Institutional capacity building for conflict sensitivity

Purpose of chapter

This chapter explains how to begin the process of mainstreaming conflict sensitivity into an organisation in a systematic way using a six-step framework.

Who should read it

Practitioners working in governments, civil society (local and international) and donor organisations. But first they need a good understanding of the key aspects of conflict sensitivity as outlined in the earlier parts of this Resource Pack.

Why they should read it

Because all practitioners at all levels are both impacted by, and can impact, the development of their institution's capacity for conflict sensitivity.

Contents

1.
Introduction

1.1 A definition

Institutional capacity for conflict sensitivity

This means the ability of an organisation to develop and use the sum of its human and organisational capital to minimise negative and maximise positive impacts on the conflict dynamics of the environment(s) where it works. Human capital includes staff and partner skills, knowledge and experience. Organisational capital includes departments, structures, financial resources, organisational culture and learning.

1.2 Why should an organisation want to be conflict sensitive?

Essentially because it will increase the effectiveness of their programming, by minimising the risks to actors involved and mitigating the risk of occurrence or escalation of violent conflict. Other reasons might include:

- internal and external assessments or reports showing that intervention in conflict areas caused harm and have not been maximising possibilities to impact positively
- linkages demonstrated between increased conflict sensitivity and more effective humanitarian relief, human rights, poverty reduction, and peacebuilding programming
- harmonisation of programmes with partnership agreements (eg NEPAD, ACP-EU Partnership within the Cotonou Agreement) and international commitments (eg Millennium Development Goals, Responsibility to Protect).

1.3 Background

TABLE 1	
The 'What' and 'How' of conflict sensitivity	
What to do	**How to do it**
Understand the institutional context	Carry out an institutional analysis
Understand the interaction between the institutional context and the capacity building needs	Link institutional capacity building to the institutional analysis
Use this understanding to address weaknesses and build on strengths	Plan, implement, monitor and evaluate conflict-sensitive capacity building

There are some very real institutional challenges that need to be addressed, even in the most capable organisations, if conflict sensitivity is to become a reality in terms of organisational strategy and operational practice. Although many organisations have made quite considerable progress in recent years in promoting good practices in conflict and conflict-prone areas, and donors, national governments, INGOs and local civil society organisations have developed and adapted many aspects of their own institutional capacities, particularly since the mid-1990s, they all have some way to go before becoming genuinely conflict sensitive. Even those that have made significant progress acknowledge that new challenges arise daily, and that these challenges require the development of appropriate institutional responses. Some of these challenges are recurrent and common to organisations working in highly fluid contexts where, for example, there may be an absence of effective and / or legitimate partner organisations, or where the situation is so insecure and volatile that institutional development is seen as impossible. Indeed, many of the factors that negatively impact on an organisation's capacity for mainstreaming conflict sensitivity, such as lack of institutional commitment, high staff turnover, lack of institutional memory, and weak analytical capacity, are linked to both difficult operating environments and funding structures that emphasise 'acting' above 'thinking'.

There are, however, ways to look systematically at institutional challenges, to learn how others have attempted to respond to them, and also to prioritise key areas of action. Again, there are often considerable internal and external challenges that must be overcome to effect change. At times it is necessary to gain some distance from one's working environment and one's own place in it in order to fully understand all aspects of the challenges and opportunities that exist. Understanding institutional dynamics, connections and disconnections is particularly important when attempting to improve an organisation's conflict sensitivity.

Increasing institutional capacity for conflict sensitivity – preferably through mainstreaming across all programme areas – helps organisations better to manage their relationship with a volatile context, and improves the quality of their work. **Table 1 in Chapter 1** suggests a framework for implementing a conflict-sensitive approach. Table 1 above suggests a similar approach to mainstreaming conflict sensitivity within an organisation.

BOX 1
Organisational capacity assessment
A consultant undertook an assessment for CARE International of existing organisational strengths and capacities relevant to the successful mainstreaming of conflict sensitivity in the organisation. The main purpose of the review was to clarify CARE's stance and role(s) relative to conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding, and to make recommendations on how to strengthen its capacity to support country office operations in conflict-affected areas. Staff in the field and headquarters, as well as other organisations, were consulted. One of the key findings was that organisational culture can be a key constraint; many CARE field staff felt overwhelmed by the roll-out of many different initiatives.
It was therefore seen as critical that conflict sensitivity should not be viewed as yet another initiative, but rather that CARE should develop capacity and competence in an incremental manner at different levels, without compromising its traditional core strengths; and should ensure that conflict-related work remained consistent with CARE's vision and mission. It was recommended that the process be supported through focal points at various levels of CARE rather than by creating a separate conflict transformation and peacebuilding unit. A key priority, given the feeling of initiative overload, was for the process to remain demand and country office driven, while modestly increasing capacity.

Conflict sensitivity is not an easy add-on, or something that can be acquired by undertaking one or two specific and discrete 'peacebuilding' projects. It means integrating the

Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building:
tools for peace and conflict impact assessment | Chapter 5

3

appropriate attitudes, approaches, tools and expertise into an organisation's culture, systems, processes and work. This cannot be brought about overnight; it will take time and needs to be based on an understanding of the institutional context and in particular the capacity, and the limitations, of the organisation when it comes to mainstreaming conflict sensitivity.

For example there may be reasons why, initially, a minimalist approach may work better than a full-blown rollout across the organisation – see Box 1 above.

Table 2 lists what are likely to be the essential prerequisites for developing a sustainable capacity for conflict sensitivity.

TABLE 2
Five essential prerequisites

A. Institutional commitment
This is indispensable to making conflict sensitivity a reality; without support from the top, organisational change will not happen. If an organisation's leadership is not actively and enthusiastically supportive of conflict-sensitive approaches, there may nevertheless be scope to pave the way for incremental organisational change if some key individuals and / or departments of the organisation are supportive.

B. Willingness to make changes in organisational culture and institutional structures
Such changes are likely to be needed if a conflict-sensitive approach is to take hold. It may be that a full-blown roll-out is not feasible, and indeed many organisations will recognise the 'initiative fatigue' illustrated in Box 1. But most organisations will have offices, teams and / or individuals who are open to learning, risk-taking and self-reflection – including on conflict and peace issues – and who may be able to act as drivers of change.

C. Support for capacity development
Needed to keep and build momentum as a process of change in organisational culture and institutional structures starts to occur. While many organisations do not have in-house staff development programmes, mainstreaming conflict sensitivity requires at a minimum providing space and encouragement for staff to pursue and share their own related research and learning.

D. Conducive external relationships
Needed both in the implementing area and outside it. For example, funding parameters that emphasise output over process, or programme implementation over longer-term capacity development, will make it difficult for organisations to fund conflict-sensitive programmes and / or invest in organisational capacity building. In addition, effectively mainstreaming conflict sensitivity requires at a minimum the willingness of partner organisations to engage in some level of joint review and mutual improvement of practices.

E. Accountability mechanisms
Needed to underpin and reward staff and teams who incorporate conflict sensitivity in their daily practice. While organisations do not need to have a fully developed accountability framework to begin implementing conflict sensitivity, they do, at a minimum, need measures on multiple levels of the organisation that encourage learning – and acting on learning – from past and ongoing experiences.

Building on the above five key aspects, this chapter offers a six-step framework for starting the process of mainstreaming conflict sensitivity within an organisation, including deciding whether and where a minimalist or a more comprehensive approach, or something in between, is most appropriate. The framework will help you to understand the strengths and weaknesses of your institution in relation to conflict-sensitive policy and practice, and to think about how to promote and support the development of institutional capacity for conflict sensitivity

The six steps fit within the larger framework of conflict sensitivity, and can be seen as a process for gaining a fuller understanding of the institutional context in which you operate, understanding the interaction between the institutional capacity building and the institutional analysis, and finally acting on that understanding. Table 3 brings together the six steps and the overall approach suggested in Table 1.

TABLE 3
Six steps

Framework	Step	Question
Understand the institutional context in which you operate	Step 1: Assess your organisation's institutional capacity for conflict sensitivity	**What** is the current institutional context?
Understand the interaction between institutional capacity building and the institutional analysis	Step 2: Assess how the different institutional aspects (ie A to E in Table 2) connect	**What** is the relationship between the different institutional elements?
	Step 3: Reflect on one's own and others' experiences	**What** experiences can we learn from?
	Step 4: Identify key opportunities and challenges	**What** opportunities exist and **why** do existing challenges exist (and persist)?
Act on the understanding	Step 5: Prioritise, develop and implement a plan of action	Based on what we now know, **how** do we proceed?
	Step 6: Monitor and evaluate results and review plan of action	**What** have we learned so far and **how** can we improve?

2.

Assessing institutional capacity for conflict sensitivity

*Step 1: Assess your organisation's institutional capacity for conflict sensitivity, using the matrix in **Annex 1**.*

There are various aspects of the make-up of any organisation (whether it be a government, donor, INGO or local NGO) that will impact on its ability to behave in a conflict-sensitive manner. Grouping these aspects under the five key headings in Table 2 will help to develop an understanding of the existing capacity and opportunities for conflict sensitivity. The matrix in Annex 1 provides tangible examples of all the aspects detailed below.

A. Institutional will and commitment

All organisations have 'institutional drivers', both internal and external, that contribute to setting priorities and focussing resources. Institutional will is really about how interested the organisation is in a topic and what priority it gives to it. Conflict issues or related factors such as quality and impact assessment may be very high on the institutional agenda and have a lot of institutional commitment; or may be quite low on the agenda with little

commitment. Questions to ask to assess the degree of commitment might include:

● is there an internal policy statement on the issue (or a closely related issue); for example a statement on 'Improving practice in conflict areas' (or equivalent)?
● are there dedicated personnel assigned to furthering the mainstreaming of the issue, eg a conflict adviser in the Humanitarian Department of a large INGO?
● is the issue high on the organisational agenda, eg is it regularly discussed in staff and / or management meetings?

B. Organisational culture and institutional structures

The organisational culture means the attitudes and structures that permeate the agency. The type of organisational culture has implications for an organisation's capacity to mainstreaming conflict sensitivity. For example, some organisations have very hierarchical structures while others are highly decentralised: the factors which help or hinder mainstreaming will be different in each case. Another example is the organisation with a highly oral rather than written tradition: this may impair organisational learning, especially if staff turnover is high, thus making mainstreaming more difficult. Where there are unhelpful features in the culture, you need to assess how important it is to change them, and to ask whether there is the will to change.

Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building:
tools for peace and conflict impact assessment | Chapter 5

5

C. Capacity development

Where sufficient institutional commitment exists to mainstream conflict sensitivity, including a commitment to invest in change in organisational culture and structures, developing staff skills and knowledge is important to sustaining and deepening the organisational momentum. Whereas technical service-delivery skills have traditionally been prioritised in development, and particularly in relief programmes, a stronger emphasis on analytical skills and context knowledge is necessary in order to mainstream conflict sensitivity. These include conflict transformation and peacebuilding skills, but also:

- relationship-building skills
- process and analytical understanding
- lateral thinking
- applied social science knowledge (socio-political / political-economic / anthropological)
- knowledge of the geographical context and the issues pertaining to it
- cultural sensitivity.

D. External relationships

The impact of organisations on the context is closely linked to that of their partners and other organisations that either share operational space or can directly or indirectly impact upon it. An organisation's ability to be conflict sensitive is also directly influenced by the external environment, including the funding and policy parameters within which they function. Assessing institutional capacity for conflict sensitivity – and taking steps to build capacity – therefore needs to take account of the conflict-sensitive capacities of the organisation's external partners and others they share operational space with, including implementing partners, funding agencies and political actors.

E. Accountability

Suitable accountability systems to manage the organisational mainstreaming process are essential. Policy guidelines, training, appointment of dedicated conflict advisers, etcetera, need to be complemented by clear and well thought-out accountability systems that provide appropriate rewards and disincentives to encourage staff to consider their tasks through a conflict-sensitive lens and to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate their actions and programmes in those terms. Finally and most importantly institutional capacity must be developed to ensure accountability for the impact of action (and inaction) on the communities at which interventions are targeted.

2.1 Understanding the motivation and interest that guides the assessment and the associated resources

Before assessing the institutional capacity for conflict sensitivity within an organisation (or any unit or department) there should be a frank understanding of the motivation and interest that guides the assessment and of the resources (human and financial) that are available to undertake it. Individual motivation should not be confused with the organisation's motivation, interest and resources. Individuals need to understand the motivation that will either support or undermine their organisation's ability to mainstream conflict sensitivity.

Motivation, interest and resources will vary significantly from individual to individual, agency to agency, experience to experience, and can stem from many different personal, semi-formal or formal sources. Some examples are given in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Examples of motivation / interest

Type of motivation / interest	Definition	Example
Personal	A motivation or interest primarily stemming from an individual commitment to conflict sensitivity	An individual attends an external course in conflict analysis and sees its importance and relevance to her work. She realises that without the right institutional capacities her ability to implement programmes in a conflict-sensitive manner is severely limited. Although holding a relatively low position in a large bureaucracy she wants to see how they can promote conflict-sensitive practice in her organisation.
Semi-formal	A motivation or interest stemming from an informal institutional desire to improve conflict sensitivity	A department within the agency has become increasingly concerned about the possible negative impact of their work on conflict dynamics. The Head of Department has called in all middle managers for a workshop about how the organisation could do better in responding to conflict. They want to have a framework for this workshop.

Type of motivation / interest	Definition	Example
Formal	A motivation or interest arising from a formal institutional desire to improve conflict sensitivity	After some mixed experiences in conflict areas, concerns expressed by local stakeholders, and consistent bottom-up pressure from staff located in conflict regions, senior management has instigated an institution-wide reflection process to define better practice in pursuing their core mandate in conflict areas. They have asked a group of individuals in the Quality and Evaluation Unit to develop a framework to analyse the institutional challenges involved.

The level and depth of the analysis will depend not only on the motivation which guides it, but also on the resources (human, time and financial) that are available. Investing the necessary amount of resources is essential to the quality of the analysis (and subsequent plan of action and impact), but it is important to be realistic about the resource constraints the organisation may be facing.

2.2 Depth and level of analysis

Depending on the circumstances, the six-step framework can be used either as a basis for deep analysis to feed into a longer-term institutional reflection process, or for a quick scan. The framework can be used and adapted by an individual or a group of individuals. It is best used in a participatory fashion, although it can also be used for desk-based research.

Examples of how the framework could be used:

- the director of a National Government Office of Reconciliation / Conflict Prevention uses it to frame an in-depth SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) of the entire government. This could take several weeks and involve large numbers of personnel and external specialist consultants
- an official charged with mainstreaming conflict issues within a donor agency uses it to assess progress for a report and action plan for the director
- an INGO regional technical adviser for peacebuilding tasked with improving impact in conflict countries uses it to conduct a two-day workshop with national technical advisers
- a national NGO official running a micro-credit programme in a conflict area uses it to focus on assessing the institutional challenges and opportunities for promoting conflict sensitivity through an hour-long discussion with key staff and leaders of community based organisations.

Thus the level at which the analysis is carried out – country office, headquarters or section – will be determined by the level of the individual conducting it.

The depth of the analysis, on the other hand, will be determined by the capacity of the individual or group and of the institution in which they work.

3.
The importance of connectivity

Step 2: How, if at all, do the different elements of the organisation's capacity (A – E in Table 2) connect?

Some aspects of conflict-sensitive capacity may be well developed in (eg institutional commitment) and others (eg organisational culture) less well developed. It is important to understand how these different aspects connect. The experience of organisations seeking to become conflict sensitive shows that a number of them have made good progress in developing certain aspects that help to enhance conflict-sensitive practice, for example:

- linking better practice in conflict areas directly to their agency mandate (why)
- development and usage of operational guidance for working in conflict areas – such as tools for conflict analysis (what)
- training in conflict and peace related skills (how)
- appointment of specialist skilled staff (who),

but they have generally been less successful in ensuring that progress is even across different aspects so that they connect and add up to more than the sum of their parts.

Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building: tools for peace and conflict impact assessment | Chapter 5

7

BOX 2
Examples of bad, and good, connections

In agency A, progress was made in terms of the organisation's commitment to address conflict as part of its overarching mandate of poverty alleviation. Some specialist staff were recruited, and a tool for conflict analysis was developed. But the specialists were allowed to focus more on developing explicit conflict resolution programmes than promoting and enabling conflict sensitivity across the rest of the organisation, and the tool was developed in isolation from the end users, with no comprehensive training programme on how to use it nor any clarity about how it fitted with existing planning procedures. Moreover the initiative was announced and rolled out from the top with insufficient consultation and participation across the organisation – staff lacked ownership and were reluctant to use it.

In agency B, a 'reflecting on practice' initiative involving all staff across the organisation (both at headquarters and in the field) identified that, although theirs was not a peacebuilding organisation, improving practice in conflict areas was a priority. Reflecting on the agency's mandate for poverty alleviation, and following a review of prior and existing programmes in conflict-affected areas, a new policy for working in conflict areas was designed drawing on the experience of the agency, partners and other organisations. After consultation, a plan of action to promote better practice was written. This plan identified the most pressing needs as learning, operational guidance for planning and evaluation processes, some skills development, and new strategic partnerships. Key aspects of conflict analysis were factored into existing planning and evaluation guidelines. Country directors were introduced to these updated plans and guidelines directly and a wider awareness raising campaign was conducted, as well as making training in these one of the focal areas of the general agency training and induction programmes. An electronic forum was created where people from different regions and in different parts of the agency could share their different good and bad experiences with the new approach and provide support to each other in applying it to their respective areas of work.

The first example in Box 2 shows that even where an agency has several of the key components needed for conflict sensitivity, this will not contribute to mainstreaming unless they are planned and implemented in a joined-up way. A possible way of remedying the disconnect in agency A would be to initiate a comprehensive cross-organisational consultation process (also involving relevant external partners) in the light of which both the conflict analysis tool and policy framework could be reviewed. These steps could contribute to building a sense of ownership, and increase the likelihood of the policy and the tool becoming an active part of the organisation's practice.

4.
Reflecting on experience

Step 3: Reflecting on one's own and others' experiences

There is a great deal of experience that can be drawn on to build an agency's own institutional capacity. Just as no conflict context is the same, no two agencies are the same, so what works for one agency, local office, or sector may not work for another. However, reflecting on why and how others' experiences might or might not work for one's own organisation can in itself provide useful insights.

Other experiences generally come from three main sources: other parts of the organisation; other organisations; and lessons from the mainstreaming of other issue-based frameworks (eg gender, environment).

4.1 Internal experience

Other parts of the organisation can provide useful experiences; larger organisations and those with operations in multiple geographic settings usually offer a wealth of experience and knowledge that can be drawn upon. A review of organisation-wide experiences of working in conflict-affected areas is therefore often a useful first step in a mainstreaming process. Organisations that belong to an alliance or network will also be able to draw on the experiences of sister organisations.

4.2 Experience of other agencies

Research has shown that agencies often find it most useful to learn and draw inspiration from organisations with similar mandates, operating in a similar geographical context or of a similar size, and from specialist conflict related organisations. In particular, agencies can draw on others' experiences of establishing conflict units, appointing conflict advisers or bringing in outside conflict specialists.

There is also a range of networks that can offer organisations wishing to mainstream conflict sensitivity the wealth of their own reflections and learning on conflict and institutional capacity related issues – see Table 5.

Conflict units and advisers will be most successful in mainstreaming conflict sensitivity when they help practitioners and policy- and decision-makers to increase the impact and sustainability of their work. There is currently an unresolved debate, particularly amongst donor agencies, as to whether designated conflict or peacebuilding units are more or less effective for mainstreaming conflict sensitivity than field-based

specialists. Currently, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) has a headquarters based Peacebuilding Unit that provides peacebuilding support to CIDA's regional teams. The UK government, on the other hand, has recently chosen to increase its emphasis on region-based conflict advisers who support country programmes directly. Other agencies argue that conflict is everybody's business and reject the idea of designated

specialists fearing that they will impede the mainstreaming of conflict sensitivity by marginalising it within one department or individual.

Table 5

Source	*Name of Network* / **Main focus of work**	**Contact details**
OECD Member States bilateral donor agencies, EU, IFIs	*Conflict Prevention Development Cooperation Network* Policy-related work, mainstreaming within bilateral agencies	**www.oecd.org/dac** - then follow link to "Conflict and Peace"
Donor and UN agencies	*CPR Network* Policy and operational issues	**http://cpr.web.cern.ch/cpr/**
Large US development / humanitarian INGOs (and other INGOs)	*Transition, Conflict and Peace Working Group, InterAction* Policy and operational issues relating to US INGOs	**http://www.interaction.org/disaster/TCP.html**
Canadian NGOs, institutions, academics and individuals	*Canadian Peacebuilding Co-ordinating Committee* Analysis, shared learned, facilitation and information exchange	**http://www.peacebuild.ca/**
German government and NGOs and networks	*Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt)* Project and research evaluation, new approach development and dialogue promotion.	**http://www.frient.de/english/ueberuns/ueberuns.html**

Note: this is not an exhaustive list of conflict related networks.

4.3 **Other issue-based frameworks**

In recent years, organisations have attempted to mainstream other issues – gender, environment, rights-based approaches – and to develop institutional capacity accordingly. Lessons from this mainstreaming experience can be useful in developing institutional capacity for mainstreaming conflict sensitivity.

Although conflict sensitivity mainstreaming brings up different issues, in particular because of the inherently political nature of conflict, reflecting on how an agency has attempted to mainstream gender, environment, or a rights-based approach can suggest relevant ideas, actions and experiences.

BOX 4
Learning from gender mainstreaming

The experience from the gender field has highlighted three principal elements that need to be considered when attempting to mainstreaming key issues:

- the consideration of internal and external political processes in which the organisation and its members are engaged
- the establishment of processes responsible for incorporating key issues into the design and implementation of policies
- the development of appropriate tools and technical capabilities.[1]

Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building:
tools for peace and conflict impact assessment | Chapter 5

9

Experience from the gender and environment fields, as well as from conflict, suggests that a multi-faceted approach to mainstreaming conflict sensitivity is likely to be most effective. Conflict is everybody's business, and all staff have a role in either mitigating or exacerbating it. But it is also important to have specialists in the field who understand the local context from a conflict perspective and who can make case- and situation-specific observations and recommendations. Similarly, a headquarters based department can serve as an important repository of cross-agency and global learning, theory and approaches. Without a designated responsible department in headquarters, it is unclear how the learning from field staff and region-based specialists will be collected and disseminated to other regions, countries and projects.

5.
Opportunities and challenges

Step 4: In light of the results from step 3, identify the key opportunities and possible challenges

Having reflected on the results from step 3 and the synthesis of steps 1 to 3, there should now be a basis for answering the following questions:

- What are the key needs for institutional capacity building?
- Where do the key strategic and operational opportunities lie?
- How can these opportunities be realised?

Opportunities may include:

- new institutional two-year planning process
- changing political climates
- funding opportunity for conflict related work prioritised
- change of senior staff
- new staff development fund
- partners enthusiastic to engage on conflict sensitivity
- recruitment of new members of staff
- development of multi-donor frameworks
- development of new country strategy
- combining activities with other organisations who have more experience in conflict sensitivity
- specific request from stakeholders to address conflict issues directly or indirectly

and they can be used, for example:

- to address institutional weaknesses; for example a lack of qualified human resources at the field level to promote and train in conflict sensitivity (the organisational assessment may point to strong human resource analytical capacity in conflict issues at the headquarters level, but limited opportunities for field staff to relate this knowledge to an understanding of the context. Bringing the two capacities together in a programme planning process that allows for ongoing consultation would reinforce both)
- to build on strengths
- to overcome blockages or disconnects – see Box 2
- to address 'spoilers' and threats – see Box 5 below.

BOX 5

Examples of possible spoilers and threats

- an upcoming change in the national government ruling party makes the government less likely to be sympathetic to peace and conflict issues
- a strategic review process has come up with a very 'minimalist' interpretation of the organisation's mandate which leaves little room (and few resources) for conflict sensitivity
- commitment to conflict sensitivity is over-reliant on one individual who is scheduled to relocate or over-loaded with other work
- resources for cross-institutional learning are due to be cut because of overall budget cuts
- focus on organisational growth rather than quality means that accountability to donors is likely to be prioritised over accountability to stakeholders
- general fatigue with new tools and yet another 'mainstreaming' or 'hot issue'
- lack of acknowledgement that peace and conflict are issues that should be dealt with (either directly or indirectly) by the agency.

Options include establishing conflict units, appointing conflict advisers or bringing in outside conflict specialists. To support mainstreaming, the ultimate goal of this specialised support should be to build the capacity of other staff, and the organisation at large, to implement conflict-sensitive programming.

The establishment of a unit charged with mainstreaming conflict sensitivity can be a very important starting point for the process. It demonstrates an institutional commitment. The unit and its advisers can play an important role in leading the mainstreaming process and centralising learning and knowledge and disseminating it throughout the organisation.

To support the mainstreaming process, conflict advisers can work with staff to develop:

- mechanisms and frameworks for policy development and revision
- conflict-sensitive tools designed or adapted to the organisational processes and language
- mechanisms and frameworks for procedural changes
- staff training programmes
- revised or additional staff qualifications
- accountability mechanisms
- revised programme and indicator development guidelines
- revised programme assessment frameworks
- revised monitoring and evaluation guidelines
- guidelines for partner capacity assessment and training.

See also **section 5.4.2** above on the unresolved debate, particularly amongst donor agencies, as to whether designated conflict or peacebuilding units are more or less effective for mainstreaming conflict sensitivity than field-based specialists.

6.
Plan of action

Step 5: Prioritise, develop and implement a plan of action

Once the analysis phase is over it is important to link it to a plan of action; many agencies have commissioned or undertaken their own analysis of how to improve practice in conflict areas, and individuals themselves have also long identified problems and raised issues, but there is a marked fall-off in the implementation of the ideas and suggestions when no ownership is taken of the process of turning the analysis into action. It is highly desirable to ensure as wide an ownership as possible of both the analysis and the plan of action. (Partial ownership, or a lack of ownership, should be seen as a challenge to overcome rather than an insurmountable obstacle. Committed individuals with little support have achieved a remarkable amount in some cases.)

A plan of action can be a personal plan (and may not even be anything formal or written down), or something more formal relating to a unit within the organisation or to the organisation as a whole. The nature of the plan will depend on the influence, interest, motivation, and resources of the individual or unit supporting it. Any plan will have to prioritise and seek a balance between the aspirational (the perfect conflict-sensitive organisation) and the achievable, given the many very real constraints that are likely to be faced and the limited time and resources that can be deployed to overcome them. Staff in

some organisations have found it helpful to identify both short- and long-term plans of action and to consult key partners on the following key questions:

- what are the priority needs and how can they be fulfilled?
- what are the goals?
- what strategic alliances need to be developed?
- what resources need to be mobilised?
- what is the time-frame?
- where do we start?
- what is my / my department's strengths and what can we add to the process?

For example, there may be a pressing need for the agency as a whole to develop a comprehensive commitment to conflict sensitivity, but little top-level support for this in the short term, although one influential manager is sympathetic. Rather than abandoning efforts to change the agency's position, one option would be to seek some flexible resources from the manager to develop methods linking conflict analysis to the programme cycle and to train staff in these methods. Building strategic alliances with other like-minded individuals to engage in awareness raising and advocacy of the importance of conflict sensitivity may also help.

The plan of action will necessarily involve developing conflict sensitivity skills, raising awareness and advocating for the incorporation of a conflict sensitivity framework. These approaches are explained in more detail below.

6.1 Skills development

(see **Annex 2** for additional resources)

Building and reinforcing conflict-sensitive skills will support the mainstreaming process and at the same time ensure that the institution is able to maintain the capacity for conflict sensitivity that it has already built. Too often, however, training is conducted as a one-time event with little or no follow-up. Such training is useful for raising awareness, but offers minimal capacity development. Effective training will build on the organisation's existing culture, processes and strengths to offer long-term support and development of the skills and information required by staff to be conflict sensitive. The following recommendation for increasing the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming in peace operations is relevant:

"Existing gender-awareness training programmes for peacekeepers should be given in a more systematic manner accommodating the usual six month rotation of peacekeepers and integrating context based gender-awareness. This should in turn be linked to monitoring and evaluation of the application of this training". [2]

Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building:
tools for peace and conflict impact assessment | Chapter 5

11

It is a mistake to offer all staff the same training. Some organisations have taken this approach to the Do No Harm tool or Interest-based Negotiations, for example. A more effective approach is to offer all staff in the organisation an introduction to conflict sensitivity, followed up with specifically tailored training for different areas of the organisation: eg policy analysts, planners, project implementers, monitoring and evaluation specialists, field staff, senior managers. Conflict sensitising existing courses and staff development opportunities can be an effective way of achieving this tailoring.

The training itself, general or job-specific, also needs to be followed up with a long-term capacity development plan. Staff need to be encouraged and given the space to apply their course learning to their daily work, to try new approaches and to learn from their mistakes. Conflict advisers can be used as mentors to help work through challenging issues. Performance objectives and reviews can also be used to provide staff with the space and encouragement to explore areas of conflict sensitivity for themselves. For example, a water specialist may participate in a general introductory course on conflict sensitivity, but then be encouraged to research various aspects of the intersection between conflict and water resources. The water specialist could then share the new learning with other staff or with partner and like-minded organisations to ensure that as many people benefit as possible.

Organisations frequently rely heavily on training, workshops and seminars to meet their staff capacity development needs. But formal training courses are not the only approach available, and – depending on an organisation's culture, structures and resources – may well not be the most effective approach.

BOX 6
Alternatives to training

Search for Common Ground, a peacebuilding organisation, has developed a cross-fertilisation programme between different offices in different conflict areas. An individual from one country office spends ten days to two weeks with a counterpart in another country office. The visitor learns from the activities and approach in the host country office and then takes that knowledge home to see how it may be applied. Likewise, the individual in the host country can learn from the knowledge and experience of the visitor.

Search for Common Ground is also developing 'Committees of Practice', which include staff from their offices around the world who are working on similar themes or using similar skills. These groups will initially come into contact with each other through workshops but will later keep in touch through e-mail exchanges and periodic activities. The purpose of the Committees is to help build common knowledge within the organisation and to document this knowledge for future use within and outside the organisation.

As Box 6 above shows, peer learning and exchanges can provide an opportunity for staff to learn from others who are already knowledgeable about the material, and also about the organisational context.

Other approaches to training can be categorised under three headings: Share, Learn, and Support.

Sharing can involve approaches like secondments, where a staff member is temporarily posted to a part of the organisation that has had some success in implementing conflict sensitivity, or an important component of conflict sensitivity. Secondments can also be to other organisations where effective learning can take place. Conversely, an organisation that has had some success mainstreaming conflict sensitivity may consider seconding an appropriate member of staff to a partner organisation that is having less success.

Exchanges are similar to secondments, except that two organisations benefit rather than just one. For example, the peacebuilding department of an organisation may offer a conflict specialist to the monitoring and evaluation department of either their own organisation or an outside organisation. In exchange, the peacebuilding unit gets the expertise and support of a monitoring and evaluation specialist so they can learn more about the opportunities and challenges for mainstreaming conflict sensitivity in monitoring and evaluation processes.

Partnering is another form of sharing learning and experience that builds on the advantage of diversity and economies of scale. In Uganda, for example, a group of development agencies designated representatives from each of their organisations to form a working group to learn about conflict analysis together. The working group then worked together to build capacity for conflict analysis in each member organisation. In this way the team was able to build on each member's strengths and ensure that each organisation benefited from the diversity of the group. Another approach would be to take advantage of economies of scale by bringing together a group of organisations and designating lead responsibilities for learning and dissemination to different members. Organisation A might focus on conflict analysis, organisation B on indicator development, and so on. Then, when a member organisation needs help on a particular aspect, they could turn to the responsible organisation for specialist support.

Including partners in conflict-sensitive skills development is essential. Joint skills development with collaborating partners can support and reinforce conflict sensitive capacity development within a wider range of organisations.

Learning can also involve working with partner or like-minded organisations. A network of practitioners,

either from within the organisation or outside, can provide an important source of experiential learning. As with the example of partnering above, the network need not be comprised of conflict sensitivity specialists. Gender and environment specialists, for example, can often provide a wealth of information with respect to successes and challenges of mainstreaming. A formal or informal community of practitioners from like-minded organisations is all that is required to share experience and seek the advice of others. These groups may already exist at some level, perhaps in the form of a donor coordination committee or a network of volunteer-sending agencies, or it may be necessary to create them. Brown-bag lunches can be very effective within an organisation or for organisations located in close geographic proximity to each other, while e-mail networks can be useful for connecting across large distances. Such networks are not complicated to establish.

Space for reflection is also an important aspect of learning. Informally reflecting on past practices and completed projects can be an effective means of better understanding the complexities of conflict sensitivity and for informing decision making around new project or programme design. External space for reflection is equally important, and may take the form of support for education leave, night classes or summer schools, and self-funded leave. Even just one day per month at a local library or equivalent can provide staff with important space for reading and learning from previous experience.

BOX 7
Training and skills development

Catholic Relief Services (CRS) has an explicit commitment to peacebuilding, which is reflected in the organisation's mission statement. Its strategic plan includes building capacity in peacebuilding. In addition to developing in-house training capacity, CRS has, since 2000, joined with the Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at University of Notre Dame to offer a peacebuilding summer institute for staff and partners. The 10-day course covers conceptual understanding and various training methodologies, such as inter-religious dialogue. There is a lot of staff interest in attending the course and staff have to compete for places: criteria include the usefulness of the training to the individual's particular area of work, and the individual's position in CRS.

CRS will also be conducting a worldwide training-of-trainers course in the use of the Caritas peacebuilding manual that was published in 2002.

Support is an equally important component of skills development. The Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) offers a help desk service that connects practitioners working in the field with academics and researchers at two leading Universities. For example, if in the course of conducting a conflict analysis in Bolivia, a development worker discovers substantial issues with land rights, but knows nothing about land rights in Bolivia, the worker can find out if there are any experts in that area through an easily accessible thematic and geographical database on the organisation's intranet. They can then make contact with the expert directly, or contact a SIDA conflict adviser. SIDA had previously used this approach successfully as a mainstreaming tool for environmental issues.

Resource centres can also provide an effective means of support. Whether virtual (eg internet based) or real (eg a library or document centre), resource centres can provide a useful repository of reference materials for practitioners, policy staff and others. When designing a conflict analysis, for example, it is often helpful to see what types of analyses other organisations have used. There are unlikely to be tools or frameworks that can be used as they stand, but the experience of others can provide a useful base and source of new ideas or approaches. Resource centres must be easily accessible, with data and lessons learned stored in a format that is easily retrievable.

6.2 Advocacy and awareness raising

Conflict sensitivity is an approach that different organisations will adopt for a variety of different reasons, depending on their organisational culture. But it is important to ensure that it is not relegated to a set of "sterile and tokenistic 'tools', useful to make superficial adjustments rather than profound, long-lasting transformations."[3]

Awareness raising seeks to build support for mainstreaming by helping other organisations, or other parts of one's own organisation, to experience a conflict-sensitive approach and understand how it relates to them. All the tools and processes mentioned in this chapter will support awareness raising by helping staff answer questions such as:

● what is the organisation's objective?
● how should the organisation interact with the conflict dynamics?
● what processes and procedures support the organisation's actions?
● to whom is the organisation accountable?

Box 8 below provides an example from Kenya on one approach to raising awareness.

Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building:
tools for peace and conflict impact assessment | Chapter 5

13

The conflict-sensitive approaches programme, in collaboration with the Office of the President, supported and facilitated a Kenyan district commissioners' workshop on conflict-sensitive approaches to development.

The workshop, which was organised by Africa Peace Forum, aimed to introduce and raise awareness on conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding work among 86 Kenyan district commissioners. As civil servants representing the government at the local level, district commissioners play an instrumental role in the implementation of development and peacebuilding programmes, and were therefore identified as a key audience for institutional awareness raising. Although the workshop focused on raising awareness at the district level, good linkages were established with the Office of the President which provided participants as well as being co-organiser.

The workshop introduced the tools and concepts of conflict analysis to the participants and presented them with ways of incorporating conflict analysis into programming and project cycles. The discussions drew on the district commissioners' experiences in identifying the root causes of conflicts in their areas, and the stakeholders involved. These discussions gave participants the opportunity to share experiences of successes and failures. They expressed great interest in following up the workshop with more targeted training, and including additional districts.

In contrast to awareness raising, *advocacy* is used to effect a specific action or response based on a specific argument. Like awareness raising, advocacy is often conducted with individuals or organisations that do not yet support a conflict-sensitive approach.

Awareness raising and advocacy can be most effective when used together to promote mainstreaming of conflict sensitivity. One principle of both advocacy and awareness raising is that if people are to support an approach, it needs to be built on their language and experiences (and those of their organisation) so they are able to see its relevance to their work. When first introduced to conflict sensitivity individuals or organisations are often hostile for fear that it just means more work for them. People tend to be much more receptive when they understand how conflict sensitivity can be used to increase the sustainability and impact of their existing and future initiatives.

6.3 External policy drivers and commitments

Certain organisations support their work by adopting guidelines, policy frameworks, and agreements developed by other organisations. Some of these are listed in Table 6, below. Many of these guidelines can be used by agencies and interested parties to further the building of institutional capacity – either within their own organisation, or in terms of advocating to others. However, staff in some organisations may be unaware of these materials, or may not understand how they can be used as a reminder of the relevance and importance of conflict sensitivity, or as a lever to obtain, for example, extra resources.

Examples:

1. A country director for a donor agency is putting in a proposal to headquarters for finance for an extra member of staff (a part-time national conflict adviser). He notes how this will significantly enhance the agency's capacity to deliver on its commitments as outlined in the OECD-DAC guidelines 'Helping Prevent Violent Conflict: Orientation for External Partners'.

2. A national civil society organisation uses national governments', and also EU donors', commitment to the Cotonou Agreement (Article 11) to advocate against a government-sponsored and EU-funded infrastructural project that is likely to cause conflict and unrest amongst a minority group.

3. An Emergency Unit deputy director for a humanitarian organisation uses a point in the revised Sphere Guidelines to strengthen her request for resources for conflict analysis training for all her staff: "Understanding the nature and source of conflict helps to ensure that aid is distributed in an impartial way and reduces or avoids negative impact. In conflict-affected settings, an analysis of the actors, mechanisms, issues and context of the conflict should be carried out prior to programme planning."[4]

TABLE 6
Guidelines, policy frameworks and agreements

Document	Relevant to	Nature	Where to find
AU-NEPAD	African countries	Vision and strategic framework to address challenges currently facing African continent	**http://www.touchtech.biz/ nepad/files/en.html**
ACP-EU Cotonou Agreement	Certain African, Caribbean, Pacific Governments and EU Member States	Overarching trade and aid agreement based on political dialogue	**http://europa.eu.int/comm/ development/body/cotonou/ agreement/agr06_en.htm** See particularly Article 11 on conflict
OECD-DAC *Helping Prevent Violent Conflict: Orientations for External Partners* (April 2001)	Donors from OECD Countries	Policy guidelines adopted by OECD-DAC related to how development assistance can contribute to conflict prevention and peace	**http://www.oecd.org/dac** See particularly Conflict & Peace Network Page where full guidelines are available
EU Programme of Action for the Prevention of Violent Conflict	EU Member States and donors	High level policy commitment to mainstream conflict prevention in all aspects of its engagement (including development co-operation and trade)	**http://www.eu2001.se/static/ eng/pdf/violent.PDF** See also other EU statements related to importance of mainstreaming conflict issues
SPHERE Handbook 2004	Humanitarian agencies	Standards and best practice agreed upon by humanitarian agencies.	**http://www.sphereproject.org/ handbook/hdbkpdf/ hdbk_c1.pdf** See particularly Common Standards 3: Response. These recommend understanding conflict and using the understanding to inform programming

7.
Monitor and evaluate results

Step 6: Monitor and evaluate results and review plan of action

What impacts have the capacity building steps had on your organisation? What went well, less well and, most importantly, why? Go back to step 1 and re-do the analysis: what has changed, what has not, and what can be done to enhance the impact?

For example, the organisation may have progressed substantially in analysing conflict and linking the analysis to conflict-sensitive planning through the development and adoption of an agency specific tool. But conflict-sensitive monitoring and evaluation may not have been conducted because it was not prioritised in the strategic plan, or because no specific resources were allocated. Therefore after re-doing your institutional analysis you may conclude that institutional commitment and resource allocation should be prioritised rather than further development or training in conflict related tools.

Just as in project or programme monitoring and evaluation, setting clear goals and objectives from the outset is critical to ensuring the ability to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the action plan in the future. Focal areas include:

Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building:
tools for peace and conflict impact assessment | Chapter 5

15

- *strengthening* internal capacity. Evaluate the degree to which the process has enhanced your internal organisational capacity for conflict sensitivity. Review programmes planned and implemented within the organisation's conflict-sensitive framework, and survey staff opinions on how the process has worked.

- *working* with partners and like-minded organisations. Possible approaches include evaluating how the process has strengthened external relationships in terms of partners' capacity for conflict sensitivity. As previously mentioned, institutional capacity building for conflict sensitivity should not stop within the organisation. In order to impact on the context, the evaluation needs to also include partners (local and international). Monitoring and evaluating progress should therefore also include key external partners and could take place as part of joint review and learning sessions.

In formulating, implementing and evaluating the plan of action, it is important to be aware of – and avoid – the so-called 'project trap'. Whereas conflict sensitising a project may have a beneficial impact on the organisation-wide commitment and ability to be conflict sensitive, it should not be confused with conflict sensitising an organisation. Indeed, going beyond project-level conflict sensitivity is a key objective of the mainstreaming process, as it ensures that all future projects and activities have an enabling institutional environment for conflict sensitivity.

Accountability

In many situations of structural or violent conflict, institutions that are charged with developing and implementing significant social, economic and judicial programmes and policies are not held directly accountable to the people affected by these interventions. International agencies are generally held accountable to their own governments for project outputs, but often not for operational approaches or impact. To enable staff and organisations to be responsible for actions related to conflict, they must have the skills, processes and procedures that support and reinforce such accountability. The skills and processes outlined in this chapter will help to create an environment conducive to mainstreaming conflict sensitivity, but will need to be combined with measures to enable accountability to conflict sensitivity at the individual, programmatic and institutional levels.

Conflict sensitivity requires support for the accountability of individuals and organisations to:

- beneficiaries and institutions who are being supported
- organisations and individuals that fund programmes
- national and international laws and principles applicable to the institution or individual.

A. Institutional accountability

Conflict sensitivity will be most effective and easiest to mainstream when it has institutional support across programmes. Means of strengthening institutional accountability include:

- developing a policy that confirms the organisation's commitment to a conflict-sensitive approach
- making conflict-sensitive programming and support processes key criteria in decision-making by the institution's senior management team (or other group that is responsible for approving programme strategies and large expenditures)
- establishing mutual accountability for conflict sensitivity through joint programming and co-ordination with other programmes and institutions
- supporting mutual capacity and accountability for implementing conflict-sensitive tools and processes through joint training and the development of tools and procedures for mainstreaming conflict sensitivity
- conducting regular external evaluations with conflict sensitivity as one of the criteria; involving partners, other institutions (governments, civil society, donors) and affected communities in regular reviews and final evaluations to help ensure that those impacted by the intervention have influence over it.

B. Programmatic accountability

At the programme level it is important to have an internal process that supports conflict-sensitive programming and allows for new approaches to be tested and mistakes reduced through joint problem solving. Projects should be approved and evaluated partially in terms of their conflict sensitivity and responsibility for conflict-sensitive programming should be shared within the institution. Programmatic accountability can be enhanced by:

- encouraging and reinforcing conflict-sensitive programming in the development and evaluation of programmes. Encourage joint problem solving and adjustment of programmes during internal and external meetings to make them more conflict sensitive
- establishing conflict-sensitive programming criteria and applying the criteria to each project or programme proposal. Criteria could include elements such as: analysis, capacity assessment, identification and participation of stakeholders, direct and indirect programme impact, coordination and co-operation with other actors, and participation of partners in programming
- enabling (and instituting mechanisms for) programmes to receive recognition and to document success stories in support of awareness raising
- involving partners, other institutions (governments, civil society, donors) and affected communities in the

programming process to ensure the process remains attentive to both those who are involved in its implementation and those who are impacted by it

- (for funders) requesting conflict-sensitive programming in calls for proposals, and allocating sufficient resources and time, for the programme development and evaluation process necessary for conflict-sensitive programming

C. Individual accountability

Beyond the institutional and programmatic accountability measure, organisations need to ensure that all staff members understand their responsibility in a conflict environment; are provided with the resources and skills necessary to meet that responsibility; and are enabled to do so through incentives and support structures. Individual accountability thus requires:

- individuals who understand the role and objective of their organisation in relation to conflict. These can be communicated in a number of ways that will provide staff and partners with a justification for why they are mainstreaming conflict sensitivity: review of the mandate, founding principles, human rights law, humanitarian principles (see also **section 6.2** on advocacy and awareness raising, above)

- staff who understand how to act in a conflict-sensitive manner. If reinforced throughout the organisation, the capacity and skills development opportunities outlined in this chapter will encourage them to change the way they do their programming

- staff who have the opportunity to implement a new conflict-sensitive idea or approach that will help them own and advocate for the approach within the organisation. When implementing a new concept or idea, individuals need to receive support and reinforcement throughout the programming process. As they learn, they will be able to adjust the programme and avoid doing harm during this learning process

- conflict-sensitive skills to be included in job descriptions for new staff. These skills include: conflict analysis and reporting, facilitation of participatory processes, qualitative programme development, monitoring and evaluation, conflict resolution or negotiating, coordination and relationship building (see **section 6.1** on skills development, above)

- elements of conflict-sensitive programming, relating to the position of the staff member, to be included in staff appraisal and evaluations, but only at the point where the individual's learning and work is demonstrably fully supported by the organisation.

8.
Endnotes

[1]Maya Buvinic, "Project for Women in the Third World: Explaining their Misbehaviour", Washington: International Centre for Research on Women, 1984 pg 21, cited in March, C., I. Smyth, and M. Mukhopadhyay, *A Guide to Gender-Analysis Frameworks*, Oxford: Oxfam GB, 1999.

[2]International Alert, *Gender Justice & Accountability in Peace Support Operations: Closing the Gaps* Section 1, London: International Alert, December 2003.

[3]March et al: 15.

[4]The Sphere Project, *The Sphere Handbook 2004*, Oxford: Oxfam Publishing, forthcoming 2004: 35.

**Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building:
tools for peace and conflict impact assessment | Chapter 5**

17

Annex 1

ANNEX 1 **Institutional framework for mainstreaming conflict sensitivity (CS)**				
Key aspects necessary for developing institutional capacity.	**Sub-issues that form part of the key aspect (list is suggestive, not complete)**	**Possible strengths, as they relate to the sub-issues**	**Possible weaknesses, as they relate to the sub-issues**	**Suggested actions / useful experiences**
A. Institutional commitment Key questions: *Is the external context (both in terms of in-country and regional situation, and global policy environment) conducive to CS?* *What is the current extent of internal institutional commitment to follow through on CS within the organisation?* *How deep and how wide is the organisational commitment to CS?*	**Internally:** 1. Leadership's personal background 2. Leadership's perception of the organisational history 3. Commitment at non-management levels **Externally:** 4. Overarching policy frameworks 5. National, regional and global political context and events	1. Leadership have personal experience and understanding of the importance of CS 2. The identity and past experiences of the organisation (as perceived by its leadership) underline the need for a conflict-sensitive approach 3. There are strong champions for CS in key management and non-management positions 4. Policy frameworks are conducive to mainstreaming a CS approach (strong link with the more general political climate) 5. National, regional and / or international political events and processes are conducive to prioritising CS	1. Leadership lack understanding / experience of how CS can help the organisation achieve its mandate and / or leadership is ideologically opposed to CS 2. Past organisational experiences suggest that CS would not be appropriate (eg the organisation has had a traumatic experience of peacebuilding programming) 3. Lack of understanding and commitment to CS on non-management levels and / or resistance to change 4. Policy climate does not prioritise CS 5. CS is perceived as 'too sensitive' due to (national, regional and / or global) political events	Internal and external advocacy and awareness raising contributes to developing institutional commitment. References to how CS the organisation fulfil its existing policy commitments and achieve its mandate. Western donor agencies have signed up to the OECD-DAC guidelines on preventing violent conflict (2001). Reference to this commitment can be used as an advocacy tool. Internal discussion forums can support strengthened institutional commitment as well as promote organisational change. For example, a UK-based development NGO has established a 'conflict cluster' open to all interested staff which meets twice a month to discuss issues of common concern in relation to conflict, providing a useful forum for cross-organisational exchange and learning.

Key aspects necessary for developing institutional capacity.	Sub-issues that form part of the key aspect (list is suggestive, not complete)	Possible strengths, as they relate to the sub-issues	Possible weaknesses, as they relate to the sub-issues
B. Organisational culture and institutional structures Key questions: *Is the organisational culture of the organisation enabling for CS?* *Do existing institutional structures support conflict-sensitive practice and how might they need to change?*	1. **Communication:** Extent of cross-organisational knowledge transfer and learning. 2. **Hierarchy and structure:** (De)centralised? Strongly hierarchical or not? Do the institutional structures inhibit or promote CS? 3. **Systems and procedures:** Existing policies and frameworks for planning and programming	1. Strong tradition of cross-departmental learning and documentation of lessons learned 2. Clear roles and responsibilities (whether centralised or decentralised structure). Benefit of clear focal points for conflict (conflict advisers, clusters, intra-organisational learning mechanisms etc) 3. Analysis of conflict (and associated political and power 'process' issues) can be fitted relatively easily into existing policy and operational frameworks.	1. Intra-departmental jealousies, 'fiefdom mentalities', artificial divisions and genuinely different cultures can breed conflict and inhibit learning 2. Overly centralised structures, generating a lack of ownership in and / or suspicion towards 'central' initiatives, or untransparent, decentralised structures inhibiting cross-organisational policy development. Potential risk of marginalisation if 'peacebuilding' is the exclusive domain of one (technical) organisational unit. 3. Existing policies and operational frameworks focus on outputs and 'service delivery', explicitly excluding more political analysis and / or more process-oriented frameworks.
C. Capacity development Key question: *What skills does my organisation as a whole, colleagues in different departments and partners need to have and / or develop for CS to become a reality?*	1. Human resources · Recruitment: What skills do we look for? · Reward: What skills and achievement of what type of objectives are rewarded? · Retention: How are skilled individuals retained? 2. Training and induction: What staff and partner skills do we seek to develop and how? 3. What analytical tools does the organisation currently use?	1. Understanding of the context and analytical capacity is a key component of recruitment and is also rewarded. Individuals with conflict and context skills are offered incentives to stay in the organisation (flexible postings, field / headquarter rotation systems, training opportunities, competitive salaries etc) 2. Induction and training on conflict-related issues are offered to both staff and partner organisations, including security training with a power analysis element, conflict transformation courses and / or advocacy training 3. Organisation is currently revising its handbook of operational practice – commitment to CS has been made	1. Technical and service delivery oriented skills are prioritised over analytical skills and context knowledge. 2. Induction and training programmes focus on technical skills and do not include power / political analysis (either operational or in an advocacy context) 3. Either no tools for conflict analysis used and / or other tools do not link analysis to practice

Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peace building: tools for peace and conflict impact assessment | Chapter 5

19

Key aspects necessary for developing institutional capacity.	Sub-issues that form part of the key aspect (list is suggestive, not complete)	Possible strengths, as they relate to the sub-issues	Possible weaknesses, as they relate to the sub-issues
D. External relationships Key questions: *What kind of partnerships do we need to complement our own CS capacity building?* *How do our external relationships (including with donors) and the context within which we operate influence our capacity building abilities?*	1. Partners' perspective on CS and capacity 2. Funding climate 3. Operating environment	1. Partners are enthusiastic about CS and have (or are able to develop) capacity for it 2. Indication that CS can bring more funds to the organisation 3. Operating environment allows time for reflection on CS and organisational change	1. Partners are uneasy about (or against) incorporating a CS approach and / or don't have (or are unable to develop) capacity for it 2. The organisation's funding structures make adopting a CS approach problematic (it will be hard to get resources for it) 3. High-intensity conflict and acute crisis make it near-impossible to invest time (and resources) in CS capacity building
E. Accountability Key question: *What accountability measures are needed to advance conflict-sensitive policy and practice?*	1. Appraisal and incentives (staff accountability) 2. Reporting (accountability to donors) 3. Participation and evaluations (accountability to stakeholders, see also "External relationships", above)	1. Flexible staff appraisal systems that include evaluation of analytical skills and context understanding 2. Reporting structures emphasise organisational learning and encourage reference to both direct and indirect impacts 3. Partners and other local stakeholders participate in project/programme evaluations and are involved in follow-up	1. Appraisal systems emphasise technical skills and 'output' performance over analysis and process 2. Inflexible reporting criteria restrict learning and exclude an assessment of wider (unintended) impacts 3. Evaluations involve only the organisation and the donor, no significant input from other stakeholders

Annex 2

Resources and training facilities

The following organisations provide a variety of training opportunities. This list is merely indicative, and there are hundreds of other organisations and trainers that offer a variety of opportunities. Agencies and individuals should explore in detail the nature and contents of any training to ensure that it adequately meets their specific needs.

Canadian International Institute of Applied Negotiation (CIIAN), a Canadian organisation dedicated to the prevention and resolution of destructive conflict at the local, national and international levels. CIIAN provides individual courses, certificate programmes and professional designations. For further information, please call (001) 613.237.9050 or see their website at **http://www.ciian.org**

Coalition for Peace in Africa (COPA), an African membership organisation, organises skills trainings and workshops on conflict transformation for development, human rights and humanitarian practitioners. For further information, please call +27 11 331 2944 (South Africa) or +254 2 577 558 (Kenya) or e-mail **enquires@actionsupport.co.za**. There is a sister organisation in Asia – Action Asia e-mail: **ActionAsia@online.com.ch**

Cooperation for Peace and Unity (CPAU), an NGO network in Afghanistan, offers training courses on Working With Conflict and Do No Harm and has developed a training curriculum for development and humanitarian NGOs working in Afghanistan. For further information, please call +92 (0) 91 5701763 (Peshawar office), or +93 (0) 70278891 (Kabul office) or e-mail **sulnad@brain.net.pk**

Eastern Mennonite University hosts a Summer Peacebuilding Institute with courses in conflict transformation and peacebuilding. For further details, see web site: **http://www.emu.edu/ctp/spinow2.html**

Field Diplomacy Initiative, an NGO based in Leuven, Belgium, provides training courses in field diplomacy and conflict impact assessment. For further details, see web site: **http://www.fielddiplomacy.be**

Institute for Conflict Resolution (INCORE) at the University of Ulster, and the United Nations University (UNU), offer summer courses in second track diplomacy, conflict transformation and evaluation and impact assessment of peacebuilding programmes. For further information, please contact Fiona Barr: **school@incore.ulst.ac.uk** or visit web site: **http://www.incore.ulst.ac.uk**

Peaceworkers UK, a London based NGO, provides links to education and training programmes aimed at enhancing the skills of civilians working in regions affected by conflict. A UK Training Directory can be downloaded from: **http://www.peaceworkers.org.uk**

Responding to Conflict (RTC), a Birmingham based NGO, offers conflict training courses for humanitarian and development practitioners. See web site for further information: **http://www.respond.org**

On-line sources of further information on training opportunities are available from UNOCHA at ReliefWeb **http://www.reliefweb.int/training** and also from **www.conflictsensitivity.org**

Annex 3

Bibliography

Action for Conflict Transformation, *Action for Conflict Transformation – Reflections of Practitioners Worldwide*. Phnom Penh: ActionAsia, 2003.

Buvinic, M., "Project for Women in the Third World: Explaining their Misbehaviour." Washington: International Centre for Research on Women, 1984.

Fischer, S., J. Ludin, S. Williams, D. Ibrahim Abdi, R. Smith and S. Williams, *Working with Conflict. Skills and Strategies for Action*, London: ZED Books/ Responding to Conflict, 2000.

Leonhardt, M. and C. Gaigals, *Conflict-Sensitive Development: A Review of Policy and Practice*. London: International Alert, Saferworld with IDRC, 2001.

Lange, M., *Building Institutional Capacity for Conflict Sensitive Development and Humanitarian Practise*. London: International Alert, forthcoming March 2004.

International Alert, *Gender Justice & Accountability in Peace Support Operations: Closing the Gaps* Section 1, London: International Alert, December 2003.

International Alert, *Resource Pack for Conflict Transformation*. London: International Alert, 2003. *Available in English, French and Russian.*

March, C., I. Smyth, and M. Mukhopadhyay, *A Guide to Gender-Analysis Frameworks*, Oxford: Oxfam GB, 1999.

Nyheim, D., M. Leonhardt, and C. Gaigals, "Development in Conflict: A Seven Step Tool for Planners." London: International Alert, Saferworld and FEWER, 2001.

Reychler, L. and T. Paffenholz (Eds.), *Peacebuilding: A Field Guide*, Leuven: Field Diplomacy Initiative, 2001. *Available in English, French and Dutch.*

Sherriff, A., "Supporting and Enhancing Community Based Peacebuilding", *Guidance Notes for DAC-OECD CPDC Working Group*. London: International Alert, November 2003.

The Sphere Project, *The Sphere Handbook 2004*. Oxford: Oxfam Publishing, forthcoming 2004.