



DISCUSSANT NOTE-INTRODUCTION AT THE SEMINAR:

“MULTI SECTORIAL PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES IN A POST-CONFLICT ENVIRONMENT: CAN THEY MAKE A DIFFERENCE?” , ORGANISED BY FONDAZIONI4AFRICA AT THE EFC WEEK, BRUSSELS, JUNE 1 2010

BY: ANDREA DE GUTTRY, SCUOLA SUPERIORE SANT’ANNA, PISA

Goal of this session: to discuss the Foundation4Africa Northern Uganda project as a case study in order to ascertain how, to what extent and under which conditions, multi-sectorial partnerships can contribute, if at all, to post-conflict reconstruction policies and programmes that positively impact on human security in different societies.

In order to properly position the key aspects of the issue at stake in the context of the present debate on development, peacebuilding and post- conflict reconstruction let me just start with a few comments on the three main topics we are supposed to discuss: Multisectorial, Partnership, and Post conflict environment.

As a preliminary comment let me just underline that the development cooperation entered the peacebuilding debate only in the early 90’s: at that time the relationship between development and conflict has been established in the scholarly literature. Typically the development approach to post-conflict peacebuilding makes a linkage between the outbreak and recurrence of conflict to the persistence of poverty and inequality. This approach is illustrated by the World Bank 2000/2001 Report on attacking poverty, which came after a decade of denial of the link existing between inequality and political violence. The report focuses on complexity of deprivation, and, accordingly, sets out the remedies in terms of opportunity, empowerment and security. The Report highlights the linkage between poverty and conflict, as in Bosnia-Herzegovina or in Sierra Leone, where failed development led to conflict. It argues that inclusive development has the potential to break a cycle of conflict or address critical peacebuilding goals.-

Multisectorial

Post conflict development packages stem from the assumption that aid agencies, donor countries, donors, and local actors agree in strategic and operational terms and should therefore be able to work together: concepts such as “integrated missions”(Brahimi 2000) dominate the landscape and bring together ambitious and complex programs ranging from institutional reform to economic development, and a large set of actors, including donor-funded NGO’s.

Partnerships

The emergence and proliferation of new modes of governance has been labelled as the ‘shift from government to governance.’ It is characterised by new non-hierarchical modes of coordination that operate alongside traditional command-and-control policy making and policy implementation by public actors. This involves a whole range of public, private, and civic actors that cooperate across the traditional sectorial boundaries in a bid to achieve common goals and resolve complex issues. Multi-stakeholder partnerships is one of such new forms of cooperation that is emerging as a preferred tool geared towards enhancing participation, legitimacy, and effectiveness of policy-making. For example, the number of UN agencies, programmes, and specialized agencies that engage in multi-stakeholder partnerships spans virtually across all fields of action of the organisation: from the World Health Organization (WHO) to the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), from the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), from the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), and so on. Even though up to date there has been scarce systemic investigation of the specific characteristics, outcomes, and impacts of multistakeholder partnerships, its potential could be of particular relevance for countries emerging from violent conflict.

Partnership is one of the main instrument to seriously and coherently address the issue of the concept of local ownership: but

- a)with whom
- b) to do what
- c) which is the role of the local partners
- d) which decision-making process

Post Conflict

New approaches to post-conflict reconstruction can be summarised as the overall shift from peacekeeping to peacebuilding. Practical experience in post-conflict settings has shown that the absence of armed conflict (*negative peace*) is important but might not be enough to ensure long-term peace and security. Presently, academics and practitioners tend to agree that short-term conflict management should be combined with long-term measures aimed at transforming the roots of conflict, thus setting a more ambitious goal of *positive peace* that includes justice, equity, and other core social and political goods that can contribute to transforming the social, economic, and political structures that contributed to the outbreak of violence in the first place. The latter may include economic and developmental issues, weak institutions, inequitable social structures, inadequate security, authoritarian politics and poor

governance, long-standing intercommunity and inter-group conflicts, or regional geopolitical tensions. In the contemporary context, in almost all cases, peacebuilding processes will include a major investment in resources and engagement from the international community.

Such an understanding of peacebuilding brought to light the need to adopt more comprehensive, integrative, and participatory approaches in post-conflict interventions. This approach to peacebuilding is represented in the latest documents of the UN as well as in the creation of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Parallel to the shift from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, a new understanding of security has emerged giving birth to the concept of human security. The concept of human security represents an attempt to include a focus on security concerns of individuals and communities in their daily life alongside the traditional notions of state and international security. This concept therefore, is concerned with a wide range of different threats to the security of individuals and communities and refers to a condition in which the individual are safeguarded from critical and pervasive threats that can affect the vital core of their lives: survival, livelihood, and basic dignity. Moreover, the concept of human security is increasingly adopted by different international, regional and local organisations as a framework for their operations. In December 2003 the concept of human security found its way into the European Security Strategy (ESS) and is now increasingly used by European decision-makers (for example, by High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana) as a new defining principle of the EU security strategy and foreign policy.

Multi-sectorial partnerships could potentially serve peacebuilding goals. The number of local-level multi-sectorial partnerships in post-conflict settings is also increasing significantly. One well known initiative in this field is the 'Mines to Vines' project in Croatia spearheaded by the NGO and Nobel Peace-Prize co-recipient Roots of Peace. The project, launched in 2000, aimed at transforming mined land in Croatia into vineyards through a partnership forged between the NGO, local authorities and communities, belonging to both Croats and Serbs, the California wine industry, leaders of the Silicon Valley high tech community, and the academia, and supported by the U.S. State Department and by the Croat government.

Multi-sectorial partnerships could potentially contribute to Human Security .

The concept of 'human security' represents an attempt to move beyond the over- simplistic' character of traditional concepts of security, toward a notion that focuses on the protection of individuals and communities in their daily life. It is distinguished in this respect from notions of international, national or 'regime' security.

Human security recognizes that more and more contemporary forms of violence threaten the security of individuals and communities. In the human security framework of analysis, the concept of violence and insecurity goes beyond its traditional understanding to embrace a wide range of different sources of threats that stem from the economic, political, criminal and social sectors to the environmental, sanitary and alimentary sectors. In positive terms, human security incorporates both *freedom from want* and *freedom from fear*, and refers to a condition in which the individuals are safeguarded from

critical and pervasive threats that can affect the vital core of their lives (i.e. the individual's requirements for life): survival, livelihood and basic dignity.

In addition, the condition of having human security means having the ability to mitigate the critical and pervasive threats to one's vital core: the capacity to change one's circumstances, and the ability to participate in decisions which impact one's life (empowerment and participation).

Finally, a few comments on how to assess the impact, the quality and the relevance of Multisectorial partnerships.

HOW: through the lenses of Human Security, ie verifying to which extent to these Multisectorial Partnerships contribute to promote Human Security.

8 Criteria

1. The human **security framework should be holistic, i.e. addressing both freedom from fear and freedom from want**, which in practice means that conflict-related; crime-related and development-related threats and vulnerabilities need to be addressed;
2. Second, the human security framework should recognize the **interconnection and interdependence among sources of threats**;
3. Third, the human security framework should examine and promote **participatory approaches**, involving the main stakeholders;
4. Fourth, the human security framework emphasises **the importance of including bottom-up approaches** that take into account the perspectives of people affected by threats and vulnerabilities;
5. Fifth, human security seeks to **empower the people** who are affected by threats and vulnerabilities, so that they may mitigate the impacts on their own lives. This goes closely hand-in-hand with a bottom-up approach:
6. Sixth, the human security framework aims to **be non-discriminatory**, with a focus on the specific needs of **vulnerable groups**;
7. Seventh, the human security framework needs to be based **on common values of human rights**, starting from the human dignity of the individual and including rule of law, good governance, democracy and accountability;
8. Eight, **the mutually-reinforcing nature of human security and human rights, as well as human development, should be given particular attention in a human security framework.**