

## **Program Initiative Prospectus**

### **Phase II**

## **Peacebuilding and Reconstruction (PBR)**

**2000-2004**

### **PI Team**

Marc Van Ameringen

Stephen Baranyi

Dina Craissati

Shaukat Hassan

Olaf Juergensen (MAP Director)

Michael Koros (PCIA Coordinator)

Wardie Leppan

Calvin Nhira

Shannon Smith (Research Officer)

Pamela Scholey (Team Leader)

October 2000

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS**

BELLANET	Bellanet International Secretariat
BICC	Bonn International Centre for Conversion
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIETAfrica	Community Information Empowerment and Transparency
CCR	Centre for Conflict Resolution
CPR	Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction
DFAIT	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade
EU	Evaluation Unit, IDRC
ICTs	Information and Communication Technologies
IMADS	Integrated Mine Action Development Strategy
LACRO	IDRC Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
MAP	Mine Action Program
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MERO	IDRC Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa
MINGA	Natural Resources Management in Latin America and the Caribbean PI
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
PBR	Peacebuilding and Reconstruction PI
PBDO	Partnership and Business Development Office, IDRC
PCIA	Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment
PCR	Project Completion Report
PI	Program Initiative
PNA	Palestinian National Authority
PO	Program Officer
ROSA	IDRC Regional Office for Southern Africa
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### LIST OF ACRONYMS

I.	CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND .....	1
II	STATEMENT OF PURPOSE .....	4
	1. WORKING DEFINITION OF PEACEBUILDING	
	2. MISSION	
	3. OBJECTIVES	
III.	PROGRAMMING FRAMEWORK .....	5
	RESEARCH FOCUS	
	PROGRAMMING APPROACH	
IV.	PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION .....	7
	1. PHASE II WORK PLAN	
	2. FLAGSHIP ACTIVITIES	
	3. INTRA-IDRC SYNERGIES AND PARTNERSHIPS	
	4. EXTERNAL NETWORKING AND DISSEMINATION	
	5. CLOSING THE LOOP	
	6. MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
	7. MANAGING RISKS	
V.	RESOURCES .....	10
VI.	REACH, OUTPUTS, IMPACT .....	11
ANNEX I:	PROGRAMMING FRAMEWORK	
ANNEX II:	EVALUATION PLAN	
ANNEX III:	PROFILES OF TEAM MEMBERS	

## **PHASE II PROSPECTUS**

### **PEACEBUILDING AND RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM INITIATIVE**

#### **I. CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND**

The Peacebuilding and Reconstruction Program Initiative (PBR PI) was created in October 1996 at a time when the international community was confronted by a paradoxical situation. By the mid 1990s a number of long-standing local and regional wars in Central America, Asia and Africa had finally drawn to an end; simultaneously, several new or simmering conflicts had broken into violence—shattering any expectations for a more peaceful world order with the end of the Cold War. Most of the emergent wars were in the developing world and most were intra-state conflicts—exposing the necessity for the international community to address the twin issues of peace and development in an integrated manner.

The concept of peacebuilding was officially introduced into the international lexicon in 1992 by the then UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali in his report, *An Agenda for Peace*, as one of the key instruments at the service of the international community to deal with the threat or reality of war. Peacebuilding was defined as a post-conflict activity for “rebuilding the institutions and infrastructures of nations torn by civil war and strife; and building bonds of peaceful mutual benefit among nations formerly at war.” It involved both short term measures to support the implementation of peace agreements that were put into place and longer term measures to address the root causes of conflict to avoid a relapse into violence. The concept of peacebuilding was quickly embraced by academics, policy makers, international agencies, humanitarian actors, development practitioners and field workers each of whom saw its relevance and importance for their own work in facilitating the difficult transition of war-torn countries to sustainable development and peace.

The widespread international acceptance of the new peacebuilding agenda concealed the serious weaknesses and limitations in peacebuilding research, analysis, policy and practice. Despite decades of research in peace studies and development studies, there was little knowledge or understanding of the complex and multi-faceted challenges of rebuilding wartorn societies. The challenges included securing the implementation of peace agreements; demobilization, disarmament and reintegration of ex-combatants; reform of military and security agencies; re-settlement of refugees and internally-displaced soldiers; rehabilitation of the war economy; ensuring the physical safety of individuals and communities; and establishing a viable political system—all these against the backdrop of a recently-ended violent conflict that had ripped the entire social fabric of a society. If after some fifty years development research still defies efforts to generate answers, peacebuilding research had to start with identifying the relevant questions.

Moreover, there was an equally pressing need to better understand and build upon the relevance or applicability of the experiences of one country for the reconstruction of other war-torn countries. Comparative or cross-country studies were few in number and lacked a systematic or rigorous approach to allow for conclusions that could be applied more broadly. In the early 1990s, the multiplication of peacebuilding experiences across the world and the growing need for policy and operational guidelines by key actors inevitably spurred the growth of a diverse body of research and analysis drawn from many different disciplines which gradually came to constitute a new genre of development research. By 1996, peacebuilding had emerged as a legitimate research area—deserving further exploration of its scope, boundaries, methodologies and substantive insights. Equally importantly, given the demand for peacebuilding research, it was increasingly recognized that research itself promised to play a potentially important role as an instrument of peacebuilding.

Thus, when the PBR PI was created in late 1996, it was with the expectation that it would help contribute to the evolution of the peacebuilding field from a developmental and Southern perspective while supporting peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction in selected settings through the effective use of research as a tool. The new PI quickly agreed on its mission: “to support research, policy development and capacity building as tools to assist countries emerging from violent conflicts to make the difficult transition to peace, reconciliation, social equity and sustainable development.” It was recognized early on that among IDRC’s programs, the PBR PI was distinctive in two key respects: first, because it focussed specifically on the developmental challenges of post-conflict societies, and second, because its programming approach was designed to contribute actively to the processes of peacebuilding and reconstruction in countries emerging from violent conflicts.

To establish its specificity and originality, the new PI argued that conflict-torn transitional countries confront challenges that are significantly different from other developing country contexts. Faced with the interrelated tasks of building peace and development in a particularly precarious and fragile political context, post-conflict countries require a different mix and sequence of policy imperatives. This in turn required research which specifically addressed post-conflict priorities as the basis for better policy making and programming. In addition, given the fluidity of the political context, it was argued that research would play a catalytic role in facilitating processes of dialogue, consensus and coalition building, and policy development. The PI’s main objectives and three-level programming approach were designed to respond to these needs. These included:

- (i) country-specific projects in support of national reconstruction;
- (ii) cross country, regional or comparative analyses of peacebuilding and reconstruction experiences and documenting lessons learned;
- (iii) collaborative and systematic initiatives between Southern and Northern researchers and policy makers to facilitate the emergence of a global agenda for peacebuilding research, policy and action.

Country-specific programming was intended to address national reconstruction priorities through research, policy development, individual and institutional capacity building. Given the composition of the PI, the prospectus identified the following as key areas: (i) institutional and policy reform; (ii) environmental security and strategies for co-management in post-conflict environments; and, (iii) information and communication technologies in the context of peacebuilding. It was expected that social-gender analysis would be employed in each of these areas to determine the differential needs, roles and capabilities of social groups in post conflict settings. Initially, the PI decided to support projects in six countries: South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, Eritrea, Palestine and Cambodia as well as selected cross-country, regional or global projects. In addition, the PI agreed to support cross-country, regional or global projects across a limited range of thematic issues in light of emerging priorities.

The PI's three-year prospectus provided a coherent but fairly broad framework under which the program was able to support research that responded to the evolving perspectives and agendas of multiple constituencies in the various contexts in which the PI worked. During its first phase from 1997-2000, the PBR team deliberately adopted an experimental and open-ended approach to programming. The PI supported 42 projects and 41 research support activities that shed light on different dimensions of post-conflict peacebuilding and reconstruction and/or utilized research as a tool for peacebuilding and reconstruction. 52.3% of its projects were country specific; 34.6% were cross-regional or thematic; and 13.1% were global. In other words, there was a distinct split between the PI's country-specific projects and its thematic projects. Contrary to initial expectations, the PI was only partially successful in designing and implementing country-level programming in its initial target countries. In fact, due to a combination of internal and external factors, the PI discontinued its programming in Eritrea and Cambodia while initiating programming in Guatemala. The PI's project portfolio in each of the five target countries (Angola, Mozambique, South Africa, Palestine and Guatemala) was quite varied, reflecting local circumstances and priorities. However, given financial limitations, it proved difficult to develop a programming strategy that would generate a critical mass of projects at the country level.

On the other hand, there was a gradual consolidation of the PI's thematic projects around several distinct areas including democratization, demilitarization, land issues, political economy of peacebuilding, post-conflict violence, community and social reconstruction. The PI's cross-country, regional and global projects served to shed light on the common problems that post-conflict countries share and confirmed the relevance and transferability of lessons from one context to another.

The PI's experiences in implementing its original prospectus, reinforced by insightful feedback from internal and external reviewers, were useful in leading the PI to undertake an extensive strategic review of its programming in February-March 2000. At a full PI meeting held in Jerusalem in April 2000, the PI decided to refine its programming framework in order to tighten its focus, establish its unique niche, and enhance its performance and effectiveness. While

solidly based upon the PI's work in Phase I, the current prospectus for Phase II constitutes a significant re-orientation of the PI's strategic directions, as described below.

## **II. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

### **1. PBR's Working Definition of Peacebuilding**

Since peacebuilding is an elusive concept which has acquired multiple meanings through usage, the PBR team has agreed on the following working definition of peacebuilding to guide its programming: ***“Peacebuilding is the pursuit of policies, programs and initiatives that seek to create the conditions for war-torn countries to transform or manage their conflicts without violence in order to address longer term developmental goals.”***

### **2. Mission**

The PI seeks to contribute to peacebuilding through ***research on*** and ***research for*** peacebuilding by engaging Southern partners in this rapidly evolving field. The PI's mission is to support knowledge generation, policy development and research capacity building as tools to assist war-torn countries in their transition to peace and sustainable development. The PI will work primarily in three regions: Southern Africa, the Middle East and Central America. However, the results of the research it supports in these three regions, or at the cross-regional or global levels, are expected to have broader applicability.

### **3. Objectives**

- a) To enhance knowledge and understanding of three key aspects of post-war transitions: democratization, human security and the political economy of peacebuilding;
- b) To contribute to research capacity building, policy development and institutional arrangements that support transitions from violent conflict to peace and sustainable development at the local, national, regional or international levels;
- c) To promote innovative thinking and strategies for sustainable peace through historical and critical analysis of the nature, dynamics and impacts of current peacebuilding agendas;
- d) To encourage the development of new research methodologies, approaches, tools and partnerships in support of peacebuilding.



### III. PROGRAMMING FRAMEWORK

#### 1. Research Focus

The PI recognizes that countries emerging from war face multiple challenges all of which would benefit from further research and analysis. However, based on its experiences in Phase I, the PI has decided to focus its attention on three research areas within the broader peacebuilding field: **Democratization, Human Security** and the **Political Economy of Peacebuilding**. These have increasingly been identified as fundamental and necessary dimensions of peacebuilding. They are also the areas in which research (both *on* and *for* peacebuilding) promises to make the most important contributions in terms of informing policy, programming and practice, as well contributing to processes of peaceful and democratic transition. Thus, they have been singled out for focused attention during the PI's second phase. In addition, over the next four years, the PI has decided to support a few, selected projects which aim at generating critical insights into the **Challenges of Peace**.

**Democratization** encompasses the political dimensions of peacebuilding. Under this rubric, the PI will support research which examines the key governance issues that confront war-torn countries in their political transition. These include the legitimacy and capacity of the post-war state; the need to reform the state's formal legal, political, and judicial institutions; the challenges of re-negotiating political participation to include historically marginalized groups, and more specifically, the opportunities for ensuring the equal and effective participation of women in democratization and peacebuilding.

**Human Security** is an integral part of peacebuilding since it addresses the insecurity of individuals and communities as a direct consequence of war and the inability of the state to provide safety and protection. For the purposes of the PBR PI, human security is understood to cover only a narrow set of issues, namely, mine action programs; residual violence which results from the mutation of political violence into criminal violence and the role of small-arms in post-war societies; security sector reform, including new roles for the military, police and intelligence agencies; and finally, the need for security frameworks that provide for human security at the regional or sub-regional levels.

**Political Economy of Peacebuilding** constitutes an issue area that has begun to attract special research attention insofar as it seeks to link the economic with the political dimensions of wars, violence and peacebuilding. Under this umbrella, the PI will limit its support to research that focuses specifically on economic agendas that motivate or sustain wars, and how these agendas can be influenced for peacebuilding; the nature of appropriate economic and social policies for post-conflict reconstruction; the political economy of land reform which stands out as both a source and a possible solution to violent conflicts; and finally, the politics, dynamics and impacts of external assistance.

Unlike the three issue areas described above, the PI's decision to support selected projects on **"Challenges to Peace"** aims at addressing difficult questions which go beyond the immediate

needs or established boundaries of current peacebuilding agendas. It is anticipated that during Phase II, the PI will contribute to a deeper understanding of the longer term viability and sustainability of peace processes, by supporting a few selected research projects that examine the contested visions of peace and the nagging problems in peacemaking, peacebuilding and conflict prevention from a historical and critical perspective. It is expected that the PI will devote no more than 10% of its funds for projects under this rubric.

## 2. Programming Approach

The above issue areas comprise the PI's thematic framework. However, in each of the three regions in which the PI works (Southern Africa, Central America and the Middle East) the selection of projects will be guided by regional priorities. Annex 1 provides a graphic representation of the PI's thematic and regional matrix. At the end of four years of programming, PI hopes to have a critical mass of projects under selected thematic issue areas within and across different regions. It is important to emphasize that the fluid nature of post-conflict peacebuilding requires a programming approach that is highly responsive and adaptable to country, regional and international contexts—albeit within a well-defined thematic framework.

Similarly, the complex nature and dynamics of the peacebuilding agenda calls for interdisciplinary, collaborative, and policy-oriented research. Moreover, because the target audiences for peacebuilding research are diverse (ranging from national and local authorities to international agencies and grass roots organizations), the PI is committed to working with established research institutions as well as non-traditional research partners such as community organizations and peacebuilding practitioners. In line with IDRC's mandate, the PI privileges support to Southern institutions and North-South partnerships that involve significant capacity-building in the South. The PI encourages innovative research approaches that employ new information and communication technologies in support of peacebuilding and reconstruction.

Two aspects of the PI's programming approach deserve special attention: the importance of *social/gender analysis* and the need for *peace and conflict analysis*. The PI promotes research that involves *social analysis* with the aim of promoting the rights of historically marginalised groups, with a special emphasis on women, the rural poor and indigenous people. Given the deep-rooted cleavages that characterize post-conflict societies, the centrality of such analysis for peacebuilding research is evident. However, the tools for rigorous, empirically-based social/gender analysis are not well-established. Interestingly, there is greater interest in the development of gender tools than of multiple but differentiated social analysis tools. To date, the PI has been more successful in developing gender tools for its programming as well as for use by its research partners. These need to be more firmly grounded in social analysis, involving race, class, ethnicity and other social cleavages that shed light on both the dynamics of conflict and the potential for peacebuilding in war-torn societies.

In case of gender, the PI has tried to address gender on two levels: by trying to mainstream it in its programming, and by funding a number of gender-specific projects. With PBR's *Gender Equitable Research Tools* in place, the PI will move away from a focus on quota to a focus on

feminist perspectives, and towards a more careful application of gender analysis in its programming. Indicators that illustrate whether gender analysis has been mainstreamed into specific projects are:

- results include a gender equality dimension;
- resources are provided to ensure the above during a project's implementation phase;
- researchers/institutions demonstrate the capacity to work with equality issues

One of the key features of peacebuilding research is its focus on the interface between peace, security and development. The insights from peacebuilding research apply to the policies and practices of domestic actors as well as to the role of official development assistance. The PI has invested resources to facilitate the development of a new methodology that tries to understand and assess the peace and conflict impacts of development and peacebuilding initiatives in particularly precarious political contexts. *Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA)* is a methodology that the PI hopes to apply to its own work as a donor agency while it strives to identify ways of mainstreaming it to inform the work of its research and other institutional partners.

### **III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION**

#### **1. Phase II Work Plan**

The PI has already elaborated its pipeline for FY 2000-20001. In terms of the main areas of project development, the current year's pipeline constitutes a bridge between the old and the new program framework. It builds upon and consolidates several previous lines of inquiry while opening the door for new projects that reflect the updated programming matrix. The PI acknowledges the importance of continued support to individual projects that actively contribute to processes of peacebuilding and democratic transition in particular contexts. However, the PI also recognizes the need to move away from stand-alone, discrete research projects to more integrated project development around a smaller set of issue areas. In addition, the team has resolved to promote selected cross-regional thematic projects (along the lines of its flagship projects) involving program officers from different regions. One such project, on Civil Society Participation in Peacebuilding Processes, is already being explored. Finally, the PI intends to pull together, and help synthesize the results of earlier projects, as described below under "Closing the Loop."

#### **2. Flagships Activities**

The PI has identified two of its in-house, Centre-administered projects as its flagship activities to strengthen its niche as a "research donor" as well as a "knowledge conveyor" within the global peacebuilding community. These are the Mine Action Programme (MAP) based in the regional office in Johannesburg and the Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) Project based in Ottawa. Both projects were created to meet specific needs during Phase I, but each has since created its unique niche within the peacebuilding field. Both projects are designed to build upon

the global interest in making better use of development assistance to improve human security and sustainable development through strong collaboration among like-minded donors, the creation of a strong body of knowledge about peacebuilding, and the active involvement of Southern researchers and practitioners in the peacebuilding field.

### **3. Intra-IDRC Synergies and Partnerships**

CSPF 2000-2005 provides an effective framework for deepening the work of the PBR PI. CSPF identifies peacebuilding and conflict resolution as key concerns in Southern Africa, Central America and the Middle East. These are the three regions where the PI currently works and will continue to build upon in cooperation with the respective regional offices. CSPF also recognizes conflict management and peacebuilding as key development concerns both under the SEE and ENR Programs. This provides a strong opportunity for the PBR PI to collaborate with other PIs (especially PLAW, CBRNM, and MINGA) to develop a common agenda around issues of human security, conflict resolution, and governance. CSPF further draws attention to the promise of ICTs to contribute to development. The PI has already started to examine the use of ICTs as effective peacebuilding tools for documenting local-level initiatives as well as for policy making. PBR PI is currently collaborating with Bellanet and ACACIA on selected projects. During Phase II, the PI fully intends to consolidate and deepen its programming links with other relevant programming units within IDRC while continuing its close collaboration with other relevant units including PBDO, Evaluation Unit, Canadian Partnerships.

### **4. External Networking and Dissemination**

Given the novelty and the international appeal of the peacebuilding agenda, opportunities for partnership and networking are very strong among research, policy and operational agencies working in conflict-prone, conflict-torn and post-conflict contexts. Itself a donor, the PI has identified its niche as a “knowledge conveyor” within the peacebuilding community. The PI’s unique contributions reside in its ability to interact with multiple stakeholders in the South as well as the North, involving a wide range of actors from researchers, program managers in aid agencies, national or international policymakers, operational agencies and peacebuilding practitioners. The PI sees its role as facilitator, in linking theory and practice, Northern and Southern perspectives, governmental and non-governmental actors. The PI is committed to serving as a strong advocate for direct Southern participation in the development of the peacebuilding field, from the initial idea stage to the completion of projects it funds. It will continue to encourage active collaboration, partnership building and exchanges between individuals and institutions in the South. While it recognizes the importance of northern partnerships and the role of northern institutions in peacebuilding effort, the PI will primarily serve to strengthen research skills and management capacities of southern individuals and institutions. The PI will also actively assist in the dissemination of research findings through various means such as discussion forums and publications. The PI’s dissemination strategy includes reaching a wide circle of people and institutions, including all stakeholders and particularly the marginalized groups.

In Canada, the work of the PBR PI has generated much interest and assumed a relatively high profile both within and outside of IDRC. This may be due to a number of factors, including the current thrust of Canadian foreign policy, Canada's involvement in peacebuilding and reconstruction work, and the dramatic and urgent nature of peacebuilding concerns worldwide. The PI has established strong working relations with the relevant peacebuilding programs at the Department of Foreign Affairs and CIDA as well as with selected non-governmental organizations and institutions, including the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee. Internationally, the PI regularly participates in various research, policy and donor networks, including the Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction (CPR) Donors' Network.

The PI has developed global as well as regionally-specific communications/dissemination strategies which span the electronic and print media. The PI's updated website, reflecting the changes in direction, will be launched shortly. In addition, the PI supports the production of a wide range of publications including books, working papers, and discussion papers.

## **5. Closing the Loop**

As part of its commitment to consolidate the research it supports and to link its work to the broader body of knowledge, policy and practice in peacebuilding, the PBR team has agreed to produce several studies based on insights drawn and lessons learned from projects supported in Phase I. Team members have already begun to include this type of work in their work plans to ensure that it gets done. The PI has recently supported two major workshops on Peacebuilding in Central America and Peacebuilding in Africa both of which have generated important insights on long-term peacebuilding challenges in these two regions, as well as the interface between research and policy. The lessons from these workshops lend themselves to comparative analysis which is currently under consideration. Similarly, the PI has offered to organize a Policy Workshop in the Fall of 2001 focussing on the policy impacts of peacebuilding research. Finally, on CIDA's request, the PI had prepared a review of the state of the art in Peacebuilding Evaluations for presentation at the Canada-Japan NGO Peacebuilding Workshop that was held in September 2000. This activity directly flows from and in turn contributes to the PI's Evaluation Plan.

## **6. Monitoring and Evaluation**

It is increasingly recognized that just as peacebuilding is a new field that required developing its own methodologies, tools and knowledge base, evaluating peacebuilding programming requires new approaches and strategies. To date, the PBR PI has attempted only a "first generation" self evaluation of its programming which comprised evaluating its program design. However, the PI recognizes the need for and has taken steps towards more formal, external evaluations in order to allow us to determine not only whether our program design and implementation is sound but also whether we are having any impact through our programming. To that end, the PI has designed an evaluation plan for the next programming cycle (See Annex II).

## **7. Managing Risks**

The PBR PI deals with highly complex and quite often sensitive social, political and security issues in war-ravaged countries/regions. Effective programming in such war-torn areas requires a thorough knowledge of the local people and issues, and of the political dynamics obtaining there. Also essential is a keen sense of what is possible and where the opportunities for effective policy intervention lie. Time is often a critical factor.

The PI needs to remain alert to several specific risks in its programming. First, in some instances the PI's activities might be construed as interference in the local dynamics upsetting the balance of power. Second, in the course of a project the ground realities can suddenly change for the worse, forcing postponement or even abandonment of the project. Third, cultural sensitivities of some southern interlocutors/partners might defeat the PI's best efforts to develop a promising program or project.

To deal with these types of risks, the PI will carry out more intensive spadework such as a rigorous and extensive information gathering, and wide networking to cross check and develop a wider support base. Sustained engagement and full project accompaniment will also reduce risks, as will a careful selection of regional partners.

## **V. RESOURCES**

The Centre's allocation to PBR PI for FY 2000-20001 is CAD \$3 million. The PI expects to distribute roughly 25% of its resources in the Middle East, 25% in Central America, 25 % in Africa and 25% inter-regionally and globally—with the last category including the PI's in-house flagship activities.

However, the PI recognizes the value of expanding its funding base. In Phase I, the PI decided to pursue a multi-layered partnership and resource expansion strategy in recognition of the high visibility, urgency, and rapid evolution of the peacebuilding agenda. This strategy worked well during Phase I, particularly because of the PI's ability to draw upon its in-house professional expertise to add value to the work of key partners in Canada and in the regional offices. The PI established sound working relations with multiple partners (including research networks, NGO coalitions, donors' networks, and international organizations) in the South and in the North. Through these partnerships, we were able to take advantage of several opportunities for co-funding and parallel funding--raising a total of \$1,104,500 as co-funding and \$2,881,500 as parallel funding from 1997-2000. Simultaneously, we carefully nurtured relations with several donor networks with a view to mobilizing joint donor support for collaborative work on our flagship activities: Mine Action Programme and the Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment. MAP has already attracted external resources of \$400,000 and expects to generate \$1 million additional resources for its next phase. The PCIA project expects to raise up to \$1 million in the next two years in support of an ambitious program of work that compliments the core concern of the Global Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction (CPR) Donors' Network to mainstream

peacebuilding into official development assistance. The PI will continue to cultivate partnerships and resource expansion opportunities bilaterally with traditional partners like the Ford Foundation, UNDP and others for concrete projects and initiatives. In Canada, the PI will further develop its mutually beneficial relations with DFAIT and CIDA around the Canadian Peacebuilding and Human Security agenda. In addition, the PI will continue to work closely with Canadian universities and NGOs that are involved in peacebuilding.

## **VI. REACH, OUTPUT AND IMPACT**

Throughout the programming cycle, the PI's activities will be closely monitored and the expected results will be assessed according to the program's *reach* (those who will be targeted and affected), *outputs* (specific products and processes) and *impact* (broad qualitative changes).

### **1. Reach**

The PI will attempt to reach all interested individuals and groups of people who are likely to be active in the peacebuilding and development nexus, and through whom the goal of capacity building can be reached:

- the non-traditional researcher concerned with local PBR issues
- grassroots activists engaged in peacebuilding and reconstruction work
- members of traditional local power structures who need to be drawn into PBR work
- local non-governmental institutions who perceive the need for PBR work but have little or no resources to employ
- local government authorities who lack the knowledge and know-how to effect change
- formal research institutions, professional researchers and others linked to the research environment who need to be continuously and actively engaged in the generation of knowledge, innovative methodologies and realistic policy options
- opinion makers and media personnel who can articulate PBR needs and challenges
- government officials and policy makers who need to be a party to and engaged in the PBR process for it to succeed

### **2. Outputs**

The nature of outputs will vary from project to project; some will forge, bridge or strengthen relationships thereby laying the groundwork for constructive and collaborative activities. Others will produce immediately tangible products such as research reports, manuals, handbooks or events such as meetings, seminars, and dissemination and training workshops. Still other outputs will manifest in the form of inclusive processes such as consultations, briefings and regular field exchanges. Expected outputs include:

- local interpretation and analysis of events, processes and needs
- development of research skills, project management and financial management at the local level

- researchers and community representatives trained in PBR work
- new networks and strengthening of earlier ones
- creation of database at the community and national level
- speaking/lecture tours and dissemination workshops to share research findings
- use of ICTs in promoting PBR work

### **3. Impact**

The impact that PBR programming will have on communities and countries it targets is also critical to its effectiveness as a development actor and to its continuance as a benign and disinterested donor. The PI will pay particular attention to opportunities to mainstream both gender analysis and peace and conflict impact assessment into its own work as well as in the works of other developmental/donor agencies. Some expected impact are:

- dialogue and communication among stakeholders, beneficiaries and powers that be
- information sharing among grant recipients, researchers, practitioners, and community and advocacy groups
- strengthened research and management capacities for PBR work
- creation of an enabling environment for more constructive engagements among interested actors
- policy shifts aimed at pushing forward the peacebuilding and reconstruction agenda
- promotion of policies and programs that will enable women and other marginalized groups to participate in the analysis, formulation and implementation of peacebuilding and reconstruction work
- adoption of gender analysis and PCIA in peacebuilding and developmental work



# ANNEX I

## PEACEBUILDING AND RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAMMING FRAMEWORK

<div>Thematic Focus</div> <div>Geographic Focus</div>	Democratization	Human Security	Political Economy of Peacebuilding	Challenges to Peace
<b>Southern Africa</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legitimacy and Capacity of the Post-war State</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mine Action Programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic and Social Policy for Post-Conflict Reconstruction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Viability of Peace Processes</li> </ul>
<b>Middle East</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reforming Political and Judicial Institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residual Violence: Mutations from Political to Criminal Violence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic Agendas in War, and Implications for Peacebuilding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peace for Whom: Contested Visions of Peace</li> </ul>
<b>Central America</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Renegotiating Political Participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small Arms Proliferation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land Reform</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical Perspectives on Peacebuilding</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-Regional/Global</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensuring Women an Equal and Effective Voice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security Sector Reform: New Roles for the Military, Police and Intelligence Agencies</li> <li>Regional Security Frameworks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Politics and Impacts of External Assistance</li> </ul>	

## **ANNEX II**

### **EVALUATION PLAN**

July, 2000

Evaluation of Peacebuilding Programming is in its infancy. The PI has agreed to prepare a state of the art review for an international workshop in September 2000, which is also designed to inform its own programming. At the PI meeting in April 2000, the team agreed that monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are key programming components. Toward operationalizing this agreement, there is a commitment to regularly integrate M&E in programming. For example, the PBR PI will:

- Use PCRs, as well as “mini-PCRs” (for smaller projects) systematically, while striving to create demand and utility for this tool. Such usage of PCRs would help identify and address programming issues.
- Re-commit to rigorous monitoring of projects and sharing of information through: e-mail correspondence; documented phone calls/personal communications; trip/event reports; interim progress reports; field visits, including the increase of group/cross-regional field visits.
- Use the PI’s Progress Reports to produce an annual internal assessment and to facilitate necessary adjustments.
- Further institutionalize informal practices, such as: requiring evaluations of projects seeking IDRC support for a Phase II; and evaluations/assessments of institutions with whom we have an ongoing relationship of funding projects.
- In developing projects, encourage systematic built-in monitoring and evaluation components

In addition to this systematic integration of M&E, the PI will undertake the following specific evaluation of key activities during the current programming cycle.

Evaluation Issues	Used by whom, how and when?	Questions to be answered	Conduct and Manage	Dates	Cost
<b>A. Objective:</b> Program Level Strategic Evaluations: PBR PI's "Flagship" Projects; Partnership Review					
<b>i. MAP - Mine Action Programme (804221/98-8908)</b>	<p>(a) Internal review Used by: PBR PI; MAP Coordinator; the eventual external M&amp;E consultants. To: help generate the questions to be asked by and design the external M&amp;E; and generate lessons from a flagship project</p> <p>(b) External M&amp;E: -those external organizations which comprise the MAP Advisory Committee, to help make recommendations and steer MAP -PBR PI, PBDO and MAP Coordinator, for partnership activities and needs</p>	<p>(a) A review of MAP's program activities, directions, partnership and resource expansion activities.</p> <p>(b) Assessing the longer term viability and sustainability of MAP. Monitoring MAP's ongoing activities and current direction; evaluating reach and impact; future recommendations. More specific questions and M&amp;E objectives to evolve from the internal review.</p>	<p>(a) Lead PO/Project Coordinator. IDRC Evaluation Unit will facilitate and coordinate any group work, the development of a conceptual piece and/or M&amp;E system</p> <p>(b) external consultant</p>	<p>(a) March - April 2001</p> <p>(b) After (a); FY02</p>	<p>(b) approx 30,000</p>

Evaluation Issues	Used by whom, how and when?	Questions to be answered	Conduct and Manage	Dates	Cost
<b>ii. PCIA - Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (100226)</b>	<p>-By the PI, regarding: continuation of the project; lessons from a flagship project; indication of enhancement of partnerships</p> <p>- By the PCIA Unit and its partners, to respond to multi-donor needs, to determine continued salience of project</p>	<p>-Assessment of the project's activities and program of work in light of the objectives of the Project, as well as PBR PI's goal to contribute to methodological advancements in the field of peacebuilding</p> <p>- Continued relevance/need for an in-house PCIA project/unit</p> <p>- Examination of the success of partnership components and RX components (for the Project and for the PI/IDRC)</p> <p>-Lessons to be learned from this attempt at multi-donor coordination; lessons to be learned as a flagship of the PI</p>	<p>External consultant; managed by Lead Program Officer</p>	<p>After the first 12 months (Start: after April 2001)</p>	<p>approx 30,000</p>
<b>iii. Review of an Ongoing Partnership at the Donor/Programming Level: Ford Foundation</b>	<p>PBR PI, Evaluation Unit, IDRC, the Ford Foundation; to learn about a partnership; to think about ongoing partnerships in this and other cases</p>	<p>Potentially as part of a larger Evaluation Unit (EU) strategic evaluation of partnerships:</p> <p>-attempt to understand how partnerships with other donors work;</p> <p>-utility: what makes them beneficial to IDRC; how they are beneficial for IDRC partners</p> <p>- what may make them difficult</p>	<p>-Potentially in conjunction with EU's strategic evaluation</p>	<p>If with EU, autumn 2000</p>	

Evaluation Issues	Used by whom, how and when?	Questions to be answered	Conduct and Manage	Dates	Cost
<b>B. Objective:</b> Project Planning and M&E					
<b>i. Angola Small Grants Fund (003401)</b>	<p>-Lead PO, to assess effectiveness, lessons; for use in designing the Angola Small Grants Fund II.</p> <p>-PBR PI team members, in considerations of similar undertakings</p>	<p>-Effectiveness in: meeting objectives; carrying out PBR PI's and ROSA's programming ; building Angolan research skills; identify shortcomings/potential/lessons learned as a support mechanism for programming.</p> <p>- How does the Fund 'fit' PBR PI's programming; questions about design; questions about implementation and administration; questions about monitoring; questions about project performance.</p>	Lead PO	August - October 2000	In-house, minimal costs
<b>ii. Small Grants in Peacebuilding and Reconstruction (fund) (003972/97-0221)</b>	<p>-Lead PO, to assess effectiveness, for generation of lessons</p> <p>-PBR PI team members, in considerations of similar undertakings</p>	<p>- Was this mechanism a valuable instrument to meet the PI's mandate?</p> <p>- Was it a useful option for disbursements to projects in the context of the PI's mandate?</p> <p>-Was this a useful window for building partnerships?</p> <p>-lessons learned?</p>	Lead PO	<p>-began February 2000</p> <p>-finished by August, 2000</p>	In-house, minimal costs

Evaluation Issues	Used by whom, how and when?	Questions to be answered	Conduct and Manage	Dates	Cost
iii. ICTs and Human Rights (100152)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PBR PI members, as there is potential resonance with other PBR PI projects</li> <li>- Lead Program Officer, other project donors/partners and project leaders to reflect on the ongoing program of work and activities of the project, and assess if changes should be made.</li> </ul>	<p>Two interlinking elements to this project's M&amp;E</p> <p>(i) The elements of each training course (methodology, content, form, style, interactive materials, performance of participants in mini-research projects) will be evaluated by course participants on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>(ii) IDRC will initiate an overall M&amp;E during the mid-life of the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Can ICTs be used to equip those engaged in complex field activities such as human rights monitoring, investigations, advocacy?</li> <li>-To what degree can ICTs contribute to these activities?</li> <li>- What elements of the project should be revisited, retooled, etc.</li> </ul>	Lead Program Officer, or external consultant managed by the Lead Program Officer	<p>(i) ongoing (2000 - 2002)</p> <p>(ii) mid-tem: approx. October 2001</p>	<p>(i) Include d in project funds.</p> <p>(ii) To be determ ined</p>

## ANNEX III

### Profiles of Team Members

**Marc Van Ameringen** is the Regional Director for the Southern Africa Office of IDRC based in Johannesburg. A political scientist, he has published articles on Canada and the new international division of labour and edited three books on the pace of transition in South Africa.

**Stephen Baranyi**, a political scientist, is a Senior Program Officer based in Ottawa. He has extensive research and policy experience in the areas of peace, human rights, and social participation in Latin America, Southeast Asia, and Southern Africa.

**Dina Craissati** is a political sociologist with a particular interest in issues of social and political development in the Arab region. A Senior Program Officer based in Cairo, her research interests include community organization, adult education, movements for social and democratic change and the contemporary gender discourse in the Arab world.

**Shaukat Hassan** is a political scientist and a Senior Program Officer based in Ottawa. He has more than 20 years experience in the analysis and practice of international politics, especially in the areas of military and human security, environment and development as well as politics of developing countries.

**Olaf Juergensen**, the Director of the Mine Action Programme, is a human geographer based in Johannesburg. His main areas of research and programming involve engaging conflict and post-conflict situations from the perspective of migration, state building, and development.

**Michael Koros** is the Coordinator of the Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment project, based in Ottawa. A political economist with an undergraduate business degree, he has twelve years of project, programme, and policy development and implementation experience. He has worked in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Cambodia, Croatia and Canada with multilateral and bilateral funding agencies, the Canadian government, NGOs and universities.

**Wardie Leppan** is a Senior Program Specialist based in Johannesburg. He holds post-graduate degrees in engineering and development studies. His areas of expertise include energy policy, women in development, sustainable ocean research, and food security.

**Calvin Nhira** is a Senior Program Officer based in Johannesburg. The former Chair and Director of the University of Zimbabwe's Centre for Applied Social Sciences, he has consulted and published extensively in the field of natural resource management.

**Shannon Smith** is the Research Officer for the PBR Team and the Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment Unit. She has a background in Philosophy and holds a Master of Arts in International Affairs. Based in Ottawa, her research interests include gender and violent conflict,

women's movements and nationalisms, analysis and prevention of destructive conflicts, and issues of citizenship and justice.

**Necla Tschirgi** is a political scientist and political economist. Based in Ottawa, she is the PI Team Leader. Her areas of research interests include the politics of developing areas, public policy analysis, conflict and development, and post-conflict reconstruction.