

# SCOPING STUDY

# GLOBAL & INTERNATIONAL PEACE CENTRES & PEACE EDUCATION BODIES

JANUARY 2021





## **The Glencree Centre for Peace & Reconciliation**

Established in 1974 in response to the conflict in Northern Ireland, the Glencree Centre for Peace & Reconciliation works with individuals and groups to transform conflict, promote reconciliation, encourage healthy relationships and build sustainable peace.

### **Under the Patronage of the President of Ireland, Michael D Higgins.**

The Glencree Centre for Peace & Reconciliation  
Glencree, Co. Wicklow, A98 D635  
Republic of Ireland

e: [info@glencree.ie](mailto:info@glencree.ie)  
t: + 353 1 2829711

[www.glencree.ie](http://www.glencree.ie)

Twitter & Facebook:  
[@glencreecentre](https://twitter.com/glencreecentre)

[#glencree4peace](https://twitter.com/glencree4peace)

The views and opinions expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect those of the Glencree Centre for Peace & Reconciliation. Reproduction of all or part of this document may be authorised only with written consent of the source.

© 2021 – Glencree Centre for Peace & Reconciliation

The Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation is a nonprofit, non-governmental organisation and a registered charity in the Republic of Ireland. Registered Charity No. CHY5943. Charities Regulatory Authority (CRA) No. 20009823.

# Scoping Study on Global and International Peace Centres and Peace Education Bodies

This Scoping Study was undertaken on behalf of the Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation by the Centre on Conflict, Development and Peacebuilding (CCDP).

**For information, please contact:**

Centre on Conflict, Development and Peacebuilding (CCDP)  
Graduate Institute  
of International and Development Studies  
Maison de la Paix,  
Chemin Eugène-Rigot 2, P. O. Box 1672  
1211 Geneva 1,  
Switzerland

<http://graduateinstitute.ch/ccdp>  
Email: [ccdp@graduateinstitute.ch](mailto:ccdp@graduateinstitute.ch)

## Preface

While the majority of Glencree’s peace work has been undertaken on the island of Ireland, the Glencree Board became increasingly concerned by the polarisation of politics internationally, the decline of multilateralism, the impact of the climate crisis on peace, and the acceleration of a partisan discourse mirrored in a partisan media.

As part of a strategic review currently being undertaken by the organisation, the Board wished to ascertain what we could usefully contribute to global peace, drawing on our experience of thirty years of violent conflict.

The Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation was set up in 1974 as a response to the outbreak of violent conflict in the north of the island. During that time, Glencree created a quiet, safe space for dialogue between victims of the conflict and between former enemies in the interests of a sustainable peace. Our peace work continues in an immediate post-conflict situation where, twenty-two years after the signing of the Good Friday Agreement in 1998, the legacy of the past continues to poison the present and the future. We also continue to share the challenges and the lessons that have been learnt from our own conflict with over 10 international communities in conflict.

In mid-2020, Glencree commissioned a scoping study to provide an overview of a range of main actors working in the field of international peacebuilding and an advisory report on the possible steps and challenges for Glencree to raise its international profile. The study was undertaken by the Centre on Conflict, Development and Peacebuilding (CCDP), based in Geneva, with input from both external stakeholders and internal Board and staff at Glencree. The report was presented to Glencree in December 2020.

Glencree is keen to share the findings of this scoping study with the wider peacebuilding and research communities. We do so to contribute to the range of knowledge and understanding of peacebuilding activities and practice and to contribute to the field of peacebuilding and policy. Peacebuilding is a dynamic and changing concept and this scoping paper identifies and raises interesting insights on the nature of peacebuilding in changing geo-political, cultural, social and economic contexts.

The financial support for this study was generously provided by the Embassy of Switzerland in Ireland. We extend a very sincere thank you and acknowledgement to the Embassy team and to Ambassador Louis-José Touron for their interest and support in this work and in wider Glencree programmes and activities. This is much appreciated.

We also extend sincere thanks to the CCDP team from Geneva who undertook the study in a very timely and professional way. They provided us with strategic discussion points and questions of interest to Glencree and to those concerned to build more peaceful relations across different communities and peoples.

**Barbara Walshe**  
**Chair of the Board**  
**Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation**

**January 2021**



## Scoping Study on Global and International Peace Centres and Peace Education Bodies

Commissioned by the Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation

16 January 2021

In Pursuit of a *Gesamtkunstwerk*

### Executive Summary

This scoping study aims to provide an overview of the main actors working in the field of international peacebuilding, as well as reporting and advising on the possible steps and challenges for Glencree to raise its international profile. The report is divided into five sections plus an annex, which outlines key characteristics of 14 peacebuilding and peace education entities.

### Peacebuilding functions

- At the beginning of the study, the CCDP identified seven types of peacebuilding organisations associated with specific peacebuilding functions. Informed by consultations with Glencree’s staff, four were selected as the most relevant to Glencree’s work and strategic development. These are “Mediation”, “Network-Building”, “Community Dialogue” and “Peace Education”.
- **Mediation** is a process that supports the parties of a conflict to organise their flow of communication and find options to resolve their dispute.
- **Network-building** is a process meant to strengthen ties with peer organisations. It allows for the sharing of best practices, peer learning, and provides support for lobbying strategies among the members of the network.
- **Community dialogue** constitutes various forms of engagement with (and among) affected populations in efforts to promote reconciliation, memory, dealing with the past, and ultimately the process of healing that permits living together in inclusive communities.
- **Peace education** is a broad term which, for present purposes, can be understood as organising **trainings** for practitioners and policymakers in the field of peacebuilding. In addition, there may be an interest in reflecting on the interconnectedness of community dialogue and peace education.

### Key aspects of organisations identified in light of the above functions

- Each organisation is “known for something”, meaning that it has defined its **niche** via a robust narrative around which it has established the reason for its existence.
- Many organisations have a branded convening space (i.e. a “**flagship**” event) on a specific issue and for a particular target group. An alternative, even if not mutually exclusive, to flagship events is the development of dedicated spaces for dealing with the past in order to support wider national healing processes (e.g. a **museum**).
- A strategic advantage is to cultivate **trust relationships** with individuals and groups across national, regional and international levels, often accompanied by a granular understanding of local contexts and conflict dynamics.
- Key is to embrace an “**entrepreneurial philosophy**” that allows for opportunities to be swiftly identified and seized; this, in turn, requires capitalising on available and potential financial and human resources with the necessary skills or expertise.

## Organisational models

- When thinking about organisational expansion, it is crucial to find the right balance between capacities located within the organisations or within a network, while at the same time acknowledging advantages and disadvantages that come along with working in **small or big organisations**. In order to facilitate Glencree's reflections in this direction, the report presented three organisational models, meant to explain the organisational set-up to provide regional or global services.
- The **decentralised model** consists of a headquarters with field offices in the countries in which the organisation is active.
- The **centralised model** consists of one physical and legal entity, from which and to which entities and individuals travel.
- The **partner model** operates by means of legal contracts establishing rights and duties between the organisation and its partners elsewhere.

## Glencree on the international peacebuilding scene

- Glencree finds itself working within **competitive dynamics** between peacebuilding NGOs headquartered in the Western hemisphere as well as state-based organisations that reduce the NGO space for peacebuilding.
- The landscape of peacebuilding capabilities has grown as a result of two decades of **specialisation** in the broader peacebuilding sphere. Many of the most lucrative niches appear to be covered by existing peacebuilding NGOs or international organisations.
- At the global level, Glencree has a niche as a **conveyor of experience** deriving from the Northern Ireland peace process and its implementation.
- Within a European perspective, a particular opportunity exists at the level of violence-affected or divided **cities**.
- The strength of Glencree as a European peacebuilding organisation will continue to be based on its track-record as an active peacebuilder in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. This can include **community-level** inclusion efforts on the island, or efforts to address conflict dynamics surrounding **Brexit**.

## Glencree in the international field of peace education

- A conceptual framework with values, philosophy, principles, approaches and methods should guide the construction of a **peace education portfolio**, and include the possibility of online trainings.
- The identification of one or more **themes** could facilitate the construction of a coherent training offer.
- The proposed training programme should meet the identified need of a **target audience**.
- Each training course should be self-financed in order to be sustainable.

## Road map for strategic development: phased approach following an inside-out dynamic

- It is advisable to start from a focus on what Glencree is and represents, especially its role in the island of Ireland, and then to go outwards and become regional or global.
- The first phase would include an introspection to articulate Glencree's niche and operating model.
- The second phase would see Glencree continuing its engagement on the island of Ireland while stretching out the feelers to create opportunities in related fields or contexts.
- The third phase would focus on investing efforts into strengthening its networking with peacebuilding organisations and donors working in Europe and beyond.
- In parallel to this approach, an organisational and fundraising model would need to be explored in order to accommodate this transformation process.

## Introduction

The Centre on Conflict, Development and Peacebuilding (CCDP), a research entity of the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva, has been mandated by the Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation to undertake a scoping study of global and international peace centres and peace education bodies. The study is intended to inform Glencree's ongoing strategic review and planning process. Specifically, the objectives of the study are to:

- (i) Identify and report on selected global or international peace centres (with a focus on civilian peacebuilding initiatives) and peace education bodies that are considered to be exemplary, in Europe and internationally, as well as describe and assess in detail their main programmes/activities and other specific features;
- (ii) Analyse and assess the key factors (unique/distinctive aspects) that contribute to the effectiveness or success of these institutions or centres;
- (iii) Summarise, analyse and assess the organisational capacity elements that facilitate the global focus of these centres;
- (iv) Report and advise on the global/international/regional opportunities that could exist for Glencree to innovate, either independently or in a partnership/collaboration with others, in relation to international peacebuilding and peace education;
- (v) Report and advise on challenges that could exist for Glencree as it expands towards a leadership role in international peacebuilding work and peace education; and
- (vi) Outline entry-points for Glencree's transformation to becoming a leading global peace centre.

The study was funded by a grant offered to the Glencree Centre by the Swiss Embassy to the Republic of Ireland. It was drafted by a team of five CCDP staff members: Alexandre Dormeier-Freire, Oliver Jütersonke, Augusta Nannerini, Achim Wennmann and Sina Zintzmeyer. Editing support was provided by Maëlys Glück. The work involved intensive desk research from Geneva, a number of online brainstorming sessions with senior Glencree management and staff, and a set of key informant interviews with Glencree partners and members of the diplomatic community based in Ireland. Data from these discussions, set up with the support of Glencree senior staff, informed the analysis of future opportunities, the road map, and the phased approach presented in the conclusion of the report. While the insights gathered were woven into the analysis where appropriate, together with feedback received from Glencree staff and board members, the views expressed in this study remain those of the five co-authors: they do not reflect the opinions of individual stakeholders, nor an institutional standpoint of the CCDP or the Graduate Institute.

The report is divided into five sections plus an annex. The first section offers a series of conceptual reflections and clarifications surrounding the key terms employed in the Terms of Reference and throughout this study. These clarifications go beyond academic rumination and constitute an essential part of the strategic review. The second section then offers an analysis of a selection of comparable centres, organised thematically. This section builds on an in-depth study of 14 peacebuilding and peace education entities whose key characteristics are outlined in the annex. It should be noted that the analysis of each organisation was for illustrative purposes only, and based on publicly available information as well as the authors' reading of certain operational and institutional aspects: it was not deemed necessary to consult those organisations' senior management or align the reading offered with their own official views. The third section offers a reflection on the spectrum of opportunities for Glencree within the global peacebuilding landscape. The fourth section explores potential challenges and opportunities for expanding towards a leadership role in peace education. The final section of the report concludes by offering a tentative "road map" that may inform Glencree's reflection process over the coming years.

## 1. Conceptual clarifications

Glenree's full name is the Glenree Centre for **Peace** and **Reconciliation**; the Terms of References as well as Glenree's documentation, moreover, speak of **peacebuilding**, **peace education**, **dialogue**, **mediation**, **network(-building)** and the **international**-isation of these activities. In what follows, we offer a set of cursory remarks on each of these terms and their inter-linkages.

### 1.1 Peace and peacebuilding

Following the work of Johan Galtung and many others since, peace is meaningfully understood as being more than just the absence of war or armed conflict ("negative peace"). It is seen as the pursuit of social justice through equal opportunity, a fair distribution of power and material resources, and an equal protection by and in the face of the rule of law ("positive peace"). A "peace centre" such as Glenree is then one that contributes to this long-term goal of reconciling war-torn societies, seeking to strengthen mechanisms and institutions that offer non-violent ways to deal with the past, and settling disputes and conflicts as they arise. Echoing the United Nations' (UN) Agenda for Sustainable Development, the current notion of "sustaining peace" used by UN agencies and donor governments goes in a similar direction.

Peacebuilding, then, would be the actions and processes of those involved in generating such "positive peace" – the French and German equivalents of the term, "*consolidation de la paix*" or "*Friedenskonsolidierung*" are telling in this regard: building peace entails consolidating the process of community dialogue and mediation in order to strengthen state and societal institutions' abilities to deal with conflict in the long run. For better or worse, however, the notion of peacebuilding has been appropriated by the UN and other multilateral circles as being synonymous with "post-conflict peacebuilding", and thus referring to a specific type of external intervention situated somewhere between the end of peacekeeping operations and before the processes of long-term reconstruction and recovery. As a result, many organisations ostensibly involved in peacebuilding from the humanitarian, development, mediation and social work spheres (there are others, including architecture, urban planning, or public health to name but a few we are familiar with) do not necessarily seek to label their activities as such. More recent terms and agendas such as "preventing and countering violent extremism" have further muddied the peacebuilding waters.

It is thus arguably to Glenree's strategic advantage that it only features the term "peace" and not "peacebuilding" in its name, as it can thus conveniently distance itself from "peacebuilding" debates when these are overly instrumentalised, while also being able to play that card should donor needs and expectations merit it. In what follows, we have thus opted to break the notion of peacebuilding down into a series of overarching "peacebuilding functions", along which centres and organisations can be compared and contrasted (see the annex). While the list of possible functions is quite long; the present report focuses on four: mediation support, network-building, community dialogue, and peace education. These were jointly identified during discussions with Glenree senior staff as being the most pertinent for present purposes.

### 1.2 Mediation support

Mediation is a process that helps parties to a conflict organise their flow of communication, and find options to resolve their dispute. Mediation support usually takes the form of discrete diplomacy or good offices roles played by an impartial third party. Mediation support strives to provide technical assistance, by leading, advising and informing the discussions around peace with the aim of reaching a fair compromise that meets the primary requests of all the parties involved. In other words, it is an attempt to realise a so-called "win-win". In contradistinction to "negotiation", mediation support involves actions that include and go beyond formal settings and diplomatic meetings where official representatives discuss a possible solution to the conflict (so-called track one). Organisations that carry out the function of mediation support engage with a variety of actors, including governments

and UN officials, armed groups and insurgents, as well as representatives of grassroots organisations and civil society more broadly. They are perceived as a neutral third party, external to the main drivers of the conflict and therefore impartial. The fact that they are not bound to formal settings allows them to have greater flexibility in their actions and outreach.

In UN jargon, mediation is generally equated with “peacemaking”, and thus differentiated from preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping and ultimately peacebuilding. But mediation, in the broad version outlined here, goes far beyond brokering ceasefires with the aim of eventually reaching the basis for a peace agreement. Years and decades after the Good Friday Agreement, there is arguably still need for mediation work on the island of Ireland (not least within a new Brexit context) – in other words, mediation does not stop once such an agreement has been signed, rather it entails a discrete set of tools and activities undertaken by actors such as the Glencree Centre.

### **1.3 Network-building**

The building of networks is perceived as a way to strengthen the impact, organisational capacity and overall visibility of peacebuilding organisations. Networks ensure that members are represented with local authorities and at the international level. The network is a way to amplify the success of the outcomes of the programmes of member organisations, to reinforce the social perception of their impact in the community, and to amplify the advocacy concerns of individual organisations. It allows for the sharing of best practices, peer learning, and the provision of support for lobbying strategies. Networks usually have a lead organisation, or at least a representation placed in a geographical location of importance to the work of the network. The lead organisation is the point of reference for external actors to engage with the network, and it has the role of setting out the agenda and designing the strategic vision for the action of the network.

In a peacebuilding context, networks are a key function because of the complexity of conflict-affected settings and so-called “protracted crises”: sustaining peace requires a multitude of like-minded actors undertaking their work with a variety of stakeholders and on various state and societal levels. Coordination and collaboration amongst peacebuilding actors operating in a specific setting is thus key to harnessing the “peace dividend” of their work and mitigating the effects of “spoilers” who may well be instrumentalising the proliferation of peace-related actors (and the resulting fragmentation of the peace effort) to their benefit.

### **1.4 Community dialogue**

In contrast to mediation, dialogue constitutes an engagement of various forms among affected populations in efforts to promote peace. One of these is “reconciliation” – a term that features prominently in the name of the Glencree Centre. Academically, and in the same vein as “peacebuilding”, the notion of reconciliation assumes different nuances according to the contexts in which it is applied and the actors that engage with it, to the point that some authors prefer providing a “working definition” of the word, rather than a definitive formalisation of its meaning.<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this study, the significance of reconciliation is included within the notion of “community dialogue”, understood as the actions of forgiving, memory, dealing with the past, and ultimately the process of healing that permits living together in tolerant, inclusive communities and societies to go beyond a violent past or to avoid a potentially violent future.

One of the main premises of community dialogue is that it is inclusive and convenes all parties relevant in a given society or context, which means not only parties to the conflict (as in the mediation approach). Dialogue encompasses a set of initiatives that needs to be adapted to different contexts,

---

<sup>1</sup> Brandon Hamber and Gráinne Kelly (2004), “A Working Definition of Reconciliation”, paper published by Democratic Dialogue, Belfast.

and that requires a granular understanding of local actors' needs, interests and concerns. Cultural awareness and historical knowledge of the locality and the people concerned (e.g. migrant backgrounds) is an essential prerequisite. Community dialogue can thus be conceived as a subset of social dialogue more broadly, privileging a bottom-up approach to working with community representatives, including from unions, faith-based organisations, or minority groups.

Again, from a peacebuilding perspective, it would seem that community dialogue is a key ingredient. Organisations that carry out this function enjoy a privileged access to different social groups of the communities in which they operate. They are perceived as trustworthy partners. Over time, they cultivate and strengthen their connections with smaller grassroots organisations and key instrumental members of society. And yet: not all forms of community dialogue benefit from being labelled as "peacebuilding" initiatives. Strategically, and in view of fundraising efforts, it may at times be useful to align dialogue processes more with the sphere of social work, for instance, working with marginalised, excluded or vulnerable individuals, in efforts to foster tolerance and inclusivity.

A critical element of community dialogues is that they are rooted in the specific localised understandings of conflict dynamics. In this regard, cities play an important role, as the propinquity of urban areas constitutes the driving force behind a society's socio-economic well-being; they are also the major site for political participation and deliberative democracy. It is key that such local understandings allow community dialogues to evolve from "spaces of exception" to venues in which different violent actors can coexist and engage with each other in non-antagonistic ways. Such spaces nurture community-based peace leadership through the facilitation of problem-solving and coalition-building across various stakeholders relevant to a specific setting.

### **1.5 Peace education**

Peace education, finally, is a rather broad term encompassing a variety of educational initiatives in both conflict-affected and "peaceful" or "stable" societies. The link between "education" and "peace" is reiterated by Goal 4 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, reinforcing the idea that education is about more than turning individuals into active agents of the productive system: it also creates a sense of citizenship and community belonging. As an enabler of dialogue and a tool for social transformation, education is key to countering destructive narratives, combatting xenophobia, and preventing extremist views and actions. Education is about helping people to understand the world, participate in public life, and ultimately guarantee social order and stability based on values socialised and inherited from specific cultural and historical contexts, and shared across generations. Not only does education provide individuals with tangible skills that enable productive, valuable employment, but it also develops life skills that foster constructive civic engagement and reduce the resort to violence as a means of conflict resolution.

Not all forms of education are explicitly "peace education", although many curricula (in both formal and non-formal education) may have "peace potential". Broadly speaking, organisations that perform the function of "peace education" might have linkages with academic institutions and/or with the Ministry of Education of their home country. They usually have a profiled headquarters, or an iconic building that houses them, where trainings and lectures are staged, which symbolically represents the role they hold in their community and abroad. In order to differentiate the goals, practices and outcomes of peace education programmes, the literature (with variations from one author to the next) tends to distinguish between three socio-political contexts in which such programmes are situated: ethno-political conflicts (Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, etc.), non-violent intergroup tensions (such as migration or human trafficking), and more stable contexts (e.g. Switzerland and the Nordic countries). This categorisation is problematic in many respects, not least because of the structural and substantive diversity of organisations working in these three different contexts.

Many peacebuilding and reconciliation initiatives have – for better or worse – lost touch with the education pillar, with many "post-conflict peacebuilding" optics seeking to explicitly differentiate themselves from peace education. The reasons are manifold and may have much to do with the

“securitisation” of peacebuilding as a community of practice. However, and as suggested in the concluding section of this study, there may indeed be interest in thinking about the interconnectedness of, for example, community dialogue and peace education and how combining them strategically may result in more than the sum of its parts. As will emerge from the analysis in the next section, various organisations undertake programmes related to peace education in different formats, spanning from convening trainings for practitioners to engaging with students in schools. In the annexed table, we dedicated a special space to organisations that carry out training programmes for youths and practitioners, not least because “training” was specifically identified as a function of interest to Glencree during our discussions. It should be noted, however, that “peace education” is a function that goes well beyond training *per se*.

### **1.6 Rethinking the “international”**

Finally, a few words on the use of the term “international”. In the analysis that follows, all the included organisations have an international scope and audience to their work, even when they do not implement programmes beyond the national borders of the state that is hosting them. In this sense, a leading question that may inform the reading of this document is the extent to which the “international” or “global” peace centre that Glencree aims to become is one that operates on that level and implements programmes on the ground worldwide, or one that works in a very specific local context (e.g. the island of Ireland), but is internationally recognised as being a leader in doing so. The “internationalisation” of Glencree as a centre of excellence can be understood in many ways, and this is a discussion that would seem to be at the heart of this scoping study and the strategic review and planning process it seeks to inform.

## **2. Peacebuilding and peace education entities along key functions they perform**

The identification of selected peacebuilding and peace education entities builds on an analysis of the 41 member organisations of the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO) and other organisations operating in the peacebuilding context. Organisations included in the analysis were selected in view of illustrating various peacebuilding functions as well as different geographical regions. Selection criteria further included either regional and/or international recognition within the peacebuilding community, stable size or growth over the last five to ten years, and a clear operating model.

In the course of the online brainstorming sessions with Glencree, the CCDP team presented a preliminary table including different typologies of peacebuilding organisations that represented key management characteristics and highlighted key peacebuilding functions. The following organisational types were discussed: “The Mediation Support Organisation”, “The Holding Company”, “The Network”, “The Knowledge Organisation”, “The Consultancy Firm”, “The Training Organisation”, and “The Government Agency”. Based on discussions with the Glencree team, four types and their respective peacebuilding functions were selected as the most interesting models for Glencree’s strategic development, and are therefore analysed in this report.

Research involved a systematic review of each organisation’s website on vision/mission, flagship programmes, approach, organisational capacity, and unique aspects. In some instances, it also involved reaching out to the organisation in question for further information. The annex introduces a number of peacebuilding functions, including mediation (mediation support, advisory roles), peacebuilding (community dialogue), peace education (curriculum development, academic formal education, training, etc.) and network-building, as described in the previous section.

## **2.1. An analysis of peacebuilding and peace education entities**

This section explores unique and distinctive aspects of the entities identified in the annex and assesses what makes them stand out in activities related to peacebuilding or peace education.

### **A clear narrative of what an organisation proposes on the market place of peacebuilding**

- The one aspect that all the organisations studied have in common, as diverse a group as they are, is that each one of them is “known for something”, meaning that they have defined their niche via a robust narrative around which they have established the reason for their existence.
- For example, the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HD Centre) is known as the classic high-level mediation support organisation with local field offices and deep insights into local contexts, Cure Violence is known as “the ones who use a disease control approach to violence”, ABC is known for its “women’s situation room”, and the Peace Castle Schlainingen for its OSCE Summer Academy, and so forth.
- This does not mean that each one of those organisations only does one thing, but they have consciously created their niche in the peacebuilding market in order to convey a clear-cut identity around which they can build additional activities. WANEP is another case in point: while ECOWARN, the early warning network on conflict in the ECOWAS space has been the *raison d’être* for the organisation, it has allowed WANEP to raise its visibility, grow, and develop a number of activities around ECOWARN that may be more or less closely tied to the early warning function.

### **Longstanding trust relationships with individuals and groups across national, regional and international levels**

- Organisations such as Conciliation Resources, the Berghof Foundation or the HD Centre build on unique relationships with individuals, groups, governments and/or armed actors that they have established and consolidated over many years. The resulting trust is the key ingredient to act in a mediation support or advisory capacity, and is at the heart of the respective organisation’s edge and “relationship capital”. The possibility to access the leaders and decision-makers of conflict parties gives these organisations a significant indirect capacity to influence a conflict situation.
- Contemporary conflicts are shaped by localised, regional and international interests. As a result, peace actors need to be connected across the full spectrum of actors shaping a specific conflict system. This can include access to high-level officials with leverage over a specific context or situation (e.g. the HD Centre), a relationship with armed groups, or a government to shape behaviour. International or regional institutions may be able to catalyse the work of an organisation and, as in the case of WANEP which roots its existence in the founding act of ECOWAS, strengthen ties with other actors of their network.
- Trust relationships are difficult to export, as these are based on relationship-building conducted over many years. However, how to develop such knowledge over time may be a skill that could be transferred and shared with organisations that would like to play such a role in their respective contexts.

### **Granular understanding of local contexts and conflict dynamics**

- The nature of contemporary conflicts is associated with multiple layers of disinformation or communication that peace actors need to cut through.
- Successful peace mediation support organisations draw their analysis directly from a broad range of actors involved in conflicts and based on long-term engagement in the places where

they work. For example, the work of Alianza Para la Paz is embedded in their knowledge of the region, along with their well-established ties with local actors and key institutional stakeholders. This first-hand information allows the organisation to look “behind the curtains” and understand the conflict dynamics beyond what is visible to the public at large.

- Again, as such, this type of knowledge is not exportable, but the approach on how to develop this knowledge can be shared and transmitted. In the current COVID-19 context, this can also include innovative ways of sharing such information and maintaining constructive ties with local stakeholders and key actors virtually.

### **An entrepreneurial philosophy**

- The dynamics of conflict and peace can evolve rapidly; this is why successful peace organisations have the capacity to adapt approaches and find the necessary resources to do so quickly. This includes both financial resources, but also human resources with the necessary skills or expertise for a specific adaptation (e.g. the HD Centre, ABC, or Cure Violence).
- The COVID-19 pandemic has re-emphasised how crucial such adaptability is: many local peacebuilding initiatives, from the DRC to Myanmar, have been put on hold because the international actors involved are unable to travel to local communities, raising fears that years of work in fragile environments could be undone.

### **A branded convening space on a specific issue and for a particular target group**

- Many organisations are internationally known for their regular flagship event, such as the Challenges Forum of the Folke Bernadotte Academy, the Oslo Forum of the HD Centre, or the Basel Peace Forum of Swisspeace. First and foremost, peacebuilding actors appear to maintain such forums to be perceived as “owning” a topic and to position themselves as pilot in a given field.
- In addition, these forums are used as multipurpose mechanisms – for fundraising, incubation of new initiatives, testing of ideas, learning, networking, relationship maintenance, etc.

### **Constant learning on the evolution of peacebuilding practice and contexts**

- Such learning is often captured by organisations in practitioner-friendly publication series: Conciliation Resources maintains the ACCORD series, Berghof is known for its Handbook series, while the HD Centre publishes the Oslo Forum papers.
- These series are maintained for multiple purposes, which include team-building between headquarters and field staff or local partners, infusion of innovation in existing practices, giving back “lessons learnt” to the peacebuilding sector, or influencing policy. Specific publications also serve as a reason for convening a set of actors for conferences or launch events.

### **The right balance between capacities located within the organisations and within a network**

- In-house mediation, analysis, or process-design experience allows an organisation to drive programmes or activities under its own control. Yet many organisations are opting only for a small core of capacities to stay within their team, with more specific know-how and expertise distributed over a network. An example of this is the team of experts at the Folke Bernadotte Academy.

- Achieving the right capacity balance is important because of the usually very specific knowledge and know-how needs that are required *ad hoc* or in specific moments. Too much in-house capacity can lead to an overemphasis of capacities that are not suitable, expensive to maintain, and lacking flexibility to adapt to rapidly changing contexts. In these circumstances, maintaining a roster of experts is frequently more cost-effective than making these experts part of core staff.

### **Development of dedicated spaces for dealing with the past in order to support wider national healing processes**

- The Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies is developing the Cambodia Peace Museum to highlight the resilience of Cambodia’s people in transforming conflicts. Similarly, the “War Childhood Museum” in Bosnia-Herzegovina is meant to spread awareness about experiences of being a child during war.
- These are examples of the importance that organisations devote to programmes designed to heal the past and deal with emotions. The memory of violence is also part of an organisation’s identity and way of being recognised by others.

#### **Box 1: Guiding questions for Glencree**

This section explored distinctive aspects of peacebuilding and peace education entities. The box distils key guiding questions for Glencree that flow from this analysis with the aim to stimulate reflection about its potential future development trajectories.

- ***A niche in the market place:*** In one sentence, what is the specific service or know-how we provide that sets us apart from all other peacebuilding and peace education organisations? Put differently: what is the sentence that, if someone heard it, would let them know it’s Glencree?
- ***Trust relationships:*** With whom do we have a trust relationship? Which connections should we have? What does it take to maintain these connections? What can we share about our approach to nurture trusted relationships? What is unique about this approach?
- ***Understanding of local context:*** What contexts do we know better than anyone else? How have we gained such an understanding? What edge do we have in comparison to other peacebuilding actors?
- ***Entrepreneurialism:*** How entrepreneurial are we? What does entrepreneurialism mean for us? Who pursues it, and how, within our organisation?
- ***Branded convening:*** What added value could a forum have for Glencree? What purposes could it fulfil? Which thematic field or target group would Glencree aim to cover in a forum? What would be Glencree’s edge for convening it?
- ***Continuous learning:*** What learning mechanisms do we need? What purpose would they serve?
- ***Capacities:*** What capacities do we need in-house? What capacities can be drawn from a network of associates?
- ***Creation of dedicated spaces:*** How do we frame our own experience of the Irish conflict? Could we leverage this experience by opening a dedicated space for learning and inspiration? What purpose would we like it to have? How would we explain its significance to third parties?

## 2.2. Organisational capacity elements that facilitate the global focus of international peacebuilding and peace education centres

This section looks specifically at size and growth of organisations on one hand, and at organisational models of regional and global organisations on the other.

### Size: Small versus big

Organisational size can be assessed in terms of finances as well as staff. The selection of 14 organisations analysed in this report does not provide a representative-enough sample from which to draw universal lessons – not least because the annual budget is not known for all of them, and because the organisations are set up in various parts of the world, implying different operating and staff costs. A more systematic categorisation of all 14 organisations in the annexed table was thus not possible without further financial analysis, but it nevertheless allows for a broad classification that can guide reflections on growth targets. The following indicative categories can be established.

Six of the organisations in the annex belong to the category of small organisations with annual budgets of up to EUR 5 million. Their budgets allow them to generate team sizes between 7 and 34 staff members, with the top of the range being possible for the *Allianza Para la Paz* located in Latin America, where staff costs are significantly lower than in Europe. *Swisspeace* and *Conciliation Resources* are mid-sized organisations with an annual budget of between EUR 5-10 million. They have 40 and 60 staff members, respectively. The large organisations with annual budgets of EUR 10 million and higher include the *Berghof Foundation* and the *HD Centre* with 91 and 300 staff, respectively. While the *Berghof Foundation* is closely associated with the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the *HD Centre* has been significantly diversifying its funding base including through multiple governments, the EU as well as from private patrons. As a result, its budget increased seven-fold between 2010 and 2018.

And yet, despite the fact that “size matters” in terms of the administrative capacity to implement or support large and long-term peace process support or peacebuilding initiatives, much effective peace work rests on smaller, highly-connected organisations that are agile and adaptable to rapidly changing constellations and operational needs. For instance, the *Institute for Integrated Transitions (IFIT)* in Barcelona maintains a very small headquarters, but advances its operational work primarily through a network of high-calibre advisers who are called upon if they possess the right competence for a specific situation. This case might be illustrative of the vision that “small is beautiful”: a limited size and network strength allows greater operational agility.

The question, however, is not whether “size matters” or “small is beautiful”; both organisational designs have their place in the institutional inventory of the peacebuilding world. While large organisations can suffer from over-administration (like any large institution), smaller organisations can be heavily reliant on the unique skills and personal relationships of a leader or a handful of key personnel. Tables 1 and 2 present various advantages and disadvantages of large and small organisations.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Tables 1 and 2 draw on Alanna Shaikh (2009), *Why size doesn't matter*, 20 May, available at <http://bloodandmilk.org/2009/05/20/smaller-ngos-arent-better-than-big-ones-reverse-also-true> (accessed 13 November 2020).

Table 1: The pros and cons of a large organisation

Pros	Cons
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has a certain base level of competence because of its broader experience.</li> <li>2. Can more easily expand or replicate successful projects.</li> <li>3. Usually has enough staff to cover periods of key staff turnover.</li> <li>4. Are used to the requirements and mechanics of donor bureaucracies that allows quicker project initiations.</li> <li>5. Has more experience with financial controls and demands for compliance to donor regulations.</li> <li>6. Has several ongoing projects to leverage their presence.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can be inflexible and slow as any large institution.</li> <li>2. Can have a lot of bureaucracy that stifles change and innovation.</li> <li>3. Can lose the personal touch – it’s “just business” but no longer a vocation.</li> <li>4. Has a higher percentage of funding from government donors, which limits programmatic options.</li> <li>5. Reliance on specific governmental donors can diminish the impartiality required for some peace engagements.</li> </ol>

Table 2: The pros and cons of a small organisation

Pros	Cons
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tends to be more flexible and able to change directions quickly.</li> <li>2. Tends to be emotionally committed to its work.</li> <li>3. Is generally funded by small private donors, which means it has more freedom of choice on how to use its money.</li> <li>4. Is often very connected to the communities it serves.</li> <li>5. Can be more innovative.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Faces limits on technical capacities, or has more good intentions than the competences necessary to getting the work done.</li> <li>2. Can be reliant on one operational model as a response to all challenges.</li> <li>3. May not have dedicated finance and administrative staff, which means financial accountability is weaker.</li> <li>4. If a staff member left, it would have to advertise and hire to replace them – no pool of people to draw on.</li> </ol>

### Organisational models

Apart from size, another important element of the organisational capacity is the operational model, which refers to the set-up of the organisation to provide regional or global services. Typically, this set-up flows organically from the programmatic approach an organisation adopts. Based on the 14 organisations in the annex, three models can be identified.

The **decentralised model** (e.g. WANEP, HD Centre) consists of a headquarters with field offices in the countries in which the organisation is active. This approach is appropriate for organisations that commit to a long-term engagement in a given country in order to understand its context and dynamics in detail. It is a symbolic act of engagement to open a field office. Setting up and maintaining country offices is relatively costly and requires the establishment and duplication of financial and administrative systems at various levels, which is a time-intensive undertaking. Also, most country offices are legal entities on their own that need to be registered as such in the various countries.

The **centralised model** (e.g. Peace Castle Schlaining, Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, Folke Bernadotte Academy) consists of one physical and legal entity, from which and to which institutional representatives and individuals travel. This model allows to invest all mobilised resources into the central entity and to have a relatively efficient growth. It is adapted for training centres, museum-type organisations, and conference facilities. At the same time, it implies less exposure to and engagement in field-level dynamics. For an organisation that plans to engage in new places, this model entails frequent travels and creative thinking on how to keep in touch and develop partnerships in specific

settings that do not entail legal ties (see partner model). The network approach is part of this model, as the members are not hierarchically tied to each other, but collaborate on a voluntary basis.

The **partner model** (e.g. Swisspeace), with legal contracts establishing rights and duties between the organisation and its partners elsewhere. This model is appropriate for many organisations located in the global North that provide funding and capacity-building to local organisations in conflict zones in the global South. From a financial perspective, this model essentially implies that the organisation in the North becomes a donor, and acquires the financial and administrative capacity to oversee the use of funds and policies of their partner. This model makes a lot of sense in some low-capacity contexts, but also requires close managerial engagement and the capacities to assure oversight.

It is important to underline that these models are illustrative of the spectrum of organisational designs that Glen Cree can draw upon to tailor its own model – only very few organisations correspond clearly to one of these “ideal types”, with most featuring a combination of elements related to one or the other. For the purposes of this study, we made an attempt in the annex to suggest the model that is closest to each of the 14 organisations presented.

#### **Box 2: Managing expansion amid the pressures of ongoing activities**

The question for many organisations with an ambition to expand their activities is how to manage growth amid the pressures of ongoing activities. One of the main challenges to do so successfully is to be able to put in place the financial and administrative systems that are needed to account for larger programmes and a larger annual budget. Such efforts are usually costly and are difficult to include in project budgets. Similarly, in a growth phase, resources at hand build on the planning of workload and ambitions identified in the project development phase. As growth happens during the project phase, staff members need to manage current projects and growth efforts simultaneously, which can foster staff exhaustion and burn out. Planning growth processes together with strategic partners and donors is important. It should involve assuring a dedicated amount of core funding that enables human resources and competences to manage a growth process.

### **3. Horizon scan of challenges and opportunities for Glen Cree**

This section reviews the global context for peacebuilding organisations as a foundation for exploring opportunities for Glen Cree’s institutional evolution.

#### **3.1. The global peacebuilding context<sup>3</sup>**

Glen Cree undertakes its institutional transformation at a moment of rapid political, economic and social change. From a systemic perspective, key factors shaping the current peacebuilding operational context revolve around “mega risks” associated with demographic shifts, climate change and environmental stress, technological disruption, rising inequalities and exclusion, and unprecedented rates of urbanisation. Such risks often compound each other in fragile settings, resulting in multiple and overlapping crises at local, national and international levels, including sanitary crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic. These mega-trends have already started to overwhelm existing institutions and systems.<sup>4</sup> The *New York Times* summarises the outlook in the following words: “Worldwide contagion,

<sup>3</sup> This section draws on Achim Wennmann (2019), “Reconstructing Syria, Reinventing Peacebuilding?” In Luigi Narbone (ed.) *Fractured Stability: War Economies and Reconstruction in the MENA*. Florence: European Union Institute, pp. 24-33.

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, National Intelligence Council (2012), *Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds*. Washington D.C.: National Intelligence Council.

the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression and a warming planet — not to mention rising hunger, growing legions of refugees, xenophobic bombast from strongmen leaders and a new cold war between the United States and China”.<sup>5</sup>

There is hardly any global consensus on how to address the major risks above and prevent systems from breaking down. In the peace-and-security domain, two decades of a “war on terror” and of military interventions by Western alliances in the Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and other countries created distrust and divisions in the UN Security Council that only deepened with Ukraine, Syria and Venezuela. These divisions also eroded any consensus on a liberal world order in the face of the reassertion of national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the strengthening of autocratic regimes. The Variety of Democracy (V-Dem Report) 2020 highlights that “for the first time since 2001, autocracies are in the majority”, representing the governance model for 92 countries and being home to 54% of the global population.<sup>6</sup>

At sub-national levels, peacebuilding actors are confronted with a surge in “hybrid political orders” marked by fractured control and competition over authority, legitimacy and territorial control. These constellations have led to approaches such as “hybrid peace” or “adaptive peacebuilding”, connecting to pragmatic humanitarian practices.<sup>7</sup> These include a particular emphasis on engagement with “difficult” actors wielding *de facto* political power, including organised criminal groups, gangs, militias, but also with social or youth movements, special interest groups and businesses.

This new strategic landscape has changed peacebuilding practice. Over the last three decades, international peacebuilding practice has been dominated by a set of assumptions that set countries on the path towards a so-called liberal peace. The UN and other international actors have concentrated their efforts on ending armed conflict through peace agreements, which are to be implemented through a cocktail of peacekeeping operations, state-building and peacebuilding programmes.<sup>8</sup> Such international assistance is guided by the aim of establishing a liberal peace that includes an array of functional components such as constitutions, elections, institutions and reconciliation mechanisms. Over time, an increasingly professionalised set of actors has emerged that service different components of the “liberal peace” trajectory.<sup>9</sup> The consequence has been an oversupply of peace support capabilities, especially around track II processes, including a highly competitive marketplace.

The liberal project to rebuild states and societies after armed conflict is becoming increasingly orphaned, while the Chinese approach of “developmental peace” is growing as an attractive alternative for many governments and people. Moreover, major European countries – such as Germany, the UK and Sweden – and the European Union are (or likely will be) de-prioritising peacebuilding programmes in the face of more proximate interests and threats associated with extremism, terrorism, unregulated migration, or responses to the COVID-19 economic crises.<sup>10</sup> Geopolitical interests will also shape more proximate security agendas. In Germany, some policy-

---

<sup>5</sup> Gladstone, R. (2020), “As U.N. Turns 75, the Celebration Is Muted by Calamity and Conflict,” *New York Times*, 15 September.

<sup>6</sup> See, for instance, the work of the Variety of Democracy Project: [https://www.v-dem.net/media/filer\\_public/de/39/de39af54-0bc5-4421-89ae-fb20dcc53dba/democracy\\_report.pdf](https://www.v-dem.net/media/filer_public/de/39/de39af54-0bc5-4421-89ae-fb20dcc53dba/democracy_report.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> Stepputat, F. (2018), “Pragmatic Peace in Emerging Governscapes,” *International Affairs* 94(2), 399-416.

<sup>8</sup> Gowan, R. and S. J. Stedman (2018), “The International Regime Treating Civil War, 1988-2017,” *Daedalus* 147:1, 171-184.

<sup>9</sup> Ladley, A. and A. Wennmann (forthcoming 2021), “Political Economy and Peace Agreements,” in M. Weller, M. Retter and A. Varga (eds.). *International Law and Peacemaking*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>10</sup> Sherriff, A., P. Veron, M. Deneckere and V. Hauck (2018), *Supporting Peacebuilding in Times of Change: A Synthesis of 4 Case Studies*, Maastricht: European Centre for Development Policy Management.

makers are calling for “strengthening Europe in order to defend German and European interests” and prevent Europe from becoming “an ‘appendage’ dominated by other powers”.<sup>11</sup>

Such developments illustrate that a transformation towards a multipolar order is well under way, heralding a period of turbulence driven by power politics and fights over zones of influence.<sup>12</sup> In this new order, the US, the EU and European countries have limited leeway for setting post-conflict agendas, as has been illustrated in Syria, Yemen, Libya and Afghanistan. After a series of ill-fated military interventions, many Western countries may have also lost their legitimacy as credible peacebuilders in the eyes of many local actors.

These political currents are complemented by a critique in the academic literature pointing to the dysfunctional nature of liberal peacebuilding. For over a decade, this literature has exposed massive ambitions under impossible conditions, and the lack of resources and capacity to build peace.<sup>13</sup> The academic literature also points to a pushback against the type of peacebuilding that is directed by external interveners. Many states and societal actors in the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Latin America are demonstrating increasing self-confidence and are willing to challenge the often-paternalistic approaches of “outsiders” – understood as foreign donors, international organisations or INGOs – attempting to control the peacebuilding dynamics on the ground. These observations illustrate a disconnect between peacebuilding at the grassroots level and the peacebuilding narratives and programmes of international organisations and many bilateral donors.<sup>14</sup>

### 3.2. Implications for Glencree

In the face of the strategic landscape of change charted above, the positioning of Glencree as a “global” peacebuilding actor needs to be approached with a sense of prudence and sober judgement about its own capacities and abilities to nurture peaceful change.

For instance, by internationalising, Glencree would enter the (sometimes volatile) competitive dynamics between peacebuilding NGOs headquartered in the Western hemisphere. From Yemen and Venezuela to Ukraine, South Sudan and Afghanistan, different tracks see multiple actors mobilised with many organisations scrambling over a piece of the peacebuilding pie, or actively seeking mediation or peace support roles (sometimes with counterproductive outcomes). These dynamics are likely to increase as donor governments have fewer funds available due to the COVID-19-related economic crises due to arise in the next few years.

There is also competition from state-based new entrants that reduce the NGO space for peacebuilding. Some countries are activating their own diplomatic and intelligence capacities for peace mediation, including Oman, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt, the Russian Federation, and others. The same is true for capacities of regional organisations such as the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the African Union (AU), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), or regional forums such as the Shangri-La Dialogue convened by the International Institute for Security Studies, or the Dakar International Forum for Peace and Security in Africa. The Irish

---

<sup>11</sup> Munich Security Conference (2020), *Wendezeiten*, see p. 12.

[https://securityconference.org/assets/01\\_Bilder\\_Inhalte/03\\_Medien/02\\_Publikationen/MSC\\_Germany\\_Report\\_10-2020\\_Engl\\_ExeSumm.pdf](https://securityconference.org/assets/01_Bilder_Inhalte/03_Medien/02_Publikationen/MSC_Germany_Report_10-2020_Engl_ExeSumm.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> National Intelligence Council (2017), *Global Trends: The Paradox of Progress*, Washington DC: National Intelligence Council.

<sup>13</sup> Newman, E., R. Paris, and O. P. Richmond (eds.) (2009), *New Perspectives on Liberal Peacebuilding*. New York: United Nations University; Chandler, D (2017), *Peacebuilding: The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1997-2017*, Cham: Springer Nature/Palgrave Macmillan.

<sup>14</sup> See, for instance, M. Bradbury and S. Healy (eds.) (2010), *Whose Peace is it Anyway: Connecting Somali and International Peacemaking*, London: Conciliation Resources with Interpeace; M.B. Anderson, D. Brown, and I. Jean (2013), *Time to Listen: Hearing People on the Receiving End of International Aid*, Cambridge: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects.

government itself, via its “Irish Aid” branch, has an interest in capitalising on the successful Irish experience in solving its own conflict, and in presenting itself to an international audience as the “Irish peacemakers”.

Another item to consider is that the landscape of peacebuilding capabilities has grown as a result of two decades of specialisation in the broader peacebuilding sphere. Whether it be expertise and know-how on election monitoring, national dialogue processes, peace and development advisors, architectures for peace, or on specific regional or local knowledge and relationships: many of the most lucrative niches appear to be covered by existing peacebuilding NGOs or international organisations. These specialisations have frequently grown because of direct government funding and diplomatic agendas in specific niches, including from countries such as Norway, Switzerland, Germany, the Netherlands, Finland, the United Kingdom and others. The result is that it is today much more difficult to find a niche in the peacebuilding field than after the end of the Cold War, when the peacebuilding landscape was composed of fewer actors and capabilities.

### 3.3. Spectrum of opportunities for Glenree to develop its role in peacebuilding

Building on the analysis of the global peacebuilding landscape and its implications for Glenree, this section develops a spectrum of opportunities to inform Glenree’s strategic positioning. It does so by articulating potential comparative advantages Glenree might have at the global level, as well as at the level of Europe and the island of Ireland.

#### Global

- **Glenree has a global niche as a conveyor of experience deriving from the Northern Ireland peace process and its implementation.** It could become the “one-stop shop” for relevant insight and experience about the Irish peace experience. At the same time, Glenree could strengthen both the narratives around this experience and the products it can contribute to peace processes elsewhere. Based on these elements, Glenree could nurture a group of individuals who could act as a delivery vehicle of this experience as an input to larger peace processes that are taking place elsewhere in the world. Such stand-by capacity should be in a position to be mobilised on an *ad-hoc* basis. Moreover, the strategic position of Glenree, and its familiarity with the dynamics currently developing at the border with Northern Ireland in the context of ongoing Brexit negotiations and their aftermath, could provide valuable insights to international actors facing similar scenarios.

#### Europe

- **Position Glenree at the “European” rather than at the “global” level.** Many parts of Europe require and will require more peacebuilding expertise and know-how. Many peacebuilding NGOs in the Western hemisphere have developed capabilities related to the far-away conflicts of the 2000s and 2010s, yet few have developed networks or relevant know-how for the growing peacebuilding challenges in Europe, associated with exclusion, xenophobia, migration, or separatism. In order to be a European peacebuilding organisation, Glenree could enter a strategic cooperation with the Irish Foreign Ministry and/or other actors that could leverage diplomatic and non-governmental capacities for mutual gain. This could include cultivating and strengthening its relationship with the diplomatic representatives of EU countries in Dublin, who could act as a conduit for collaborative engagements with peacebuilding organisations in their respective countries.
- **Focus on city-level peacebuilding.** Within a European framing, a particular opportunity exists at the level of violence-affected or divided cities. Financial support for peace operations by governments – and especially foreign ministries – are still shaped by an understanding of civil

wars and national-level conflict framings in far-away conflict zones. They do not perceive European conflict dynamics through a peacebuilding lens. Glencree could use the sub-national, city-level experience of peace and conflict dynamics as an entry point for a new alliance of cities for peacebuilding, including for instance Belfast, Bilbao, Mostar, Donetsk, Sarajevo, Marseille, Barcelona, Ajaccio and others. In the European peacebuilding landscape, this is currently an open niche that few actors have entered from a peacebuilding perspective (networks exist from a safety and security perspective, include the European Forum for Urban Security).

- **Build from an Irish base outward to Europe.** Glencree could build a niche on topics that grow out of the Irish experience, including on the decommissioning of arms, security sector reform, illicit economies and smuggling, urban segregation despite peace agreements, urban terror attacks, dealing with a violent past, or community-level reconciliation. The focus on the city level would also connect to Glencree's experience with community-level processes.

### **The island of Ireland**

- **Keep being an Irish peacebuilding organisation.** The strength of Glencree as a European peacebuilding organisation will continue to build on being an active peacebuilder in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. These can include community-level inclusion efforts on the island, or efforts to address conflict dynamics surrounding Brexit. Arguably all attempts to extend the scope of Glencree's work internationally must not be to the detriment of the quality and depth of the programming work undertaken on the island of Ireland, which remains the cornerstone of the centre's identity and reputation.

### **3.4 Spectrum of opportunities for Glencree to develop its role in peace education**

Positioning Glencree as a leading institution in the field of peace education poses, in the global context described above, a whole series of challenges and opportunities that are summarised here in a few key points.

#### **Thematic visibility and priority**

We have already referred to the difficulty of clearly identifying and defining educational and training activities emanating from the concept of peace education. Today, the debate is more oriented towards "inclusive caring" and focuses on issues of violence in schools in all forms, including harassment, bullying, and other forms of physical and non-physical violence. The identification of a theme in the field of peace education (such as community dialogue, and sub-themes such as urban dialogue, intergenerational dialogue, inter-religious dialogue, or any other niche built from its recognised Irish-based experience), is a solution that makes it possible to tighten up the general theme of peace education and to give a clear visibility to an education/training portfolio. This does not mean that any other training project should be excluded, but it does imply that each activity should be positioned as a marker towards the main theme. A conceptual framework with values, a philosophy, principles, approaches and methods should guide the construction of a peace education portfolio and its potential conceptual link to the peacebuilding function Glencree envisages to develop as a narrative. The ASK model, that identifies the need for training to shape attitudes (A), build skills (S), and develop knowledge (K), should be an essential second step in achieving this goal. It will help define the purpose that the training portfolio serves. The identification of one or more themes in the field of peace education could facilitate the construction of a coherent training offer articulated around the objectives of transforming Glencree into a leading global peace centre. The question of the capacity to deliver training, and the quality that goes with it, can lead to collaborations with members of the Glencree network and/or develop relations with new educational institutions.

### **Building a coherent offer in line with objectives and resources**

Depending on the purpose of the proposed training, its modalities may differ; today, most training programmes in the field of community dialogue or peace education focus mainly on a flexible offer that corresponds to the needs of their target audience (often professionals or youths). Without being able to generalise everything, the training courses are short and certifying, on the one hand, or rather of the extra-curricular educational activity type on the other, when it concerns a younger public (school visits, summer schools, discussions with young people, use of the arts to raise awareness among adolescents, contribution to the development of curricula on how to deal with the past and build dialogue, networking, etc.). Other institutions also offer training-of-trainers (i.e. Berghof) or building capacities in peace education, which would be an interesting avenue to explore for Glencree in view of its legitimacy stemming from its action in the Irish dialogue. The credibility and recognition of a training course is based on the reputation of the trainers, the institution, and the certification given (if desired). The question of certification can play a role, but is not necessarily desirable depending on the purpose a peace education programme serves.

The current context of COVID-19 is pushing most institutions to digitalise their training offer. Without entering into the pedagogical debate on the pros and cons of distance learning, this should nevertheless be kept in mind insofar as the training offer will have to adapt to this constraint with the possibility of losing certain key aspects that are generally associated with face-to-face and informal contacts (such as social networking, collaborative skills, certain pedagogies implying physical presence, etc.). It is therefore not possible to simply convert face-to-face distance learning into face-to-face teaching; it must be specifically thought out and designed.

### **Identification of target audiences**

The proposed training programme must meet the identified need of a target audience. The target population often determines much of the structure of training provision. Describing the audience, in conjunction with the identification of key values and missions, forms the main nexus for the creation of a training programme. What are these for Glencree in the perspective of becoming a leading global peace centre? Youths, women and the Irish community at large have so far been Glencree's central target audience. If the activities were to be extended beyond what they are today (Europe), a target audience or audiences would need to be identified.

### **Funding mechanisms**

While the question of financing should not be taken out of its broader context within Glencree, it would be interesting to explore the financial viability of a training programme independent of the others – or, in other words, to see whether each training course could be self-financed in order to be sustainable. Depending on the type of training activities, scholarship opportunities exist, for example through foundations such as the Open Society and other bilateral (i.e. Irish Aid) or multilateral donors. Specific donors should be identified in the event that such an option is relevant, which would include taking into account their specific requirements.

## **4. A phased approach: a tentative road map from the inside out**

As a result of the issues discussed above, this section provides suggestions about the process Glencree might adopt in its transition into a global peace centre. It proposes a phased approach that follows an inside-out dynamic, i.e. grounded in what Glencree is and represents, and in its role on the island of

Ireland, to go outwards and become a regional or global actor. Concretely, this would imply in a first phase an introspection to articulate its niche and operating model; in a second phase to continue its engagement on the island while stretching out the feelers to create opportunities in related fields or contexts; and in a third step to then start investing efforts into strengthening its networking with peacebuilding organisations and donors working in Europe (and beyond) to expand its operational field. In parallel, an organisational and fundraising model needs to be explored that would accommodate the transformation process.

### **Introspection – articulating Glencrecree’s niche and operational model**

In view of strengthening its profile on an international scale, Glencrecree’s legitimacy as a peacebuilding organisation will need to remain strongly associated with its role as a national peacebuilding actor in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. Glencrecree is known for its constructive role in the Irish conflict, but much less is known about “*how*” the organisation operates to bring together groups from both sides of the conflict. It would therefore be important for Glencrecree to clearly articulate the niche of its role in this process and the model (or theory of change) it uses. In this sense, a question to ask would be: “What is it the world should know about Glencrecree’s role in the Irish experience?” In other words, can this model, or parts of it, be replicated or taught in other contexts? One particular aspect to pay attention to should be Glencrecree’s conceptual understanding of the connection between peacebuilding (community dialogue/mediation) and peace education, as discussed above. The two elements have been given equal weight for this mandate, but for internal (and ultimately external) clarification, it would be important to clarify the relationship between them. For example, they could be mutually enriching – for instance if the idea behind it is to use the insights from the community dialogue and mediation activities to inform curriculum development – and vice versa, to use the responses and reactions of people attending training programmes to feed back into action at the community level. Such an approach could be interesting, but would need to be clearly articulated and programmatically followed. In the case of Glencrecree, another element to keep in mind for the operational model is the location of Glencrecree, as the organisation has the asset (and the burden) of not only being an impressive organisation, but also of having a magnificent physical presence that should be part of the model. Once such a model has been articulated and agreed upon, a critical review of Glencrecree’s activities and programmes may be needed to test whether all of them can be logically connected to the operating model, or whether some tough decisions need to be made, and which ones.

### **Prospection – continue the focus on the Irish context while stretching out the feelers**

In our view, Glencrecree’s efforts in its future activities should continue to be focused on confirming the organisation as an effective and trusted peacebuilding actor on the island of Ireland. Everything else builds on these roles and achievements. As mentioned above, the current context is indeed favourable to explore the application of Glencrecree’s model to continuously evolving circumstances. Notably, uncertainty created by COVID-19, the unpredictable outcomes of Brexit negotiations, and the immigration context are triggering reactions of social distrust and dissatisfaction among particular local and urban communities. In the long term, this uncertainty risks jeopardising stability in the region, which ultimately threatens peace. These realities offer connecting points to issues other European cities and contexts are facing, to which one could reach out and explore possibilities for sharing experiences, partnering and proposing new initiatives to donors.

### **Extrospection – network- and partnership-building**

An important part of becoming regional and/or global will be for Glencrecree to increase the recognition of its operational model within the peacebuilding world, as much with potential partners as with potential donors. Building up its relational capital will help Glencrecree raise its profile internationally. By

extending its legitimacy outside of the Irish context, it will also become easier to consolidate the reputation of Glencree and the branding of its premises. Bearing in mind that it is generally advisable to build on what already exists, we suggest that Glencree start again by looking “inside” and identify potential key connections or friends that have shown support and interest in Glencree’s work over the years. Investing time and effort in cultivating existing networks is the first step towards organisational expansion. Second, building ties with peer organisations on the island of Ireland and in Europe is crucial to expand existing networks further and beyond national borders. Attending workshops and conferences, or organising thematic events, are some of the ways to create and expand networks and raise the profile of Glencree’s operational model. As mentioned in Section 2 above, networking can be a way to understand how sister organisations manage to build trust in foreign contexts, what kind of expertise they identify their work with, and how Glencree can complement these efforts and build its own niche. At a later stage of its strategic development, Glencree might consider whether it is worth joining a broader network, or even assuming a leading role in a newly established network of sister organisations on the island of Ireland.

### **Form follows function**

In parallel to this phased approach, the organisation may want to look at its institutional set-up, analyse its organisational strengths and weaknesses, how it needs to adapt, and where to put the efforts to realise new functions, such as networking and fundraising efforts. From a financing perspective, Glencree might focus on three strategic pillars for its growth strategy that would be mutually supportive: (a) infrastructure: assure the financing of the renovation of its premises for adaptation to a state-of-the-art convening and training centre; (b) content: funding for programmatic work/networking in clearly-defined areas (e.g. as suggested above at the European level and with cities); and (c) pooled core funds: negotiate partnership agreements with multiple donors to assure multi-year funding for the organisation’s administration. There will not be a magic bullet to raise the needed funds and it will take some effort, but networking based on a clear niche and building partnerships with donors will carry fruits when the time is ripe.

With a broadened network, a clearly articulated niche and an adapted organisational structure, Glencree will identify complementary operational partners and will be seen as bringing a specific contribution to the table to launch activities in new contexts. All is there, inside, waiting to be shaped in the right way.

## Annex

<b>Name</b>	<b>Vision/Mission</b> The way each organisation describes itself	<b>Flagship/Programmes relevant to Glencree's work</b>	<b>Approach</b> How they work on peace, country focus, thematic focus	<b>Organisational Capacity</b> Staff size, country offices, annual budget (last available year), institutional model, key partnerships, organisational model	<b>Unique Aspects</b> Issues to highlight
<b>Mediation Support</b>					
Conciliation Resources (UK)	Conciliation Resources provides practical support to help people affected by violent conflict achieve lasting peace. We draw on our shared experiences to influence policies and improve peacebuilding practice worldwide.	<p>“Ethiopia: Persisting with Peace”. Facilitated peace talks between the Ethiopia government and the Ogaden National Liberation Front, providing technical advice to the Kenyan team and the conflict parties throughout the six years of negotiations.  <a href="https://www.c-r.org/news-and-insight/ethiopia-persisting-peace">https://www.c-r.org/news-and-insight/ethiopia-persisting-peace</a></p> <p>“Engaging Armed Group”. Ground breaking research talking to armed groups. Report 16<sup>th</sup> Accord “Choosing to Engage”.  <a href="https://www.c-r.org/accord/engaging-armed-groups">https://www.c-r.org/accord/engaging-armed-groups</a></p>	<p>Work contingent to long-standing relationship with actors in the local context.</p> <p>Mediation support, dialogue with armed groups, dealing with the past, trainings for peacebuilders, inclusion of women, youth and refugees, climate and environment.</p> <p>Caucasus, East Africa, Horn Africa, Latin America, Pacific, South Asia, Southeast Asia, West Africa.</p>	<p>60 employees.            80 partners (Global community of “peer organisations”).            6 regions.            In 2019, income increased to GBP 8.84 million.            Partnership with Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs and Department of Foreign Affairs and trade of Ireland.</p> <p>Organisational partner model.</p>	New strategic relationship with Brussels-based mediation organisation mediatEUr.

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
Berghof (DE)	<p><i>“Creating space for conflict transformation.”</i> We work with like-minded partners in selected regions to enable conflict stakeholders and actors to develop non-violent responses in the face of conflict-related challenges.</p>	<p>“Intra-Sunni Dialogue and Strategy Development in Lebanon”. The project seeks to contribute to overall stability and peace in Lebanon by working with key actors in the Sunni community.  <a href="https://www.berghof-foundation.org/ru/programmes/middle-east-north-africa/intra-sunni-dialogue-and-strategy-development-in-lebanon/">https://www.berghof-foundation.org/ru/programmes/middle-east-north-africa/intra-sunni-dialogue-and-strategy-development-in-lebanon/</a></p> <p>“Supporting Political Dialogue and Transition in Yemen”. The overall aim of this project is to support Yemeni and international efforts for a political solution not only to end the war but also to re-launch the political transition process in Yemen that started in 2012.  <a href="https://www.berghof-foundation.org/ru/programmes/middle-east-north-africa/supporting-political-dialogue-and-transition-in-yemen/">https://www.berghof-foundation.org/ru/programmes/middle-east-north-africa/supporting-political-dialogue-and-transition-in-yemen/</a></p>	<p>Strive to build trust space with hard-to-reach actors, and – if a conflict has turned violent – provide inclusive and multipartial mediation and dialogue spaces to establish conditions conducive to a sustainable peace.</p> <p>Contribute to empowerment and development of competencies through workshops, trainings and coaching on methodology and practical mediation skills.</p>	<p>91 employees.  2 offices in Germany (Berlin and Tübingen).  In 2019, budget of EUR 10 million.  German Ministry of Foreign Affairs.</p> <p>Organisational partner model.</p>	<p>Discrete engagement with German Foreign Policies.</p> <p>Engagement with social media and digital tools.</p>

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
HD Centre (CH)	Swiss-based private diplomacy organisation founded on the principles of humanity, impartiality and independence.	<p>“Oslo Forum” is a series of retreats for international conflict mediators, high-level decision-makers, and other peace process actors. It provides a discreet and informal space to reflect on current mediation practice, collaborate across institutional and conceptual divides and advance negotiations.</p> <p><a href="https://www.hdcentre.org/osloforum/the-oslo-forum/">https://www.hdcentre.org/osloforum/the-oslo-forum/</a></p>	<p>Discretion is key.</p> <p>They “Assess, Engage, Operate”.</p> <p>Exceptional field networks, access to conflict actors, and knowledge of the context.</p>	<p>300 staff. 17 offices. 45 projects. 40 countries</p> <p>In 2019, their budget increased 717.9% from 2000 to 2018.</p> <p>Strong ties with Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs.</p> <p>Decentralized organizational model.</p>	<p>Convening power, and credible engagement with high-level officials.</p> <p>Entrepreneurial philosophy.</p> <p>Professional attitude to manage discreet process.</p> <p>Granular knowledge about conflict dynamics.</p>
Folke Bernadotte Academy (SE)	<p>A bridge between conflicting parties, conflict prevention and international crisis management.</p> <p>Slogan is “Instead of Arms.”</p>	<p>“The International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations (Challenges Forum)”. It is a partnership dedicated to the advancement of UN peace operations. It provides a platform for dialogue among partner organisations from all continents, including the five permanent member states of the United Nations Security Council.</p> <p><a href="https://www.challengesforum.org/about/">https://www.challengesforum.org/about/</a></p>	<p>Evidence-based knowledge.</p> <p>8 areas of expertise: Dialogue and Peace Mediation, Leadership and Cooperation, Women Peace and Security and Youth, Peace and Security, Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration, Security Sector Reform, Rule of Law, Human Rights and Election Support.</p> <p>Around this expertise, they can deploy 4 kinds of programmes. Namely “Research”, “Secondments”, “Training and Advice” and “Support to Civil Society.”</p>	<p>About 25 people listed as “experts”. Headquarter in Stockholm. Projects in Afghanistan, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Liberia, Mali, Myanmar, Palestine, Somalia, Sub-Saharan Africa.</p> <p>Possibility to second their staff members to third organisations working in the field.</p> <p>Centralised organisational model.</p>	<p>Part of the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.</p>

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
<b>Network</b>					
GPPAC (NL)	Global network of locals. We all share the same goal: to prevent violent conflict and build more peaceful societies everywhere.	<p>“Peace Champions in Uganda”. It prevents the re-radicalization of young adults from sliding back into acts of violence. Established a team of young adult and youth <i>peace champions</i> who have become change agents in their communities, capable of leading the transformation of attitudes of their fellows in the community. <a href="https://www.gppac.net/peace-champions-uganda">https://www.gppac.net/peace-champions-uganda</a></p> <p>“Cameras in Hand. Youth empowerment in Kyrgyzstan.” The project focused on using a creative and engaging participatory video methodology to empower youth. <a href="https://gppac.net/youth-empowerment-kyrgyzstan">https://gppac.net/youth-empowerment-kyrgyzstan</a></p> <p>“WOSCAP”. The project enhances the capabilities of the EU in conflict prevention and peacebuilding by providing evidence-based research. <a href="https://www.gppac.net/woscap">https://www.gppac.net/woscap</a></p>	<p>Local ownership, conflict sensitivity and inclusivity. People-center approach (i.e. human security). They aim at enabling collaboration, improving practice and influencing policy.</p> <p>The network is guided by a strategic plan providing a framework under which all GPPAC activities fit, but which leaves enough room for members’ own perspectives and choices.</p>	<p>Hundreds of members. Headquarter in the Netherlands. Members in 15 regions, including in Africa, Latin America, Asia, Middle East, Europe, Caucasus and Western Balkans. Sum of income in 2019 of EUR 3.5 million. Partnership with German Ministry of Foreign Affairs and UN Peacebuilding Fund. Works with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and with support of Swedish International Development Agency.</p> <p>Centralised organisational model.</p>	GPPAC was honoured to be awarded the prestigious Luxembourg Peace Prize in July 2019.

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
WANEP (GH)	Strong national Networks in every member states of ECOWAS. Has credibility and wide recognition both internationally and locally in the areas of peacebuilding and conflict prevention.	<p>“Organizational Development &amp; Sustainability Index (WODI)”. This project is a tool for monitoring and evaluating the institutional progress and challenges of WANEP as the leading peacebuilding network in West Africa.  <a href="https://www.wanep.org/wodi/">https://www.wanep.org/wodi/</a></p> <p>“ECOWARN-ECOWAS Early Warning and Response Network”. The project is an observation and monitoring tool for conflict prevention and decision-making. As set out in Article 58 of the revised 1993 ECOWAS Treaty, its establishment and functioning are defined by the Protocol, Relating to the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, Resolution, Peacekeeping and Security of December 1999. The implementation of this tool begun in 2003.  <a href="https://www.wanep.org/wanep/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=category&amp;layout=blog&amp;id=59&amp;Itemid=99">https://www.wanep.org/wanep/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=category&amp;layout=blog&amp;id=59&amp;Itemid=99</a></p>	<p>Consistent with its function as a Think Tank and Research Advocacy Resource in the region, WANEP undertakes evidence-based research on key thematic areas of peacebuilding in partnership with major partners and relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Programmes include election monitoring, awareness activities, sensitising campaigns against drugs, supporting youth, supporting the development and implementation of the UNSCR 132.</p> <p>Trainings for civil society organisations, government agencies, public, private and international organisations in various peacebuilding components.</p>	<p>Over 500 member organisations. Headquarter in Accra, field offices in Benin, Burkina Faso, Capo Verde, Cote D’Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Bissau, Liberia. Senegal, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Togo.</p> <p>A total of 28 new staff were recruited in 2019 across the national offices.</p> <p>Partnership with ECOWAS, African Union Commission, and African Union Economic, Social and Cultural Council. Special Consultative Status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council and West Africa Regional Representative of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict.</p> <p>Decentralised organisational model.</p>	Part of Mediation support network (Based in Switzerland) and GPPAC.

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
<b>Community Dialogue</b>					
Cure Violence (USA)	Cure Violence stops the spread of violence by using the methods associated with disease control.	New York City: 63% reduction in shootings and increased level of trust in police. <a href="https://cvg.org/impact/">https://cvg.org/impact/</a>	<p>Community-based Public Safety Solutions.</p> <p>They stop the spread of violence by using the methods and strategies associated with disease control: detecting and interrupting conflicts, identifying and treating the highest risk individuals and changing social norms.</p> <p>They engage with institutions, local actors (including gangs and faith leaders) and develop plans to hire individuals already engaging on the ground.</p> <p>Areas of work revolve around children issues, parenting, schools, employment, mentoring, dealing with emotions, enrolling in rehab for drugs or alcohol problems.</p>	<p>18 international staff. Headquarter in Chicago, projects carried out in USA, Mexico, South Africa, Trinidad, UK, Honduras. Client-base income: assessment visit, with the production of data analysis, implementation plan and suggestions for recruitment, for a total of US\$ 7500.</p> <p>Organisational partner model.</p>	<p>Talk with gang members and anybody else involved in violence. Contacts with local hospitals, to get referrals when violence happens.</p> <p>Client relationships with people that ask for their intervention.</p>

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
Angie Brooks Centre (LR)	The Centre is envisioned to become a leading global institution dedicated to the promotion and enhancement of women's leadership in all aspects of development with particular emphasis on political participation, peace and security.	<p>"Women's Situation Room". A political process mobilizes women in collaboration with youth to ensure their active participation in peaceful and democratic electoral processes in Africa as a peace and security measure in accordance with UNSCRs 1325, 2250 and 2419. It engages all electoral stakeholders in consultative engagements to commit to ensuring peace before, during, and after elections.  <a href="https://angiebrooksintlcentre.org/wsr/">https://angiebrooksintlcentre.org/wsr/</a></p> <p>"Pink Panthers". All girls motorcyclist club, as part of a programme for women empowerment.  <a href="https://angiebrooksintlcentre.org/wsr/">https://angiebrooksintlcentre.org/wsr/</a></p> <p>"Talking Bus". The project uses a physical Bus that brings on board, the participation of ordinary citizens to dialogue on a range of issues affecting the society, including, but not limited to infrastructure development, education, and gender equality, rule of law as well as peace and security.  <a href="https://angiebrooksintlcentre.org/the-talking-bus/">https://angiebrooksintlcentre.org/the-talking-bus/</a></p>	The Centre promotes Women's Empowerment; Leadership Development and International Peace and Security throughout Africa. In line with United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325, the centre actively engages in women's involvement in peace and security in Liberia and across the African region.	10 staff members and 2 interns (plus board directors). Three Administrative locations in Monrovia: Office at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Fendall Campus, University of Liberia, Chief Suah Koko Centre.  Centralised organisational model	Great impact on community, because they have direct links to the perpetrator of violence on the ground.  Through a broad network of institutions, the center aims at establishing affiliate or associate relationships with institutions and organisations in all regions of the world.

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
<p>Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (CM)</p>	<p>The Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (CPCS) was born from a desire to further strengthen, support and share Asian approaches to conflict transformation.</p> <p>The foundations for what is now CPCS were laid by local peace initiatives such as the Alliance for Conflict Transformation (ACT) and Action Asia. With ACT committed to peacebuilding at home in Cambodia, CPCS focused on engaging the Asia region at large.</p> <p>The vision is to provide a space for Cambodians to reflect and learn about their nation's past; providing an understanding of the long history characterised by structural violence that the Cambodian genocide emerged from, while celebrating the work of peacebuilders that have helped move Cambodia past war.</p>	<p>CPCS is developing the Cambodia Peace Museum as an educational and experiential space geared towards supporting a wider national healing process – one which highlights the resilience of Cambodia's people in transforming conflict.</p> <p><a href="https://www.centrepeaceconflictstudies.org/peace-museum/">https://www.centrepeaceconflictstudies.org/peace-museum/</a></p> <p>Master and PhD programmes for Asian practitioners (at least 5 years of working experience in order to be selected).</p> <p><a href="https://www.centrepeaceconflictstudies.org/acts/ma-programme/about-acts-ma-programme/">https://www.centrepeaceconflictstudies.org/acts/ma-programme/about-acts-ma-programme/</a></p>	<p>The overarching framework for CPCS' approach is anchored on the principles of demand-driven interventions that address the requirements of the stakeholders and the underlying causes of the conflict.</p>	<p>15 staff members, plus faculty members for the MA and PhD programmes. Headquarter in Krong Battambang.</p> <p>Ties with Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia (sharing part of the faculty members).</p> <p>Centralised organisational model.</p>	<p>Theory-Practice Approach (i.e. hybrid academic-practitioner perspective).</p>

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
<p>Allianza para la Paz (CO)</p>	<p>Regional peace-building organisation that promotes peaceful transformation of conflicts to prevent violence emanating from social inequalities, crime, power disparities, discrimination, gender inequality and institutional weakness. We work with the understanding that a region is more than the sum of neighboring countries and similar social indicators. Region is unity, interaction and interdependence of phenomena that manifest across countries (although they are distant from each other) and across municipalities (even if they are in different countries), and that explains the differences and similarities in societies, groups and territories.</p>	<p>“Gender Approach in the Police Service of Colombia”. In cooperation with National Police of Colombia, High Counsellor for Post conflict and UN Women, the project delivered trainings on gender-based violence.  <a href="https://alianzaparalapaz.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/ANUAL-REPORT-DIGITAL.pdf">https://alianzaparalapaz.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/ANUAL-REPORT-DIGITAL.pdf</a></p> <p>“Tertiary Prevention with Young People in conflict with the Penal Code in Honduras”. The programme is geared to the prevention of violence at a tertiary level, that is, among individuals who have become involved with the law, who are being currently processed and who, therefore, are excluded from formal employment. The programme is being implemented on the basis of a relation of trust with youth groups, in this case the soccer clubs (barras deportivas) which bring together individuals who possess a collective identity and who, given the generalized context of violence in the country, end up confronting each other in neighborhoods and communities.  <a href="https://alianzaparalapaz.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/ANUAL-REPORT-DIGITAL.pdf">https://alianzaparalapaz.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/ANUAL-REPORT-DIGITAL.pdf</a></p>	<p>Their approach begins with the development of the best possible knowledge about the social reality of a country or a region.</p> <p>They strongly believe that any initiative that has a greater chance of success in the field of peacebuilding necessarily requires the participation of the state agencies in charge of resolving conflicts (which are inevitable in any society) and the populations that demand security and the facilities to develop under conditions of a democratic regime.</p>	<p>34 staff members. Headquarter in Bogota; works in the region across the North Triangle of Central America, Honduras and Colombia. The total of available resources for 2018 was US\$ 1.2 million.</p> <p>Centralised organisational model.</p>	<p>Regional approach. Knowledge of the region and strong ties with local actors.</p>

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
<p><b>Training</b></p> <p>Peace Castle Schlaining (AUS)</p>	<p>It was founded in September 1982 as an independent, non-profit and non-partisan organisation. It aims to contribute to the promotion of peace and peaceful conflict resolution and to the dissemination of practical ideas for peace, including its developmental and environmental aspects.</p>	<p>“European Peace Museum” – undergoing renovation (no available website)</p> <p>“Summer Academy on the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)”. It takes place annually over two weeks in June and it aims at expanding and deepening knowledge about the OSCE. Most participants are junior diplomats from Europe, Central Asia, the United States and Canada who are engaged in the OSCE agenda on behalf of their governments. Civil society and the research community are also represented.  <a href="https://www.aspr.peacecastle.eu/training-programmes/summer-academy-on-osce/">https://www.aspr.peacecastle.eu/training-programmes/summer-academy-on-osce/</a></p> <p>Summer Academy “Emotions in Conflict.” Dialogue held to understand the politicisation of emotions and their potential to escalate conflict.  <a href="https://www.aspr.peacecastle.eu/publications/">https://www.aspr.peacecastle.eu/publications/</a></p>	<p>It recognises the fact that the political, social and economic dimensions of conflicts need to be addressed through civilian measures and that military means alone are not well-suited to address these.</p> <p>They focus on strengthening Capacity in International Peacebuilding (trainings, capacity development, summer academy) Peace and Conflict Research, Peace and Conflict Research.</p>	<p>28 staff members + 11 board members/trustee. Headquarter in the Schlaining Castle, near the town of Oberwart.</p> <p>Centralised organisational model.</p>	<p>It was awarded the UN "Peace Messenger" status in 1987, and, together with the EPU, the UNESCO-Prize for Peace Education 1995.</p>

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
Swisspeace (CH)	<p>Our mission is to contribute to the improvement of conflict prevention and conflict transformation by: producing and sharing innovative research on topics particularly relevant for effective peacebuilding practice; shaping discourses of international peace policy with selected partner organisations; developing and applying new tools and methodologies for effective peacebuilding in specific conflict contexts; supporting and advising other actors while they engage directly in peacebuilding activities and providing and facilitating spaces for analysis, discussion, critical reflection and learning.</p>	<p>“Basel Peace Forum”. Dialogue about peace. In 2021 will also include reflections on the consequences of Covid-19 for peace.  <a href="https://basel-peace.org/2021/">https://basel-peace.org/2021/</a></p> <p>“Parliamentary Group Peacebuilding”. The group strengthens the anchorage of Swiss peacebuilding policy in the Parliament.  <a href="https://www.swisspeace.ch/activities/parliamentary-group/">https://www.swisspeace.ch/activities/parliamentary-group/</a></p>	<p>Practice-oriented research institute. It works with a wide network of partners both in research and practice. It values partnerships with academic institutions and peacebuilding organisations to promote joint learning and sharing of experiences – thereby benefiting from synergies to enhance the effectiveness of peacebuilding initiatives. Swisspeace systematically uses a conflict-sensitive approach and engages with a critical gender perspective where relevant.</p> <p>“Light footprint approach” when engaging in conflict context. This means that they work through local organisations instead of establishing a full-fledged presence on the ground.</p>	<p>40 staff.  Headquarter in Basel.  In 2019 total operating income CHF 7.6 million.  Institutional Model 3.  Strong ties with Swiss Institutions, Canton Basel – Stadt and University of Basel are the largest donors.</p> <p>Organisational partner model.</p>	<p>Strong linkages with academia (university of Basel).</p>

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
Berghof Peace Education Programme (DE)	Same as what we considered for their mediation capacity.	<p>“Transformative Peace Education. From Conflict to Dialogue in Theory and Practice”. The online course provides theoretical basis informed by current issues as well as insights into proven methods from the Berghof Foundation’s peace education practice in Germany and abroad.</p> <p><a href="https://www.berghof-foundation.org/en/programmes/trainings/transformative-peace-education/">https://www.berghof-foundation.org/en/programmes/trainings/transformative-peace-education/</a></p> <p>“Culture of Conflict 3.0: Learning spaces and media for young people to deal with internet violence and hatred”. The model project Culture of Conflict 3.0 approaches the use of internet and social media in a dialogue-oriented way: young people are being sensitised to hatred, discrimination and agitation on the web in a participative process and develop strategies, youth-focused approaches and learning media (comic films, app) for dealing with hatred on the web. Using innovative methods, the project strengthens the media- and information competence of young people and supports the development of skills, which enable them to critically consume media.</p> <p><a href="https://www.berghof-foundation.org/en/programmes/peace-education-global-learning/culture-of-conflict-30/">https://www.berghof-foundation.org/en/programmes/peace-education-global-learning/culture-of-conflict-30/</a></p>	<p>Their practical work is complemented by research to conceptualise, create new knowledge and inform policy-making on inclusive formats for dialogue, mediation, negotiation and infrastructure for peace.</p> <p>Focus on developing and implementing curricula, on providing training workshops for individuals in the formal and non-formal education system, on developing and publishing learning media, and on creating spaces of joint reflection.</p>	<p>See information on Berghof in mediation section.</p> <p>In addition, they have linkages with the German Ministry of Education, to facilitate the implementation of their programmes within the German education system.</p>	See information on Berghof in mediation section

Name	Vision/Mission	Flagship/Programmes	Approach	Organisational Capacity	Unique Aspects
War Childhood Museum (B&H)	<p>It's the world's only museum focused exclusively on childhoods that have been affected by war.</p> <p>Museum opened doors of its first permanent exhibition in January 2017 in the historical heart of Sarajevo.</p>	<p>Collection includes stories from the Second World War, Syrian Civil War, War in Afghanistan, War in Donbass, and other conflicts. The goal for the next ten years is to create the world's largest collection dedicated to the experience of childhood affected by war.</p> <p><a href="https://warchildhood.org/">https://warchildhood.org/</a></p>	<p>It has developed and is implementing educational activities with the aim of raising awareness about the importance of providing a peaceful world for future generations. In addition to hosting school visits at the Museum, our staff holds workshops, and works closely with teachers to encourage the use of carefully designed pre- and post- visit materials in classrooms.</p>	<p>20 staff members, the majority of whom are young students (pursuing MSc or PhD)</p> <p>It is an independent non-profit museum not funded by government. In addition to institutional donors and partners, the Museum has been receiving support from private individuals.</p> <p>Centralised organisational model.</p>	<p>Independent and youth-led.</p> <p>Won the 2018 Council of Europe Museum Prize.</p>
Institute for Peace and Development in Mindanao (IPDV) (PH)	<p>The Institute for Peace and Development in Mindanao envisions a progressive Mindanao, where people live with social justice and harmony in diversity, towards peace and sustainable development.</p>	<p>Last year, the Institute embarked on an information and education campaign in support of the Bangsamoro Peace Process. In partnership with the United Nations Development Programme and several other organisations, the Institute distributed "Bolkit", explaining the Bangsamoro Organic Law (BOL) in the local dialect.</p> <p>Since 2019, the Institute has been instrumental in enabling faculty members at the College of Arts and Social Sciences of MSU-IIT to conduct Capacity Enhancement Training for the teaching of the Fundamentals of Peace Educations. It currently serves as part of the Technical working group for the integration of Mindanao History to the Philippine Education System.</p>	<p>The Institute is committed to attain a just and sustainable peace and development through collaborative efforts in the promotion of culture of peace through peace education, peace research and peace action that link the University System with multi-sectoral stakeholders in Mindanao and the global community.</p>	<p>7 staff members.</p> <p>Headquarter at Mindanao State University - Iligan Institute of Technology.</p> <p>Cooperation with governmental and non-governmental organisations.</p> <p>Partners include the German Development Cooperation (GIZ)-Civil Peace Service (CPS) and ForumZFD.</p> <p>Centralised organisational model.</p>	<p>Part of Mindanao State University System.</p>

# Scoping Study on Global and International Peace Centres and Peace Education Bodies

Funded by  
Embassy of Switzerland in Ireland



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft  
Confédération suisse  
Confederazione Svizzera  
Confederaziun svizra

**Embassy of Switzerland in Ireland**



glencree

transforming violent conflict  
building peace