OSCE Chairmanship Workshop

on

Post-Conflict Rehabilitation:

Stabilization, Reconstruction and Peacebuilding

Vienna, 2 and 3 May 2011

FINAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

'V to V Dialogue' on the Conflict Cycle:

OSCE Chairmanship Workshop on Post-Conflict Rehabilitation: Stabilization, Reconstruction and Peacebuilding:

Chair's Perception[1]

The Workshop was the second event to be held within the framework of the conflict cycle component of the 'V to V Dialogues'. Its purpose, as set out in the Concept Note (CIO.GAL/14/11) and expanded upon in the Annotated Agenda (CIO.GAL/73/11), was to provide a forum for discussions and exchanges of experiences and best practices in capacity building on post-conflict rehabilitation, stabilization, reconstruction and peacebuilding.

Structured in a plenary presentation/discussion format, the one and a half-day Workshop comprised an opening session, three working sessions and a closing session. It benefitted from the perspectives of eight speakers (representing international and regional organizations, a multilateral initiative, a national capability, civil society and OSCE field operations) as well as the inclusion of just over one hundred and sixty registered participants. Especially welcome was the large number of participants from outside Vienna (from capitals, other international and regional organizations, NGOs, think-tanks and academia) as many injected pragmatic, subject-matter expertise into the discussions.

During the opening session and the first working session, on the '*Role of Regional and Multilateral Organizations in support of Stabilization, Reconstruction and Peacebuilding'*, there was widespread recognition of the continuing validity of post-conflict rehabilitation as a major task of the OSCE. Many pointed to the linkage between preventing the outbreak of conflict in the first place and, in the post-conflict phase, preventing the relapse into conflict. Both require a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach that addresses the root causes of conflict and are dependent on a functioning national government and civil society, with due respect for the rule of law, fundamental freedoms and democratic principles.

There was general agreement that the OSCE has a wealth of experience and tools (particularly its field operations) upon which to draw. In that respect, many participants highlighted the importance of collecting lessons learned on what has worked well and not so well. Others suggested that the OSCE should, according to its comparative advantages in thematic or geographic areas, be more proactive in taking a leading role in the co-ordination of international actors.

Turning to other aspects of co-ordination and co-operation among international actors, there was a common understanding of the need for improvements. In that regard, many supported the idea of further developing the Secretariat's Food-for-Thought (FfT) paper on co-ordination and co-operation among international actors (SEC.GAL/77/11) into a good practices guide. In recognition that 'one size does not fit all', it should include a number of practices that have worked well, particularly on the ground, in different circumstances – whether in formal or informal co-ordination settings, in the field or at the headquarters/secretariat level, and in different geographical or conflict contexts.

---

[1] This is an exact copy of the Chair's Perception distributed under CIO.GAL/93/11 on 16 May 2011.

There was a general acceptance that co-ordination should ideally be based on a clear division of labour, on a case-by-case basis and according to the different organizations' mandates, perspectives and competences. Differences should be seen as strengths, as long as mandate overlap does not lead to non-productive activity overlap. Many participants highlighted the importance of local ownership being at the centre of co-ordination among international actors, although it was recognized that this can be challenging when national structures are not yet fully effective. Co-ordination should be demand-driven and practical.

A number of specific recommendations were raised, for instance: for peacebuilding efforts to be successful, a set of principles should be followed; consideration should be given to establishing OSCE liaison offices to different international organizations, including at the regional and sub-regional level; physical reconstruction should be tackled in parallel with economic development and the building of social networks and, in that regard, the OSCE should be more prepared to advocate the needs of host countries with international aid and development agencies as well as with donors; development of a proper legal framework in the host country – based on transparency, accountability and fairness – is important so that outsiders (particularly in the private sector) can be confident about investing in the country; the cultural and religious specificities of the country need to be taken fully into account and, where relevant, religious leaders should be engaged more closely; and more fora created to allow civil society, particularly at the grass-roots level and also involving women and journalists in the peacebuilding process.

In the second working session, on *'Strengthening Local Ownership of non-military Confidence-Building Measures (CBMs)'*, it was broadly appreciated that local ownership of CBMs at all levels – national, sub-regional and regional – is fundamental to the success and sustainability of a peace process. While CBMs will not solve the root causes of a conflict or a relapse into conflict, nor the political differences that divide the parties, they can play a crucial enabling role, especially when complemented by other peacebuilding activities. Inclusiveness, equity and non-discrimination are essential. Accountability should apply to all.

There was widespread recognition of the merit of initially developing CBMs in matters that are less controversial, and especially those that meet local needs and priorities and improve people's day-to-day lives. In that respect, the importance of broad representation, including from civil society, and women in particular, in the design and implementation of CBMs was highlighted. Such CBMs can be especially useful in opening channels of communication that can, in turn, be used to address other, more difficult issues.

The process of building confidence can be long and difficult, especially when transparency is lacking. Hard-liners often have many opportunities to undermine the process, in particular when peace dividends are not quickly realized. Hence it is important to manage the expectations and hopes of the population, and to de-politicize the CBM process as much as possible in order to overcome potential problems, including those related to the status quo.

A number of other observations were made, such as: the need to reduce opportunities for CBMs to be used by a party to extend the conflict by different means, hence the importance of apolitical CBMs; CBMs can take numerous forms and can cover all aspects of society (economic, social, educational, etc); even small changes can lead to empowerment and confidence; the involvement of women can offer a unique opportunity; the international community has a role to play in addressing rumours that undermine confidence; the OSCE is

well placed in certain situations to take the lead in a confidence-building process; CBMs work best when basic elements of security are in place and when part of a comprehensive approach, combining bottom-up and top-down elements.

Remaining challenges are numerous, including: how to enable local ownership of CBMs when local representatives lack funding and, in that respect, what to do when the priorities of the funding providers and the beneficiaries differ; how to marry the different levels of ownership – grassroots, community, local, sub-regional and regional – and the different levels of confidence-building – between conflict parties, between civil society and national authorities, between the population and the international community.

Finally, there was a common acknowledgement that the OSCE, with its experience, available tools and potential leverage, is well placed to contribute significantly to the development and use of CBMs. In that respect, merit was seen in further developing the Secretariat's FfT paper on local ownership of non-military CBMs (SEC.GAL/78/11) into a guide on the topic that includes a range of CBMs that have worked well in different contexts as well as the pitfalls and mistakes to be avoided.

In the third working session, on the *'Recent Peacebuilding Initiatives of OSCE participating States'*, the importance of practical co-operation and co-ordination among multilateral and bilateral peacebuilding actors – at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels – was again recognized. Integrating efforts can yield important dividends. For example, sharing financial, technical, and political burdens can reduce duplication and waste, along with easing the burden on a fragile host country. Involving a wide range of international stakeholders can create a greater perception of legitimacy and accountability, and international co-operation can attract high quality technical specialists. In that context, many highlighted the advantages of the International Stabilization and Peacebuilding Initiative (ISPI) and encouraged other countries and organizations to join that informal, working-level network.

Some participants highlighted the challenges that need to be addressed, such as ensuring that: rosters of deployable civilians are up-to-date and have geographic and gender diversity; common 'duty of care' arrangements are provided to all deployed civilians; efficient logistic support is available; training is linked to emerging needs; and lessons learned are shared throughout the international community.

In closing, the Chairmanship perceives that the Workshop was an important building block in generating concrete, operational and actionable deliverables for the 2011 Ministerial Council in Vilnius and beyond. The Chairmanship has appointed Ambassador Cornel Feruta, Permanent Representative of Romania to the OSCE, to co-ordinate further work and informal consultations as part of the post-conflict rehabilitation follow-on process.

Opening Session

Keynote speaker

— Ms. Judy Cheng-Hopkins, United Nations Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support

Moderator

— Ambassador Renatas Norkus, Chairperson of the OSCE Permanent Council

In his opening remarks, Ambassador Norkus stated that this Chairmanship's Workshop on Post-Conflict Rehabilitation is the second in a series of events addressing the Conflict Cycle within the framework of the V-to-V Dialogue. He recalled that, in the December 2010 Astana Commemorative Declaration, the OSCE Chairmanship was tasked to organize a follow-up process within existing formats, taking into consideration ideas and proposals put forward by participating States, including in the framework of the so-called 'Corfu Process' and in the preparation for the Astana Summit. The topic of post-conflict rehabilitation was a priority in the Chairmanship's Work Programme in 2011 – next to early warning, conflict prevention and crisis management.

Ambassador Norkus noted the primary purpose of the Workshop was to discuss and exchange experiences and best practices in capacity building on post-conflict rehabilitation, stabilization, reconstruction and peacebuilding. He recalled that the OSCE had gained significant experience in that area since the early 1990s, particularly through its field activities, and that the Organization had the advantage of a comprehensive approach and could rely on an extensive network of institutions, thematic units and field operations to work on these different aspects of security. Since the OSCE addressed all phases of a conflict or crisis situation, the Organization could provide much-needed continuity to the post-conflict/crisis phase. The Workshop should enable mutual learning and sharing of experiences to identify areas where concrete recommendations could be made to reinforce progress, address gaps and capitalize on the OSCE's comparative advantages.

He encouraged participants to engage in an interactive and pragmatic dialogue that strived to generate concrete, operational ideas for action at the 2011 Ministerial Council, and beyond.

The keynote speaker, Ms. Judy Cheng-Hopkins, started her presentation[2] by stating that peacebuilding, although a fairly new term, encompassed a broad area. Often, confusion existed about what the term meant and where to place it on the conflict cycle. For the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), the entry point for peacebuilding was defined as the prevention of relapse of a conflict. By choosing this entry point, the majority of fragile countries were covered, as violence often re-occurred in countries which had experienced a previous conflict, demonstrated in the World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development, Since the 1960s a decreasing number of countries were truly 'post-conflict'. The link between violence and security was thus obvious.

---

[2] The presentation of Ms. Cheng-Hopkins was distributed on 4 May 2011 as PC.DEL/401/11.

Ms. Cheng-Hopkins introduced the UN Peacebuilding architecture, established since 2005 to close the *"gaping hole in the United Nations institutional machinery as no part of the UN system effectively addresses the challenge of helping countries with the transition from war to lasting peace."*[3] This architecture consisted of three pillars: the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the PBSO and the Secretary-General's Peacebuilding Fund. She informed that the PBC was an intergovernmental entity consisting of 31 Member States, where countries emerging from conflict could appeal to be placed on its agenda in order to receive support for and advise on their peacebuilding processes. Currently, six countries were on the agenda: Liberia, Sierra Leone, Burundi, Central African Republic, Guinea Bissau and Guinea. The PBC political leverage role consisted of coherence and advocacy linked to reform and resource mobilization. The PBSO supported and managed the PBC. The Peacebuilding Fund, consisting of USD 250 million, funded peacebuilding projects in twenty countries, including the six countries on the PBC agenda, in four major areas: implementation of peace agreements, co-existence and peaceful resolution of conflict, early economic recovery and peace dividends, and the establishment (or re-establishment) of essential administrative services. The Peacebuilding Fund assured a budget for related efforts across the UN system.

The keynote speaker highlighted that security sector reform was usually the most important area for peacebuilding. Particularly, as it was important to downsize and professionalize the armed forces in a post-conflict environment, next to providing civilian oversight. Security sector reform should equally include breaking the vicious cycle of dreadful living and professional conditions which often lead to the abuse of local communities. Ms. Cheng-Hopkins further emphasized that the consolidation of peace could not take place without proper rule of law. In addition, national reconciliation and transitional justice should not be overlooked so as to assure tolerance and overcome conflicts, as confirmed by the good examples from Sierra Leone and Burundi.

Finally, Ms. Cheng-Hopkins stated that the UN peacebuilding efforts filled the transition gap between peacekeeping operations and the development of focused organizations. While the budget for the former traditionally did not contain many development funds, the budget for the latter was spread over a number of organizations. Challenges remained to translate peacebuilding efforts from theory into practice. For instance, prioritization should be more strategically based. Also, national ownership kept suffering from fragmentation, while mutual accountability remained difficult to operationalize.

Discussion

One participant enquired about the role of the PBSO in Sierra Leone and Guinea Bissau. Ms. Cheng-Hopkins replied that the authorities of Guinea Bissau had embraced democracy and that a debate on security sector reform was ongoing. On Sierra Leone, she quoted the progress made and referred to the innovative thinking by the UN to promote the role of civil society and non-state actors.

Another participant sought the opinion of the keynote speaker on the role of regional organizations in the peacebuilding framework. In response, Ms. Cheng-Hopkins stressed that regional organizations certainly had a role to play and provided the example of ECOWAS and regional co-operation in West Africa to tackle drug trafficking and organized crime.

---

[3] Former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan in "In Larger Freedom" (2005)

The final participant to take the floor stressed that the OSCE comprehensive approach to security fit well with the needs of post-conflict rehabilitation and that the Organization's activities in the Balkans, Central Asia and the Caucasus had contributed significantly to the stabilization of those regions. The participant stated that a set of principles should be followed for peacebuilding to be successful. First, post-conflict rehabilitation should be conducted upon the request and consent of all parties to the conflict. Second, any decision for the OSCE to be involved should be made by the relevant decision-making bodies. Third, the OSCE's assistance should be practical, demand-driven and politically unbiased. Fourth, any assistance should consider the specificities of a particular region or country. A joint assessment by international and national stakeholders ought to precede any decisions on activities to be implemented. Fifth, proper co-ordination mechanisms between international, regional and local actors must be established, in parallel with a clear division of labour, taking account of organizations' comparative advantages. It could be considered to revisit the idea of an ad hoc consultative mechanism, mentioned in the 2003 Maastricht Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century. Sixth, a regional context and framework should ensure a cumulative effect.

The participant also noted that non-military confidence-building measures, supported by local authorities, could promote a political settlement. Further, post-conflict rehabilitation should also include the promotion of economic and environmental co-operation. Finally, a clear 'exit strategy' should be agreed upon by international and national stakeholders.

Working Session I:

The role of regional and multilateral organizations in support of stabilization, reconstruction and peacebuilding

Speakers

— Ambassador Gary Robbins, Head of the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina
— Dr. Vladimir Pryakhin, Former Senior Adviser of the United Nations Regional Centre for Preventive Diplomacy for Central Asia

Moderator:

— Ambassador Cornel Feruta, Permanent Representative of Romania to the OSCE

In his introductory remarks, Ambassador Feruta referred to the "Food-for-Thought (FFT) Paper on Co-ordination and Co-operation among International Actors in support of the Host Country" (SEC.GAL/77/11) and the "Background Brief on OSCE Activities and Advantages in the Field of Post-Conflict Rehabilitation" (SEC.GAL/76/11) as basis for discussion during the session. He raised three questions for debate among speakers and participants. First, why was it relevant to discuss the topic of post-conflict rehabilitation within the OSCE? Ambassador Feruta stated that the OSCE had wide experience in this field, but often those activities were not perceived as post-conflict rehabilitation. He stressed, however, that post-conflict rehabilitation was the most important aspect to prevent a relapse into conflict. The added value of the OSCE was its ability to address root causes through its unique set of principles and norms, its comprehensive security approach and its large toolbox. Second, what was already known of co-operation and co-ordination among international actors? Referring to the keynote statement, multidimensional tasks and challenges should be taken into account. Each actor should bring its comparative advantages on post-conflict rehabilitation, also in the recognition that there was no alternative to co-operation and co-ordination. A final question, referring to the annotated agenda, was where should the debate go from there? He opined that the OSCE was already successful in a number of areas and that lessons, both positive and less positive, should be drawn from those experiences.

The first speaker, Ambassador Robbins, presented the practical forms of co-operation in which the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina had been engaged.[4] He stressed that Bosnia and Herzegovina was, however, a unique setting since international organizations operated on a division of tasks as stipulated in the 1995 Dayton Peace Accords. The main co-ordination mechanism was the Peace Implementation Council, which oversaw the implementation of the Accords and represented the international community, through its High Representative and his Office (OHR), in the governance of the country.

Although all organizations' mandated tasks aimed towards the same goal of a stable and sustainable Bosnia and Herzegovina, co-ordination was a must. Ambassador Robbins quoted three examples. A first example was the political co-ordination between the OHR and the OSCE, in particular on the transfer of responsibility for the electoral process to the Central

---

[4] Ambassador Robbins' presentation was distributed under PC.FR/10/11 on 4 May 2011.

Election Commission, with the OSCE reducing itself to an advisory role. The speaker subsequently highlighted the co-operation on defence sector reform with national authorities, OHR and NATO. The last example dealt with the solid partnership that the OSCE had built with the Council of Europe (CoE) in a number of fields, which was expanding to include the European Union (EU).

However, changing realities on the ground had affected partnerships. In June 2008, Bosnia and Herzegovina signed a Stabilization and Association Agreement with the EU, and thus the EU gradually assumed the role of lead organization within the international community in the country. Accordingly, and as appropriate, the OSCE worked closely with EU representatives in areas where the OSCE's field presence, policy priorities and competencies were in accordance with those of the EU. Often, it was in the interest of the OSCE Mission to have its observations reflected in EU policy in order to achieve real progress on a number of areas. The OSCE's in-house subject area experts had proven to be a real added value for such policy co-operation and guidance. Where mandate overlap existed, regular dialogue was necessary to avoid activity overlap. Therefore, the OSCE maintained close links with NATO, EUFOR and the EU delegation on a number of cross-cutting security issues, in particular on the disposal of surplus of weapons and ammunitions and improvement in the management of stockpiles.

Ambassador Robbins stated that co-ordination between international organizations only worked if local institutions were willing to be involved. However, in 1995 when the war ended, domestic interlocutors were largely absent, and thus the international community had to rely on a large presence. In 2011, the responsibility of domestic decision-makers was much larger, but the conditions and objectives for the closure of the OHR were not yet fulfilled. The changed situation further required a review of existing co-ordination mechanisms to the present situation of the actors involved.

In conclusion, Ambassador Robbins warned against treating co-ordination between international actors as a solution for financial efficiency and stated that effective co-ordination and co-operation in the field depended mainly on the quality and initiative of field staff. Multi-year budgeting would further support the flexibility to adapt to the work of other organizations when needed. Installing a liaison officer had also proven its value for information sharing. Hence, establishing liaison offices to other organizations or the possibility of secondments between organizations should be considered, as should the introduction of a special co-ordinator with the NGO community at headquarters level.

The second speaker, Dr. Pryakhin, referred to the wide experience of international organizations in post-conflict rehabilitation.[5] Recent events in Kyrgyzstan had demonstrated the potential of the OSCE and its partners in that respect. Good contacts with the host country were important, but difficult since State power was relatively weak. As a result, international organizations had to replace national structures with a first task to hold free and fair elections. The Troika mechanism, including the EU, the UN and the OSCE, played an essential role not only in the holding of the referendum, but even more in the parliamentary elections. These efforts contributed to a stabilization of inter-ethnic relations in the aftermath of the events in April and June 2010.

Dr. Pryakhin emphasized that no post-conflict situation could, however, be resolved if

---

[5] Dr. Pryakhin's presentation was distributed under PC.DEL/397/11 on 4 May 2011.

peacebuilding priorities were not compatible with the host State's interests and the free will of the people. Also, a reform of the security structure was crucial to balance democracy and autocracy without slipping into anarchy. In that regard, contact with civil society had to be maintained. A number of co-ordination mechanisms were in place in Central Asia, but overlap did still take place. Hence, strengthened co-ordination between international and regional organizations was still needed. While the UN took the leading co-ordination role in Kyrgyzstan, technical co-ordination should not target political hierarchy, but rather sharing of responsibility.

The speaker added a number of additional factors for successful post-conflict rehabilitation. International and regional organizations should give thought on how to approach religious organizations, but also on how to involve women in the process. Further, journalists should be supported, as journalists were often the first victim of extremism, and mass-media should not be undermined. Finally, Dr. Pryakhin was pleased to see that academics were also invited to the Workshop, as good theory should be complemented with good analysis in order to achieve a common vision.

Discussion

The first participant stated that the events in Kyrgyzstan illustrated the need for an optimal approach of co-operation, including the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO). That Organization had undergone a substantive growth in importance in peacebuilding because of the realization that properly managed conflict prevention could address existing antagonism and tensions, and contribute to stable inter-ethnic relations. The participant highlighted the leading role of the UN and the responsibility of regional organizations to provide early warning information to the UN, but warned that they should keep their individual identities. The CSTO contributed already to projects of the Action against Terrorism Unit (ATU) and the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) of the OSCE, and that legacy could serve as a foundation for strengthening conflict resolution and preventive diplomacy in Central-Asia. In the end, however, that would require sufficient political will and commitment.

The next participant highlighted the nexus between post-conflict rehabilitation, refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). Displacement was linked with post-conflict rehabilitation since it caused instability, while the return of refugees and IDPs depended on the peace process. On occasion, the issue could be politically sensitive, especially when their return influenced referenda or elections, or when repatriation occurred on a large scale or under pressure. A sustainable return would also depend on the capacity to protect, in particular national minorities, and a solution to displacement must be the subject of negotiation between national and international actors. The participant referred to OSCE commitments, including the refugee law, and emphasized that UNHCR, in order to fulfil its mandate, depended on a number of players, including the OSCE. UNHCR-OSCE co-operation was successful in the past, for example on return and reintegration issues. Especially in the field, strategic and practical co-operation took place between both organizations based on the 1990 Copenhagen Document and the 2001 Bucharest Action Plan. The participant made the concrete suggestion to take the opportunity afforded by the 60th anniversary of the 1951 Convention Related to the Status of Refugees for the OSCE to reaffirm its commitment to the status of refugees and the linkages between displaced persons and security.

Ms. Cheng-Hopkins stated that the OSCE was in a good position to understand the root casus

of conflict through its local offices and corresponding knowledge. She stressed that the work of the OSCE could complement UNHCR as the latter had few resources to assist refugees in a number of areas, such as education, language, land rights or protection, after their return to the host country. Ms. Cheng-Hopkins equally referred to the Civilian Capacity Review, undertaken by Under-Secretary General for Peacekeeping Operations, Mr. Jean-Marie Guehenno, to optimize the use of civilian capacities within peacekeeping operations, and which resulted in 73 recommendations on both internal and external issues.

The moderator, in response to the comments made by Ms. Chang-Hopkins on problems to organize an efficient and rapidly deployable capacity, referred to the OSCE's REACT mechanism, as established in the late 1990s and questioned if that mechanism required refurbishment.

The next participant opined that, in order to stop a vicious conflict cycle, the prevention function was the crucial element. That should be done through institutional capacity building and, since the rehabilitation process had multiple layers, there was a clear need for a comprehensive approach. The participant stressed the need for physical reconstruction to be tackled in parallel with economic development and also the need to build social networks. Moreover, with regard to the former, the OSCE should be more prepared to advocate the needs of host countries with international aid and development agencies as well as with donors. The participant stated that the OSCE could play a central role in co-ordinating international efforts based on the 1999 Platform for Co-operative Security. Finally, clear local ownership would be required. Hence the host country should be a full-fledged participant of the co-ordination mechanisms and should translate the needs of the society.

Ambassador Robbins welcomed the focus on physical reconstruction to address economic and social needs, and equally highlighted the need to develop a proper legal framework in the host country – based on transparency, accountability and fairness – to attract outside investments (particularly in the private sector). The rule of law played an important role in that context.

One participant stressed the need to enhance co-ordination with civil society organizations and non-state actors in post-conflict rehabilitation, as their grass-roots perception of security would complement the perspective of international and regional organizations. Forums should be created with both kinds of actors that could, *inter alia*, discuss security issues. In that context, he referred to the example of ECOWARN by the African Union (AU).

Another participant referred to the publication of the Centre of International Cooperation that provided a catalogue of political missions from the UN and the OSCE to communicate lessons learned.

The next participant stated that the OSCE must address post-conflict rehabilitation, in the first place where it had field operations but also in other countries. The OSCE should act to prevent a reoccurrence of the conflict, especially because reaching the post-conflict phase did not signal the end of a conflict as the line between conflict and peace was not clear; the absence of violence was not a sufficient criteria. The participant argued that regional organizations stayed away in the majority of post-conflict situations and hence missed unique opportunities to build peace. Additionally, the OSCE should avoid overlap and duplication of efforts with other international actors, and that existing peace settlement formats should not be harmed.

One participant stated that the human rights approach of the Council of Europe (CoE) complemented the security approach of the OSCE. The CoE currently aimed to strengthen its field presences, taking into account its experiences with confidence-building measures (CBMs), especially in the Balkans, Georgia, Moldova and Cyprus, which had shown how a human rights approach could be successfully implemented. Those CBMs mainly targeted young leaders, journalists, the educational community and local NGOs, indicating the importance of local ownership. Co-operation should depend on the situation as not one size fits all.

Another participant stated that co-operation with other international organizations should be based on OSCE documents, including the 1999 Platform for Co-operative Security, and appreciated the FFT paper in that context. The participant emphasized that post-conflict rehabilitation began only after the establishment of an agreement to stop violence and agreed with the previous speaker that co-ordination should be based on a case-by-case basis.

A further participant welcomed the participation of so many from outside the OSCE as an external look at the Organization was useful in assessing what was at stake and how to improve a common response. The participant welcomed concrete follow-up proposals, in particular, the further development of the FFT paper into a 'good practices' guide on co-ordination and co-operation among international actors and the proposal to consider opening OSCE liaison offices to other international organizations.

In his concluding remarks, Ambassador Robbins recalled that, in the matter of co-operation and co-ordination, the image and reputation of international organizations should be inferior to the end-goal, as the ideal outcome should be the self-sufficiency of the host country.

Dr. Pryakhin concluded that, although financing was essential, the focus on funds should not be the guiding factor, since in the end donors would support a good project proposal.

The moderator made the following concluding remarks: 1) it was encouraging to hear that the role of the OSCE in post-conflict rehabilitation was recognized; 2) it was confirmed that the OSCE was an appropriate forum to continue discussions on the topic; 3) the further development of a 'good practices guide on co-ordination and co-operation with international organizations' was a logical next step; and, 4) the moderator stated he would come back with concrete suggestions. In conclusion, international co-ordination and co-operation were required. Even when mandates overlapped, each actor should act in accordance with its comparative advantage.

Working Session II:

Strengthening local ownership of non-military confidence building measures

Keynote speakers

— Ambassador Philip Remler, Head of the OSCE Mission to Moldova
— Mr. Takwa Suifon, Head, Post Conflict Reconstruction and Development Unit, Conflict Management Division, African Union Commission
— Ms. Eva Zillen, Kvinna till Kvinna Foundation

Moderator

— Ambassador Geneviève Renaux, Permanent Representative of Belgium to the OSCE

In introducing the session, Ambassador Renaux observed that local ownership was a *sine qua non* condition for the success of confidence building measures (CBMs) which, themselves, were an important contributing tool in building sustainable peace. In that respect, but not exclusively, the political support of national authorities was crucial, as was the full involvement of all local representatives, men and women, in the identification and in the decision-making processes associated with CBMs. If both were not involved, it could be a cause of failure.

She further highlighted that non military CBMs could include political measures, cultural measures, social measures (e.g., people-to-people contacts), police projects, (e.g., the Community Security Initiative deployed in 2010 by the OSCE in Kyrgyzstan), cross-border co-operation, educational or scientific exchanges, economic measures (e.g., the OSCE-supported Economic Rehabilitation Programme, launched in 2006 to promote confidence and co-operation among the Georgian/South-Ossetian communities) and environmental measures (e.g., the OSCE-led fact-finding mission that, in 2006, assessed the short-term and long-term impact of the summer's fires on the environment in the fire-affected territories in and around the Nagorno-Karabakh region).

Referring to the "Food-for-Thought (FFT) paper on Strengthening Local Ownership of non-military CBMs" (SEC.GAL/78/11), distributed by the Secretariat as background for the session, Ambassador Renaux reminded participants that non-military CBMs had two main objectives: 1) they were tools to lower tensions; and, 2) they were a means to foster trust and co-operation between the sides of a conflict or crisis. They could not, however, resolve the basic causes of a conflict nor could they bring peace by themselves. Additionally, CBMs should not be expected to deliver speedy results but rather be seen as a contribution to the overall peace process and, thereby, a means to the broader objective of enduring peace.

Drawing mainly on his experiences of the Transdniestrian conflict, the first speaker, Ambassador Remler[6], emphasized that co-operation between the conflicting sides over issues of mutual interest might not actually lead to confidence building and lasting peace *per se*.

---

[6] Ambassador Remler's presentation was distributed under PC.FR/11/11 on 4 May 2011.

Further still, CBMs could be used as tools by the sides to obstruct the peace settlement, by continuing the conflict by other means and/or using CBMs to score against each other. Moreover, CBMs could be used to exploit the international community's desire for progress towards a peace settlement.

He noted that CBMs could, nevertheless, improve the daily lives of the affected population and could thus set the conditions/foundations for wider political confidence building. However, such improvements could make the status quo more acceptable and, consequently, have a negative impact on the drive for change. In that context, it was important that CBMs should not be implemented in isolation, but as part of the wider and integrated negotiating process and with clear political involvement of the sides (which could be a problem if CBMs were not high up on the priority list of the state officials).

Finally, he opined that that the international community should consider CBMs as a long term investment in building sustainable peace. Often, the role of the international community was to 'prime the pump', including for more advanced efforts down the line, by inducing a level of confidence through international involvement, and then encouraging the sides to take ownership and build confidence with one another. Part of that effort included providing the political cover necessary to protect participants against accusations of 'softness' from those who believed that any interaction was inherently unpatriotic and that the confidence-building needed to create an environment conducive to a negotiated settlement was to be condemned as undermining the status quo.

The next speaker, Mr. Suifon, emphasized the importance of regional involvement in strengthening co-operation, including in CBMs, and working on longer term development.[7] In that respect, he opined that a sustainable peace process should be locally generated and externally supported. However, that could be a challenge when the priorities of the people differed from those of the donors and the international community, because it was difficult to locally own, lead and co-ordinate a process that was reliant on outside funding. He also noted that ownership could occur at different levels, such as local and regional levels. In terms of confidence building in the post-conflict period, he stated that it was needed between: partners and the international community; the former warring factions and the international community; the local population and any peacekeeping force; and, the national representatives in the peace process and the local population they represented.

When addressing post-conflict rehabilitation, it was important that it be based on inclusivity, equity and non-discrimination (including towards non-state actors) and with a particular focus on marginalized and vulnerable groups (especially women). He also highlighted that capacity building was more than just training and that it was important to use local competences to the maximum extent possible and to draw on regional support where there were weaknesses in local capacities. Moreover, confidence building was as much about building consensus among divided factions and the wider population.

The final speaker, Ms. Zillen, highlighted the importance of local ownership by women in the peace process and the need to involve them in designing and implementing CBMs.[8] Women could play a particularly useful role through open communication across dividing lines, thereby helping to dispel myths and rumours and to ameliorate actions by the sides that aimed

---

[7] Mr. Suifon's presentation was distributed under PC.DEL/398/11 on 4 May 2011.
[8] Ms. Zillen's presentation was distributed under PC.NGO/2/11 on 4 May 2011.

to destroy confidence. She also pointed out that involving women could improve people-to-people contact, increase transparency and enable trust to be built between officials and the people. Also, women could raise local needs that were especially known to them (such the provision of school buses). That, in turn, could lead not only to practical solutions, but also to building trust that elected officials were working for those that elected them and, at the same time, also empowering women.

She reminded participants that many human rights activities were not liked by hardliners on each side and, consequently, those involved in such activities, as well as their families, were often threatened, criminalized and/or isolated as a result. Accordingly, it was important that the international community supported and paid attention to the security of vulnerable people. Further still, the international community should ensure it was not a part of problem of ignoring/marginalizing women. Hence, it needed to acknowledge, speak and listen to women and to involve them in, for example, needs assessments (particularly if there were no female officials involved).

Finally, she welcomed the sharing of good practices on CBMs (and also bad practices so others could avoid the same mistakes) and the focus on capacity building (but also pointed out that skills training sometimes needed to be matched with equipment being provided). She also underscored the importance of co-ordination among international actors, including by looking at what other actors were doing in order to identify different yet complementary work that could be undertaken.

Discussion

The first participant to take the floor highlighted the important of roles of CBMs and political dialogue in furthering the peace process, as they could create favourable conditions, foster co-operation and be beneficial in identifying problems and solutions thereto. CBMs which were detached from politics and less controversial (such as those addressing health care, social integration and environmental issues) were particularly useful as they often made it easier to achieve progress in arriving at common agreements without the need for political discussions. Nevertheless, it was necessary to take account of the views of all stakeholders, including at the political level, hence progress might not always be achievable in the absence of political advancement. The need for support from the international community, including through mediation and the provision of the necessary resources for CBM implementation, was underlined.

The next participant noted the necessity of ensuring CBMs, and local ownership thereof, were tailored to each conflict. Economic CBMs were especially useful as they tended to draw divided communities together. Rule of law CBMs could also be beneficial. In that respect, the focus should not be just on criminal law (to bring perpetrators to justice) but also on laws that address people who cannot get their land back and/or who do not speak the language of the winning side.

A further participant pointed out the challenges of ensuring CBMs were effective. To that end, a comprehensive approach was important as was joint planning among international actors. Analysis of the lessons learned from previous and current post-conflict missions showed that civilian missions were deployed to meet foreign policy objectives of those deploying such missions. Additionally, the host country needed to be sufficiently committed, including to political reform, for a mission to be successful. While the participant's own

organization would not force a host country to accept all its standards, it would not refrain from pointing out those standards and also asking difficult questions (such as those related to the treatment of vulnerable groups). Working with local populations, including through dialogue and the involvement of civil society, was particularly important.

Another participant observed that involvement in CBMs played to the OSCE's strengths, especially as the Organization had years of experience in that field. In response to questions posed to the speakers by that participant, Ambassador Remler noted that just because a conflict/settlement was frozen did not mean that relationships between the sides and with the international community were frozen. Moreover, changes in host countries (such as changes in the make up of local or state governments) could change those relationships. Consequently, the international community needed always to be ready to provide extra impetus and encourage greater local ownership, thereby taking advantage of any positive changes. The best CBMs were those that were initiated, or at least inspired, by the different levels within the host countries, that were unforced and that were self-starting. The role of the international community in those situations was to foster CBM development, including by providing sufficient space for the sides to interact. Mr. Suifon mentioned that regional and sub-regional dynamics could not be ignored as there was inevitably a regional dimension to a conflict. For instance, incidents could have impacts across borders. Plus, one could not deal with one country without addressing what was going on in neighbouring countries, especially as neighbouring countries could be either a force for good or, conversely, a spoiler. Thus regional organizations have an important role to play in building sustainable peace among neighbours, many of whom may see it as their right to be directly or indirectly involved in the crisis.

Yet another participant welcomed the international community helping in the design and implementation of CBMs but opined that it was up to locals to make CBMs happen. He forewarned against the dangers of CBMs being misused to build nationalism or manipulated to further national agendas. He also noted that CBMs, locally owned at all levels, could be useful not only after a peace agreement was reached but also before, especially if they created a better atmosphere within and between the sides.

The next participant also highlighted the importance of local ownership as a central plank in building sustainable peace, but noted that some host governments (as well as some regional organizations) lacked any mechanisms to deal with non-state actors. That was a problem that certainly needed to be tackled as the local population associated with a non-state actor would not have any confidence in a peace process that did not also deliver on its needs. Thus, focussing on government-to-government confidence building was not enough. In that respect, the involvement of civil society, which was part of the problem but also a part of the solution, was crucial. Hence, the participant advocated the pursuit of both top down and bottom up approaches.

A further participant pointed out that conflicts vary and the effectiveness of CBMs will differ depending on the prevailing circumstances. He also noted that CBMs could not be implemented in isolation and nor could they restore trust where none existed, such as when territories were occupied. That latter view was countered by another participant who opined that such a situation (i.e., occupied territories) was exactly when CBMs were most needed, including to reduce tensions.

The next participant recognized the merit of developing and sharing good practices and

lessons learned related to CBMs. Co-operation between the OSCE and other international actors was important and should be based on the 1999 Platform for Co-operative Security. Moreover, there should be a multi-dimensional and holistic approach towards post-conflict rehabilitation, in general, and towards CBMs, in particular.

Yet another participant highlighted that, according its organization's research, actions were required at different levels and put forth four recommendations in that respect: 1) mechanisms were needed that built trust where none existed and that this should be achieved through the identification of specific areas where tension and mistrust existed, and the creation of opportunities to address issues before they became problems (including by making greater use of forums and the personal involvement of religious/cultural leaders); 2) practical and manageable relationships needed to be developed, including through institutionalizing communication channels; 3) synergy between international actors should be created, including through agreeing on appropriate divisions of labour; and, 4) the political space of civil society must be protected.

The final participant to take the floor agreed that CBMs would not solve problems in reaching a peace agreement, and may even solidify the status quo. However, peace had rarely been reached when CBMs were not used – and that pointed to importance of CBMs as a peacebuilding tool. His experience had shown that CBMs which opened channels of communication were particularly useful, including because they created a possibility for other issues to be tackled beside those specifically addressed by the CBM. Also beneficial were those CBMs that alleviated suffering on the ground.

In her concluding remarks, the moderator reiterated that the OSCE already had considerable experience in post-conflict rehabilitation, as well as an impressive range of tools, including CBMs, to address the post-conflict phase. However, successful implementation of those tools was reliant upon the willingness and political will of the sides to conflict, as well as all participating States, to make full use of all the available tools. Additionally, the moderator re-emphasized that local ownership was a crucial component of building sustainable peace. She closed by underscoring that the elaboration of a best practice guide on local ownership of CBMs would be a useful contribution to the Organization's work on post-conflict rehabilitation.

Working Session III:

Taking stock of lessons learned, recruitment & rosters and training in peacebuilding with a view toward recent initiatives of OSCE participating States

Keynote speakers

— Mr. Kevin Rex, Deputy Director, Civilian Operations Deployment and Coordination division, Canadian Stabilization and reconstruction Task Force
— Mr. Stefan Tinca, Director of the Training Centre for Post-Conflict Reconstruction, Romania

Moderator

— Ambassador Robert Loftis, Acting Co-ordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, U.S. State Department

Ambassador Loftis began by expressing his gratitude to the OSCE for organizing the workshop. He emphasized his Organization's support for the International Stabilization and Peacebuilding Initiative (ISPI) and gave a brief outline of the Initiative. In that context, the ISPI's contribution to the enhancement of civilian capability and the strengthening of interoperability among international actors was highlighted. He also mentioned the ISPI's technical sub-groups dealing with lessons learned, training and recruitment which would be more closely discussed later in this working session.

Ambassador Loftis further stressed the importance of co-operation and co-ordination among multilateral and bilateral peacebuilding actors at strategic, operational and tactical levels. The necessity to share burdens while avoiding duplication, to involve a number of international actors and to attract high quality technical specialists was stressed. Eventually, international peacebuilding partnerships should be assessed upon their effectiveness in reducing violence and in developing capacities for conflict management and sustainable recovery.

The first speaker, Mr. Rex, provided an overview of the ISPI, giving an illustration of its aims, history and structure.[9] Founded in Washington in 2009, the ISPI was presented as an informal network of States and international organizations. Its aim was to enhance civilian capacity and increase interoperability among international actors by developing informal, virtual environments to facilitate activities of co-operation and the exchange of information, experiences and best practices related to stabilization and peacebuilding. The Initiative did not, however, see itself as a policy making body.

Subsequently, three common work streams and related needs were examined: Knowledge Management and Lessons Learned; Deployable Civilian Capabilities; Policy Strategy and Resources. In that respect, the importance of common standards in the assessment and implementation of lessons learned as well as recruitment and training issues was stressed.

---

[9] Mr. Rex's presentation was distributed under PC.DEL/400/11 on 4 May 2011.

Furthermore, the need for international co-operation on bilateral and multilateral levels was mentioned as well as the usage of online tools for information exchanges on best practices and lessons learned.

On the structural organization, Mr. Rex reiterated that the ISPI's International Working Group was divided in three technical sub-groups, dealing with training and exercises, recruitment and roster management and lessons learned. A particular focus was given to the Stabilization and Peacebuilding Community which communicated and interacted through a web portal where reports and information on events was shared and regularly updated. That portal was described as a global network of about 600 international state- and non-state actors participating in online-discussions.

Mr. Rex concluded his presentation by stressing that ISPI was open for participation to all actors who had a sincere interest in developing an operational peacebuilding and stabilization capacity and invited participants to join.

At the beginning of his presentation, the second speaker, Mr. Tinca, addressed changing circumstances in global politics and the resulting need to reconsider concepts and approaches of traditional foreign action.[10] Subsequently, he illustrated Romania's foreign policy agenda which, since the 1990s, had moved from a non-intervention doctrine towards a more active role, particularly in the Balkans, Africa and Afghanistan. After having taken a solely military approach, the benefits of civil co-operation had been realized by the country.

In that context, the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs had launched the initiative to establish the Training Centre for Post-conflict Reconstruction (CeFoR), which would incorporate various civil society organizations and think tanks to contribute to the Centre's training and research components. It was positively remarked that, so far, the Centre had been well received and faced surprisingly little international competition.

He noted that, however, the Centre's structure and comprehensiveness left room for more improvement. For example, only a limited number of areas related to research had so far been covered, and the Centre's network for civil society actors and think-tanks would be further developed. The focus for 2011 was stated to be the elaboration of a national roster which should eventually gain an international outreach. In that respect, future co-operation with the ISPI and the EU would be welcome.

In his conclusion, Mr. Tinca identified the OSCE's possible role in terms of peacebuilding and co-operation with his own Institution. Here he noted that, after the OSCE's previous shift towards preventive action, a potential niche in post-conflict action should be elaborated for the OSCE, drawing from its comprehensive security approach. Related to Romania's activities, he underscored that, since there was space for everyone, no competition in that field should exist.

Discussion

The first participant to take the floor introduced the Australian Civilian Corps (ACC), a governmental organization deploying specialists to countries affected by natural disaster or

---

[10] Mr. Tinca's presentation at the OSCE Chairmanship Workshop on Post-Conflict Rehabilitation was distributed under PC.DEL/399/11 on 4 May 2011.

conflict. He stated that the ACC had so far greatly benefitted from information shared in the ISPI network and he encouraged others to join the Initiative. Eventually, his Country's aim was to co-operate internationally in post-conflict rehabilitation on a long-term basis, including through joint missions, joint training and joint approaches.

Referring to the presentation of Mr. Tinca, the next participant gave an overview of the rosters of the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC). Containing approximately 2000 staff, the rosters provided a basis for deployments of experts to various international operations. In that context, the geographical diversity was emphasized, with half of the deployed experts originating from non-Western countries. Since 2006, thematic rosters had been established, including a standby team of 7 mediation experts. Additionally, efforts to promote gender equality throughout the rosters were mentioned. Finally, he pointed out that the entire capacity was managed by no more than 18 staff members.

The final participant to speak gave a brief outline of the UK Stabilisation Unit, which was a semi-independent governmental institution, comprising staff from the UK Ministry of Defence, Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Department for International Development. Similar to the organizations mentioned by two previous speakers, the UK Stabilisation Unit was presented as an organization which sent experts into countries affected by conflict. Much emphasis was given on the elaboration of best practice models through debriefing processes. So far, the three most important issues identified with regard to the deployment of civilians to post-conflict missions were: 1) greater attention needed to be paid to common 'duty of care' arrangements for deployed civilian staff; 2) more focus was needed on providing logistical support to the missions; and, 3) debriefing of returning officials was critical to finding out want went well, what needed improving and what the next deploying staff needed to know.

In his closing remarks, the moderator noted that most countries and organizations appeared to be still in a period of experimentation with regard to developing deployable civilian capability for post-conflict missions. Many different approaches were being tried and he was not sure that there was a single right approach that could be used in every case. Hence, it was important that those involved in developing such capabilities should continue share their experiences and, as appropriate, experiment with new ideas, particularly in the field.