



ASSESSING RESILIENCE FOR PEACE

GUIDANCE NOTE
APRIL 2016

ASSESSING RESILIENCE FOR PEACE

GUIDANCE NOTE
APRIL 2016

Assessing Resilience for Peace: A Guidance Note

All rights reserved, Interpeace, April 2016

Interpeace Headquarters
Maison de la Paix
2E Chemin Eugène-Rigot
CH-1202 Geneva
Switzerland
info@interpeace.org
T: +41 (0) 22 404 5900
www.interpeace.org

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by Graeme Simpson (Interpeace), Anupah Makoond (Interpeace), Patrick Vinck (HHI), and Phuong N. Pham (HHI) with additional inputs from (in alphabetical order): Otto Argueta, Joao Boavida, Mirko Hoff, Renée Larivière, Caitlin Leahy, Jerry McCann, Maud Roure, James Suah Shilue and Ana Glenda Tager.

FAR is a project of



Steering Committee: *Interpeace* - Renée Larivière, Jerry McCann, Maud Roure, Graeme Simpson,

Programme Officer: *Interpeace* - Anupah Makoond

Liberia: *Interpeace* - Anne Moltes; *P4DP* - James Suah Shilue, with Godfrey Eloho, Kennedy Berrian, Horace P. Nagbe, Deimah P. Kpar-Kyne, M. Abraham Jabateh, Georgette Dabieh Princess Loveland

Timor-Leste: *Interpeace* - Ariane Inkesha; *CEPAD* - Joao Boavida, with Joana Viegas, Caitlin Leahy, Etno Carvalho

Guatemala: *Interpeace* - Ana Glenda Tager, Mariel Aguilar, Otto Argueta, with Jonatan Rodas, Ivonne Solorzano, Claudinne Olgades, Wendy Cuellar

Survey Research: *Harvard Humanitarian Initiative* - Patrick Vinck, Phuong N. Pham, with Stacie Constantian, Kelsey Gleason, Pierre Buysschaert, and the interviewers

Global Desk Review: Erin McCandless, Graeme Simpson, with Zoe Meroney and Kathryn Whitlow

With additional inputs from scholar-practitioner experts: Alexandros Lordos, Rob Ricigiliano, Ami Carpenter, Rachel Locke, Peter Woodrow, John Lewis, Jordan Ryan, Hugh Macleman, Erin McCandless, Andrea Ó Súilleabháin, Åsa Wallton, Anita Ernstorfer, Sam Doe

With the Financial Support of



The information provided and views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of Interpeace, Harvard University, or the funding agency.

This report is the product of the Framework for Assessing Resilience (FAR) programme. It offers analytical and operational reflections and guidance reflecting an approach to the assessment of resilience both as a lens – or a way of seeing, analyzing and understanding peace and conflict in any society – and as a vehicle which serves as an operational way of doing things. The methodology and approach of this programme, which are documented in this guidance, also reflect an approach to locally owned and driven processes which are themselves powerfully animated by the endogenous nature of resilience. Finally, this guidance aspires to inform both policy and practice. We hope the guidance note may be absorbed in both the policy and practitioner worlds, adapting these areas of thought and practice to the individual country context so as to respond more effectively to conflict-related challenges, threats, or stressors. Perhaps the guidance note might even be transformative, like the proposed framework and approach to resilience for peace itself.

A project of



The Framework for Assessing Resilience was made possible through support from



CONTENTS

2	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
7	1 INTRODUCTION
9	2 CONCEPTUAL AND STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
9	2.1 RESILIENCE AS A LENS NOT A LABEL: POTENTIAL FOR INTEGRATION IN PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING
10	2.2 THE ‘CONVENING POWER’ OF RESILIENCE
11	2.3 RESILIENCE AS BOTH RETROSPECTIVE AND PREVENTIVE
13	2.4 CONTRIBUTING TO POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE PEACE
14	2.5 A RESILIENCE FOR PEACE FRAMEWORK
16	2.5.1 The Unique Nature of Conflict as a Risk or Stressor
18	2.5.2 Endogenous Resilience
20	2.5.3 Absorb, Adapt, Transform – A Fluid Resilience Spectrum
22	2.5.4 A Multi-level Systems Approach to Resilience for Peace
25	2.5.5 Positive and Negative Manifestations of Resilience
27	2.5.6 From the Contextual to the Universal: Analytical Framework for Analysing and Tracking Resilient Capacities for Peace
29	3 PROCESS GUIDANCE
29	3.1 PROCESS MATTERS
32	3.2 CARRYING OUT THE ASSESSMENT: KEY STEPS
34	3.2.1 Step 1: Contextualization
49	3.2.3 Step 3: Analysis and Documentation of Consultation Findings
53	3.2.4 Step 4: Validation of Findings
54	3.2.5 Step 5: Development of Strategies to Strengthen Resilience for Peace
57	4 PROGRAM AND POLICY GUIDANCE
58	4.1 STRENGTHENING RESILIENCE FOR PEACE WITHIN A SPECIFIC CONTEXT
60	4.1.1 Stakeholder-Influencing
61	4.1.2 Uptake of Findings
64	4.1.3 Evaluation
65	4.2 INSIGHTS FOR INTERNATIONAL POLICY
69	5 REFERENCES
69	RESOURCES RELATED TO THE FAR PROGRAMME
70	WORKS CITED
70	INTERACTIVE WEB-BASED RESOURCES

71	6 ANNEXES
71	ANNEX 1: SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS FOR THE QUALITATIVE CONSULTATION
75	ANNEX 2: FACILITATION GUIDES FOR THE QUALITATIVE CONSULTATION
80	ANNEX 3: EXAMPLES OF DATA-CAPTURING TEMPLATES FOR QUALITATIVE CONSULTATION

FIGURES AND TABLES

16	<i>Figure 1: Resilience for Peace Framework</i>
28	<i>Figure 2: Resilience and the Factors Impacting Peace/Conflict System</i>
32	<i>Figure 3: Principles of the Resilience for Peace Assessment</i>
45	<i>Figure 4: Factors of the Peace/Conflict System Emphasized in Each Case Study</i>
51	<i>Figure 5: Analysis of Findings towards a Resilience for Peace Assessment</i>
59	<i>Figure 6: The Five Steps of the Resilience for Peace Assessment</i>
60	<i>Figure 7: Stakeholder-Influencing – Selected Risks and Opportunities</i>
64	<i>Figure 8: Using the Resilience for Peace Framework to Monitor Programme and Policy Impact</i>
33	<i>Table 1: Summary of the Five Steps of the Resilience for Peace Assessment</i>
41	<i>Table 2: Options for Sequencing between Quantitative and Qualitative Consultations</i>
47	<i>Table 3: Examples of Manifestations of Resilience</i>

1 INTRODUCTION

THE CHALLENGE: ASSESSING RESILIENCE FOR PEACE

What makes societies resilient as opposed to fragile and vulnerable to violent conflict? What is it that helps them anticipate risk, resolve conflicts collaboratively, respond creatively to crisis, and steer social change in ways that foster shared benefits for peace and development? These fundamental questions persist as a major challenge for peacebuilders despite growing attention given to better understanding and addressing the key sources of fragility in conflict-affected societies. As peacebuilding aspires to being transformative, it is essential to understand the endogenous assets, attributes, qualities, resources and ultimately actions, which enable that kind of positive transformation, which we call ‘resilience for peace’.

The Framework for Assessing Resilience (FAR) programme was conceived to address these questions through an iterative process of inter-disciplinary desk-review; consultation with key informants, scholars, and policy specialists; participatory research; dialogue; and perception surveys. The project was implemented between 2014 and 2016 in three very different countries – Guatemala, Liberia, and Timor-Leste. It was intentionally designed as an inclusive and participatory process with a strong emphasis on local perspectives, ownership and leadership, as well as reciprocal learning processes fostered through exchanges between researchers and practitioners from the three pilot countries. The project generated a series of publications and related documents, including a global desk review, country notes on assessing resilience, survey reports, and country analyses of resilience for peace. This report presents the analytical and operational lessons learned through this project. It introduces the Resilience for Peace Framework developed through practice and reflection on what was found to be highly specific to each context and what was genuinely generic and cross-cutting.

The Resilience for Peace Framework can be approached both as a *lens* – or a way of seeing, analyzing and understanding peace and conflict in any society – and as a *vehicle* which serves as an operational guide in programming. This guidance note identifies avenues to engage in assessing resilience for peace among communities, societies, and institutional structures, through locally owned and driven processes which are themselves powerfully animated by the endogenous nature of resilience. It also seeks to inform policy and practice on integrating resilience into peacebuilding and conflict prevention strategies.

The term ‘resilience for peace’ was coined to reflect the positive orientation around capacities for peace – and the resources, capacities and actions of ordinary people that contribute to the promise of durable peace. It is, however, rooted in the understanding, analysis and experiences of conflict and even violence. Indeed, the sources of resilience manifest themselves in relation to conflicts and the risks or hazards associated with real or potential violence. We therefore often refer to ‘resilience *for* peace’ or ‘resilience in relation to conflict’. These notions of risk and resilience are not indistinguishable or simply interchangeable, but are inextricably intertwined in practice – and this reality is reflected through the dual usage throughout this guidance note.

An assessment of resilience for peace is not unlike an assessment of resilience to violent conflict, or even a conflict analysis, in how it treats risks. But it is precisely in its emphasis on process and endogenous assets, attributes, qualities, resources and ultimately transformative actions at multiple levels (individual, household, community, society) that the Resilience for Peace Framework provides unique value to inform national-level peace and conflict assessments.

Resilience to violent conflict suggests capacities and strategies for preventing, recovering from and transforming violent conflict. Resilience for Peace is more assertive in that it posits processes aimed at sustaining and enhancing peace. The capacities and strategies for both may be similar, if not occasionally identical, but whereas resilience to violent conflict will find its applications principally in fragile and conflict-affected societies, resilience for peace may be relevant to all societies, regardless of the level of violence they experience.

Although the guidance and the framework provided draw heavily on peacebuilding principles and practice, the relevance is considerably broader than just to the peacebuilding field (hence it is not called ‘resilience for peacebuilding’). Thus, the framework should be of value to anyone looking to integrate conflict sensitivity across diverse sectors and practice areas, including sustainable human development and humanitarian action.

The present report was written to facilitate the use of the Resilience for Peace Framework in both the policy and practitioner worlds. Its adoption in these areas of thought and practice can serve to guide future response to challenges, threats or stressors. However, the guidance and framework for assessing resilience is the product of a particular set of processes that are documented and outlined here. Whilst these demarcate some important principles and targets, they are intended to be flexible and to foster innovation and discretion rather than be merely prescriptive. This is a reflective ‘guidance note’ and not an operational blueprint, and should be used as such.

Assessing Resilience for Peace: A Guidance Note has three main components and objectives corresponding to its structure:

1. **Conceptual and Strategic Guidance:** To provide a conceptual and strategic framework for examining and analysing how resilience informs and contributes to peacebuilding and the understanding of risks and conflict dynamics, as well as what is universally relevant about resilience for peace and its relation to conflict.
2. **Process Guidance:** The guidance is intended to guide practitioners on the process of carrying out an assessment of resilience for peace within particular contexts. This framework has been derived from deep research and programmatic engagements in three pilot countries, each with its own distinctive context, legacies of conflict, and enduring conflict-drivers or risks. The guidance therefore offers reflections and lessons from the process as well – premised on a recognition that the voices and perspectives of ordinary people in these conflict-affected societies need to be heard and respected, and situated at the heart of the exercise. How this is done is inevitably as important as what it reveals.
3. **Programme and Policy Guidance** Finally, the guidance also seeks to offer reflections on the policy implications, opportunities and agenda offered by this work, including a particular concern for deepening the understanding of and engagement with resilience, and its relevance for a more integrated and holistic approach to peace, development and humanitarian action. It aims to offer recommendations and guidance on linking the assessment of resilience for peace with programmes and policies.

2 CONCEPTUAL AND STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

This section provides a series of strategic and conceptual notes that frame the approach to resilience for peace. These are informed by an interdisciplinary global desk review and rooted in the experience and learning developed through the country-level research. Building on these notes, the overall framework for understanding resilience for peace is then introduced and discussed in the following section.

2.1 RESILIENCE AS A LENS NOT A LABEL: POTENTIAL FOR INTEGRATION IN PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING

There has been a great deal written on resilience and deep cross-disciplinary thinking about its application to the fields of ecology, psychology, and anthropology, as well as the engineering sciences. A systems-based approach to resilience has also produced extensive tools and assessment frameworks for grappling with development programming, humanitarian crises, natural disasters, climate change and a variety of ‘external shocks’ affecting and potentially jeopardizing the wellbeing and livelihoods of communities and societies.

We use the definition of ‘resilience for peace’ in this guidance, as a reference to the diverse endogenous attributes, capacities, resources and responses, that potentially enable individuals, communities, institutions and societies to deal peacefully with the impact of past conflict and violence, as well as to prevent new and emerging patterns of conflict and violence.

However, it should be noted that part of the FAR methodology was precisely premised on the fact that the notion of resilience for peace had neither a literal, implicit or universal meaning nor common usage in any of the pilot countries. Indeed, the word ‘resilience’, itself, often did not have a recognized translation in vernacular languages in these countries. Rather than impose a predetermined meaning for resilience as a label, a critical part of the FAR process was to enable the local teams and informants to build a context-specific working definition of resilience in practice and as a lens in their societies.

There has been some concern that the notion of resilience has become a new buzzword, used as an alternative label to recycle old ideas across a number of fields. Yet there is a counter-argument that resilience as a lens, rather than a label, offers more integrated thinking or holistic operational approaches, as well as potential coherence in planning and programming.

Resilience as a lens is particularly helpful at the intersection between the conflict and peacebuilding fields, on the one hand, and the fields of development, disaster recovery and humanitarian action, on the other. Precisely because of its relevance and meaning across these disciplinary and sectoral divides, the resilience lens offers a creative means to integrate a ‘conflict-sensitive approach’ across diverse fields of practice.

But in order to navigate the reciprocal and symbiotic relationship between natural disasters, humanitarian crises and development approaches on the one hand, and conflict and violence on the other, it is all the more important to attend

to the unique character of both the risks and the contexts of conflict, and to understand fully how this intersects with other forms of risk, hazards, stressors or shocks. Resilience for peace can only serve this purpose and be fully complementary to wider resilience assessments, if proper analytical attention is given to the distinct nature and character of the harm done and risks posed by violent conflict in particular contexts.

However, until recently, notions of resilience have not been applied in the conflict and peacebuilding field, except perhaps as alternatives to risk or fragility, for example, in the ‘risk and resilience’ approach to youth violence prevention. The potential of this approach has therefore not yet been fully realized. This is illustrated by the fact that although resilience is noted several times in the various Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in relation to a variety of external shocks – climate change, natural disaster and humanitarian crisis –, it is not mentioned at all in relation to Goal 16, which specifically deals with peace as one of the universal goals of the SDGs. If resilience is indeed to be a helpful asset and a useful lens through which peace and conflict sensitivity can be integrated into wider development goals and approaches, then rather than this being left as implicit, we need to fully understand what is unique and particular about resilience in relation to conflict as a distinctive risk, stressor, or shock, and how this manifests itself in different country contexts at different points in time.

2.2 THE ‘CONVENING POWER’ OF RESILIENCE

That the resilience lens focuses attention on the capacities, assets and attributes of individuals, communities, institutions or societies, rather than on fragility and obstacles to peace, is highly significant for participatory peacebuilding analyses and processes. Many participatory methodologies for conflict analysis have evolved over time to include analyses of peace capacities or positive change agents alongside conflict-drivers. However, a resilience-based assessment approach gives unique emphasis to these assets, attributes and strengths. The focus of the resilience approach is differentiated in its emphasis and orientation or may importantly supplement existing peace and conflict-related assessment frameworks. For example, this approach and the framework for assessing resilience, may have particular value as a complement to the fragility assessments undertaken under the rubric of the New Deal for Fragile and Conflict-affected States (New Deal).

Furthermore, this orientation has proven to have an effective convening effect in the participatory assessment process itself. This was observed in practice in all three of the pilot countries of the FAR programme, as the quotes from the researchers themselves illustrate:

‘...when people have been asked about obstacles to peace, it is heavy for them, but asking about strengths is a lighter experience for people and they are very happy to discuss together the things that make them strong.’ - FAR/CEPAD Lead Researcher, Timor-Leste

‘Discussing the assets and capacities for peace and for problem solving, enabled us to get people around a table who might otherwise have been adversaries based on their interests... but who could discuss more easily based on their common attributes and capacities and shared commitment to peaceful solutions.’ - Interpeace Learning and Policy Officer, Latin American Office, Guatemala.

This orientation of resilience for peace enables diverse and potentially antagonistic stakeholders to convene around the positive attributes for building peace in lieu of the often more divisive discussion of conflict-drivers. This means that the very processes of assessing and monitoring resilience can themselves contribute to enhancing resilience through this convening effect. Resilience analysis and assessment can thus demonstrate resilience in action.

Attention to the capacities contributing to the resilience of communities or societies – particularly in conflict-affected or fragile societies – does not imply that understanding and analysing the particular fault-lines or risk factors for conflict/violence is not critically important. Indeed, there is a real danger in treating risk as generic rather than disaggregating it and understanding the particularities of it – the particular impact, consequences, targets and timing of conflict and violence, for example. But it is our experience that the assessment of resilience for peace in practice, provides a potential convening power and a contribution to building resilience itself. And that therefore it could be of real value to consider complementing diligent risk and conflict analyses with a participatory resilience assessment as a means of initiating transformative change processes.

Furthermore, although the particularities of contexts and conflict-related risks vary, the common attributes and dimensions of resilience across different disciplines and practice areas – including not only peace and conflict, but humanitarian action, development, and disaster risk and recovery approaches – offer a creative means for breaking down barriers between these different fields of endeavor in conflict-affected societies. This suggests a different but important potential convening effect by mainstreaming a particular approach to conflict-sensitivity within these fields through the resilience lens.

2.3 RESILIENCE AS BOTH RETROSPECTIVE AND PREVENTIVE

A core value of assessing resilience lies in uncovering the endogenous assets, attributes, qualities, resources and actions embedded within communities and societies which can potentially serve to protect them from violent conflict. Resilience in relation to peace and conflict has an important temporal frame: it is both about how societies navigate and draw on past experiences in dealing with the manifestation, causes and legacies of past conflict, as well as how these communities and societies anticipate the risk of emerging patterns of conflict. Assessing and understanding resilience to conflict is therefore important to how communities and societies deal with the past, as well as potentially vital to the agenda of preventing violent conflict in the future. These preventive aspirations also complement and resonate strongly with similar concerns to harness resilience as a preventive rather than merely palliative attribute of programming in the development, disaster recovery and humanitarian crisis arenas.

This temporal frame reflects a vital dimension of complex adaptive systems: these systems evolve, learn or adapt from prior experience. Societies and different orders of social organization – whether communities, institutions or even households – constitute examples of complex adaptive systems within different levels of any society, and an analysis of their resilience must therefore pay attention to this temporal frame. This is not just a matter of ‘dealing with past conflict’, nor is it a simple assertion that resilience for peace is both forward looking and backward looking. Rather, it requires the understanding that resilience for peace is both shaped by, and responsive to, the context and proximity of past conflict, whilst being a creative asset base for the prevention of future violent conflict.

Resilience in Relation to Past and Future Violent Conflicts

The reference to the nature of, and proximity to, past conflict was present in all three of the pilot country cases – albeit more explicitly in some instances than in others.

In Timor-Leste, the particular character of violent conflict associated with a struggle for liberation from Indonesia, coupled with the divisiveness of competing historical narratives about the past, and the challenges of embryonic state formation (complicated by the transition of a former liberation movement into a government in power), fundamentally shaped the perspective that resilience for peace is primarily defined in terms of social cohesion and national unity.

In Liberia, residual conflicts over resources, power and identity continue to play out despite the formal end of the civil war just over a decade earlier. These were exacerbated by the failure of state service delivery during the 2014 Ebola crisis and provoked a graphic recollection of civil war, reigniting old traumas and creating new ones. Although the immediate crisis tended to elicit resilience measures that were often described as ‘survivalist’, a strong reference point was how these approaches emulated the responses, actions and capacities that were deployed during the conflict (as well as an occasionally romanticized perspective of how things were before the war). The Liberia country note explicitly mentioned that *“it is important that this notion of resilience is understood and appreciated in relation to the legacies of past conflict, as well as in relation to current aspirations to consolidate peace and address the risks of reemerging or new conflicts, rather than exclusively being seen as responsive to natural disasters or external shocks.”* - FAR Liberia Country Note

In Guatemala, definitions of resilience were framed not only in relation to the legacy of conflict itself, but also in relation to a peace process that allegedly failed to address the underlying structural drivers of the conflict, manifesting themselves in new and evolving forms more than 20 years later. This produced an important differentiation between the immediate manifestations of conflict and violence on the one hand, and the enduring structural or underlying causes of conflict (conflictivity) on the other. This reference to continuity and change in patterns of conflict elicited an important distinction between an approach to resilience as a palliative measure in the face of unresolved conflict or violence, as opposed to resilience as a potentially preventive phenomenon in response to the underlying structural causes.

The unique circumstances that define endogenous resilience in each of these countries illustrate the value of highly context-specific resilience assessment and analysis processes. The country reports for each pilot case study and the national survey results in Timor-Leste and Guatemala provide comprehensive analyses and more detailed descriptions of the endogenous manifestations of resilience in each of the countries.

2.4 CONTRIBUTING TO POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE PEACE

Resilience for peace clearly takes diverse forms although these are neither static nor mutually exclusive. Resilience can be absorptive or adaptive, but it can also have a transformative and/or preventive outcome. The distinctions between absorptive, adaptive and transformative forms of resilience are analogous, albeit not equivalent, to the distinction between negative peace (focused on consequences and symptoms of violent conflict) and positive peace (addressing the underlying causes and drivers of violent conflict and contributing to sustainable peace and the prevention of re-emerging conflict). At the absorptive and adaptive end of the spectrum are strategies and capacities that enable systems to survive despite shocks and stressors, without necessarily excising the threat or addressing its underlying causes. On the other hand, transformative forms of resilience refer to those strategies and capacities that look to address the stressors and shocks through change processes, which in turn, address not just the symptoms, but the causes.

In the context of assessing resilience for peace, there is an additional layer of analytical complexity embedded in the relationship between the resilience spectrum and the peace spectrum. Endogenous processes of re-stitching the social fabric of relationships damaged by violent conflict not only serve as retrospective means of adaptation but also operate as forward-looking and preventive in nature. Resilience for peace requires systems that are dynamic and reconfigurable. Building 'positive peace' thus rests on an understanding of the continuities and changes in patterns of violence, morphing and transmuting sources of fragility, shifting patterns of marginalization and exclusion, and continuity in the underlying drivers of conflict. In different societies and at different times, these drivers may be based on patterns of political marginalization, economic exclusion, the independent momentum of identity-based conflicts, or a particular combination of these.

This approach to resilience presents peacebuilders with a potentially innovative orientation. Furthermore, it also offers a similarly novel orientation to policy-makers and practitioners from the development assistance and humanitarian action fields who are committed to integrating a conflict-sensitive approach into their work. Whereas traditional models of peacebuilding and conflict-sensitive programming are informed by conflict analyses, centered on understanding the sources of societal and state fragility, resilience is primarily concerned with the attributes, capacities and responses, associated with how, where and why peace gains traction or may be sustained. Such a resilience analysis – that seeks to understand and harness the factors that enable individuals, communities and societies to insulate themselves from resorting to violent conflict or transform the contexts that give rise to such violent conflict – can be a useful complement to conflict analyses when designing integrated peacebuilding and development strategies. Rather than merely addressing the symptoms or seeking to ameliorate the effects of violent conflict ('negative peace'), this approach lends itself more readily to building 'positive peace' through seeking to access, understand, and enhance the endogenous assets, capacities and processes that might help to consolidate and sustain peace, or prevent violent conflict.

However, if transformative forms of resilience can contribute to 'positive peace', then it is also true that adaptive and absorptive forms of resilience might contribute in important ways to the more immediate amelioration of suffering, or the cessation of hostilities, or address humanitarian crises resulting from the shock of violent conflict. Absorptive, adaptive and transformative forms of resilience in the face of conflict, may therefore contribute in important ways to achieving both negative *and* positive peace.

2.5 A RESILIENCE FOR PEACE FRAMEWORK

Building on the lessons learned from the country case studies and broader analysis, this section puts forth a framework for analyzing and assessing resilience for peace. This framework is the result of an iterative process derived from lessons learned in three pilot country cases and initially informed by a global desk review, which canvassed a spectrum of resilience studies, frameworks and tools, across several disciplines and practice areas. This is the first attempt at developing a framework that looks at peace and conflict through a resilience lens, as well as examining resilience from the perspective of peacebuilding – a significantly different approach to resilience compared to existing frameworks documented in the global desk review.

The resulting framework is not intended as a prescriptive instrument, but rather as a ‘guiding framework’ for practitioners, scholars and policy-makers, and one which enables the mainstreaming of a ‘peace and conflict’ approach and simultaneously supports integrated programming and policy across peacebuilding, development and humanitarian fields, through a common resilience lens.

The Resilience for Peace Framework does not offer a scale or measurement for ranking countries or systems against each other and is not bound to a predefined set of universal or standardized indicators. It offers a method for the systematic and replicable analysis of resilience using participatory mixed methods research approaches. It relies on balancing numbers and stories, acknowledges the changing rather than static nature of conflict as an incremental and evolving source of risk, and relies on the voice of local actors themselves for the definition and manifestations of resilience for peace. The framework proposed in this guidance note is therefore designed as a means for engaging diverse stakeholders in order to track and analyze resilience in relation to peace and conflict. When conducted regularly over time, it can also serve as a tool for assessing both continuity and change in resilience within particular contexts.


This Resilience for Peace Framework is premised on the recognition that the particular manifestations of resilience in each country context will differ, partly in relation to the forms of risk, and also in relation to the continuity and change in patterns of conflict and the nature and trajectory of diverse and incremental political processes or transitions. What this means is that assessing resilience for peace is not as simple as comparing a quantitative phenomenon over time, but rather necessitates observation and analysis of the changing forms and manifestations of resilience capacities (actions, relationships, processes and structures) using multiple indicators of the trajectories of conflict and the commitment to peace. Resilience for peace cannot be reduced to a single quantitative measure or index in any given context because resilience is – for the most part – a complex, moving target.

The manifestations of resilience will differ from country to country (at different levels, in the structures, processes and relationships in society), but these manifestations may vary or change within a particular country over time, at least as regards where and how resilience for peace manifests. This time-bound and ‘granular’ character of resilience can be observed in the highly specific forms and patterns of resilience documented in each of the three pilot countries of the FAR project. That said, the Resilience for Peace Framework nonetheless offers a reference that can anchor the analysis of resilience in relation to peace and conflict in any given context, as well as an appropriate basis for learning and reflective comparison across different contexts. The framework, described in detail in the following pages is characterized by:

- the distinctive nature of resilience in relation to conflict as opposed to other kinds of risk, stressors or shocks;
- the structures, processes, relationship and actions through which resilience for peace manifests and the endogenous nature and characteristics of such resilience;
- the fluid nature of the spectrum of forms of resilience in relation to conflict or for peace;
- the need for a multi-level systems approach to resilience for peacebuilding; and
- the positive and negative manifestations of resilience and their relation with peace and conflict factors.

Figure 1 offers a graphic representation of the conceptual and strategic understanding of resilience for peace – the Resilience for Peace Framework. It remains a two-dimensional representation of a complex conceptual framework, and therefore cannot fully do justice to the nuances and details described in the following sections. However, it does provide a schema for understanding and analysing resilience in relation to a particular type of stressor – potentially violent conflict. The diagram summarizes the five key aspects of the Resilience for Peace Framework listed above. It provides a graphic representation of the spectrum of resilient responses to conflict and the diverse levels within any society in which these might manifest. The diagram also seeks to present the relationship between resilience and peace and conflict by showing how, on the one hand, positive manifestations of resilience can produce virtuous cycles - in which positive manifestations of resilience *may* contribute to peace, and sustainable peace may in turn render communities and societies more resilient in the face of violence or conflict. On the other hand, resilience can also create vicious cycles in which negative manifestations of resilience may foster conflict and resilience to conflict may in turn be undermined. This representation should not be taken to imply deterministically that all peace factors automatically contribute to positive resilience, or that all conflict factors necessarily contribute only to negative resilience. Conditions and relationships within and amongst these peace and conflict factors and how those dynamics play out in different contexts determine outcomes. This is a key point that affirms the importance of ensuring that resilience assessments are conducted in a context-specific manner.

Figure 1: Resilience for Peace Framework



2.5.1 THE UNIQUE NATURE OF CONFLICT AS A RISK OR STRESSOR

While the concept of resilience has gained increasing traction in the development, disaster risk and recovery and humanitarian fields over the past few years, its application to the field of peacebuilding is much more recent. Although there is often a symbiotic or reciprocal relationship between humanitarian crises and conflict, conflict almost inevitably produces humanitarian emergencies and often compounds the impact of natural disasters. While natural disasters and humanitarian crises can in turn trigger conflict, there are some aspects of conflict that make it a distinct type of shock or stressor. Consequently, there are some important differences in how resilience is applied in the peacebuilding field.

Much of the disaster recovery and humanitarian response perspectives view resilience as the capacities that enable communities or societies to respond to or anticipate ‘external shocks’ such as floods, earthquakes or climate change,

even though these disasters – whilst caused by nature – may be affected in various ways by human behaviour, interventions and relationships. Violent conflict, on the other hand, is *fundamentally* about human-made processes that are rooted in ‘internal’ social behaviour rather than momentous ‘external’ events.



Furthermore, the humanitarian or disaster recovery discourse is often shaped by the notion that resilient communities ‘bounce back’ or ‘bounce back better’, potentially implying a recovery which returns to, or improves upon, the previous circumstances. However, conflict is more often than not akin to chronic stress rather than to shock, and is frequently more enduring or endemic within societies; it is non-linear in nature, may change in character, and is defined precisely by the *irreversible changes* that it provokes within the society or community. Unlike what might be the case in the process of recovering from natural disaster, or humanitarian crises, the solution of returning to the prior situation or ‘bouncing back’, is seldom even an available, and not necessarily a desirable, option in the wake of violent conflict.

Although some violent conflicts are more sudden than others, the violence itself often represents the extreme ‘event’ (or shock) within an enduring conflict continuum which includes a much wider and incremental evolution of cycles of conflict and conflict escalation. For example, a society experiencing shock-like incidents of racial violence or ethnic cleansing will likely also have witnessed long periods of pervasive and endemic racism or racial prejudice. This analysis can be useful to peacebuilders as well as other practitioners, as it indicates that in most situations of violent conflict, there is a potentially diverse spectrum of entry points for identifying and supporting resilience in the prevention or mitigation of violent shocks.

The damage wrought by violent conflict strikes at the heart of the social fabric of communities, damaging or disrupting social, civic and political institutions, and destroying places of belonging and social cohesion. An enduring consequence of conflict is that it decimates relationships of trust, both between people and groups in society as well as between society and the state.


Resilience for peace must therefore include those processes aimed at building or rebuilding and sustaining trust throughout different levels of social organisation, whether between individuals and groups or between the state and its citizens. In so far that much of the resilience thinking in the humanitarian field is premised on the assumption that social and political cohesion are crucial to resilient recovery and adaptation, there is an important opportunity, and indeed a common need among peacebuilders, development practitioners and humanitarian actors, to address damaged institutional relationships and the disrupted social fabric. This implies an opportunity and necessity for a more robust interface between the peacebuilding, development and humanitarian fields through the common cause of strengthening resilience.

Finally, understanding the relational ‘harm done’ as a result of violent conflict, demands recognition that conflict and peacebuilding are anything but static, linear or mono-directional processes. A ‘conflict transformation’ perspective acknowledges that within complex adaptive social systems (see section below), patterns of conflict and violence (and the underlying patterns of marginalization and exclusion, as well as the relationships they sustain), themselves transmute, change, and evolve over time. This presents important challenges for how we understand notions of resilience as not

only articulating the creativity and resourcefulness of communities and societies in dealing with past violence and conflict, but also anticipating the threat of re-emerging conflict and potential violence, recognizing that – unlike earthquakes and volcanic eruptions – these risks do not necessarily manifest along the same lines of social and political fissure as pre-existing conflicts/events.

2.5.2 ENDOGENOUS RESILIENCE

Endogenous resilience – i.e. capacities that are already embedded within individuals, communities and societies and the relationships among them, as opposed to capacities that are cultivated or ‘built’, - lies at the heart of the understanding of resilience developed through FAR. It is for this reason that it is positioned at the center of the social system in figure 1 above and in the graphic illustration to the right. This graphic depiction does not imply that this is a specific ‘level’ of the social system. This depiction is rather intended to be consistent with the literal definition of an attribute that is ‘endogenous’ – originating from within the tissue of an organism, cell or system – in this instance, at the different levels of the social system, and in the ‘connective tissue between these levels.



As discussed in the previous section, conflict is an internal stressor that goes to the very heart of a society’s structure, so resilience in relation to conflict is best framed as endogenous and embedded in the processes, structures and relationships, and agency of systems and sub-systems within any society, rather than as a static set of capacities. If this means that resilience capacities should be conceived as emanating from the structures, relationships and processes that define social organization, then it is also important to acknowledge that resilience capacities can be shaped by the actions and agency of individuals and groups. It is therefore important to recognize resilience as agency manifested in the organization, actions, responses and attribution of meanings by people in the context of risks or legacies of violence and conflict.

As such, the sources of resilience are embedded in the relationships between people and groups, between people and the state, as well as manifest in the ‘connective tissue’ between these different levels in society. Endogenous resilience is also sometimes latent until triggered by particular conflict dynamics. Consequently, the specific manifestations and meanings of resilience in relation to conflict will inevitably vary from one society to another and may also shift or evolve over time because of the constantly evolving trajectory of the peace and conflict cycle within any society. Therefore, in order to adequately identify and understand the endogenous capacities of resilience for peace in a society, due consideration must be given to the nature and form of the political processes and transitions, as well as the proximity to past conflict and violence.

The endogenous manifestations of resilience in relation to conflict thus remain highly context-specific and are forged in relation to particular moments in the peace and conflict cycles/continuum of any particular community, society or system.

This proscribes some limits on the role of external actors in their aspiration to ‘build’ resilience. International actors in particular, are constrained and must be especially cautious in any technocratic endeavors to ‘build’, rather than to support, facilitate, accompany or enhance, the resilience capacities and attributes of conflict-affected societies, communities or states.

‘In the context of ... externally-led peacebuilding approaches, it is arguable that regional, national, and community-level ‘endogenous’ knowledge have not found effective channels to influence and inform the international decision-making process – despite the theoretical commitment to ‘local ownership’ in peacebuilding.’- FAR Liberia Country Note, p. 13

This perspective on the endogenous character of resilience in relation to conflict, also resonates strongly with notions of social, economic, political and human capital that are prominent in the ‘well-being’ or ‘sustainable livelihoods’ concepts at the heart of development or humanitarian approaches to resilience. This resonance potentially offers a common platform and a creative opportunity for an integrated strategy for resilience-based planning and programming, in which the assessment of resilience for peace or in relation to conflict is not merely complementary to - but an essential dimension of - the wider approach to resilience. This offers critical support to, and a potential new vehicle for, integrating a conflict-sensitive approach to development, disaster recovery and humanitarian response.


It is worth noting the strong resonance of the notion of endogenous resilience with theories of social capital that assert the central role of ‘social and political cohesion’ in the resilience of communities or societies in the face of conflict and violence (Coletta and Cullen 2000). In relation to social and political cohesion, it is argued that societal resilience relies not merely on horizontal social cohesion embedded in the relationships among people or groups, but also on the vertical cohesion which speaks to the relationship between people and the state and other societal institutions. This is similarly captured in the important distinction between notions of bonding social capital (between members of a community), bridging social capital (which connects different communities or groups to each other) and linking social capital (connecting these groups through mediated relationships via institutions, norms and the state, etc.).

This approach recognizes that alongside the horizontal relationships among groups and individuals, the state and other institutions play a key mediating role and are significant in shaping, protecting, guaranteeing and where necessary constraining the relationships among individuals, groups and communities in society, which is vital to resilience for peace. These notions of social and political cohesion and social capital are also important in recognizing that although we identify resilience as embedded within structures, processes and relationships at different levels of society, particularly in relation to resilience to violent conflict, these levels are intertwined parts of a system, and are not insulated from each other. This has creative implications for the value of a resilience-based approach to the relationship between peacebuilding and statebuilding in fragile and conflict-affected societies. Such a resilience-based approach demands attention not only to building the capacities of state institutions, but to the transformation of the relationships between state and society, which lies at the core of the relationship between peacebuilding and the statebuilding enterprise.

2.5.3 ABSORB, ADAPT, TRANSFORM – A FLUID RESILIENCE SPECTRUM

A 2012 working paper on resilience published by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) summarizes the mainstream thinking on resilience capacities as organized in three main categories, in what the authors refer to as the 3D Resilience Framework: Absorptive capacity, Adaptive capacity and Transformative capacity (Béné et al. 2012; McCandless and Simpson 2015). In practice however, the boundaries between these broad responses are fluid and are not regarded as mutually exclusive or sequential.

This was supported in practice and by evidence through the three case studies of the FAR programme, which indicated that responses or ‘capacities’, which may begin as defensive, survivalist and absorptive of stressors or shocks, may in fact evolve over time into more creative and proactive adaptive strategies for mitigating the effects or risks of conflict and violence. Further still, these capacities can also evolve into transformative processes which develop from or entrench changes



that address the root causes of violent conflict. Therefore, whilst recognizing the analytical and theoretical value of the 3D categorization of resilience, it is nonetheless evident that in practice, this categorization of resilience responses or capacities is not necessarily comprehensive or fine-grained enough in capturing the diverse and complex manifestations of resilience to conflict/for peace.

Resilient capacities and responses are in fact highly diverse in character, across different levels, from the individual, to the community, to the institutional level etc. This reflects a spectrum of responses which is neither necessarily sequential, nor mutually exclusive. This also raises important questions about whether or not the neat equation can be made between resilience and positive peace as may have been implied above. As will be seen below, negative manifestations of resilience, instead of producing more peaceful societies, can create exclusive insular communities and groups, which might be highly divisive and conflictual. But less obvious, yet more striking, is the extent to which resilience responses within communities and societies may in fact be ameliorative, protective and adaptive in situations of injustice or hardship, addressing only the symptoms of exclusion, exploitation or oppression (and thus potentially contributing to ‘negative peace’), without actually engaging or addressing the underlying causes of the conflict. In short, far from being implicitly transformative, resilience in relation to conflict may, more often than not, be characterized as defensive, absorptive or adaptive in the face of violence or conflict.

This might well suggest that as resilience gains popularity in the peacebuilding field, there is a case to be made for exercising caution concerning the extent to which the notion itself is politically contested. Transformative forms of resilience for peace deserve particular attention because they are more likely to induce change processes that make the shift from simply mitigating violence (negative peace) to addressing underlying causes and structural aspects of conflict (positive peace). Without detracting from the shorter term importance of mitigating the effects of violent conflict, transformative resilience nonetheless occupies a special place in conflict transformation and conflict prevention programming

Country Example

The context-specific resilience assessments undertaken through the FAR programme in the three pilot countries uncovered distinct expressions of resilient 'social organization' and 'resistance' that challenged the boundaries of the more 'traditional' categories of resilience. The examples below illustrate the fluid boundaries and potential shift in the categorization of resilience from narrow and defensive self-reliance (akin to absorption and adaptation) to a protest against corruption, community-based initiative, and even demonstrations of resistance (implying varying degrees of transformation).

The **Liberian case** showed that women organized defensively to cope with the impact of Ebola, whether through collective savings, community farms, migration or illicit cross-border trade. Over time, however, some of these strategies such as the Susu clubs, informal savings partnerships which began as a means of collective survival, evolved into sustainable local women's organizations for joint problem-solving, dialogue and durable organizations for trade, leveraging of savings and credit, and collaborative production capacities. These organizations came to be seen as vital to social cohesion in a time of crisis, including across the agricultural and social sectors. Even more significant was the way in which these forms of action and organization came to empower women in ways that challenged entrenched gender stereotypes of women as mothers and wives, initiating potentially fundamental important transformations to the social order.

In **Timor-Leste**, the fluidity of resilience was illustrated by the role and perception of traditional (legal) authorities. Whereas these were unanimously considered central to the resilience of Timor-Leste because of the cultural traction they were believed to have within communities, Timorese also recognized the extent to which these structures could be inaccessible and exclusionary. Women and victims of sexual violence and gender-based crimes, as well as young people, constitute some of the main groups that are routinely marginalized by customary structures. Moreover, systems of customary justice have become increasingly contested and flexible when confronted with urban settings and the challenges of 'modernization'. Ordinary Timorese recognized the value of these traditional platforms for resolving disputes, but were quite articulate about the need to adapt and combine the traditional and the modern state legal systems to produce a more contextually appropriate response to crimes or to resolve disputes. Far from treating these systems as resilient because they were inflexible or rigid, they were actually embraced as flexible and adaptable and in need of being integrated rather than insulated from each other.

In **Guatemala**, rather than reflecting the classical boundaries of these categories of resilience, the research and consultations gave rise to a more diverse and fine-grained spectrum of resilient responses, actions and capacities. These included the identification of social organization and resistance as expressions of resilience, particularly through protest against a corrupt government. Furthermore, whilst these responses might have begun as reactive and defiant, they not only became transformative in driving seismic political change in the course of the 2015 anti-corruption campaign but were even more significant in that they did this through peaceful action in a society with an expansive history of, and proclivity for, violence.

2.5.4 A MULTI-LEVEL SYSTEMS APPROACH TO RESILIENCE FOR PEACE

Resilience itself is a multi-faceted phenomenon that manifests at diverse levels in society: at the individual level, at the level of the family, within communities, within institutions, within and across identity-based groups in society, and at the state level, or society-wide and national political level as well. There is an added layer of complexity in that each of these levels exist as a system wherein the relationships between the different levels are equally, if not more, important than the individual levels themselves. A systems approach to resilience for peace is therefore not merely a set of attributes, qualities, actions or capacities detectable at each of these different levels of society, but rather, resilience for peace is significantly shaped by the connectors and the relationships between its presence at these various levels – as part of a wider (ecological) system.

This multi-level systems approach to resilience is not unique to peacebuilding and features prominently in resilience frameworks developed across various fields, including development, disaster recovery, climate change adaptation and humanitarian crisis intervention (see also CDA GPPAC 2015; Lederach 1997). As such, the systems approach offers an additional mechanism for integrating policy and programming through the resilience lens. Bringing in systems thinking to the assessment of resilience for peace, although necessary, does indeed render the endeavour more complex. Understanding the interaction between these levels at which resilience manifests, and the relationships between them, benefits from deeper engagement with systems theories that offer more holistic, cross disciplinary, and integrated attention to processes of social change. Tools and perspectives that can access and penetrate at these different levels in society, and tease out the complex and frequently unpredictable relationships among them, must be identified and included in the assessment processes.

From the perspective of resilience for peace, the relationship among these different levels is of particular importance to the logic or trajectory of conflict or peace, but this is neither automatic nor mono-directional. There are dangers in assuming that national-level processes or structures inherently address all the relational dimensions of societal reconstruction after conflict, or that they can adequately anticipate new patterns of exclusion or evolving forms of conflict. For example, this is a challenge that has arguably been encountered and needs to be creatively addressed in the implementation of the New Deal's fragility assessments. In particular, assumptions that national-level processes automatically 'trickle down' to the local level, or percolate to the 'rank and file', can be very problematic - not least because of the potential that these very national-level processes can be severely tested or even undone by the emergence or reemergence of violent conflict at the local level. The reverse is also true: excellent efforts to build peace locally, may be undermined by failed endeavors and leadership at a broader societal level. Understanding the dynamic relationship among different levels and layers in society – and in particular the 'connective tissue' and intermediary agents that span these different levels – is critical for engaging with the systemic nature of conflict itself.

An important dynamic that defines and permeates the relationships among the community and/or household level and the broader state and/or society level, as observed in all three of the FAR case studies, is the residual power and traction of customary, traditional, informal, and hybrid systems, relationships and institutions, in the face of modern state formation and development. Given the centrality of this dynamic to peacebuilding, an assessment of resilience for peace should be capable of navigating how resilience capacities interact with such dynamics. Unfortunately, much of the analysis and work on resilience and resilient systems has focused on the individual, household or community-level,

and has consequently been primarily associated with highly localized approaches which may suffer from their disconnectedness to wider national political processes.

Local-level initiatives are often confronted with the challenge of replicating, broadening or enhancing the localized experience, or the reciprocal danger that positive local-level manifestations of resilience might in fact be undermined by national or wider processes to which they are unpredictably connected. Perhaps even more striking is the danger that highly culturally-specific or ‘exotic’ traditional processes are easily romanticized or mythologized as having some inherent resilience attributes, values or components, without these being assessed themselves for their efficacy, inclusivity or durability. By the same token, these processes are potentially undermined by the alternative tendency to unhelpfully ‘demonize’ them as inherently incapable of complying with prevailing norms, such as in gender or human rights terms. Yet this fails to acknowledge the extent to which these traditional practices and institutions may nonetheless meaningfully connect to, and have traction in, local cultures and transformational idioms. They may even be seen to hold the key to social cohesion and conflict prevention in some communities and societies.



Understanding and assessing resilience in relation to peace and conflict through a systems approach, which recognizes the diverse and complex ways in which social systems adapt and respond to shocks and stress, offers a creative space for multi-level engagements as well as multiple points of entry in operational programming. It also demands sensitivity to the changing and evolving temporal frame of what might be possible and effective in different contexts, in the wake of different conflicts, and at different moments in conflict cycles and the processes of peacebuilding. It is an approach which acknowledges and is enriched by the fact that these opportunities change over time in any given country context, depending on a range of factors, including the proximity to the conflict, the nature of the political process or transition, the character and changing meanings of violence, and the mutating challenges of conflict and fragility.

This approach to complex, diversified, multi-level engagements, is not simply equivalent to the tradition of multiple track’ peacebuilding, each with its own parallel targets, constituencies and differentially measured outcomes, nor ought it simply to be treated as equivalent to the geographical definition of ‘the local’ or of ‘communities’, or of the different levels in a society. Instead, this systems approach to resilience for peace acknowledges the particular importance of the factors that cross or connect the different levels of a society – the ‘connective tissue’ at the heart of endogenous forms of resilience. Of particular importance here may be resilience manifested at the institutional ‘level’ where these social and state institutions frequently cross other levels in society. This also applies to particular social sectors and constituencies, such as women, youth, victims, displaced people, former combatants or veterans, all of which exist in and cross or stand above the different levels of society, and which offer highly specific experiences and perspectives on what resilience for peace might mean and look like in practice.

Our mixed-methods research may inadvertently reinforce this highly localized tendency in the field of resilience if we are not attentive. Although focus groups and surveys are aggregated to create national pictures, they still seek information at the local and individual level. The way in which these data are disaggregated is therefore crucial to the ability to see resilience for peace from the perspective of particular societal groups and sectors, whether based on age, gender, ethnic identity, economic status, etc. And, indeed, resilient responses, actions and capacities inevitably manifest uniquely when viewed through these prisms. Furthermore, considerably more work needs to be done on how resilience manifests itself through and within the practice and cultures of institutions, both inside and outside the state.

The attention to institutional and institutionalized manifestations of resilience, as well as the distinctive perspective on resilience offered by particular societal constituencies, are noteworthy considerations in elevating the resilience for peace discourse from one that is highly localized to one that engages the more national and international policy levels. This focus on institutional capacities and manifestations of resilience, as well as the disaggregation of societies and communities by reference to key social constituencies and stakeholders, can also be observed across different areas of practice, such as development and humanitarian action. It is therefore critical to the coherent connection and integration of resilience in relation to conflict and peace into a broader discourse with these other dimensions of resilience, or resilience in relation to other risks, stressors or shocks.

Finally, a systems-based approach to resilience for peacebuilding, also demands that the complex nature of peace and conflict cycles and systems are themselves fully understood and analyzed. The chronic stressors associated with conflict escalation and the associated risks of violence, need to be fully understood in context. Conflict and the potential of violence are simultaneously:


- **A risk or hazard:** the probability of negative events and their negative consequences;
- **A part of the context of any conflict-affected society,** addressing the legacies of violence, mistrust and dislocation; and
- **A system in itself,** with cyclical patterns and evolving forms, manifest in the relationships among the different levels of a society or community, the potential for transmission of conflict among these levels, and the set of triggers, drivers and connectors that will impact and shape this.

2.5.5 POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE MANIFESTATIONS OF RESILIENCE

It is all too easy to assume that the endogenous manifestations of resilience are necessarily benevolent in communities and within conflict-affected societies. Yet it is clear that, except as a subjective experience, resilience, like social cohesion, is a neutral concept and not ‘inherently good’ in the ways it manifests. This presents important challenges and opportunities for how peacebuilders relate to the notion and organizing principle of resilience. Patterns of marginalization and exclusion often produce highly socially cohesive and resilient responses that may nonetheless be sinister rather than socially desirable. Youth and criminal gangs are one such powerful illustration of the highly resilient and creative forging of alternative places of belonging in response to marginalization and exclusion.

Highly resourceful but ‘negatively resilient’ systems of patronage and corruption constitute another example in which the resilience strategy becomes entrenched in new state structures and institutions and thereby becomes embedded in relationships to – and within – the state. Highly resilient, powerful, and cohesive conflict-based or illicit sub-economies, or defensively organized ethnic or religious groups, may all present challenges to positive relationship-building and may even creatively reorganize around violence as their organizational and economic cement. The negative manifestations of resilience, like the positive attributes, need to be understood and assessed in their full complexity: these too may not just play themselves out as short-term coping mechanisms in the face of adversity, but can be more actively adaptive or even transformational in character and effect, and capable of developing a trajectory and momentum for change of their own. Although these reflections on the potentially negative manifestations of resilience have been generated in the context of an assessment and research process specific to the peacebuilding field, these observations and the anticipation of these consequences are arguably of significant importance in both the conceptual and strategic thinking of the resilience field more generally.

So, resilience may manifest in both positive and negative forms: in either virtuous or vicious cycles depending on the specific conditions under which peace and conflict factors contribute to positive/negative resilience respectively. On the one hand, resilience capacities may serve or enable peaceful processes which mitigate or prevent violence and bolster the capacity of societies and communities to resist the resort to violence; whilst on the other hand, resilience may foster forms of organisation that promote, exacerbate and may even rely on violence or undermine peace. In addition, it should be noted that the boundaries between these vicious and virtuous cycles are neither immutable nor definitive. Thus, it is important to come to terms with the complex and sometimes porous boundaries between these different manifestations of resilience and the implicit dangers of a possible slide from positive to negative manifestations of resilience, as well as the rich, constructive potential of the reverse processes. This also implies a need for caution in assuming that either the virtuous or vicious cycles are quite as pre-determined as may be suggested in the diagram. It is not automatic that peace factors necessarily lead to positive resilience or that conflict factors inherently produce negative



manifestations resilience; these are more fluid processes in any context that need to be tracked and analysed. Therefore, from a conceptual, tactical and political perspective, it is essential to recognize, anticipate and seek to understand all these forms and manifestations of resilience, as well as how they relate to each other.

This has important operational and programmatic implications for a strategy and an approach based on resilience for peace. Not only can it foster strategies for supporting, enhancing or ‘boosting’ the positive manifestations of resilience, but similarly may offer up opportunities to undermine, neutralize, address or even co-opt and transform the negative manifestations of resilience. A comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of both negative and positive manifestations of resilience may be of strategic value to efforts at conflict-sensitive programming by highlighting existing capacities and actions that need to be nurtured and those that must be excised, co-opted or altered in order to enhance resilience to conflict and for peace. Moreover, the systemic and endogenous nature of resilience as articulated in this guidance note lends itself to long-term efforts, outlining an opportunity for conflict sensitivity to shift from being only a programming imperative to becoming a sustained policy approach, serving to better integrate the fields of peacebuilding, development assistance, humanitarian response or disaster risk recovery through the common resilience approach..

Country Example: Positive and Negative Forms of Resilience

The phenomenon of highly cohesive and resilient youth groups, often bound by their illicit organizational activities, by economic or acquisitive motives, by common group or gendered identity, or by violence itself was evident in all three of the pilot countries. In **Liberia** young men, the ‘Pen-Pen boys’, often but not always former combatants who had become motorbike taxi riders, integrated or morphed into bike gangs involved in various forms of urban crime. In **Timor-Leste**, young men in the urban areas similarly formed martial arts groups - often organized and run by older men - which were frequently on the margins of illegality, but their negative roles and manifestations of resilience were also entrenched by their criminalization at the hands of the government. In **Guatemala**, the phenomenon of turf-based youth gangs, frequently integrated into the trade and transit of narcotics was often seen as being at the cutting edge of pervasive street violence, similarly consolidated by the ‘mano dura’, or hard law enforcement approach of the government authorities, in lieu of youth-based social crime prevention or violence prevention programmes.

In addition, as the research in **Timor-Leste** showed, the manifestations of resilience may also be contested and do not always operate in quite such a binary ‘positive or negative’ fashion. So, whilst traditional cultural and customary legal systems were identified as a binding source of social cohesion and resilience and as a source of non-violent conflict management (for example, the Nahe biti bot processes in Timor-Leste and the Palava Hut traditions in Liberia), such traditional systems and processes were also viewed critically. This was because of their potentially negative patterns of exclusion (for example, of women and youth) or because of the costs of many traditional rituals which may have overly taxed or effectively disempowered those who could not afford these fees for cultural or kinship practices – effectively barring them from certain rites of passage or social graduation.

‘These aspects of Timorese culture particularly disadvantage groups with less economic power such as the poorest, widows, female headed households and youth. FAR Timor-Leste Country Note, p. 34.

2.5.6 FROM THE CONTEXTUAL TO THE UNIVERSAL: ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSING AND TRACKING RESILIENT CAPACITIES FOR PEACE

One of the key challenges of the FAR Programme has been to adequately reconcile the highly context-specific findings about endogenous forms and manifestations of resilience, with a comparative, multi-country research approach. This has demanded that a balance be sought between the important ‘granularities’ of conflict-specific descriptions of resilience capacities on the one hand, and the ‘higher altitude’ or more generically recognizable manifestations which do lend themselves to comparisons across time and potentially across contexts, in the assessment of resilience, on the other.


While the manifestations of resilient capacities and responses might be highly context-specific and time-bound in any given case, they are, nonetheless, to a greater or lesser extent, still reflective of more generic and systemic consequences, and of the agency of local actors in response to their specific contexts and conflict-related hazards to which they are exposed. Figure 2 below presents six broad categories of factors – social cohesion, leadership and politics, safety and justice, information and communication, economic resources, and the legacy of the past – that are considered relevant to the analysis of peace and conflict in any given context. The categorization builds on the peace dimension framework developed by Vinck and Pham over 15 years of research on attitudes about peace. It represents a different angle or cross-section of the key societal or conflict systems, including the different forms in which resilience capacities for peace manifest through processes, structures, relationships and actions. The endogenous resilience capacities that sit at the heart of the Resilience for Peace Framework in figure 1 and which have been described in section 2.5.2 are actively influenced and shaped by these six factors.

Despite the different country and conflict contexts, it is possible to position and articulate the places, forms and manifestations of resilience in relation to six peace and conflict factors in any system within this frame of reference, without compromising the context-specificity. Even if the six peace factors do not weigh equally in importance in every conflict-affected society, the extent to which resilience contributes to peace will depend on whether resilience capacities:

- Strengthen or undermine social cohesion;
- Draw on or compromise responsive leadership, good governance and inclusive politics;
- Foster or inhibit access to economic resources and opportunities;
- Are a source of learning from or merely further entrench the legacies of past conflict;
- Are supported or undermined by societal information and communication networks; or
- Contribute to or undermine systems of law and positive perceptions of justice and safety.

Figure 2 illustrates the manner in which resilience capacities and manifestations – which inevitably differ significantly from one societal context or conflict system to another (and even from one community or family, etc., to another) – may reinforce and support the key peace factors, or may undermine peace or even contribute to conflict where they manifest negatively. In keeping with our broad framework on resilience for peace, the factors in figure 2 are framed positively as *peace factors*, but the six categories could also be described in opposite terms, as *drivers of conflict*. What is important, and relevant to the assessment of resilience for peace, is that practitioners recognize that these six categories are relevant and impact all the levels of the system and should be used as a guide in their analysis to ensure that they are giving sufficient attention to those factors relevant to peace and conflict.

Figure 2: Resilience and the Factors Impacting Peace/Conflict System



The granular expressions of the local context will still vary from place to place and in different parts of each system or sub-system, and will likely even change over time in their manifestations (see figure 5 below for an application to each of the three pilot countries). But it is in situating endogenous manifestations of resilience in relation to the distinct characteristics and consequences of existing risks, stressors or shocks associated with a conflict continuum in any society, that a common foundation for meaningful comparison between conflict-affected societies is revealed.

It is in the analysis of inter-related, multi-level manifestations of resilience within a systems approach, that the more universal or generic comparisons are possible. Furthermore, it is when this systems thinking is accompanied by an understanding of the resilience spectrum described above, as well as recognition of the potential for both positive and negative manifestations, that we discover a framework for monitoring and assessing resilience, which is both true to the local context but discernable and visible from a slightly higher altitude in more universal or comparable terms.

It is, however, important to note that what the diagram perhaps does not illustrate graphically or adequately, is the importance of those key manifestations of resilience capacities that operate as connectors across the different levels of the system and which may be present to a greater or lesser extent in any specific conflict-affected system. These may include particular forms of social capital and social cohesion, the vital functioning of networks and communications systems, the straddling potential of leadership, patterns of inclusion or exclusion, heterogeneity across the system, the intermediary role of civil society organization, etc. It has already been noted that in the context of conflict-affected social systems, this ‘connective tissue’ or the resilience factors that straddle and connect the different levels are of

particular potential importance. They may vary in form and impact from one society to another, but are important aspects, nonetheless, of a framework for assessing resilience for peace in any given country context.

3 PROCESS GUIDANCE

Following the introduction of the Resilience for Peace Framework, this section seeks to guide practitioners on the process of operationalizing the framework and carrying out an assessment of resilience for peace within specific contexts.

3.1 PROCESS MATTERS

The strategic and conceptual assertions about resilience for peace discussed in Chapter 2 of this Guidance Note articulate the ‘what’ of a resilience assessment. Once there is an understanding of Resilience for Peace, practitioners will be most concerned with the ‘how’ of the assessment process. This chapter is not framed as a set of instructions but instead provides a more general and principled overview of the key steps and best practices that can contribute to a participatory, inclusive and locally owned assessment process. The pilot nature of the FAR programme means that the relationship between the guidance and the case studies is iterative, such that the guidance draws largely from and reflects on the experiences documented in detail in the country notes and resilience survey reports of the three pilot countries. The substantive content and country-level analysis contained in those documents are not reproduced here, but can be accessed online and can serve as inspiration to practitioners looking to design assessment processes in their own context.

The FAR project has been based on a particular methodology, one that draws inspiration from Interpeace’s own experience with peacebuilding in the last twenty years and the principles of Participatory Action Research (see for example Krumer-Nevo 2009; McIntyre 2007; Baum et al. 2006). Whilst this is not entirely unique to Interpeace or the peacebuilding field, it was seen to serve the ultimate objective of the FAR project, and indeed Interpeace’s overarching mission to facilitate locally owned, inclusive and participatory peacebuilding processes in societies affected by conflict.

Moreover, the endogenous nature of resilience for peace requires an approach which recognizes and prioritizes the importance of local ownership, leadership and innovation. The process and approach through which the FAR programme sought to understand the meanings and manifestations of resilience in relation to conflict and for peace in three very different country contexts, thus strongly emphasized these issues.

The FAR programme sought to access the subjective perspectives in defining and understanding resilience for peace. This was achieved by means of mixed methods: qualitative research and extensive consultations through focus group discussions at the local level in all three countries; key stakeholder interviews; the design and implementation of national surveys in two of the three countries, based on randomized sampling (this was seen not only as adding quantitative methods to qualitative one but as extending the forms of participation and ownership, as well as helping to triangulate, challenge and check our results); validation and feedback of findings; and the involvement of a multi-stakeholder working group in months-long participatory action research processes in all three countries.

The point about this methodological approach was not just about its scientific rigor (important as that was) – but about the importance of inclusive, participatory, locally owned, driven and lead processes of defining and uncovering the dimensions of resilience for peace that were specific to each country context. In so doing, this approach also sought to define some of the process requirements necessary for locally owned and driven articulation of the assessment criteria for resilience in relation to conflict and peace factors.

As a complement to fragility assessments, for example, under the rubric of the New Deal or the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS), that are sometimes criticized for being inadequately participatory or consultative, and as an innovation within the wider resilience field, this approach has been an important dimension through which the FAR Programme has contributed to strengthening the role and hand of local stakeholders and an inclusive local process. It has also provided an innovative approach which has a strategic value and relevance for the resilience field as a whole.

The importance of this in assessing resilience is not just as a matter of principle and strategy, but it is invaluable for the analysis itself, which in turn underpins the pragmatic design of operational programming, endeavors to support resilience for peacebuilding, and as a matter of policy. It is also indicative of the fact that it is vital to assess the resilience of particular societies and communities for peace, by comparison with themselves, rather than against externally imposed standards or criteria that are not specific enough to any given conflict context.


In order to conduct the assessment to its full potential, and to maximize the prospects for the assessment to contribute to positive change, consideration of the following operational principles is important. These process-based principles are key if we are to effectively access the embedded endogenous expressions of resilience. They are helpful in understanding the diverse and fluid nature of resilience responses and capacities in relation to peace and conflict. They are invaluable in identifying and grasping both the positive and negative manifestations of resilience, as well as for detecting resilience within the ‘connective tissue’ of a complex, multi-layered social system. Finally, these operational principles are indispensable to grasping the convening power and potential of the resilience lens. These operational principles are therefore important to the practical application of the resilience for peace framework:

- **Participation:** Participation means more than simply consulting people; it means engaging them in a sustained manner and creating conditions that enable them to speak freely, reflectively, and without fear. In order to be meaningful, participation must be more than a one-off but should rather be seen as an ongoing exchange between participants and researchers. It is ultimately the extent to which participants trust and take ownership of a process that determines whether its outcomes are likely to be sustained.
- **Inclusivity:** Societies are heterogeneous, and post-conflict and fragile settings in particular, are often polarized. Moreover, some groups such as minorities, women and those living in remote areas are often marginalized. It is important that the resilience assessment engages as diverse as possible a range of groups as it helps to build bridges of understanding. Furthermore, heterogeneity is widely recognized as important to resilience, and this is indispensable to ‘discovering’ convening aspects of a resilience assessment in practice. Design of research methods (including timeframe and budget) needs to include, therefore, strategies that ensure inclusivity.
- **Action-Oriented:** Ideally, an assessment of this nature would lead to action in the form of interventions and policies aimed at strengthening resilience for peace. Participants in the consultation are likely to have expectations about the follow-up, and early consideration of ‘what’s next?’ will help to manage these. Whereas the assessment

itself can be designed as a short- to medium-term endeavor, the action that follows is likely to require a long-term commitment. To the extent that the assessment relies heavily on dialogue, it is important not to present dialogue for its own sake, or this may feed into frustrations associated with ‘dialogue fatigue’, which does not produce concrete results. This is not to say that the action needs to be defined at the beginning of the assessment, but rather, is defined as a result of an inclusive and participatory process. This ‘action-orientation’ is integral to the sense of ‘agency’ of the actors and participants themselves, which has itself been identified as an important dimension of resilience in relation to peace and conflict.

- **Methodological Rigor:** Our experience has shown that the qualitative and quantitative research that becomes the basis for the assessment is significantly strengthened by methodological rigor. It is crucial that researchers document narratives and data provided by participants in a systematic and transparent manner. Ethical research practices must be observed, such as gaining informed consent, seeking permission of guardians before interviewing minors and obtaining the necessary authorizations to enter communities. Biases and assumptions should be disclosed, and desk-based research such as context analyses and actor mapping should be fully referenced. Methodological rigor gives the resilience assessment the credibility it needs and ensures an important objectivity that can help to cut across political divides.
- **Local ownership:** When people are able to hear and see themselves in the process and its outcomes, they are more likely to accept and take ownership of the assessment. When ownership is integrated from the very outset, this paves the way for the sustainability of peacebuilding efforts. Local ownership at the national, sub-national and community levels is generally found where opportunities for real engagement, responding to the interests of those participating is intentional and evident at all stages of the process. If there is evidence of exclusion, or of limiting the voices of any that are consulted, it is likely the ownership has been compromised. This may negatively impact the potential convening power of the resilience assessment process, can inhibit the articulation of endogenous resilience capacities, and may impede the ability to translate local and community level resilience coherently across both horizontal and vertical relationships within the social system.
- **Legitimacy:** The assessment will be seen as legitimate if it is seen to be methodologically rigorous, locally owned and led, and representative of all sectors of society. Despite best intentions, however, there may be spoilers who intentionally seek to undermine the legitimacy of the resilience for peace assessment. It is important, therefore, to have ongoing monitoring of the different stakeholders’ perspectives vis-à-vis the endeavor, combined with proactive efforts to engage and keep informed all those with influence on the political context. Assessing resilience for peace is fundamentally a political process.
- **Flexibility:** In some stages of the assessment, there is likely to be some tension between the imperative for action, participation and inclusion on the one hand, and the demands of methodological rigor on the other. It is important to allow some margin of discernment and adaptability so that this tension can become a creative element of the process rather than a handicap. Moreover, contextual circumstances may change, at times quite rapidly, and it is important that the process is flexible enough to respond to changing dynamics. Finally, it is worth noting that while the flexibility with regard to the assessment itself is key, it is in the operationalization and follow-up – where action is most effective when guided by the process – that this principle requires the most attention.

Figure 3: Principles of the Resilience for Peace Assessment



3.2 CARRYING OUT THE ASSESSMENT: KEY STEPS

The mixed-methods design that was developed over the course of the FAR programme can be summarized in five steps:

1. Contextualization
2. Consultation
3. Analysis and documentation of consultation findings
4. Validation of results
5. Development of strategies to strengthen resilience for peace

Figure 3 above and the table below provide a general outline of the assessment steps. Figure 3 illustrates the sequencing of the key phases of the assessment whilst also drawing attention to the relationship between the Resilience for Peace framework presented in section 2.5 and the assessment process. Because this is a guidance which values a context-specific approach, practitioners looking to undertake this assessment are encouraged to embrace the symbiotic relationship between the process and the conceptual guidance such that both are used iteratively. The table below summarizes the objectives and outputs of each of the five steps. The remainder of this chapter provides guidance on each of these, noting that they are not necessarily sequential, may sometimes happen in parallel or overlap, and sometimes lead to revisiting previous steps.

Table 1: Summary of the Five Steps of the Resilience for Peace Assessment

STEPS				
<i>Step 1</i>	<i>Step 2</i>	<i>Step 3</i>	<i>Step 4</i>	<i>Step 5</i>
Contextualization	Consultation through mixed methods	Analysis and documentation of consultation findings	Validation of findings	Development of strategies to strengthen resilience for peace
KEY ACTORS				
Specialists and country experts	Focus groups, key informants, survey respondents	Research team, partners, working group, second wave focus groups, key informants	Working group, representative key stakeholders	Working group, partners
OBJECTIVES				
To arrive at a context-specific interpretation of resilience that can be used as a basis for designing the consultation phase and integrated into its implementation	Generate knowledge on the resilience capacities that exist at different levels of social organization – individual, household, community, society, state	Provide a systematic analysis of endogenous resilience that exists in the context. Document these findings and analysis in a form that can serve as the basis for dialogue with a variety of national stakeholders	Share the findings of the consultation, and the analysis to have emerged with persons who were consulted, as well as other relevant national stakeholders, with a view to seek their validation and ensure ownership of the findings	Translate the assessment findings into concrete actions for strengthening resilience for peace
OUTPUTS				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general context analysis, which includes the identification of key conflict drivers • A working definition of resilience • Actor mapping and stakeholder analysis • Identification of risks and opportunities of conducting the resilience assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation design or research protocol, • Implementation of the consultation and information gathering • Mobilization of individuals, organizations and networks that can be engaged in subsequent phases of the assessment process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analytical framework that draws on the resilience for peace schema (see section 2.5), and is adapted to the context • Accessible documentation for disseminating the context-specific resilience for peace framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination of findings with a view to obtaining feedback and validation from a broad range of stakeholders • Definition of a plan of action for developing strategies to strengthen resilience for peace 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a process for the development of strategies and proposals for strengthening resilience for peace • Concrete policy recommendations and programmatic actions to strengthen resilience for peace • Engagement of key stakeholders on issues related to strengthening resilience for peace

3.2.1 STEP 1: CONTEXTUALIZATION

The contextualization step seeks to arrive at a context-specific interpretation of resilience which will be used as a basis for designing and implementing the consultation phase. The key outcomes are

- 1 a general context analysis including the identification of key conflict drivers based on primary and secondary literature review, and interviews,
- 2 a working definition of resilience, adapted to the context,
- 3 an actor-mapping and stakeholder analysis that identifies the different constituents in the context and key people who need to be engaged in the consultation phase, as well as the relationship between the different constituents, and
- 4 an identification of the risks and opportunities associated with conducting the resilience assessment and clarity on the ways in which it will remain adaptable to the context.



Ideally, the resilience assessment should be led by a local organization or a group of local researchers, whose research rigor and non-partisan standing are indispensable to the impartiality of the assessment process. The group or entity leading the assessment must have sufficient non-partisan credibility in the eyes of diverse stakeholders in order to lead the process effectively. Moreover, they should have a detailed and expert knowledge of the context, and optimally should have previous experience operating at or integrating across and between the different levels of society. In the case of the FAR project, the assessment was led, in all three countries, by local researchers who had several years of experience implementing peacebuilding programmes. They were all respected in their fields of endeavor and had previously conducted in-depth conflict analyses in their countries. This proved to be an important asset in the contextualization phase as the teams had easy access to literature and first-hand knowledge of the context. That said, intuitive first-hand experience should not be a substitute for a robust research agenda and methodology, as well as the systematic documentation of the most pertinent and relevant social, political and economic dynamics in the context.

Context Analysis and Definition of Resilience

The principal function of the context analysis is to arrive at a rigorous definition of resilience, which has integrity and is true to the main issues and dynamics in the country. The definition of resilience should take into account both the potential triggers of violence and long-term drivers of structural conflict. Section 2.5 of this guidance note provides the framework of resilience for peace at a strategic and conceptual level. This is the first point of departure for defining resilience, but this conceptual definition must then be adapted to resonate with local populations and respond to the specific risks and manifestations of violence and violent conflict in the context (see for example Conflict Sensitivity Consortium 2012).

The context analysis helps to set the parameters of the conflict assessment and answers the ‘resilience to what?’ question. There is no blueprint or formula for context analysis, but in general terms this should include a historical perspective on conflict and violence, an understanding of the transition or political evolution of the society in the wake of or in

the midst of conflict, continuity and change in patterns of conflict, and the prevailing social, political and economic trends as well as their implications for peace and conflict. The six categories of factors impacting the peace and conflict dynamics in a given context and outlined in section 2.5.6 – (1) social cohesion, (2) leadership, good governance and inclusive politics, (3) access to economic resources and opportunities, (4) legacies of the past, (5) societal information and communication networks, (6) systems of law, and perceptions of justice and safety – can also be used as a basis for organizing the context analysis to ensure that it allows for the definition of the nature of the conflict risk/stressor. Additional factors to take into consideration when conducting the context analysis and developing a context-specific definition of resilience are the proximity to the past conflict, the manifestations and risk of existing conflict, the nature and character of the state and state/society relationship, as well as the particular political processes and cultures in each country. Moreover, resilience should be explored and ultimately defined in a language and vocabulary that can be easily understood by all who will be consulted. This contextual analysis can be more broadly applied to streamline resilience for peace focused analysis across sectors and instruments (e.g. humanitarian and development assessments).

Context-Specific Resilience

The three contexts in which FAR operated led to three distinct approaches to resilience following the respective context analyses and identification of the key conflict risks and stressors.




In **Timor-Leste**, resilience was defined in terms of social cohesion as the assets (or the 'glue') that hold the society together and make it able to deal with past conflict and confront future conflict in an adaptive and transformative way. This definition draws on the contextual analysis which identified the task of building an effective and legitimate state (at the end of the Indonesian occupation and independence in 1999) as the overarching dynamic likely to put a strain on peace. Moreover, as the common enemy disappeared, fractures within Timorese society have become more prominent, highlighting a particular need to foster horizontal social cohesion between different groups.

In **Guatemala**, the context analysis uncovered three principle drivers of conflict – disputes over natural resources and mega projects in which local communities and the private sector frequently confront each other, the high rates of violence and insecurity linked to narco-traffic and other forms of criminal activities, and the fragility of public institutions which delegitimizes the state and undermines a civic conscience. This context of manifest violence underpinned by long-standing structural conflicts oriented the research team towards a more comprehensive definition of resilience, understood as the capacities and conditions that enable individuals and communities to respond to both the manifestations and root causes of conflict.

Liberia is a country emerging from a protracted civil war. Although it has successfully prevented relapse into large-scale violence for the last twelve years, the root causes of conflict remain, and the state is still unable to provide basic services such as health care to its citizens. This lack of services was directly responsible for the severity of the Ebola epidemic in 2014. Against this backdrop, resilience has been defined as 'the capacity, including abilities, relationships and assets developed by individuals, communities, institutions and systems to recover and adapt to the consequences and risks of conflict and disaster (Ebola) in order to strengthen better relationships for sustainable peace and security.'

Laying the Foundation of a Systems Approach through Actor Mapping

In all three countries, a list of key constituent groups was drawn and juxtaposed against geographical representation to ensure an inclusive qualitative consultation process. Moreover, in those countries where the national surveys were undertaken, a random sampling method for the survey complemented the deliberate efforts at representativeness in order to make consultation even more inclusive. Building on their knowledge and research of the relationship among stakeholders, the research teams also identified those groups with whom engagement could be sensitive or whose relationship with other groups compromised joint consultation. Sector-specific focus groups or key informant interviews were arranged to consult these groups or individuals for whom free expression would have been compromised in large, heterogeneous groups.



Assessment Risks and Opportunities


A fourth aspect of the contextualization is the analysis of potential risks and opportunities that such an assessment entails. This can be conceived as an extension of the actor-mapping and stakeholder analysis wherein researchers deepen their engagement with the social and political dynamics and situate the assessment process within the 'system' where it will be conducted. This is key to ensuring that the long-term vision in which the assessment is situated – building peace – is protected through the monitoring of the different stakeholders' perspectives vis-à-vis the project and proactive efforts to engage with influence on the political context, noting also the likelihood that some dimensions of the assessment will be contested.

In the case of FAR, the assessment was being conducted by local peacebuilding organizations with a clearly defined mandate to contribute to peacebuilding efforts within their respective country contexts. The resilience assessments were part of their broader peacebuilding objective, hence framing these as part of ‘resilience for peace’ initiatives. It is our observation that such a framing contributed to the positive responses to the assessment in the three pilot countries,

Noting that it is helpful and desirable to have a broad objective at the outset of the assessment, it is also true that the very essence of participatory action research is that participants are the owners of the knowledge generated, and it is for them to decide how the findings are to be utilized. Moreover, the articulation of objectives and intended uses of the assessment should be sensitive to the shifting political context. Researchers may therefore need to adapt the specific objectives of the assessment as the process and/or political context evolves. This presents its own potential risks and creative opportunities. An analysis of risks and opportunities of conducting a resilience assessment can also inform the appropriate timing for the consultation.

3.2.2 STEP 2: CONSULTATION THROUGH MIXED METHODS

The contextualization phase provides the necessary information to design and implement the consultation phase. At this stage, the goal is to identify and unpack the endogenous resilience capacities that exist at different levels of social organization – individual, household, community, society, state. Specifically, the expected outcomes of this phase include (1) the consultation design, including specific instruments such as a facilitation guide for focus group discussions and interview and survey questions; (2) the implementation of the consultation and information gathering using instruments for data collection and knowledge-capturing; and (3) the mobilization of individuals, organizations and networks who can be engaged in subsequent phases of the assessment process.



Consultation Design

A legitimate assessment should be an inclusive and participatory process which balances the imperatives of methodological rigor with sensitivity to the context. The consultation phase is foundational to ensuring inclusivity and participation, so defining a clear and transparent process is key. The following need to be considered in the design of the consultation:

- *Consultation methods:* In FAR, we used a combination of surveys, focus group discussions (FGD) and interviews for the consultation
- *Selection of participants to consult:* This should be guided by the actor mapping and stakeholder analysis undertaken in the contextualization phase
- *Instruments for consultation,* such as FGD and interview facilitation guide and survey questionnaire
- *Logistical plan,* including timeframe, geographical reach, budget, and human resources

The use of mixed methods, as was the case in FAR, contributes to a process that is participatory and inclusive, as well as rigorous. Whereas focus group discussions and interviews may help engage people in a more interactive manner, surveys broaden participation through the methodology of randomized sampling, rendering the process more inclusive. Moreover, the ability to ensure consultations that are broad based and inclusive as well as meaningfully participatory and deep is precisely what operationalises the multi-level systems approach. It is important to engage with all levels of social organisation and the full array of relevant stakeholders, but it is equally key to ensure the consultations are sufficiently deep to uncover the linkages between the manifestations of resilience at different levels. Moreover, as described in section 2.5.2, endogenous resilience capacities may not always be explicit and may therefore necessitate a process of self-discovery by those consulted.

The purpose of this guidance is not to replace a standard research methods guide, but to provide an overview of options. The methods include:

Qualitative consultations through focus group discussions (FGDs) and interviews which seek to facilitate open-ended and interactive discussion and give participants the space to steer the conversation to reflect a reality which is most relevant to them. Insights are generated through the exchanges between participants and often take the form of anecdotes, stories and statements. In addition to what is said, the dynamics and interactions between participants can reveal important information. In all three countries, FAR used both heterogeneous and homogenous FGDs. Heterogeneous FGDs include representatives from different sectors of society, whereas homogenous FGDs are constituent or sector specific. The latter are used for groups that are difficult to reach or those who are unable or unwilling to speak in large multi-sectoral groups.

Interviews are conducted with key individuals, such as high-level government officials, civil society leaders, or influential scholars, practitioners and activists. Moreover, researchers may choose to conduct interviews with individuals who stand out in a focus group discussion, either because they expressed a strongly dissenting voice, were especially shy, or appeared very knowledgeable or influential about specific subjects of relevance. Having a clear facilitation guide as well as experienced facilitators with the necessary facilitation skills is key for both FGDs and Interviews.

The value of the qualitative consultations is that they allow researchers and participants to uncover the endogenous resilience capacities at the different levels – individual, community, institutional, state, society – as well as to reflect on the interactions among different resilience capacities. Moreover, the discussions with stakeholders constitute a platform for reflection on the impact of resilience capacities on conflict drivers and peace factors. As discussed in section 2.5.5., resilience is not inherently benevolent, and understanding the conditions that lead to either virtuous cycles of peace or vicious cycle of conflict is a key goal of the resilience for peace assessment. Given, that the relationship between resilience and peace is neither straightforward nor uncontested, the participatory nature of FGDs and interviews is particularly fitting as it lends itself to the nuanced analysis desired in this instance. This approach can also serve the valuable purpose of documenting the unique understandings of resilience in relation to peace and conflict from the perspective of specific social constituencies such as women or youth. These groups are generally identified in the actor-mapping exercise during the contextualization phase.

Surveys are based on a standardized questionnaire administered to a random sample of respondents; they generate aspects of people's perceptions and opinions in a given context. Whereas the discussions in FGDs and interviews can explain certain phenomena, surveys can reveal information about the extent of these. In the case of Guatemala, for

example, FGDs revealed that people resort to passive acceptance and silence as a way of coping with high levels of criminality because they fear reprisals and do not trust the police and judicial system. The national survey revealed the extent of this 'passive acceptance' by revealing that out of almost 4,000 respondents asked what they do when they feel unsafe, 56% said that they do not go out, compared with only 8% who said that they called the police.

Importantly, the random sampling allows for broad consultations that contribute to ensuring that the assessment is truly made at all levels of the system. Moreover, the use of a standardized questionnaire can help with the classification of resilience capacities in terms of actions, relationships, structures and processes as described in section 2.5.2. Some of these categories of resilience capacities may not come out organically through FGDs and interviews. The same can be said of the distinction between absorptive, adaptive and transformative resilience capacities (see section 2.5.3 of the resilience framework). Precisely because of the fluidity of the resilience spectrum, qualitative consultations are likely to cause problems with – and rightly so – the categorization of endogenous resilience along these boundaries, and so the survey questionnaires provide a complementary tool for identifying which resilience capacities are transformative, as opposed to adaptive and absorptive.

The use of both structured survey questionnaires and more open focus group discussions and interviews helps to strike a balance between capturing the complexity of the multi-level and systemic nature of endogenous resilience and the need for a systematic assessment that can be replicated over time.

In mixed methods, qualitative and quantitative research components can be combined in multiple ways, including sequential and parallel designs. There is not one single or best approach but a variety of options, each with its own value and pitfalls.

Table 2: Options for Sequencing between Quantitative and Qualitative Consultations

Design option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<u>Option 1:</u> Conduct the national survey after qualitative consultations (SEQUENTIAL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings from the consultation can be used as a basis for designing the survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions raised by the survey may require additional in-depth conversations with stakeholders
<u>Option 2:</u> Conduct the national survey before the consultations (SEQUENTIAL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The survey generates a lot of data that can give a very focused orientation to the qualitative consultations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative consultations may become too directed and narrow The survey will not be grounded in the views of national actors
<u>Option 3:</u> Conduct qualitative consultations before and after the national survey (SEQUENTIAL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to design a survey that is grounded in consultations Post-survey FGDs and interviews are opportunities to re-engage people Most inclusive and participatory method 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires the most resources and time
<u>Option 4:</u> Conduct the national survey and qualitative consultation simultaneously (CONVERGENT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shortens the duration of the consultation phase There is an opportunity for both processes to be aligned, and to verify findings against one another in real time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will require greater human capacity and coordination Can become very confusing if not done with sufficient diligence

Selection of Participants for the Consultation

The selection of participants for the consultation process aimed at assessing resilience for peace must be guided by the principle of inclusivity, while accounting for geographic, sectoral and constituent representation. The actor-mapping exercise informs the selection of key participants and must also examine the dynamics between different constituent groups to identify how best to engage those groups most appropriately. The stakeholder analysis will help to identify key individuals, for their influence on certain issues or sectors, as well as in relation to the risks and opportunities of conducting a resilience assessment. For example, some participants may be approached jointly in a focus group, while others must be treated separately. This also guides the method selection: not all participants may be approached through surveys, for example. However, the survey allows for many more people to be consulted in a short period of time. Whereas participants for FGDs and interviews are chosen on the basis of who they are or what institution they

represent, a randomly sampled survey captures the views of the layperson. Moreover, a survey is able to reach people in more remote areas depending on how the sampling is approached.

Country Examples: Qualitative Methods

For FAR, the mixed-methods approach selected for the assessment included a sequential design combining focus groups and nationwide surveys. In both cases the surveys were population based among a random sample representative of the adult population. The consultations were as follows:

- In Guatemala: 11 interviews, 276 focus group participants, and 3712 survey interviews
- In Timor-Leste: 10 interviews, 262 focus group participants, and 2952 survey interviews
- In Liberia: 63 interviews and 1089 focus group participants

The dynamic of focus groups at times revealed as much about resilience as the responses themselves. In a focus group discussion conducted in Baucau, Timor-Leste, participants criticized the police freely although representatives of the police were also in the discussion. This reflects the fact that people are identified as community members first, and only then in relation to their job. This may partly explain a key finding of the assessment in Timor-Leste that despite the deficiencies of the police force, it is seen to contribute to resilience, particularly when they collaborate with community-based organizations to provide security.

In each country, specific groups were consulted beyond the general population:

- In Guatemala: Women's organizations, political parties, private sector, resistance groups, indigenous groups, youth groups
- In Timor-Leste: Lia Nain (traditional leaders), youth groups
- In Liberia: Youth groups, small business and traders, especially women, people with disabilities

This assessment is not intended as research, but action research, explained as follows. This action orientation can be initiated through the consultation process, which is the first point at which the researchers/ facilitators of the assessment begin to reach out to individuals and groups across regions and countries. One of the points that has been noted in the conceptual guidance and elsewhere is that resilience for peace requires synergistic state/society relationships, and furthermore that intermediary leaders, civil society organizations and others who can connect the government to communities can contribute to resilience capacities in that regard. The consultation phase can already allow for the identification of such intermediary leaders.

In fact, the consultation starts with the process of mobilizing participants, either through local focal points, or by sending invitations in person, via email, phone or mail. This may include obtaining the necessary formal and informal authorizations from relevant authorities. Researchers must therefore be ready to explain the purpose of the exercise to different types of actors.

For well-established organizations, mobilization is likely to be easy as they may have well-established networks and local focal points. Nonetheless, it is always worth investing in additional mobilization so that it is not always the ‘usual suspects’ participating in consultations. The mobilization process should make every effort to engage with both formal and informal authorities such as local leaders to minimize resistance which could inhibit participation.

Instruments for Consultation

‘Resilience’ cannot always be translated into local languages and does not necessarily resonate with participants. A clear explanation of the concept, accompanied by full disclosure of the objectives of the assessment may be a necessary introductory step. The working definition of resilience and articulation of objectives developed in the contextualization phase may be useful in that regard. It is perfectly acceptable that at the end of an FGD or interview, the initial definition has been rejected or reformulated, additional questions posed or some questions considered irrelevant, but it is important to come prepared. For qualitative consultations guiding questions and facilitation guides should be developed to stimulate the discussion (see Annexes for examples). Based on the FAR experience, the following questions – derived from the Resilience for Peace Framework explained in the conceptual and strategic guidance – can be a useful starting point for adapting context-specific instruments. The contextualization will allow for language adjustments, and that emphasis is given to the most relevant areas:


- 1) *Resilience to what?* What are the main sources of manifest and structural conflict in the context (see sections 2.5.1 and 3.2.1 for further elaboration)?
- 2) *In what forms do endogenous resilience capacities manifest?* As actions, relationships and networks, structures (norms, institutions and values) or processes (see section 2.5.2 on endogenous resilience)?
- 3) Are these resilience capacities absorptive, adaptive or transformative? (See section 2.5. 3 for a description of the resilience spectrum)?
- 4) *Whose Resilience?* At what level do the resilience capacities exist: individual, community, society, state? How do the different levels relate with one another (see section 2.5.4 on the multi-level systems approach to resilience)?
- 5) Do any of these resilience capacities have *negative consequences*? (See section 2.5.5 for a detailed explanation of the negative and positive manifestations of resilience.)

For the survey, a semi-structured instrument was preferred, combining standard introduction and questions, including close-ended and open-ended items. As with the facilitation guide for the qualitative consultations, the development of the questionnaire requires engaging with both the contextual analysis and the conceptual guidance in order to arrive at the specific questions.

The six factors of the peace/conflict system shown in figure 2 and explained in the conceptual and strategic guidance (social cohesion; leadership, governance and politics; safety and justice; information and communication; economic resources; and legacy of the past) were most useful to frame questions and areas of enquiries. Asking people *'what do you do in order to be resilient to conflict?'* or *'what do you do in order to be resilient for peace?'* may be too broad and not context specific enough to elicit a meaningful discussion. However, asking them, *'what do you do in order to be resilient in light of the high rates of crime caused by narco-traffic'* (Guatemala) or *'how do you cope with the ineffectiveness of public services'* (Liberia) will resonate better. For each country, areas of emphasis were identified during the contextualization phase.

The six factors are not exhaustive and are often interrelated, meaning that alternative formulations may be preferred. Nonetheless, they provide a basis for analyzing how endogenous resilience practically affects peace and conflict in a given context. In this regard they can be helpful to guide the discussions and develop the survey instrument. Moreover, not all factors will be equally relevant, and an assessment may deliberately choose to focus on one or several specific factors. This is the first step to constructing the consultation instruments – both qualitative and quantitative. Figure 4 illustrates the dimensions that the three research teams focused on during the qualitative consultation as a result of the contextualization phase. As this figure illustrates, each of the country case studies focused on different aspects of the six factors.

Figure 4: Factors of the Peace/Conflict System Emphasized in Each Case Study



The areas of emphasis were identified as a result of the context analysis. It is nonetheless important to note that all six factors as well as the interactions among them are important to understanding resilience of the system as a whole. For example, whereas the patriarchal social structures are emphasized as a key conflict stressor in Liberia and significantly undermine social cohesion, patriarchy also affects the distribution of economic resources and productive patterns, is tied to legacies of the past, and has consequences on perceptions of justice. The relative emphasis on particular factors does not mean that the others are not in play. Rather, it signifies that in a particular context, at a given moment in time, these are the issues seen as most pressing. Therefore, in keeping with the assessment's action orientation, it is in relation to those conflict risks that resilience capacities are in greatest need of being leveraged. In addition to ensuring its relevance to contextual priorities, it may be useful to unpack the concept of resilience into more tangible terms that people will relate to when developing a survey questionnaire or FGD facilitation guide. Drawing on the responses collected from the three case studies, the table below proposes a categorization of resilience capacities as: (1) actions; (2) relationships and networks; (3) structures - norms, institutions, and values; and (4) processes in keeping with the description of endogenous resilience described in section 2.5.2.. These can be thought of as 'the forms in which resilience manifests in practice.' As before, this list is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive and will inevitably overlap. However, the experience from FAR demonstrates that there is value in breaking down resilience into more relatable concepts.

The conceptual guidance provides a description of the systemic nature of resilience (see section 2.5.4) and why it is important to understand the different levels of social organization at which resilience capacities are available and manifest. Ensuring that there is some discussion on this is important, and it is likely that in the focus group discussions this comes out naturally. In the survey, there is a need to ensure that there are questions specific to the different levels, including individual, familial, community, institutional, state-level and society-wide resilience.

Table 3: Examples of Manifestations of Resilience

	Example of Questions	Examples of answers
Actions	What do you do?	Don't go out Move to another place
Relationships and networks	Who helps you? Who provides support? Who is responsible?	The Xefi Suco Village saving associations The police
Structures (norms, institutions, values)	What keeps you united?	Our legacy of resistance gives us fortitude Our culture infuses good conscience Religion teaches us to love each other
Processes	How is violence prevented in your community? How do you cope with economic difficulties? Why aren't things worse?	We organize neighbourhood watch as a community We are now doing backyard farming to put food on the table The women in the community come together to discuss their problems and boost morale. We take one step at a time, small small, the slow way

Importantly, there is evidence from the three case studies that not all forms of resilience lead to positive outcomes (see section 2.5.5 of the Guidance Note). Capturing this through discussion and/or the survey is crucial. The complexity and nuance of this topic means that it may be more readily captured in discussions than in a survey. In the case of FAR, because the survey took place after the qualitative consultations, we were able to ask specific questions on examples that were repeatedly evoked in the FGDs – such as lynching by vigilante groups. This may be a sensitive topic as people concerned with or engaging in practices that could be termed as ‘negative manifestations of resilience’ may be present in FGDs or be among survey respondents. It is thus important to use respectful language so that people do not feel alienated. Furthermore, people may not readily see their resilience capacities as negative such as in the case of Liberia, where women and youth migration to mining towns was cited as a resilience strategy aimed at seeking livelihood opportunities, but further discussion revealed that these migrants often ended up worse off than before as they become forced into prostitution and drug trafficking. The facilitator may therefore have to engage participants in a reflective process to imagine potential consequences of some of the resilience capacities they have identified.

Finally, people do not necessarily classify their actions or resources as being absorptive, adaptive, or transformative (see section 2.5.3 of the Guidance Note) and nor are these categories mutually exclusive. Therefore, asking questions in both the survey and qualitative consultations, which allows researchers to get the information needed to make this analysis, is key. Context-specific language can help: for example, in Liberia, people talked of coping in contrast to actions that enable them to achieve a better quality of life. The reality in practice, however, is likely to be that there will be more to say about coping or survival strategies best approximated to absorptive and adaptive resilience. Getting from this point to transformative actions is precisely the intent of the resilience assessment, and a central objective of the final phase in which strategies for strengthening resilience for peace are developed.

Logistical Plan

As is the case with any endeavour, it is necessary to factor in the financial, time-based and human resource investments that are required in order to implement the assessment.

The choice of consultation methods, the number of participants to engage, the number of researchers that can be mobilized, and the duration of the consultation will all be subject to cost considerations. The principles set out at the beginning of this section about participation, inclusivity and local ownership should be the first guiding factors in designing the consultations. This will then have to be balanced out against the resources and capacity available to carry out the process. This often means using representativeness as a means of ensuring inclusivity. Thus, it is vital to the assessment’s integrity that transparent criteria which consider both the context analysis and actor-mapping exercise are used to select participants and locations where consultations take place. Moreover, it should be noted that while the consultation is likely to be the most logistically demanding phase of the assessment, adequate resources and time must also be allocated to the other phases.

It should be acknowledged that assessments that aspire to be inclusive and participatory will require a considerable investment of both time and resources. It is expensive to travel around a country to capture the voices of people, and it takes time to have a profound discussion with them. Moreover, better results can be achieved with experienced and well-trained personnel both for the facilitation of focus group discussions and implementation of national surveys. However, this initial investment is what helps to ensure the inclusivity, ownership and legitimacy of the assessment and

subsequently renders programmes and policies that emerge from it more effective. Finding the right balance between resources and time available is thus an integral part of the assessment design.

Implementation

Once the consultation has been designed and implementation is underway, knowledge-capturing and data collection become very important. Documented findings constitute the principal output of the consultation process and will be the basis upon which analysis is undertaken.

For the survey, data collection is more straightforward as it entails recording responses to a predefined and fixed set of questions. In the case of FAR, this was done electronically using tablets on which the questionnaires had been entered. Answers were collected via a centralized server and data could be generated from there. The software used was KoBoToolbox developed by faculty at the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative. Enumerators undertaking the survey were trained in how to use the software, record the answers from the respondents and upload the responses to the server. The HHI team was responsible for training the enumerators and compiling the responses.

In the case of the qualitative consultations, the research teams developed information-recording templates organized according to questions in the facilitation guides. Information-gathering needs to be more flexible in this case, but nonetheless systematic. Knowledge-capturing and data collection are strongly connected to this phase of documentation and analysis, developed further below. The research teams undertaking the qualitative consultation always consisted of at least one facilitator and one note-taker. In addition to a facilitation guide for the FGDs, the teams developed a reporting guide so that the note-taker knew what to look out for, and to ensure that this was systematized. Sessions were generally recorded through voice recorders as well and transcribed, but transcriptions were used to verify quotations and fill gaps rather than as the principal consultation output. Examples of the reporting templates can be found in Annex 3.

In addition to knowledge-capturing with a view to informing the findings of the assessment, it is worth building in a process of reflection throughout the consultation process. Given the importance and value of a systems approach as well as the nuanced nature of the resilience spectrum and the sometimes blurred lines between positive and negative manifestations of resilience, data-gathering benefits from applying a continuously critical and reflective lens to the findings. Furthermore, as the research team progresses with the consultation and becomes more familiar with the context, they may find that the initial guiding questions need to be adapted, vocabulary changed slightly or facilitation style adjusted. This is not the case with the survey since the questionnaire needs to be standard once it is designed and used.

3.2.3 STEP 3: ANALYSIS AND DOCUMENTATION OF CONSULTATION FINDINGS

Once consultations and data collection have been completed, the findings need to be rigorously analyzed and systematically documented. The goal of this analysis phase is to produce (1) an analytical framework that draws on and adapts the resilience for peace framework (see section 2.5) to the context and (2) accessible documentation for disseminating the context-specific resilience for peace assessment.


Analytical Framework

From the consultation, and through the data collection and knowledge-capturing instruments that have been used, researchers will have a set of raw data which is generally voluminous and, whilst being a very rich source of detailed knowledge, anecdotes and statistics, cannot be disseminated in its entirety to a wide audience. Rather, the data will need to be synthesized into trends and organized along analytical categories as well as being adequately disaggregated on the basis of geography, gender, age, economic status, and other social identities in order to reflect the nuances in resilience across the society.

In order to get from the raw data to a context-specific resilience for peace assessment, researchers will need to undertake a systematic analysis of the findings from the consultation phase, and this requires an ***analytical framework***. Just as there is no one ideal option for the sequencing between qualitative and quantitative consultations, there is also no ideal process of conducting the analysis. The chosen analytical framework will depend on the context and even more specifically on the findings that emerged from the consultation. It is impossible to form an analytical framework that applies to all contexts, but based on the three case studies that were part of the pilot project of assessing resilience for peace, Interpeace and its partners have developed a Resilience for Peace Framework that has been articulated in the conceptual and strategic guidance and summarized in the resilience for peace schemas graphically represented in figures 1 and 2. It is worth noting that the framework depicted through these two figures and described in section 2.5 of the guidance note was not available to the research teams undertaking the resilience assessments. For future assessments, however, the Resilience for Peace Framework that has been developed can be used to organize the consultation findings and inform their analysis. This framework is not intended as a rigid set of prescriptions for the analysis, but can and indeed should be ‘tweaked’ and adjusted in light of the context and findings. As more assessments of resilience for peace are conducted in the future, this framework is likely to evolve.

Figure 5 below illustrates how data collected through the consultation processes can be ‘distilled’ through the Resilience for Peace Framework in order to produce a coherent and systematic assessment of resilience for peace in a given context. In addition to the primary data collected through qualitative consultations and the survey, it may be useful to refer also to secondary resources, such as quantitative data from existing surveys and indices, as well as qualitative information gathered through desk reviews. It is likely that many of these resources would have already been identified in the contextual analysis phase.

Figure 5: Analysis of Findings towards a Resilience for Peace Assessment



Documentation of the Findings for Dissemination

The resilience for peace assessment is conceived as an action-oriented exercise in which the consultation findings inform programmatic and policy strategies for supporting and strengthening endogenous resilience for peace capacities in the context where the assessment is being undertaken. The documentation of findings should seek to make this objective a priority. In practical terms, this means that the consultation findings must be accessible to stakeholders participating in the validation of findings and in the subsequent work of the multi-stakeholder national working groups on resilience (see step 4 below).

The flexible and customizable character of the framework should nonetheless be balanced by a commitment to rigorous and systematic analysis. This is important to the legitimacy of the assessment as well as to its effectiveness in programme and policy design. A point worthy of consideration regarding documentation is that although the broad dissemination of raw data can carry risks, researchers may find it valuable to ensure that these nonetheless remain available and accessible. In the subsequent phases and perhaps in future programmes, stakeholders may wish to go into greater detail about a specific issue or region that is only covered in summary form in the final documentation. The raw data can then be retrieved to find this additional information. Secondly, the raw data provide evidence of the process and can serve to demonstrate that it was indeed inclusive and conducted with methodological rigor. This is necessary for the legitimacy of the assessment.

Finally, the format and language of the resilience assessment will be guided by the analytical framework, but it is also important that it is accessible to local audiences and useful for engaging national stakeholders in a broader dialogue about resilience for peace in the country. The assessment should also be developed with consideration given to the baseline and subsequent assessment efforts to ensure its approach can be considered in the future.

Country Reports

In the case of the FAR programme, the research teams produced written reports, referred to as ‘country notes’ to document the qualitative analysis as well as separate survey reports. In addition, a synthesized document combining the findings from both processes was produced. The structure of these reports and the formats chosen were guided by two factors: the analytical frameworks used and the intended purpose of the document, i.e. as a basis for the national multi-stakeholder working group process (see step 5 below). Moreover, given the need to validate the findings through an inclusive and interactive process (see step 4 below), the teams also developed shorter documents and presentations to communicate the key findings in a format accessible to a wide audience. These shorter documents were also helpful in the engagement with various political stakeholders.

[See the References for a list of reports produced in the context of FAR.]

3.2.4 STEP 4: VALIDATION OF FINDINGS

The fourth step consists of sharing the consultation findings in their documented and ‘analysed’ form with the ‘owners of the process’, i.e. those consulted and engaged, as well as other relevant national stakeholders, whose buy-in is necessary for the steps that follow. The validation is a feedback loop in which researchers who led the data collection and analysis processes ‘transfer ownership’ of the assessment back to local and national stakeholders whose knowledge informed the consultation in the first place. This phase of the assessment has two objectives: (1) dissemination of the findings of the assessment with a view to receiving feedback and validation from a broad range of stakeholders and (2) definition of a plan of action for developing strategies to strengthen resilience for peace.

The process of analysing the findings from the consultation requires synthesis and interpretation. This is most effective when done by a small group of people, or at times one or two individuals. Given that an important principle of the assessment is local ownership, it is therefore necessary that the findings, when synthesized and analyzed, are then shared with those people who participated in the consultation, and whose ownership is already in play.

This step can be described as a ‘validation’ phase wherein the findings are presented to persons from different sectors of society so that they can give their stamp of approval and, where they disagree, highlight these points. Some groups may point out that their views which were shared during the consultation have been misrepresented or otherwise under-represented. It is also the opportunity for them to see how their own perspectives fit in with other perspectives that exist in the country.

Validation can take on different forms and happen at different moments throughout the entire assessment process. The protocols and practices in a given context will often determine how validation should be carried out in order to obtain the desired local ownership of the assessment. Moreover, ownership is never absolute, but rather a matter of degree. The more people are engaged (e.g. informed, appreciative of and willing to use the assessment as a basis for their own work,) the greater the degree of ownership.

Re-mobilizing all of those engaged in the consultation phase is typically not viable (both in terms of efficiency and cost-effectiveness). Indeed, in the case of the FAR programme, in none of the three pilot countries were the country teams able to validate with all of those consulted. However, the research teams developed strategies to ensure broad representation in the validation process by including feedback from each of the sectors and regions represented in the consultation.

In the cases of Timor-Leste and Liberia, the research teams organized one large validation forum convening regional and sectoral representatives, as well as key stakeholders in strategic positions, to present the findings and seek their inputs. In the case of Guatemala, however, the research team held a much smaller national meeting with high-level representatives of key institutions and sectors, considering that if these leaders and influencers accepted and validated the findings, their constituencies were most likely to follow. In the case of Guatemala, this meeting was also the process through which members of the national working group were selected. Once the working group process was underway, public forums were organized to disseminate the findings to a broader public. Whereas in Timor-Leste and Liberia, the symbolism and visibility of a large event was necessary as a conduit towards national ownership, the protocol in Guatemala was such that a more politically oriented process was required first before opening up to larger audiences.

Regardless of the form that the validation takes, whether as one big event, or as many small events, the key is to make it as interactive as possible so that stakeholders have the opportunity and time to assimilate the findings and give their feedback and critique. A presentation is necessary but not sufficient; structured discussions and/or more informal group exercises can be valuable in helping stakeholders engage with the findings. Equally important is that the findings are considered ‘draft’ to ensure that feedback coming from the participants in the validation phase can be incorporated into the final assessment. Moreover, this step is most useful when it is designed as a forward-looking exercise which gives the orientation for the development of strategies for strengthening resilience for peace. Stakeholders attending a validation forum or similar workshop should be given the space to articulate the process by which these strategies are to be designed and implemented.

In the case of FAR, such orientation included defining the mandate of the multi-stakeholder national working groups on resilience and the criteria for membership (see step 5 for greater detail). Whether or not this is the chosen strategy for developing policy recommendations and programmes, the important point here is the link between the validation process and the next step. This is the critical juncture at which the process shifts from being a consultation-based research endeavor to becoming an action-oriented process. The researchers or organization that has up to now conducted the consultations and analysis effectively transfer leadership to national stakeholders. The legitimacy of policies and programmes which emerge from the assessment hinges on the fact that they were developed through a process articulated by a broad and representative group, and not from a select group of researchers or single organization.

3.2.5 STEP 5: DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIES TO STRENGTHEN RESILIENCE FOR PEACE

The fifth and final step is to translate the assessment findings into concrete actions for strengthening resilience for peace. The next and final chapter will explore this in more detail. There are several processes that can be used in order to design programmes and policies aimed at strengthening resilience. In the case of FAR, and indeed an extension of Interpeace’s approach to peacebuilding, this was achieved through a multi-stakeholder dialogue process – referred to as a national working group. This section describes this specific approach, noting that other methods exist and could be chosen in lieu of the national working group. Whether through a national working group or other process, the expected outputs of this phase are (1) the development of a vehicle or process through which the assessment findings are used to design policies and programmes for peacebuilding, (2) concrete policy recommendations and/or programmatic actions to strengthen resilience for peace, and (3) the engagement of key stakeholders on issues related to strengthening resilience for peace.

In each country, a national working group was assembled. The national working group is a small group of people representing different institutions, constituencies or sectors of society, who also possess expertise and knowledge in relevant issue areas. Additional criteria for the selection of working group members include their access to decision-makers or their own influence on decision-making. They meet regularly to address a specific issue, either by providing solutions to a specific problem, or in this case, to make proposals for strengthening the resilience for peace. Knowledge is generated through facilitated dialogue and so the multi-sectoral character and representativeness of the group is key in order to ensure that the solutions take into account the different perspectives and positions of concerned constituencies.

Moreover, researchers have an important role in facilitating and supporting these discussions, such as through the documentation of minutes and undertaking additional research where necessary.

This phase of the process becomes very context and content specific. There are also many variables that will be out of the control of researchers and facilitators, including the political and policy context and the dynamic that will be generated among members of the working group. There are, however, some best practices which can be shared for the facilitation of this process based on the experience of the three country teams and Interpeace's experience with such multi-stakeholder dialogues for over 20 years.

Membership in the working group is especially critical and should be based on the following:

- Membership should be multi-sectoral, inclusive and representative of different sectors in society. Ideally, a broad number of people will be consulted in the development of criteria for membership. The validation process can serve as a platform for the definition of these criteria as well as the selection of members itself.
- Members should have some experience with such processes or the willingness and capacity to contribute to such a process.
- The individuals must be seen as legitimate representatives (although this is not formal representation through election) of the sectors they seek to represent whilst also having access to decision-making and influence in their respective institutions or sectors. High-level representatives such as ministers and CEOs will often not have the time to participate in such processes and so mid-level officials, professors and relevant professionals are often the best placed to be members of the working group.
- The working group should balance effectiveness with inclusivity. The larger the group, the longer and more difficult will the deliberation be or the higher the chances of absenteeism and lack of engagement. At the same time, inclusivity is important and so balancing between the two is necessary. In the pilot studies, the size of the working groups ranged from seven to thirty, although in the latter case, not all thirty members attended meetings on a regular basis. In cases where the groups were larger, smaller subgroups can sometimes be created to ensure full engagement of all members.

In so far as the working group obtains its mandate through a consultative process during the validation phase, they become the conduit through which ownership is transferred from the researchers to the broader population. In this regard, working group members are accountable to the public and have the responsibility for decision-making. That said, whereas the process will be led by the members, researchers have a key role to play in terms of facilitation and providing the necessary backstopping to the process. This may include a range of functions such as sending invitations and reminders to members for agreed upon meeting times, preparing and circulating agendas and minutes of meeting, organizing the meeting venue, refreshments and necessary materials as well as conducting additional research to follow up on initiatives undertaken by the group and supporting the necessary networking and desired partnerships or collaborations. In so far as facilitation is concerned, researchers may be required to develop a facilitation plan in order to support the group in meeting its objectives within the allocated time frame.

The drafting of policy recommendations and/or programmatic proposals is not the end point of the assessment: these

policies and programmes should also be operationalized. A key aspect is engaging key stakeholders – policy-makers and other influential actors – who have the capacity to mobilize resources (financial, material, human) and political will for the implementation of proposals. The working group is itself a platform for this engagement, and the dynamics that will be generated among members has immense potential for the creation of partnerships that can operationalize the proposals. The following section of the guidance note provides some additional reflections on this process.

4 PROGRAM AND POLICY GUIDANCE

OPERATIONALIZING RESILIENCE FOR PEACE

The final section of this guidance note outlines options for operationalizing and applying the assessment of resilience for peace to inform programme and policy choices, both at domestic and international levels, as well as through shorter- and longer-term engagements.

The resilience for peace assessment is a participatory process that seeks to understand the existing and potential endogenous resilience capacities that individuals, communities and societies possess. It is a unique contribution to national-level peace and conflict assessments. The resulting understanding of resilience for peace enables the design and implementation of peacebuilding programming. Beyond conflict and peacebuilding, the Resilience for Peace Framework contributes to the integration of resilience for peace as a focus across diverse sectors and practice areas, including sustainable human development and humanitarian action. Resilience-sensitive programming and policy-making contribute to global and multi-lateral processes such as the SDGs and Agenda 2030, as well as to the fragility assessments and peacebuilding and statebuilding goals of the New Deal.

Resilience for peace complements more conventional conflict analyses and assessments that have become a standard component of any sound peacebuilding intervention. Conflict analyses – including those that look at both peace and conflict factors (for example, peace and conflict impact analyses) – largely focus on understanding the dynamics of conflict (and peace) in a given context. A resilience for peace assessment instead emphasizes capacities and attributes that individuals, communities and societies possess, and the interactions between these factors. These capacities and attributes manifest in various forms, including resources, actions, processes, institutions or relationships.

Tracking and analyzing these capacities and attributes enables peacebuilding actors and policy-makers to design interventions and policies that affirm, support and build upon the endogenous strengths of individuals and collectives within the context. They also help to safeguard against ill-planned interventions that fail to resonate with the most directly affected populations and which therefore inevitably fail.

The inclusive nature and action-orientation of the resilience assessment is – in and of itself – an empowering exercise that provides stakeholders with an opportunity to articulate and apply their own resilience, and can be a useful strategy for mobilizing their engagement in the design and implementation of policies and programmes. In this regard, the resilience assessment can support and energize local and national ownership of peacebuilding, developmental and humanitarian interventions.

While it can be a stand-alone process, the value of the resilience for peace assessment is highest when it is an early part of policy and programme design processes or otherwise used to inform strategic policy moments such as the drafting of development or social plans by ministries and governments. Used as a longitudinal tool, the assessment provides unique insight on monitoring and evaluating the effects of programmes and policy choices by measuring changes in factors associated with resilience for peace over time. This calls for the assessment of resilience for peace to become a prerequisite for sound intervention and a standard component of evaluating the contribution of interventions to long-term, sustainable peace.

4.1 STRENGTHENING RESILIENCE FOR PEACE WITHIN A SPECIFIC CONTEXT

Translating findings about resilience for peace into programmes and policy options is an integral component of the assessment framework rather than a separate exercise. This aspect, too, is a locally driven, context-specific, process. There is a large body of research and guidelines on evidence-based policy-making. The object of this section is not to reproduce such guidance but to outline key challenges and opportunities for the design and implementation of practical programmes and policies.

Programmes here refer to identifiable actions serving a particular objective such as skills training for youth, developing a curriculum within an existing educational system, providing an access to credit scheme for women. Policies refer to initiatives that seek to change the norms, either formally or through legislation or informally through a memorandum, strategy or planning document, or the articulation of a new vision. Examples of policies include new legislation, reform of the education system or a development plan.


By design, the assessment provides a vehicle through which the assessment findings are used to inform policies and programmes supporting those resilience capacities that foster peace; this was outlined as step 5 (Development of Strategies to Strengthen Resilience for Peace) of the process guidance.

In reality, however, step 5 is never quite so neatly linear and largely depends on engagement and policy focus throughout the various stages of the resilience assessment process as set out above. The assessment of resilience for peace is inevitably a highly politically charged process that requires a sustained effort to engage, persuade and win over strategically positioned stakeholders in support of policies and programmes fostering resilience for peace. When possible, the assessment should establish vertical and horizontal linkages and coherence with other sectors to ensure consistency and potential systemic operationalization (i.e. not limited to one actor / sector). Ultimately, the translation of assessment findings into programmes and policy requires:

- *Stakeholder influencing* : Strategic engagement with key stakeholders and communication of findings
- *Uptake*: Support for uptake of findings that reflect assessment of findings and recommendations from the resilience for peace assessment
- *Evaluation: Determination of whether* policies and programmes informed by the assessment findings are effective and contribute to peacebuilding and related objectives.

These three components frame the discussion in the remainder of this chapter.


Figure 6: The Five Steps of the Resilience for Peace Assessment



4.1.1 STAKEHOLDER-INFLUENCING

Stakeholder-influencing refers to the strategy to engage key stakeholders - individuals with influence on decision-making processes and the ability to mobilize people and resources behind a cause, whether it is in the programme or policy realm. Stakeholder-influencing is a necessary component of operationalization because unless these key stakeholders are informed and convinced by the relevance and value of the assessment, there will be limited opportunities for developing and implementing concrete programmes and policies as a follow up to the assessment. ‘Influencing’ is a two-way relationship. It is used here as a foundational element of policy uptake, but this engagement also ensures that the resilience assessment is flexible, sustaining its relevance to the political context and current policy priorities and maintaining vertical linkages and coherence with other sectors. The requirement here is that results must be presented fully and impartially regardless of political sensitivities or interests for the sake of key stakeholders’ engagement. It is the assessors’ responsibility to find ways to engage on difficult topics without jeopardizing the integrity of the assessment process. Whilst noting that the independence and politically impartial nature of the assessment protects its credibility, this cannot serve to extricate the assessment from the current political conjuncture, because it is in its ability to be relevant to the existing political context that the assessment will contribute to effective peacebuilding, developmental and humanitarian strategies in terms of both programming and policy.

Figure 7: Stakeholder-Influencing – Selected Risks and Opportunities



A stakeholder analysis aimed at identifying key individuals and institutions as well as the interactions and political dynamics among them should be part of the actor-mapping exercise conducted during the contextualization phase. Early engagement with the key actors identified will help to ensure that they are more responsive to the findings. In all three countries, researchers had informal meetings as well as more structured discussions with key stakeholders as part of the context analysis. This helped to ensure that they had the right stakeholders engaged in the operationalization phase.

Guatemala: Case for Policy-Influencing and Relevance to the Political Context

In Guatemala, a dramatic shift in the political context required rapid adaptation of the assessment of resilience for peace. On 16 April 2015, the office of the Government's Attorney and the International Commission Against Corruption in Guatemala – CICIG – announced a wide-ranging investigation of a powerful network of corruption within the government. The investigations led to the arrest of individuals belonging to this network, from low-level government officials up to high-level appointees, and sparked massive popular protests and demands for reform in the political and electoral system.

Because of the subsequent national crisis, the national working group took the decision to focus on the corruption of the political system and the precarious state of public institutions in the analysis of the capacities for resilience of Guatemalan society, as the main threat for escalating conflict in Guatemala.

The existing working groups on resilience capacities in relation to crime and insecurity, and on socio-environmental conflicts were merged in a single working group set up to analyze the social protest in response to corruption of the political system, as an expression of society's potential transformative capacity. Within that political space, the working group sought to identify the resilient options in the situation that might promote structural transformations in the long term.

The ability to make the necessary adjustment and engage with key stakeholders to reflect the national priorities was pivotal in giving the assessment process, and in particular the working group, greater access to key stakeholders and the wider public. On 16 July 2015, the national working group organized a public forum attended by over 150 invitees, to broaden its dialogue with the diverse actors engaged in the protests and reform movement. The fact that the working group has become a credible platform - perhaps the only one in the country – for dialogue between groups from different sectors and positions during the current conjecture is highly significant.

4.1.2 UPTAKE OF FINDINGS

It is one thing for key stakeholders to listen to or read the findings of the assessment, but for them actually to use these findings and recommendations in the design of policies and programmes is quite another. An effective stakeholder-influencing strategy that includes the early engagement of key actors and their sustained interest in the process is a necessary condition for the uptake of findings into programmes and policies, but it is unlikely to be a sufficient one. Key stakeholders that could play influential roles in bringing about change need to buy into the resilience for peace assessment findings fully. Those not brought in earlier should be made aware of the findings, convinced they are credible, and informed that they will contribute to effective policies and programmes for supporting resilience for peace capacities aimed at preventing violence and consolidating peace. In sum, the assessment findings and recommendations must gain *traction* among policy-makers, scholars, practitioners, and other key people whose influence matters to the decision-making processes.

Key stakeholders are more likely to appropriate the findings and strategic orientation of the assessment if the latter resonates with issues which they prioritize. While being mindful of this, it is also important to stay true to the findings

that emerged from the consultation. The point of an inclusive and participatory process is precisely to allow voices that have been muted or unable to find a platform to emerge. This is especially important when seeking to influence policy-makers and national policies because governments and politicians are usually keen to implement policies that will be popular as this sustains their position, and people are more likely to implement a policy (such as abide by the terms of a new law) when they think it is to their benefit. The consultation process and the validation phases are instrumental to obtaining and demonstrating this legitimacy. Finally, the credibility and methodological rigor of the assessment are, of course, of vital importance.

If undertaken diligently, the consultative process (both qualitative and through survey tools) at the heart of the assessment should produce findings that are context specific and therefore relevant to both key stakeholders and the public at large.

Achieving the uptake of findings is a long and non-linear process, which cannot be expected to result from a one-off meeting or presentation, but instead relies heavily on sustained engagement. It may be useful to include this explicitly as an indicator of success in the evaluation of resilience for peace assessments. This would allow the researchers or organizations conducting the assessment to monitor whether sufficient attention is being given to its operationalization.

Evidence from the Field: Uptake of Findings

In the three pilot case countries, national working groups developed programme and policy recommendations aimed at strengthening resilience for peace. The comprehensive assessment of resilience for peace informed the working groups. The working group identified key entry points and policy spaces that would allow the development of concrete programme and policy recommendations

In **Guatemala**, the national working group found an entry point for policy-making in analysing the ways in which information flows. Horizontal and vertical collaboration between different sectors of society were found to be important sources of resilience for peace. It resulted in a draft proposal to set up a multi-sectoral structure for the resolution of conflicts related to the management of national resources. Misinformation on the other hand fueled socio-environmental conflicts. This particular proposal resonated strongly with public officials, the private sector, as well as civil society, all of which share a keen interest in finding a solution to ongoing conflicts related to the management of national resources. The findings were also relevant to the ongoing debate on reforming public institutions, because of the April 2015 political crisis, which created opportunities to experiment with new forms of institutional arrangements.

In **Liberia**, the national working group identified opportunities and entry points through ways in which local community networks had effectively mobilized to disseminate information on Ebola prevention measures and revived traditional community safety protocols in order to contain the spread of the virus. The working group leveraged findings about networks and traditional customs and their relation with trust in institutions to suggest guidance and support for community networks and integration in the government's communication and outreach strategy - whether in the specific context of a crisis, or more generally as part of wider efforts to build trust in the government.


In **Timor-Leste**, the national working group recommended enhancement of the effectiveness of civic engagement by adopting a resilience approach, which draws on the findings of the assessment. The proposal includes recommendations for building on traditional Timorese culture and drawing on the Catholic Church in the implementation of civic education programmes - both of which came out strongly as elements of resilience for peace in the assessment. The proposal posits civic education as a conduit for more synergistic and mutually accountable relations between the state and society. This issue is at the very heart of the post-independence challenge in Timor-Leste, as the country seeks to build its national unity from within instead of by reference to an external occupying force.

4.1.3 EVALUATION

The ultimate objective of the context-specific, participatory and action-oriented assessment is to contribute to strengthening resilience for peace. Resilience for peace means that endogenous capacities do exist for the peaceful resolution of conflicts, and the transformation of conflict structures and these capacities and attributes can be strengthened at - and among - different levels of society. The impact of policies and programmes that emerge from the assessment process must therefore be viewed in relation to this broad objective, noting that there will also be more specific objectives relating to the details of the intervention.

Once there is uptake of the findings and recommendations from the assessment, the next task will be to assess whether programmes and policies informed by the assessment do in fact contribute to strengthening resilience in relation to conflict and for peace. In order to evaluate impact effectively, follow-up assessments are needed.

Figure 8: Using the Resilience for Peace Framework to Monitor Programme and Policy Impact



When conducted regularly over time, and consistently integrated in the policy-making process, the resilience for peace assessment may become an effective tool for tracking the progress of policies and programmes, as well as recalibrating policies and programmes in light of changing circumstances.

4.2 INSIGHTS FOR INTERNATIONAL POLICY

In addition to the development of programmes and policies to strengthen resilience for peace at the country level, the resilience for peace assessments open up numerous creative opportunities and platforms for policy engagements at the multi-lateral and international level. These international policy opportunities resonate at the interface between peacebuilding and the wider field of resilience per se and beyond, to the broader fields of international development and humanitarian aid. Resilient systems that can both help prevent natural disasters or foster development need to be designed in such a way to support resilient systems for peace, or they may well in fact create more conflict.

The assessment of resilience for peace or in relation to conflict also adds unique value to the analysis and understanding of transformative as opposed to more absorptive, adaptive or ‘ameliorative’ responses. Rather than treating conflict management or conflict transformation as different styles or categories of operation, the resilience lens frames this as a continuum of endogenous capacities and responses, in which the boundaries between these responses are fluid rather than rigid. The greater nuance that the resilience lens brings to our understanding of peacebuilding provides a good basis for designing more sophisticated interventions.

The fact that resilience for peace is both about how communities, societies, and social systems deal with past conflict, as well as how they learn from this in anticipating and dealing with the dangers of new or re-emerging conflict, is illustrative of its relevance and contribution to addressing the enduring challenge of conflict or violence prevention. Strategies and policies that support, boost or strengthen these endogenous assets and attributes (or neutralize or co-opt them when they manifest negatively) would represent a policy shift from crisis action, to conflict and violence *prevention*. The assessment of the positive attributes and capacities for peace, therefore, has great potential to complement the capacity for post-conflict recovery, with the capacity to anticipate the shifting and transmuting patterns of new conflict and risks of violence, rather than presuming that such conflict will simply manifest along the same lines of fissure as was previously the case. This presents a policy objective that is about seeking to prevent the displacement, reemergence or evolution of violent conflict, rather than merely enabling communities and societies to cope better in the face of crisis – a vital part of the wider field of resilience.

Resilience in relation to conflict and *for peace* provides a unique vehicle for mainstreaming a resilience-sensitive approach within diverse areas of programming, building on a more sophisticated understanding of the distinct nature of the risks associated with conflict and violence, their intersection with other areas of risk, stress or shock, as well as the attributes and capacities that underlie resilience. Beyond the particular character of the risk or hazard of conflict, the common systemic concern with resilience as a set of assets, attributes, responses and capacities facilitates the integration of a sensitivity to resilience for peace and a substantially similar language to describe this across various sectors and practice arenas. Using a resilience lens in the design and implantation of policies and programmes – whether in the fields of development, agriculture, health, education, etc. - is especially pertinent in conflict-affected societies where not just peacebuilding interventions, but *all* interventions, need to be conflict and resilience sensitive.

Given the application of resilience across different fields of practice, the resilience for peace lens offers a common language and discourse that serves as an integrative vehicle to help break down the barriers between various practice arenas and support and enrich a number of other strategic, operational and policy priorities. More by accident than by design, the unexpected incidence of the Ebola epidemic in the middle of the FAR programme implementation in Liberia, provided unique insight into the inter-relationship of peace and conflict issues in the context of a natural

disaster and humanitarian crisis. One of the most important observations has been the extent to which the lack of trust between states and citizens, both a cause and consequence of violent conflict, impacted upon the effectiveness of the Ebola response. Liberia's resilience capacities are most prominent at the community level, in the form of traditional leaders, women's groups and youth responses, and not in its state institutions. Channeling the response through community and traditional leaders appears to have been much more effective than official government communiqués. The Liberia country report documents in some detail the complex manifestations of this, the creative challenges it produced, and the importance of flexible and adaptive programming approaches that enabled learning and reflection that is of wider value to integrated programming across these fields of endeavor. The wider relevance of this needs to be further explored and appreciated, both at the policy level and in practice.

The participatory nature of the Resilience for Peace Assessment piloted in the FAR programme brings to light the need for, and value-addition of, using such participatory, inclusive, locally-owned and driven approaches in the assessment and evaluation of peacebuilding programming more generally. This implies potential boundaries to the role of international actors, particularly as regards the subjective dimensions of resilience, the definition of priorities and the criteria for assessing progress and changes over time. It is also very important that resilience for peace is understood in the context of particular communities and societies, and that progress is therefore based upon assessment of these societies in comparison to themselves over time, rather than comparatively ranking countries by reference to some external/imposed standards and criteria. This does, however, demand that the right balance be found in assessing resilience in relation to conflict and for peacebuilding, between criteria that are granular enough to be useful and functional in the local context and at the national level, whilst being universal enough to offer lessons and perspective across different contexts. The issue of equilibrium between universality and context specificity merits greater attention not just in the field of resilience for peace but much more widely. This is also particularly timely and important as the global policy community contemplates how to implement and monitor the progress of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs) associated with the New Deal.

The SDGs, the New Deal for Fragile and Conflict-affected States, and Agenda 2030 offer frameworks for development and touch on a broad spectrum of practice areas such as health, environmental protection, agriculture, or peace (in Goal 16). They are examples of policy platforms where resilience for peace offers an important vehicle for connecting, integrating and mainstreaming aspirations and goals. In fact, the FAR programme was always articulated as developing approaches to resilience for peace that were intended to be complementary to these engagements, especially the fragility assessment framed as a part of the New Deal for Fragile and Conflict-affected States. It is also worth noting that the word 'resilience' is itself used several times through the SDGs, although not in relation to Goal 16.

The adopted systems approach has demonstrated the importance of understanding the different dimensions of resilience that manifest at various levels across any society. These include the critical but severely under-studied dimensions of resilience expressed within and through institutions, both inside and outside the state. There is still a significant gap in attention to resilience at the institutional level in favor of more prevalent local and community-based approaches. However, this is a vital dimension of the relationship between state and society in fragile and conflict-affected contexts that offers to translate resilience into a wider societal phenomenon with important public policy implications.

By drawing attention to the systemic nature of resilience, the resilience for peace framework offers an alternative perspective on institution- and statebuilding and the relationship this may have to peacebuilding. This is relevant to

the peacebuilding and statebuilding goals set out in the New Deal as it emphasizes the centrality of state and society relationships (civic trust) to peacebuilding and statebuilding. As it is currently set out, the PSGs instead risk treating statebuilding as a matter of improving the capacity of particular institutions. This is important because strong states with ample capacity do not necessarily produce peace, but can in fact themselves be the source of conflict.

Finally, experiences of specific social groups, sectors and constituencies offer a distinct perspective on what resilience for peace might mean and look like in practice and what this might imply for both policy debates and strategic programming in these spheres. The view of resilience in the face of conflict offers unique perspectives when refracted through the prism of a gendered perspective, and this has vital policy implications for the field of women, peace and security, the implementation of UN Resolution 1325, etc. The FAR research has uncovered how the definition and nature of resilience can become contested when viewed through a gender lens, or from the particular perspective of women. This includes challenging perspectives on how the articulation of resilience attributes might either entrench gender stereotypes, or may offer innovative means for challenging these traditional roles. Similarly, the perspectives of risk and resilience for peace and in relation to violence and conflict in the youth sector present distinct challenges for peacebuilding and violence prevention. This includes some potentially negative manifestations of resilience, which were illustrated in all three of the FAR pilot countries. The implications are important for current policy debates on youth-based violence prevention in general, and the strategic endeavor to ‘combat/prevent violent extremism’ in particular. This also has particular relevance to the recent UN Security Council Resolution on Youth, Peace and Security. The importance of including and undertaking detailed research on resilience in relation to conflict/for peace within these and several other social sectors and constituencies, is that this will sophisticate and nuance the understandings of resilience more generally, while also offering up innovative avenues for programming and policy implementation. More disaggregated work still needs to be done in that regard.

In conclusion, the global policy value and contribution of FAR and the work on ‘resilience for peace’ is rooted in the approach and processes described in this guidance note. The notion of endogenous resilience conveys and relies on the voice, ownership, leadership and agency of local actors and practitioners. In so doing, it offers an authentic set of voices in the global policy space. The authenticity of these voices has its own unique value, including the promise to change the policy discourse from one which is reactive and dominated by international donors and multi-lateral agencies, rather than being proactively driven by the local practitioners and participants themselves. With this in mind, FAR also aspired to draw on consultative and inclusive participatory processes, to enable the articulation of ordinary voices ‘from below’ within these pilot countries – not as an extractive exercise, but as one which cultivated the authenticity, audibility, visibility and ‘ownership’ of local actors in these global policy debates. This is particularly important in defining the means for assessing progress in peacebuilding and the sources of endogenous resilience that can be supported and strengthened in these conflict-affected societies.

5 REFERENCES

RESOURCES RELATED TO THE FAR PROGRAMME

Centre of Studies for Peace and Development (CEPAD). 2016. *Understanding and Strengthening Resilience for Peace. Timor-Leste Final Report.* CEPAD and Interpeace. Dili, forthcoming.

Centre of Studies for Peace and Development (CEPAD). 2015. *Understanding Resilience from a Local Perspective.* CEPAD and Interpeace, Dili. [Available online at: http://www.interpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/2015_05_19_FAR_Country_Note_Timor_ENG.pdf].

Vinck, P. and P.N. Pham. 2016. *TIMOR-LESTE: Population-based Survey on Attitudes and Perceptions about Resilience and Peace.* Boston: Harvard Humanitarian Initiative.

Vinck, P. and P.N. Pham. 2016. *GUATEMALA: Population-based Survey about Conflicts and Resilience.* Boston: Harvard Humanitarian Initiative.

Interpeace Oficina Regional para América Latina. 2016. *Resiliencia y Construcción de Paz: Marcos de Análisis para la Resiliencia en Guatemala.* Guatemala: Interpeace, forthcoming.

Interpeace Oficina Regional para América Latina. 2015. *Frameworks for Assessing Resilience in Guatemala.* Working Document. Guatemala: *Interpeace.* [Available online at http://www.interpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/2015_10_13_FAR_Country_note_Guatemala_EN.pdf].

Interpeace Oficina Regional para América Latina. 2015. *Resilience in the Face of the Political Crisis in Guatemala.* Guatemala: Interpeace. [Available online at http://www.interpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/2015_07_29_FAR_Guat_crisis.pdf].

McCandless, E. and G. Simpson. 2015. *Executive Summary of Assessing Resilience for Peacebuilding.* Geneva: Interpeace. [Available online at: http://www.interpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2015_09_11_FAR-Executive-Summary-2015-v3.pdf].

Platform for Dialogue and Peace (P4DP). 2015. *Documenting the Resilience of Liberians in the Face of Threats to Peace and the 2014 Ebola Crisis.* Monrovia: P4DP and Interpeace. [Available online at: http://www.interpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/2015_11_17_Liberia-Country-Note-2015.pdf].

WORKS CITED

Baum, F., C. MacDougall, and D. Smith. 2006. Participatory action research. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*. 60(10):.854-857.

Béné, C. and R. G. Wood, A. Newsham, and M. Davies. 2012. *Resilience: New Utopia or New Tyranny? Reflection about the Potentials and Limits of the Concept of Resilience in Relation to Vulnerability Reduction Programmes*. IDS Working Paper, No. 405, 11. London: Institute of Development Studies..

Coletta, N. J. and M. L. Cullen. *Violent Conflict and the Transformation of Social Capital: Lessons from Cambodia, Rwanda, Guatemala, and Somalia*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 2000.

Conflict Sensitivity Consortium. 2012. *How to Guide to Conflict Sensitivity*. London: Conflict Sensitivity Consortium. [Available at http://local.conflictsensitivity.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/6602_HowToGuide_CSF_WEB_3.pdf].

Cooperrider, D.L. and S. Srivastva. 1987. Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In Vol.1 of *Research In Organizational Change And Development*, 129- 169. Edited by R.W. Woodman and W.A. Pasmore . Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) in collaboration with CDA Collaborative Learning Projects and Norwegian Church Aid. 2015. *Conflict Analysis Framework: Field Guidelines and Procedure*. The Hague, The Netherlands: GPPAC..

Krumer-Nevo, M. 2009. From voice to knowledge: participatory action research, inclusive debate and feminism. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 22(3):.279-295.

Lederach, JP. 1997. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*, 37. Washington DC:: United States Institute Press.

McIntyre, A. 2007. Vol. 52 of *Participatory Action Research*. CA: . Sage Publications.

INTERACTIVE WEB-BASED RESOURCES

Harvard Humanitarian Initiative. KoBo Toolbox <<http://www.kobotoolbox.org/>>

Overseas Development Institute. ODI Resilience Navigator <http://bwa-presentation.co.uk/odi_reviews/index.php>

6 ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS FOR THE QUALITATIVE CONSULTATION

Liberia

Location: Focus Group in all of Liberia's 15 counties and each group discussion should include representatives of the following sectors:

- Community leaders
- Ebola survivors/bereaved families
- CSO heads/leaders
- Government reps
- Traditional/cultural leaders
- Street gangs
- Religious leaders
- People with suspected cases but tested negative
- Health Workers
- Government Ebola task force managers
- Security personnel/Ebola Task Force Committee
- People with disability
- Heads of international organizations
- Pen-pen boys
- Community rights advocates
- Farmers
- Youth leaders
- Market women
- Women's groups
- Public transport driver

Timor-Leste

Location: 13 district capitals (Dili, Ermera, Lautem, Viqueque, Baucau, Bobonaro, Oe-Cusse, Liquica, Manatuto, Ainaro, Aileu, Manufahi, Suai).

Covering all 13 districts will allow CEPAD to gather a broad cross-section of ideas and experiences from citizens in different contexts across the country.

Each FGD should include members of the following sectors which are representative and inclusive of all groups within Timorese society:

- Local and traditional authorities
- Youth and students
- Elders
- People with disabilities
- Martial arts groups
- Women (particularly housewives, widows, activists, victims, leaders)
- Professionals (including teachers, health workers and others)
- Catholic Church (Nuns, Priests)
- Other religious affiliations (Protestant, Islam, etc.)
- Local governance authorities (DA, SDA, etc.)
- Justice sector actors (state and customary)
- Political parties
- Former resistance fighters and activists (e.g. Members from OPMT)
- Private sector
- PNTL (police)
- F-FDTL (army)

Guatemala

Location: 11 out of 22 departments are selected to reflect geographical distribution as well as relevance to main types of conflict present

Region	Department	Issue
Central	Guatemala	Violence and insecurity
West	El Quiché	Socio-environmental conflicts
	Totonicapán	Socio-environmental conflicts
	San Marcos	Socio-environmental conflicts
	Huehuetenango	Socio-environmental conflicts/ violence and insecurity
North East	Jalapa	Socio-environmental conflicts
	Zacapa	Violence and insecurity
	Izabal	Violence and insecurity, socio-environmental conflicts
North	Alta Verapaz	Violence and insecurity
	Petén	Socio-environmental conflicts/ violence and insecurity
South	Escuintla	Violence and insecurity

In each selected location, participants for focus group discussions were selected based on the following criteria. There was one focus group discussion in each location

Criteria	Target Groups and sectors	Number participants per focus group
Persons belonging to a sector or organisation involved in the conflict issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based Organisations • NGOs • Organisations of Civil Society • Women's Groups • Private Initiatives 	5
Local civil servants of public institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PNC • Army • MEM • MARN • CONAP • Sector Seguridad • Sector Justicia 	5
Persons who can disseminate findings and communicate on the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Press • National Press • Other Media 	2
Persons in institutions that have developed analytical work or programmes on the issue areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Centres • Universities • NGOs 	3
People belonging to religious institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pastorales Sociales • Iglesia Evangélica 	3
Indigenous authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departmental, Municipal and Local Councils 	2
Opinion leaders with influence on policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Party Members • Civic Committees • Civil Society • Women's Movements • Private Initiatives 	2

ANNEX 2: FACILITATION GUIDES FOR THE QUALITATIVE CONSULTATION

These were used by the facilitators to guide focus group discussions in order to learn more about people's resilience

Liberia

*(Before the Ebola
Outbreak)*

Note- the questions below are not intended to be prescriptive for interviews and engagements but guidance intended to stimulate and facilitate interactions. The principle of 'blank sheet' remains fundamental; therefore, these questions will only aid the dialogue. Another reason for having such a helpful guide is to ensure that dialogue keeps within earmarked timeline and theme, recognizing that the teams do not have the luxury of time, especially during the current state of emergency with all the associated implications.

1. In August 2013, Liberia (celebrated) ten (10) years of peace. What does that celebration mean to you and your community, looking at situation before the war and after the war?
 - What has changed – do you feel that you/your community has recovered, rebuilt, transformed. Is there a return to the 'normal day'?
 - What are you happy or sad about?
 - Can you tell us about some of the things that keep you going and living together as a community?
2. In these 10 years, what has helped you to overcome the effects of the past conflict and contribute to strengthening peace ?
 - Traditional institutions
 - Families
 - Systems
 - Leaderships
 - Farms/businesses
 - Relationships with other communities or people
 - (including negative effects of these strategies)
3. What are the things that you are doing to keep things going peacefully?
 - Traditional institutions
 - Families
 - Systems
 - Leaderships
 - Farms/businesses
 - Relationships with other communities or people
 - (including negative effects of these strategies/activities)

Liberia

*(After
the Ebola
Outbreak)*

The Following questions were added after the Ebola outbreak:

1. Can you please share with us your experience about the outbreak of the Ebola virus in Liberia:
 - How are citizens involved in the fight against the virus?
 - How was the situation before the outbreak?
 - How is the situation now with the outbreak?
2. How are people managing with the situation right now?
 - How do people occupy their time?
 - Have you noticed any new behavior in people (changing from one thing to another)?
-drinking more or less, using more social network/mobile phones, meeting more or less as a community, attending Churches or Mosques more or less?
 - Are people friendly with each other more or less?
 - Are people doing things together?
 - Are there some new creations and activities as a result of the epidemic?
3. Who do you think is more affected by the Ebola outbreak (e.g. women, youth, elderly, children, physically challenged, orphans, etc.)? *(Prompt the respondent to provide answers on the following – in terms of infection, death and survivors)*
 - Why do you think so?
 - Can you give some examples of how they are coping and adapting?
4. How are (local) institutions/structures/households/systems responding to the Ebola outbreak?
 - Which institution do you think is more affected by the Ebola outbreak?
 - Based on the above, why do you think so?
 - What are some of the changes you observe in your/their activities?
 - Can you give some practical examples?
5. Which institution/group do you rely on for information on the Ebola crisis? Why?
6. How are victims/survivors received in your community?
 - Can you tell us some practical stories?
7. Are there things that you would like to share with us on Ebola that we did not cover?

Timor-Leste

Questions for Discussion

1. What holds Timorese tightly together to allow us to succeed in overcoming past conflict and conflict that we might face in the future? Why? What are concrete examples?
 - *[facilitator will encourage brainstorm of 'elements' using prompts about types of elements including capacities, institutions, processes, relationships, physical infrastructure...]*
2. Of these elements, what are the most important or the strongest?
 - *[facilitator will guide participants through some prioritization of components to agree on 3-5 and write these clearly on a separate flip chart]*
3. Looking at these elements, can you think about whether they existed/how strong they have been over time and will be in the future?
 - *[facilitator will present a simple timeline which marks key points in Timor-Leste history (Portuguese colonisation, 1974 proclamation, Indonesian Occupation, 1999 referendum, Independence, 2006 crisis, now and future) and will ask participations to describe which assets have existed at different points and how they have changed]*
4. At which level do these elements exist or are strongest? Individual, family, community, district, national level? Does resilience at one level impact another level?
 - *[facilitator will present a simple ladder of levels from individual to national and ask participants to indicate where the assets exist and where they are strongest].*
5. Looking at these elements that you have identified, are all groups in the community able to access/be involved in such components? Or are some groups excluded?
 - *[facilitator will use a diagram placing the example in the centre and placing different groups around the outside. Different symbols can be used to indicate whether the group has access to the asset or not, leaving space to write some reasons]*
6. Can you identify the positive and negative behaviours or consequences associated with these elements?
 - *[facilitator will list positive and negative points in two columns for each asset]*
7. What does resilience mean in your context and how can the elements we've identified be strengthened?

Conclusion of discussions

Facilitator will reiterate the objective of FAR and link this with the results of the discussion. Facilitator will give a brief summary or overview of the results of the discussion and ask for any additional clarifications and conclusions.

Guatemala

The main question that participants will explore is:

‘What are the factors that allow Guatemalan society to face up to the difficulties related to the fragility of public institutions, socio environmental conflicts and the situation of violence and insecurity?’

The Group will then break into three subgroups to explore each of the three issues in greater detail (the thematic focus will depend on the location, and in some locations it may be more appropriate to focus on only 1 or 2 issues):

- Group 1: Socio-Environmental Conflict
- Group 2: Violence and Insecurity
- Group 3: Fragility of public institutions

Guiding Questions for the subgroup discussions are:

Area of Exploration	Questions for the Group
Strategies of resilience	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What do people do on a daily basis in order to cope with the difficulties related to the issue?• Do you think that response capacities exist in the family, the community, the municipality and department?• Who or what helps you to do what you do?• Do you organise in any way? How?• Is there an institution or group that helps you?• Who or what creates obstacles to your endeavours? And who facilitates your actions?
Sources and Meanings	<p>Of the actions cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have you had experiences of successful joint actions or initiatives to overcome the difficulties?• How and why did it work? How do you know?• How did you know that this was what you had to do?• Is this what needs to be done always or was this an exceptional case?

<p>Learnings and identification of new sources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what way do these actions help in practice? • To give you an immediate solution but after the issues re-emerge • To control the situation and allow things to return to normal • To recognise that something has changed compared to the previous situation • In what way did the actions taken impact people, the family, the community, etc.?
<p>Follow up</p>	<p>In relation to what has been discussed, what are the key points or findings that you would like to follow up on?</p>

ANNEX 3: EXAMPLES OF DATA-CAPTURING TEMPLATES FOR QUALITATIVE CONSULTATION

Liberia

- Date: -----
 - Location: -----
 - Facilitator:-----
 - Note-taker:-----
 - Type of Discussion: Key Informant interview FGD
1. **Key Issues** (One line per key issue; underline those that were most emphasized):

 2. **Coping and adapting mechanisms:**

 3. **Quotes:**

- Observations :**
- a. Overall dynamics of groups:
 - b. Composition of the group:
 - c. What was not said:
 - d. KII character:

 - e. Points of convergence, divergence and contradiction

- Others-----
- Key persons and participants (name, contact and phone number) - may be contacted to participate in National Group Meeting
4. **Challenges:**

- Recommendations for the team:

Timor-Leste

Date of FGD:	
Place:	
Report author:	
CEPAD staff present at FGD:	
Number of participants and (M/F):	

Part 1: general information about the district (population, key characteristics, etc...)

Part 2: selection process of participants

- How were participants selected?
- Were there any problems encountered?

Part 3: synthesis of responses to FGD questions

- *What holds Timorese tightly together to allow us to succeed in overcoming past conflict and conflict that we might face in the future?*
- *Of these elements, what are the most important or the strongest?*
- *Looking at these elements, can you think about whether they existed/how strong they have been over time and will be in the future?*
- *At which level do these elements exist or are strongest? Individual, family, community, district, national level? Does resilience at one level impact another level?*
- *Looking at these elements that you have identified, are all groups in the community able to access/be involved in such components? Or are some groups excluded?*
- *Can you identify the positive and negative behaviours or consequences associated with these elements?*
- *What does resilience mean in your context and how can the elements we've identified be strengthened?*

Part 3: facilitator's observations

- *Group dynamics*
- *Was there consensus about strongest elements of resilience?*
- *Engagement of participants?*
- *General reactions of participants and feedback on topic/discussion*
- *Time?*
- *Modifications required for next FGD?*

Categories of resilience:

List the categories of resilience that the discussion results might be placed into

Timor-Leste**SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

Date	District	Key Results	Observations

Guatemala

Fecha: _____ Lugar: _____

Facilitador (es): _____

Composición del grupo (sector, condición étnica y de género, etc.): _____

Observaciones: _____

Minuta de Reunión de consulta/sectorial	
Fecha:	
Lugar	Sede de las personas entrevistadas
Objetivo:	Objetivo general Objetivos específico
Temas clave:	
Participantes:	
Temas Generales:	

Guatemala

Resumen de la discusión				
	Estrategias	Fuentes	Aprendizajes	Puntos clave
Tema 1: Conflictividad socio-ambiental	Estrategias Ámbitos Actores	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Contextos •Justificaciones •Resiliencia negativa/positiva 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lecciones •Alternativas •Aprendizajes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Temas
Tema 2: Violencia e inseguridad	Estrategias Ámbitos Actores	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Contextos •Justificaciones •Resiliencia negativa/positiva 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lecciones •Alternativas •Aprendizajes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Temas
Tema 3: Fragilidad de las instituciones públicas	Estrategias Ámbitos Actores	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Contextos •Justificaciones •Resiliencia negativa/positiva 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lecciones •Alternativas •Aprendizajes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Temas

