative analysis tool); engage committed organisations with resources
- **Capacitate member organisations (3)** to more effectively achieve their goals
- **Common interests unite people (3):** having ongoing connections with likeminded people that give each other support in situations of problems.
- **Importance of M&E (3)**
- **Effectiveness depends on members (3)** and how effective they are
- **A network is only as strong as the solidarity of its members (3)**
- **Service and support the members (2)** A danger with networks is that they evolve into organisations in their own right and often end up 'competing' against their members.
- **Networking requires time and patience (2)**
- **Synergy enhances capacities (2):** a joint agenda can enhance our individual capacity in peace building
- **Domination of the English language is a problem (1)**
- **Maintain continuity (1)**
- **Create structures that help reduce competition among members and address internal conflict (1)**
- **Personal relations are key (1)**
- **Reach out to grassroots (1):** Networks need to be careful not to become clubs of those in the know - they need to reach out particularly to those working at community level

### 39. In what ways could networks contribute to your work?

- **Exchange experiences (63)** and learn from the work of others - lessons learned, best practices
- **Access to knowledge and expertise (39):** Networks give access to information and education. They can provide their members with expertise, analytical materials and reports from the field of conflict prevention.
- **Joint activities (26)**
- **Contacts and partnerships (26):** Networking supports working relations and provides its members with contacts.
- **Advance interests, lobby and advocate (16):** Networks give the possibility to defend and advance the interests of the public and those of their participants at national and regional levels. They give us a collective voice and may amplify the voice of the marginalised. They may lobby for changes in the national legislation.
- **Build capacities (13);** trainings, workshops
- **Funds (13):** Networks may provide financial support to members
- **New ideas and visions (7)**
- **Unified approach (5):** elaboration of a common agenda
- **Raise awareness (4)** about our work

## Annex 4: Global survey report version B - for people indirectly involved in GPPAC

- **Peace education (4)**
- **Analyse conflict (4):** A network may help to investigate the causes of conflicts
- **Solidarity (3)** and mutual support
- **Create South -North links (1)** Draw attention of donors in the North to the problems of the South
- **Minimise competition (1)**

### II. INVOLVEMENT WITH THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR THE PREVENTION OF ARMED CONFLICT (GPPAC)

40. Are you familiar with GPPAC? (If no, you do not have to answer the remaining questions)

Yes	No
91	11

41. In what ways could GPPAC contribute to your work?

- **Exchange knowledge (18)** collect and share lessons learned and best practices on network strengthening
- **Helping build our capacity (16)**
- **Conferences (13)**
- **Provide access to knowledge and expertise (12)** in the field
- **Resources (12)**
- **Strengthen cooperation (9)** between civil society organizations, governments, and international institutions
- **Lobbying and advocacy (7)**
- **Raise the profile and influence of peacebuilding organizations and promote change (6)**
- **Joint initiatives (5)**
- **International initiatives (3)** that can add value to local projects
- **Develop common policy (3)**
- **Interacting with policymakers (3)**
- **Solidarity (3)** and moral and concrete support
- **Partnerships and contacts (3)** with others in the field
- **Strengthen existing networks (1)**
- **Raise public awareness (1)** on prevention of armed conflicts

42. What has been your involvement with GPPAC (you may also check more than one box)?

No involvement	Provided funding for GPPAC	Attended national GPPAC meeting	Attended regional GPPAC meeting	Attended global GPPAC conference in New York	Informal contacts with GPPAC member(s)	Other
8	6	28	53	50	46	12



**43. Would you (have) want(ed) to be more directly involved?**

Yes	No	Don't know / not applicable
74	11	11

**Why or why not?**

**Yes:**

- **Would like to contribute to the network (11)**
- **To be informed (7)** about the global initiatives and processes
- **To enhance our capacities (7)** by receiving knowledge and skills
- **To have a voice (5)** about global issues and contribute to debates
- **To share experiences (5)**
- **To cooperate with others (5)**
- **To increase our voice and visibility (3)**
- **We have the same interests (1)** as GPPAC

**No:**

- **Lack of time/other priorities (8)**
- **No clarity about added value (2)**
- **Have received no response from GPPAC (1)**
- **Waste of time (1)** As long as GPPAC is not able to create a relevant regional network of peace NGOs in the Middle East that can begin discussing the main problems of the region and the ways of solving them, it is a waste of time

**III. THE STATE OF THE GLOBAL AND REGIONAL GPPAC NETWORKS**

**44. What, if any, are the benefits of the global GPPAC network for your organization?**

No benefits (answer with 'X')	Benefits (specify)	Don't know / not applicable (answer with 'X')
7		14

- **Opportunity to exchange experience (34)**
- **Partnerships and contacts (23)** - creating global connections and multilevel communication
- **Access to knowledge and expertise (20)**
- **Growth of my organisation's capacity (11)**
- **Draws attention (10)** of the world community to our conflicts and peacebuilding efforts
- **Facilitate cooperation and collaboration (9)** of peacebuilding organizations within their regions and globally, between governments, and international agencies
- **Lobby and advocacy (8)** at various levels
- **Meetings, conference (7)**
- **Increased visibility of organisation (6)** and more clout towards governments and regional organisations

## Annex 4: Global survey report version B - for people indirectly involved in GPPAC

- **Access to resources (4)** directly or by establishing contacts with donors through GPPAC
- **Solidarity (4)** regionally and globally
- **Joint projects (4)**
- **Link the global to the local (3)**
- **Partnership with UN (3)**
- **Reduction of the risks of conflict development (2)** in our region
- **The Global Action Agenda (1)**
- **Gained a central organising body (1)**
- **Being informed (1):** about global initiatives and processes
- **Influencing global processes (1)**

### 45. What, if any, are the benefits of the regional GPPAC network for your organization?

No benefits (answer with 'X')	Benefits (specify)	Don't know / not applicable (answer with 'X')
12		16

- **Exchange of experience (21)**
- **Partnerships and contacts (17)**
- **Collaboration (12)** on relevant regional peace and conflict issues
- **Increase of capacity of the organisation (11)**, access to training, and broadening organisations' sphere of activities
- **Receiving information (8)**
- **Lobby and advocacy (5)** at various levels
- **Increased visibility and credibility of organisation (4)**
- **Access to resources (3)**
- **Partnership with UN (2)**
- **Solidarity (1)**

### 46. What, in your view, are the most important functions of the global GPPAC network?

- **Lobbying (32)** at different levels; advancing the interests of the network members and their constituencies. Liaise with the UN and in particular the Peacebuilding Commission
- **Information (20):** Provide us with information of good quality -about global processes, what other members are doing, research results, tools and methods
- **Bring together governments and NGOs (16)**
- **Sharing knowledge and experiences (14)**
- **Partnerships and contacts (14)** among civil society and with governments
- **Advocacy (14):** high-level; organising global campaigns
- **Liaising with UN (14) - in the future,** represent the network with a seat at the UN
- **Collaboration (11):** coordinating joint activities and implementing plans. Establish working groups on different directions where conflict develops. Maximising resources through collaboration.
- **Awareness raising (11)** among populations

## Annex 4: Global survey report version B - for people indirectly involved in GPPAC

- **Access to resources (11):** financial as well as content
- **Build capacities (11):** Training of specialists and monitors
- **Supporting the regional networks (10)**
- **Develop common vision and strategy (9)**
- **Mobilisation (9):** Mobilise the world community, mass media, and international organisations in the resolution, and prevention of conflicts and war
- **Organise meetings (9):** Participation at high level international and global conferences
- **Develop methods of prevention (7):** introduce alternative approaches to address conflicts around the world
- **Coordination (6)**
- **Monitor, research and analyse conflicts (6)** and their cause-consequence relations
- **Building networks around themes (4)**
- **Trust and solidarity building (3)** between representatives of peace NGOs, grassroots peace people, representatives of UN and governments
- **Mediate (2)** between conflicting groups, ethnic groups and the state.
- **Moral and psychological support (1)**
- **Raising the profile of civil society (1)**
- **Broadening membership of the network (1)**

### 47. What, in your view, are the most important functions of the regional GPPAC network?

- **Cooperation and joint activities (27):** implementing the Regional Action Agenda. Maximising resources through collaboration.
- **Partnerships and contacts (17)** among civil society and with governments
- **Exchange of knowledge and experiences (16),** lessons learned, best practices
- **Lobby (12)** - national, regional and international. Promotion of regional interests on international level
- **Advocacy (11):** Unite forces of NGOs in conflict prevention. Present the opinion of the public to the relevant authorities.
- **Building capacities (10):** Education of our specialists
- **Elaborating norms and methods of prevention (9)**
- **Keeping us informed (6):** communication and provision of information to network members
- **Monitoring (6):** Evaluation of ongoing conflicts
- **Financial support (6)**
- **Developing joint agenda (5)**
- **Representing regional interests (3)** and special regional issues
- **Raise the profile (2)** of civil society and peacebuilding at the regional level
- **Awareness raising (1)**
- **Give global representation (1)** to local and national issues and organizations

### 48. What are your expectations with regard to these functions?

This question was interpreted in a variety of different ways. Mostly, the answers were a reiteration of the functions mentioned above: people expect that the network will carry out these functions.

**49. To what extent to have these expectations been met so far?**

Fully	Partly	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
2	34	24	4	18

**Please explain:**

**Partly:**

- **At regional level we can do more (7):** the regional initiative is limited to isolated activities, there is no systematic process. There is also no funding.
- **Lack of information and communication (3)**
- **Lack of funds (3)**
- **We have limited capacity and resources (2)** to participate in the network
- **Need more transparent and efficient governance (2)**
- **Still in early stage (2)**
- **Slow progress (2)**
- **Conferences led to new contacts (1)**
- **Gaps (1) between agendas and reality**

**Not really / Don't know/ not applicable:**

- **Have not been involved enough (13);** poor communication. Would like to receive more information on a regular basis
- **No impact so far (3)** Events such as the global gathering in New York were not more than singular events
- **Lack of concrete action (3)**

**50. What are the main challenges faced by GPPAC and/or the regional network?**

- **Unfriendly political environment (11)**
- **Communication (10)**
- **Lack of concrete activities (8)** ; no implementation yet
- **Lack of funds (8)** - need to interest donors in long-term support
- **Few contacts with state bodies and regional organisations (6)**
- **Maintaining the network (6);** Maintain the level of attention and activities.
- **Enlargement (6)** stay open to all organisations actively committed
- **Lack of focus (5)**
- **Continuity and sustainability (5);** activities have an isolated character, they are not systematic
- **Too far removed from grassroots (4)**
- **Governance (4):** ineffective, lack of ownership, lack of transparency
- **Building coherency (4)** despite the diverging issues and levels development of countries and regions
- **Socio-economic issues (3)**
- **Reality of armed conflict (3)**
- **Political realities (2):** violent conflicts, US foreign policy
- **Lack of institutional support (2)** to members and national networks/focal points

- **Politics within network (2)** particularly in Middle East where Israeli organisations are prevented from joining
- **Commitment (2) of members**
- **Language barriers (2):** information is distributed in English
- **Low capacity of members (2):** not enough skills in networking and little capacity for conflict intervention
- **Lack of means to control the system set up (1)**
- **Escalating violence (1)** throughout the world
- **Competition and rivalry (1)** between organisations, and between civil society and government or regional institutions
- **Time**

### IV. RECOMMENDATIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GLOBAL AND REGIONAL GPPAC NETWORKS

#### 51. What are your recommendations for strengthening the functions mentioned under questions 11 and 12?

- **Governance (17):** create clarity on structures and procedures; increase ownership and transparency; provide equal opportunities for all network members. Specify mandates and roles and address representativeness
- **Decide on aims and strategies (12)** for the implementation of the Action Agendas, and do so in a participatory way. Also develop benchmarks.
- **Strengthen the secretariats (10)** at various levels
- **Exchange of knowledge (9):** Learn from others. Constant exchange of information among network members
- **Build capacity (7)** of network members
- **Increase communication and access to information (7)** possibly through internet and a regular newsletter
- **Organize regular conferences and meetings (7)**
- **Influence governments (7):** Develop a system of cooperation and mechanisms of influence on politicians and the state
- **Cooperate with existing networks (7),** unite forces and methodologies with real activists and active organizations
- **Capacity building of members (6):** this would also provide them with incentives for participation in the network, moral and material
- **Monitor possible conflict zones (4)**
- **Start joint activities (4)** including follow-up of conferences
- **Financial support (4):** find long-term funding
- **Regular meetings (3):** Organise an early global forum or a constant operating network of round tables
- **Join organizations and networks that deal with security (3):** UN, NATO, EU and other multilateral and international organizations
- **Establish ongoing relations with international institutions such as UN (3)**
- **Access to experts (3):** Establishment of a data base of consultants
- **Internships and visiting fellows programmes(2)**
- **Establish monitoring mechanisms (2)**

- **Advocacy (2)**
- **Intensify lobby with UN and others (2)**
- **A joint fund (1)** for the support of regional networks.
- **Develop knowledge management systems (1)**
- **Make GPPAC more known (1)**
- **Awareness raising of populations (1)**
- **Link to the grassroots (1)**
- **Maintaining the network (1)**
- **Publish books (1)**

## V. STRUCTURE, TRANSPARENCY AND REPRESENTATION

**52. To what extent do you consider your organization to be represented in the global GPPAC network?**

Fully	Partly	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
16	23	13	16	19

**Please explain:**

**Fully:**

- **The network is part of our programmes**
- **Partly:**
- **Depends on topic**
- **Not really:**
- **Inadequate involvement and communication (9)**
- **Representation has a sporadic character (6)**
- **Not sure what's happened in GPPAC since New York (2)**
- **Not at all:**
- **No transparency (2) - don't know how to become a member**

**53. To what extent do you consider your organization to be represented in the regional GPPAC network?**

Fully	Partly	Not really	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
21	25	12	19	15

**Please explain:**

**Fully:**

- **regularly receive information and always invited to events (6)**

**Partly / not really:**

- **Not involved; too little communication (10)**
- **Isolated events (9), no continuity**
- **Depends on time and resources to take part (3)**

**54. Do you consider the regional and global GPPAC network to be sufficiently open and inclusive?**

Very inclusive	A little inclusive	Not very inclusive	Not at all inclusive	Don't know/ not applicable
21	19	12	7	26

**Please explain:**

**Very inclusive:**

- All nationalities represented at global conference
- Our region is open to new partners
- This survey is a living proof of inclusion

**A little inclusive / not very / not at all inclusive:**

- Little information and communication (7)
- Limited coverage (5)
- No common strategy; different goals (2)
- Closed circle (2): it is composed of people who have known each other for a while
- Problems with funding (1)
- Don't have a list of members (1) so can't communicate with them
- Marginalised (1): several participating organizations have spoken of feeling marginalized or used
- Globally it is open and inclusive, regionally it is closed and exclusive (1) - Middle East

**Don't know/not applicable:**

- Not aware of the process to be included (6)

**55. Can the network be strengthened by the inclusion of additional partners in your region?**

Yes	No	Don't know / not applicable
69	2	21

**Please explain:**

**Yes:**

- Better coverage strengthens the work (27) ; new partners will bring additional capacities; will also make GPPAC more known; more directions of activities could be covered
- Quality over quantity (6) Numbers don't matter but the quality of the contribution. Differentiate between well established and less established organizations, and also between individuals who represent a constituency and those that represent themselves. We need to add only organizations that are interested in the issues of GPPAC and working on them.
- Avoid becoming too large to manage (3); gradual process
- For a better interethnic dialogue
- Include more peace operation actors (1) such as police and military

**No:**

- Strengthening comes from focus and choices (1), not from a bigger crowd



## Annex 4: Global survey report version B - for people indirectly involved in GPPAC

- **Just started (1):** we need to mature the process before we bring in other actors or partners.

### If yes, do you have suggestions for partners that could be included?

For specific suggestions see regional survey reports

### 56. What is your opinion about the coverage of the global and regional GPPAC network (i.e. its spread over the globe; the countries and regions that are part of it)? How should GPPAC deal with the fact that some regions and countries are not covered?

Very good	Quite good	Not very good	Not good at all	Don't know/ not applicable
6	43	10	2	26

- **Identify possible members (29)** Pro-actively work to identify constructive peacebuilding organizations working in those areas who could be members of GPPAC; contact engaged people with leadership qualities in this GPPAC-weak regions and nations. Organising a workshop in these countries may help.
- **Raise awareness on GPPAC (8)**
- **Decide on maximum size (2)** that can be handled. Less can be more.
- **Work with existing regional networks (7)**
- **Investigate WHY they are not covered (1)**
- **Accept it (1)**, you never can cover all countries, but keep trying.
- **Achieve gender balance (1)**
- **Concentrate on conflict areas (1)**
- **Force it (1)** through administrative measures like not inviting to conferences, generating meetings outside the region, etc.

## VI. COMMUNICATION

### 57. What is your opinion about the communication between GPPAC and your organization?

Very good	Quite good	Not very good	Not good at all	Don't know/ not applicable
10	26	27	8	18

#### Please explain:

##### Quite good:

- **International Secretariat expects too much in terms of communication (4);** emails are too many and too long ; lack of time to read them
- **Efficient internet communication (1)**
- **People building peace II book (1)**
- **No contacts after New York (1)**
- **Create a yahoo group (1)**

**Not very good:**

- **Communication not systematic or not at all (18)** - ‘Recommendations or suggestions which we were asked to give were never taken up. No explanation was ever given why not. After this had taken place several times we did not believe any more that the answers to the questions were taken seriously or even respected.’
- **Language problems (1):** all communication is in English
- **It is improving through this survey (1)**

**VII. ADDITIONAL REMARKS**

**58. Do you have any other comments or remarks you would like to share with us?**

- A network should be seen to add value to the efforts of individual member organizations by providing them with opportunities. For the network to be effective it should be member driven and be active in sharing information; responding to requests and suggestions; be transparent and open about the work it does for and on behalf of its members and act consistently in accordance with the Network’s principle and values.
- GPPAC should aim high. The current commission on peace building is one of the opportunities for GPPAC to be a specialized organization of the Peacebuilding Commission.
- The thinking of belonging to such an organization (GPPAC) gives me such an excitement. Wishing you all the best in the arrangements.





## Wednesday October 11

9:00 - 12:30 break up in smaller workgroups In each workgroup a few people will do a brief presentation of not more than 5 minutes. The objective is to stimulate thinking and kick off the discussions.

### 1. Structure and Transparency

Guiding questions:

- How to realize participatory processes and bottom up structures *Short presentation by: Florence Mpaayei, Nairobi Peace Initiative, Kenya*
- How to establish democratic procedures in order to enhance the legitimacy of the structures *Short presentation by: Peter Woodrow, US Steering Committee, USA*

*Other issue to address:*

- How to build procedures for transparency and accountability in a global network

### 2. Functions of networks: capacity building and knowledge exchange

Guiding questions:

- How to conceptualise knowledge sharing and capacity building?
- What is the relationship between the two concepts?

*Short presentation by: Willemijn Verkoren, researcher University of Amsterdam, Netherlands*

- How to build structures for capacity building for members of a network?
- How to build a framework for effective knowledge generation and exchange

*Short presentation by: Syed Rifaat Hussain, Regional Centre for Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka*

### 3. Dilemma's of networks: activism vs. knowledge exchange, and focused network vs. broad movement

Guiding questions:

More or less activism:

- In how far should a network like GPPAC play a politically activist role and act like a solidarity, human rights-oriented movement?
- What are the advantages of a consensus, engagement, relationship building approach?
- Where is the balance between activism and building relationships with policymakers?

*Short presentation by: Augusto Miclat, Initiatives for International Dialogue, Philippines*

Focus vs. inclusiveness:

- Are networks that focus on a specific and narrow issue or goal more effective in mobilizing participants and achieving results than broad and diverse 'umbrella' movements?
- What are the advantages of a narrow focus vs. an inclusive approach?
- Should the Global Partnership be a focused network or a broad movement, what are the opportunities and challenges for both

*Short presentation by: Andre Kamenshikov, Nonviolence International, Russia*

#### 4. Roles within networks, secretariat versus local and or regional partners

Guiding questions:

- Should the role of a secretariat be supporting or more pro active *Short presentation by: Celina del Felice, UNOY, Netherlands*
- How to divide tasks between the secretariat and partner organizations *Short presentation by: Emmanuel Bombande, WANEP, Ghana*
- How centralized should the work of a global network be organized, what are limitations and opportunities *Short presentation by: Binky Dalupan, independent consultant, Netherlands*

14:00 - 16:00      Reporting back from the working groups followed by discussion on the recommendations for strengthening GPPAC

16:00 - 16:15      Tea break

16:15 - 17:30      Next steps for the Global Partnership

17:30              *Closing*

### Participants list

1. Kevin Clements, The Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, Australia
2. Maria Lorenza Dalupan-Palm, independent consultant, Netherlands
3. Charles Dambach, Alliance for Peacebuilding, USA
4. Celina Del Felice, United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders), Netherlands
5. Kai Frithof Brand -Jacobsen, Peace Action, Training and Research Institute of Romania (PATRIR), Romania
6. David Grant, NonViolent Peaceforce, USA
7. Eelco de Groot, CORDAID, Netherlands
8. Norbert Mao, Amani Forum, Uganda
9. Dot Maver, Peace Alliance, USA
10. Rebecca Peters, IANSA, UK
11. Ute Hegener, German Platform for Peaceful Conflict Management, Germany
12. Willemijn Verkoren, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands

#### *From the International Steering Group*

13. Fadi Abi Allam, Permanent Peace Movement, Lebanon
14. Francis Acquah, West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP), Ghana
15. Ragnar Angeby, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden
16. Johan Aufderklamm, ICRC, Switzerland
17. Emmanuel Bombande, West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP), Ghana
18. Ana Bourse, Regional Coordination for Economic and Social Research (CRIES), Argentina
19. Jone Dakuvula, Citizens Constitutional Forum, Fiji
20. Nicole Deller, World Federalist Movement, USA
21. Anara Eginalieva, Foundation for Tolerance International (FTI), Kyrgyzstan
22. Ekkehard Forberg, World Vision, Germany
23. Tina Gogueliani, International Center on Conflict & Negotiation, Georgia
24. Kateryna Gusyeva, Odessa Mediators Group, Ukraine
25. Meredith Joyce, Peaceboat, Japan
26. Raya Kadyrova, Foundation for Tolerance International (FTI), Kyrgyzstan
27. Andre Kamenshikov, Nonviolence International, Russia
28. Memen Lauzon, Initiatives for International Dialogue, Philippines
29. David Lord, Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee, Canada
30. Augusto Miclat, Initiatives for International Dialogue, Philippines
31. Kwesi Mngqibisa, African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD), South Africa
32. Florence Mpaayei, Nairobi Peace Initiative, Kenya
33. Dorothy Ndungu, Nairobi Peace Initiative, Kenya
34. Anne Palm, Civil Society Conflict Prevention Network, Katu, Finland
35. Tanja Popovic, Nansen Network in the Balkans, Serbia
36. Syed Rifaat Hussain, Regional Centre for Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka
37. Andrés Serbin, Regional Coordination for Economic and Social Research (CRIES), Argentina
38. Yoshioka Tatsuya, Peaceboat, Japan
39. Peter Woodrow, US Steering Committee, USA



## Annex 5: Programme and participants of GPPAC networking seminar, 10-11 October 2006

### *From the International Secretariat*

40. Catherine Barnes, Independent Consultant, UK (*facilitator*)
41. Malin Brenk, knowledge sharing coordinator
42. Sinan Cankaya, intern
43. Charlotte Crockett, GPPAC project officer
44. Guido de Graaf Bierbrauwer, head of programmes
45. Renske Heemskerk, UN & regional organizations coordinator
46. Marte Hellema, Latin America & Asia and Pacific officer
47. Jasmin Nordien, ISG liaison & Africa Coordinator
48. Goele Scheers, Monitoring & Evaluation officer
49. Paul van Tongeren, executive director
50. Juliette Verhoeven, research coordinator & Middle East and Central Asia coordinator

**The Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict**

**c/o European Centre for Conflict Prevention**

**Laan van Meerdervoort 70**

**2517 AN Den Haag**

**The Netherlands**

**Tel.: + 31 70 3110970**

**Fax: + 31 70 3600194**

**[info@conflict-prevention.net](mailto:info@conflict-prevention.net)**

**[www.gppac.net](http://www.gppac.net)**