Rebuilding Trust

Annual Report 2014
04 Message from the Chair
05 Message from the Director-General
06 A Tribute to Fafali Koudawo
07 About Interpeace
09 Track 6 Approach
12 Where We Build Peace
14 2014 Highlights
45 Our Support and Funding
46 Our Funding
47 Our Donors
48 2014 Financial Report
55 Our Structures and People
56 Our Governing Council
58 Our Advisory Council
59 Our Strategic Management Team
60 Interpeace Representation Offices
62 Partnerships
64 Contact Us
MESSAGE FROM
THE CHAIR

Many of today’s crises and conflicts span borders but can be traced to local grievances and situations in which people feel excluded from their society’s political or economic life. Indeed, a lack of inclusion often grows to affect the society as a whole, making a country vulnerable not only to internal strife but to external groups adept at exploiting people’s disgruntledness or the sense of exclusion they feel.

This is not a new dynamic, but it is one that we probably don’t think about enough. In order to stop this cycle, we must get more serious about fostering more inclusive societies in which everyone belongs and has a stake in the future.

The international community often focuses on efforts to build state capacity, especially in countries emerging from conflict. This is important if governments are to provide their people with basic services and build strong institutions. But we also need to focus in on the relationship between political leaders and the people they are meant to serve. How responsive is the state to its citizens? Are citizens active and engaged in the process of governance?

As we look for ways to help foster the process of building trust, I am encouraged by the work of Interpeace’s programmes, profiled here in these pages. In Mali, far-reaching consultations with thousands of people have involved not only citizens but government authorities in setting priorities for peace. In Central America, youth groups have been working alongside municipal authorities to implement policies to reduce violence.

In addition, we welcomed Alan Doss to Interpeace’s Governing Council in 2014. Alan is the Executive Director at the Kofi Annan Foundation and brings to Interpeace his deep experience in peacekeeping, post-conflict recovery and development cooperation. In 2015, Interpeace will be developing its next five-year strategic plan. In this context, I am pleased to report that the review on Interpeace’s Director-General this year was very positive, and I look forward to Scott’s continued leadership.

On behalf of my colleagues on the Governing Council, I extend my appreciation to Interpeace’s partners and to the leaders and ordinary citizens who find ways, often in the face of great difficulty and risk, to reach across divides towards peace.

JOHN A. KUFUOR
Chair of the Governing Council
WHY AREN’T THINGS WORSE?

In 2014, international news headlines were dominated by ongoing conflicts and new eruptions of violence in many parts of the globe. This continuous flow of bad news – and the human suffering it conveys – has created a sense of despair and uncertainty about the state of our world.

Such a sense of doom, however, runs the risk of blinding us to the strengths that reside in all conflict-affected societies. Let us remember that not more than two generations ago, much of today’s developed world was host to the worst violence the world has ever seen. And yet, those countries emerged from the abyss. They wrote a different future for themselves, building not on what had divided them but on what bound them in their common humanity.

These strengths exist even as countries face formidable challenges. Yet when we analyze the causes of conflicts and design solutions, we all too often focus on the obstacles to peace and the divisions in society, rather than on that nation’s resources for peace. In doing so, we may pass over the pockets of relative stability and cohesion and miss opportunities to build on these. What’s more, solutions may inadvertently undermine weak but important social bonds and make matters worse.

In our own peacebuilding work, we often see that when we shift from a conversation about division to one about commonalities, relationships strengthen and trust builds. It can sometimes be as simple as asking people to talk about what binds them instead of what divides them, or to start the conversation by asking: “As bad as things are, why aren’t they worse?” This is not avoidance. On the contrary, acknowledging shared strengths allows people to tackle divisive issues more effectively.

A recent example took place when I met with community leaders from Mandera County in northeastern Kenya, a region bordering Somalia and Ethiopia that has been plagued by local and transnational conflicts for years. When I joined them, they had spent two tension-filled days discussing the grievances that fuel their violent conflicts. They were subsequently asked to describe what binds them. Much to their own surprise, an enthusiastic and energetic discussion ensued, leading the group to identify a long list of cultural values, traditions and other elements that they have in common. The dynamic had changed. They resolved from that moment forward to protect and build on their commonalities as they seek to overcome their divisions. Fortunately, such stories of transformation are common, and should inspire us to see possibilities when others see only challenges.

From its inception, Interpeace’s work has been based on the belief that every society has what it needs to build peace. As the following pages detail, our efforts focus on supporting societies to recognize and harness their own strengths to achieve a better future.

Our work relies on dedicated local peacebuilders and trusted international partners. I am most grateful for their tireless commitment to Interpeace’s values and mission. This year we have lost one of our most astute, passionate and experienced peacebuilders, Flavien “Fafali” Koudawo. Fafali was an unwavering voice of peace in conflict-prone Guinea-Bissau. While we pay tribute to him briefly in these pages, we will honour his memory by striving to emulate his wisdom and humility in everything we do.
A TRIBUTE TO FAFALI KOUDAWO

The Interpeace family lost a devoted peacebuilder and inspiring colleague with the passing of Flavien “Fafali” Koudawo, who directed Voz di Paz (Voice of Peace), Interpeace’s partner organization in Guinea-Bissau. Fafali passed away on 23 January 2015.

In the face of recurrent military coups and after a devastating civil war, Fafali held up a vision of Guinea-Bissau as a country free of conflict, where people could determine their own future. He saw education as a driving force to fulfill this vision, and reached thousands of people across the country with his radio programme, which established him as a reassuring voice for peace. Through him, many came to a better understanding of the challenges facing the country, and the role they could play in creating a better future.

In 2007, Fafali supported the founding of Voz di Paz to help consolidate peace and stability in Guinea-Bissau. Under his leadership, the organization designed and carried out participatory research through which more than 6,000 Bissau-Guineans discussed the underlying causes of conflict and identified priorities for peace. He skilfully engaged both ordinary people and the country’s influential actors, from traditional and religious leaders to members of the military forces. Fafali once observed that peace was like a straw hut: “easy to put up, but requires high maintenance to keep it standing.”

In 2007, Fafali supported the founding of Voz di Paz to help consolidate peace and stability in Guinea-Bissau. Under his leadership, the organization designed and carried out participatory research through which more than 6,000 Bissau-Guineans discussed the underlying causes of conflict and identified priorities for peace. He skilfully engaged both ordinary people and the country’s influential actors, from traditional and religious leaders to members of the military forces. Fafali once observed that peace was like a straw hut: “easy to put up, but requires high maintenance to keep it standing.”

In parallel to his role at Voz di Paz, Fafali first came to Guinea-Bissau from Togo in 1990 as a United Nations Volunteers Programme Officer.

Fafali’s legacy lives on in Voz di Paz’s peacebuilding programmes, including the regional dialogue spaces for peace, places where people can come together to talk and find peaceful solutions to conflict. At times, his ideas were simple and elegant, for example, his drive to plant a tree at each dialogue space. The thought was to be able to construct a better future together under the welcoming shade of green leaves.

Keenly aware of the limits of his own role, Fafali persevered with unflagging courage and unwavering optimism. He is remembered among his colleagues and friends not only for his outstanding analytical skills but also for his big and genuine smile. Fafali brought a sense of humour that charmed all into keeping faith that things could change and – with enough effort and determination – would change for the better.

In recognition of the mark he left on Guinea-Bissau, he was posthumously granted the Bissau-Guinean nationality.

“Fafali was an inspiring person and a true peacebuilder, full of wisdom, and humility. His impressive intellect and eloquence helped others understand the complex challenges that Guinea-Bissau continues to face.”

Scott M. Weber, Director-General of Interpeace
ABOUT INTERPEACE

ABOUT US

Interpeace is an independent, international peacebuilding organization. We were initially established in 1994 by the United Nations to develop innovative solutions to build peace. We have a proven and recognized approach to enable people to build lasting peace.

History shows us that peace is possible. There are solutions to be found in even the most difficult conflicts. From 20 years of experience in peacebuilding, we know that peace cannot be imported from the outside, but must be built from within a society. This is why Interpeace tailors its approach to each society. Together with local partners on the ground, we jointly develop peacebuilding programmes. We establish processes of change that connect local communities, civil society, government and the international community. We work in over 21 countries in Central America, Africa, Europe, the Middle East and Asia.

As a strategic partner of the United Nations, Interpeace is headquartered in Geneva (Switzerland) and has offices in Abidjan (Côte d’Ivoire), Brussels (Belgium), Guatemala City (Guatemala), Nairobi (Kenya), New York (USA) and Stockholm (Sweden).
WHAT IS PEACEBUILDING?

Conflict is natural in society and can lead to positive change. However, it can also descend into violence. Interpeace understands peacebuilding as a process of strengthening a society’s capacity to manage conflict in non-violent ways.

Peacebuilding needs to enhance trust between individuals and between groups in a society, as well as restore the legitimacy of state institutions.

Peacebuilding is also about bringing together the different actors that are engaged in the rebuilding of a country. People from inside and outside a conflict-affected country need to work together to understand their different views, define priorities, and ultimately enable a better alignment of national policy-making, external assistance, and local priorities.

Interpeace strongly believes that peacebuilding is about deep, long-term transformations that require an integrated approach engaging a diverse range of actors.

OUR FINANCES AND SUPPORT

Interpeace is a non-profit organization. Our peacebuilding work is funded by generous voluntary contributions from governments, multilateral organizations, foundations, the private sector, and individuals.

Our 2014 expenditure of US$23.8 million reflects the growing demand for our work and that our expertise is valued by governments, civil society, United Nations agencies and other international organizations.

Our 2014 financial reports were, for the sixth year, in accordance with the International Financial Reporting Standards, the highest financial reporting standard.

Our ZEWO seal of approval shows that we are using the funds entrusted to us in a conscientious manner.
**WHAT IS TRACK 6?**

Interpeace helps establish processes of change that connect local communities, civil society, governments and the international community – an approach we call Track 6.

In the peacebuilding field, initiatives that involve government officials and other high-level decision-makers are referred to as Track 1. Initiatives involving influential actors from civil society are referred to as Track 2, and those that engage the local population at the community and grassroots level are called Track 3.

Interpeace works across all levels of society, connecting the three tracks: 1+2+3=6.

In many countries, the government, civil society and local communities often act separately to address problems they face. Our integrated Track 6 approach helps to ensure that high-level policies reflect local realities and benefit from local knowledge—contributing to the policies’ legitimacy and sustainability.

Interpeace fosters inclusive political processes by ensuring the meaningful participation of critical and marginalized stakeholders, including women, through strategies and mechanisms that are adapted to each context. For instance, a number of our programmes have specific activities tailored to address issues affecting women and specific components aimed at enhancing women’s role in peacebuilding and their capacities in conflict resolution.

Direct results and recommendations, produced through Participatory Action Research and multi-stakeholder dialogue, provide a basis for the formulation of more effective laws, policies and other peacebuilding and statebuilding initiatives at the national and regional levels.

Interpeace’s efforts in partnership with national peacebuilding institutions have contributed significantly to the long-term development of societies by introducing legitimate processes and institutions for effective conflict management.
LOCAL OWNERSHIP
Putting local people at the heart of building peace

For peace to be sustainable, local people need to be the ones defining the problem and the solution. When people take part in defining the problem, they gain a sense of responsibility and ownership of the solutions. Together with our local partners, Interpeace ensures that priorities are determined locally and not imposed from the outside. We help to create spaces for dialogue and problem solving that pave the way for lasting peace.

BUILDING TRUST
Trust is the keystone of peace

Trust is the foundation of society. Violent conflict tears the fabric of society and destroys the trust that binds relationships and gives institutions legitimacy. Interpeace works at all levels of society to develop a common vision for the future, helping to increase mutual understanding and rebuild trust.

“It is here that Interpeace makes the difference. Its approach in terms of ownership is something I’ve never seen during the course of my long career as an international peace negotiator.”

Martti Ahtisaari, 2008 Nobel Peace Prize Laureate and former chair of Interpeace
REACHING OUT TO ALL GROUPS

Building peace involves everyone

Excluding or marginalizing certain groups in society can deepen their resentment and sow the seeds of renewed violence. Interpeace’s inclusive approach engages all parties in a process of change, enabling them to move collectively towards moderation and compromise.

LONG-TERM COMMITMENT

Building lasting peace takes time

The road to peace is rarely straight and nearly always long. Interpeace recognizes that success in local peacebuilding work hinges on support that is patient and consistent.

PROCESS MATTERS

The process determines the result

The urgent need to resolve a conflict can prompt a quick fix instead of the kind of holistic response that can truly strengthen the foundations of a divided society. At Interpeace, we recognize that the process will in large part determine an initiative’s success.

“By engaging both at the local and senior political levels, Interpeace has helped to bring the needs and aspirations of ordinary people to the attention of decision makers. This in turn has helped fragile societies to strengthen governance and accountability, rebuild trust, and set priorities for long-term recovery.”

Kofi Annan, former Secretary-General of the United Nations
Our headquarters are located in Geneva (Switzerland).

Our regional offices in Abidjan (Côte d’Ivoire), Nairobi (Kenya) and Guatemala City (Guatemala) oversee peacebuilding programmes in their regions.

We have representation offices in New York (USA) and Brussels (Belgium) and most recently in Sweden as a fundraising foundation.

Interpeace also operates through its International Peacebuilding Advisory Team (IPAT). IPAT is a deployable capacity that supports countries and organizations to help them achieve greater peacebuilding impact.

In 2014 Interpeace supported peacebuilding initiatives in:

**Central America:** Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama

**Africa:** Burundi, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Rwanda, Somali region

**Europe and the Middle East:** Cyprus, Israel, Palestine

**Asia:** Timor-Leste
2014 HIGHLIGHTS

Our peacebuilding work across Africa, Asia, Central America, Europe and the Middle East
RESULTS IN PEACEBUILDING

In 2014, Interpeace supported nationally led peacebuilding programmes in more than 21 countries.

Measuring and communicating the impact of peacebuilding work presents unique challenges. First is the timeframe: It takes years to build peace, and thus our annual results are best recognized as incremental steps in advancing a programme’s long-term strategy.

Interpeace’s theory of change is critical to understanding the results we produce with our partners. Results may include, for example, new lines of communication between people and their leaders, greater confidence in public institutions, and broader participation in policy making. All are factors that help a country emerge from conflict and consolidate peace.

Contexts evolve, sometimes quickly, and can influence prospects for peace in a positive or negative direction. Therefore, a keen analysis of the situation is necessary to understanding the value of a given strategy and results produced. Peacebuilding often takes place in a sensitive political context, and at times, Interpeace will keep its role confidential.

Finally, change is often the result of a combination of factors, making it difficult to credit one particular factor or actor. We therefore aim to explain the constellation of factors that made the change possible.
Involving young people in preventing violence

YOUTH PROGRAMME

Half of Central America’s population is under 30 years of age, and many of these youth live in conditions of poverty, inequality and insecurity. With the growth of gangs and organized crime, it is the most marginalized youth, particularly those who live in urban communities, who are at high risk of becoming victims or perpetrators of violence.

But youth can also be persuasive agents for positive change. Since 2007, Interpeace has engaged young people in efforts to explore the root causes of violence and to craft policies to address them. In Guatemala and Honduras, for example, we have helped youth groups work alongside governments, municipalities and community groups to implement comprehensive youth policies. At the regional level, we work closely with the intergovernmental Central America Integration System (SICA) and youth organizations to develop a regional youth strategy and promote youth perspectives.

In 2014, the programme:

• Involved Honduras’ popular sports clubs (“barras bravas” in Spanish) in violence prevention. The clubs, named Ultra Fiel and Revolucionarios, mobilize up to 27,000 youth, a number large enough to serve as a broad basis for significant violence reduction. The process began with a series of dialogues and trainings on conflict transformation for youth, the majority of whom are at risk and lack education and job opportunities.

• Brought young people together from Belize, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama to establish a regional youth network called “Yo soy Centroamérica” (I am Central America). They strengthened their collaborative work in two regional seminars and drew up an agenda to influence regional policies working with SICA.

• Audited existing youth public policies working with national networks of youth organizations. Our partners, Coordinadora de Juventud de Guatemala (CJG) and Network Gritos in El Salvador, will disseminate the resulting social accountability reports to policymakers and civil society.

• Increased knowledge on youth violence through research in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras. The findings challenge traditional paradigms on protection and risk and clarify factors that result in youth being victimized and becoming perpetrators of violence. The research may lead to more in-depth consultative research and more effective violence prevention.

• Assisted Villa Nueva, Guatemala’s second largest city, at their request, in planning to implement a youth policy they drafted in concert with local youth networks and civil society.
Promoting positive change for high-risk youth

REDUCTION OF VIOLENCE IN EL SALVADOR

Despite democratic progress after emerging from a long civil war, El Salvador is marked by high poverty, inequality, weak public infrastructure and growing insecurity. Gangs and violent youth groups have grown more powerful, often taking control of poor urban areas. Some 60,000 youth belong to street gangs, of whom 10,000 are imprisoned.

In 2012, the two main gangs agreed to a cessation of hostilities, pledging to reduce their criminal activity in exchange for improved prison conditions, protection of their rights and opportunities for reintegration into society. Homicide rates dropped by almost 60%. In 2014, however, homicide rates rose again, due in part to a lack of political will to see the reduction of violence as an opportunity to support a major process of social peace.

Interpeace approaches the issue of violence in El Salvador through a peacebuilding lens that seeks to understand the structural causes behind the troubling number of young people turning to violent crime. Solutions look to the long term, for example, generating opportunities for gang members to rejoin the labour market and society. We seek to improve conditions for security and justice through initiatives that include perpetrators and those affected by the violence and by working with municipal authorities, the private sector and civil society.

In 2014, the programme:

- Advanced an 11-city “free of violence” initiative in which municipal authorities are working with communities to reduce gang violence. The programme adapts violence reduction activities to the urban contexts where gangs have thrived, assisted by a socio-economic diagnostic of each municipality. This process was carried out through interviews and focus groups and in concert with members of neighbourhood associations and churches as well as local authorities and gang members.

- Promoted the expansion of successful prison reform by documenting the government’s “Yo Cambio” pilot project so that it can be replicated in prisons across the country. The project, whose name roughly translates to “I’m changing,” transformed Apanteos prison in Santa Ana from one of the most violent and corrupt prisons in El Salvador to a model of penitentiary treatment and rehabilitation. Educational and productive activities organized by the prisoners themselves have not only made their relationships with each other more peaceful but opened the way for them to integrate back into society when they leave.

- Supported violence reduction efforts by others, including the Network of Communal Facilitators, which works to maintain peace and resolve specific conflicts in the municipalities; the Humanitarian Foundation, which engages the private sector in rehabilitation and economic reinsertion activities for high-risk youth; and national organizations that implemented projects under the framework of the EU Instrument for Stabilization (IFS) for El Salvador. Work with the latter involved documenting lessons learned.
Addressing the increasing role of the military in public security

SECURITY AND JUSTICE PROGRAMME

The decision by many Central American governments to use the military to maintain public security has undermined their already fragile democratic institutions and is commonly perceived as a threat to peace. In the case of social protests, for example, experience shows that the risk of violent confrontation increases when military personnel assume roles usually assigned to police trained in the rule of law and human rights.

Indeed, there is a troubling lack of legal and technical frameworks to guide the use of military force in civilian contexts. Many governments have also adopted policies that further criminalize perpetrators, harden justice sentences and increase security surveillance, despite little evidence that these policies reduce criminality and the overall level of violence.

The Interpeace programme is working to generate a broader debate on justice and security in Guatemala, including a technical discussion that defines the role of the military. There are eventual plans to expand the work to other Central American countries.

In 2014, the programme:

- Established conflict transformation mechanisms between the Guatemalan Ministry of Defense and civil society. In 2014, these mechanisms proved efficient in preventing violence during two social protests in Huehuetenango. The programme is preparing the conditions for a more comprehensive dialogue to help define, in a participatory way, the military’s participation in public security.
- Conducted participatory diagnostics on the perception of the military in public security in eight of Guatemala's 22 departments. It found, for example, that some reject a military role in public security in light of past abuses while others regard the military as the only institution capable of facing crime in the country.
- Initiated a project in El Boqueron prison with members of a gang called Mara Salvatrucha through job training and other productive activities.
Strengthening society’s resilience and ability to peacefully resolve conflicts

CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME

Central American economies depend on the exploitation of natural resources through mining, oil extraction, hydropower projects, and crops such as African palm. But as national and international companies are benefiting from the weakness of state institutions and regulations, communities are losing ground due to the lack of controls regarding access to, and the preservation of, natural resources.

In negotiations with the private sector over access to these resources, the state tends to protect the interests of private industry over that of communities. When communities have stated their positions in formal consultations, governments and industry have ignored the outcomes. Hence, communities have turned to social protest to voice their concerns.

All too frequently, States respond to these protests with repression, and in some cases have sanctioned the use of non-state armed actors to attack environmental and social organizations. The results have included violent confrontations with lethal consequences, in addition to high levels of political polarization, intolerance and divided communities. In Guatemala, the situation is amplified by the historical racism that shapes social relations and perpetuates the exclusion of indigenous people.

The conflict transformation programme is part of Interpeace’s Frameworks for Assessing Resilience (FAR) programme. It seeks to understand the key factors that drive these conflicts, but also the society’s capacities for resilience. The aim is to strengthen the positive coping capacities and to identify ways to access natural resources that are non-violent and democratic.

In 2014, the programme:

• Implemented the Frameworks for Assessing Resilience (FAR) project in Guatemala, which began with focus groups and interviews conducted with key social actors in the capital city and three departments. Participants identified three issues to serve as entry points for the consultation process: security and violence, socio-environmental conflicts and the fragility of public institutions.

• Conducted the first phase of the consultation process in 11 departments of Guatemala, which consisted of interviews and focus groups with politicians, entrepreneurs, women, youth, indigenous people and others. A key outcome was a note on resilience that will be used to initiate a national Participatory Action Research process to study how Guatemalans’ coping strategies affect social cohesion.
Promoting peace through broad participation and cutting-edge technology

The adoption of a new provisional Constitution in August 2012 and the subsequent formation of the Somali Federal Government created renewed momentum to rebuild Somalia. In addition, the Government, together with the African Union Mission in Somalia, carried out a military offensive to counter the jihadist insurgency posed by Al-Shabaab. These major steps forward have ushered in an era of new hope.

Nevertheless, the Government’s progress in meeting its priorities – stability, economic recovery, peacebuilding, service delivery, reconciliation and international relations – continues to be hampered by Al-Shabaab’s operations and political infighting, among other post-conflict challenges. Questions remain as to whether Somalia will be able to transition toward democratic legitimacy by holding elections in 2016.

In Somaliland, a hybrid governance structure, which embraces aspects of a multiparty democracy and a clan-based power-sharing system, has contributed to security and stability. However, localized conflicts persist, often over competition for scarce resources. In Puntland, momentum towards a more representative form of governance was dampened by the suspension of local council elections in 2013. However, a broad-based regional consultation conference planned for 2015 and a commitment by the President to appoint a new transitional electoral commission, there is hope for political reconciliation and a resumption of the stalled democratization process.

For almost 20 years, Interpeace has worked with its Somali partners to build and sustain a neutral political space for dialogue between stakeholders in the Somali region as well as supporting statebuilding processes through a peacebuilding lens. Among the partners Interpeace works with are the Academy for Peace and Development (APD) and the Somaliland National Youth Organization (SONYO) in Somaliland, the Puntland Development Research Center (PDRC) in Puntland, the Heritage Institute for Policy Studies in Mogadishu, and a new peacebuilding team in the southern regions.

In 2014, our programme used a range of tools to give people – especially women, youth, and marginalized groups – a voice in governance and engage them in peacebuilding. Societal and political stakeholders provided input on the design of “participatory polling” surveys and mobile technology made for swift data collection. The results indicated strong support for democratic processes, be it local council elections in Mogadishu, voter registration in Somaliland, or the democratization process in Puntland.

In 2014, APD launched a participatory process to develop better land management mechanisms. In Somaliland, we piloted a Local Governance Barometer, in which communities identified indicators they will use to measure government performance over time.

“The Peace Cup is a sign demonstrating support for the peace and reconciliation meeting for the people in the Lower Juba Region.”

– Mr. Abdi Ibrahim Abdi (known as Abdi-Bare), 1st Deputy Mayor of Kismayo responsible for social affairs
In Puntland, our partner, PDRC, hosted the first-ever consultative meeting between the President and the public, and co-organized similar public meetings in the towns of Burtinle and Galkayo. PDRC also conducted a mapping exercise to elicit people’s input on current challenges and opportunities related to democratization, decentralization and social reconciliation.

In light of the improving security situation, our programme established a new peacebuilding team for the south and central regions. In the Juba regions, the team has been engaging the community and administration on issues such as community security, reconciliation, the involvement of women and youth, and the identification of criteria for selecting a strong and effective state parliament. The programme team also organized a football tournament to commemorate the International Day of Peace, providing a rare opportunity for youth and other community members to be together in a spirit of peace and hope.

As the partner of the National Electoral Commission in Somaliland, Interpeace directly supported the development and procurement process for a new biometric voter registration process to be rolled out in 2015. Our democratization programme also organized two expert workshops on electoral systems for officials of the Somali Federal Government in Mogadishu and Djibouti.

MOBILE PEACEBUILDING

Building on the Somali region’s rich oral tradition, and taking into account high levels of illiteracy, Interpeace and its partner, the Puntland Development Research Center (PDRC) developed a mobile audio-visual unit (MAVU) that uses film to engage people in dialogues on peacebuilding, reconciliation, and civic participation. Viewings take place on a giant inflatable screen and are followed by moderated discussions.

In 2014, the MAVU process was replicated in Somaliland by Interpeace’s partner, the Academy for Peace and Development (APD). As in Puntland, the approach has proven particularly effective at reaching people in remote rural communities who appreciate the chance to take part in important societal conversations.

“It seems like magic on a wall. How is it possible for me to watch people speaking who are not present?” said an elder in the town of Gudmo Biyo-Aas in Somaliland. “I, for one, have been educated on the merits of this film screening.”

Community discussions using mobile audio-visual units played a key role in supporting reconciliation processes in Puntland (Xero-jale) and Somaliland (Oog and Gabiley). In Puntland, PDRC’s MAVU team screened films depicting past local reconciliations and facilitated discussion on how the reconciliation would occur in Xero-jale. When the negotiations between the two conflicting parties broke down, the team broadcasted peace poetry that softened community attitudes and brought the negotiating elders back to the discussion table.

In a similar approach, APD’s MAVU team in Somaliland recorded peace messages from two conflicting clans and shared these messages across the conflict line. As a result, both clans accepted the “blanket of peace” offered by the other, laying the foundation for a negotiated settlement to the conflict. APD also worked with the local administration to support and monitor the mediation effort.
Although the Algiers peace talks have broken off several times since they began in July 2014, there is hope that they will soon translate to a peace agreement. A signed accord between the conflicting parties, although critically important, is nevertheless one of numerous steps towards addressing the structural problems that triggered the 2012 crisis and caused the virtual collapse of the State.

Efforts to restore State authority and to reconstruct the country will need to be accompanied by the restoration of trust – between communities, and between the people and the State. However, the national Commission for Truth, Justice and Reconciliation (CVJR) established in 2014 is yet to be fully operational. Yet Malians’ expectations for a national reconciliation process in which they can actively participate remains high.

In 2014, Interpeace and its partner, the Malian Institute of Action Research for Peace (IMRAP) conducted a national dialogue process that engaged people at all levels of society and across political divides. Through 127 focus groups and more than 70 interviews, IMRAP consulted with more than 4,700 Malians from all walks of life and leanings, including members and sympathizers of armed groups, in all eight regions of Mali and in refugee camps in Mauritania and Niger. People identified the following major obstacles to peace: the management of socio-political diversity and the crisis of societal values; the regulation of the competition around resources and socio-economic opportunities; the governance of access to public services; and the mechanism for management and resolution of local conflict and armed rebellions.

The findings were validated by key Malian stakeholders at the National Conference and published as the Self-Portrait of Mali: On the Obstacles to Peace. A documentary film that captures highlights of the consultations and interviews of key participants is available on the Interpeace website. The findings also reveal that people have little knowledge of the realities in other parts of the country, a gap that tends to foster stereotypes, stigmatization, and a sense of inequality and marginalization. The Self-Portrait is therefore a remarkable example of Malians’ capacity to reach a consensus on the underlying challenges facing their society, one that goes beyond generally accepted narratives and overcomes societal divides.

Finding solutions to these priorities for peace is the next step. To ensure they are grounded in local realities, the Interpeace–IMRAP programme will conduct Participatory Action Research involving people from across the country. Thematic working groups made up of experts and resource persons will ensure solutions draw on best practices and research, while the parallel dialogue process will ensure the necessary participation and buy-in at grassroots and higher levels of the society.

“Our country needs this kind of meeting; it gives Malians the opportunity to talk frankly and self-critically in order to find a lasting solution for peace that every Malian hopes for.”

Participant in the National Conference in Bamako
The coup d’etat in April 2012 in Guinea-Bissau triggered a profound crisis that damaged the economy and further weakened state structures as conflicts multiplied between institutions and interest groups. In April 2014, however, the country held general elections that were hailed by observers for their exemplary process, respect of procedures and high turnout. International sanctions in place since the coup d’état were lifted, allowing trade and aid to resume. What is more, the election winners brought representatives of other political parties into the government, an inclusive move that helped to stabilize the country in the short term and lay the foundation for national reconciliation. Nevertheless, the country faces a difficult road ahead as it sets out to reform the judicial, defence and security sectors, and provide its people with basic services.

Interpeace and its partner, Voz di Paz, have been working to promote trust and dialogue within Guinea-Bissau through a joint programme since 2007. Voz di Paz’s capacity to engage with people across the social and political spectrum is due to its unique “peace architecture.” First are 10 Regional Spaces for Dialogue, in which leaders chosen by their communities can be called upon to help prevent and resolve local conflicts. The programme achieves broad reach through partnerships with more than 30 national and community-based radio programmes and a network of some 50 youth organizations. It also cultivates trust with the Government, members of the security forces and other key leaders.

Voz di Paz’s efforts to foster strong citizen engagement and promote a culture of debate played an active role in the lead up to the 2014 elections. Voz di Paz’s weekly radio programme, broadcast nationally and through 33 community radio stations, covered such topics as the roles and responsibilities of the state and its citizens, democracy, local governance, and the management of public goods. Voz di Paz asked the communities to develop peace messages that were voiced by prominent people at the start of each national news broadcast.

The Interpeace–Voz di Paz programme drew on its long experience of conducting countrywide research consultations to gain new input on the obstacles to peace. Voz di Paz facilitated a process in which key stakeholders re-examined the root causes and assessed the evolution of the situation, concluding that the dysfunctional justice system was perceived as the most urgent priority to be addressed.

“Voz di Paz makes it possible for people to speak up about what they care about. They have created a sense of citizenship and trust in the power of each individual.”
– Catholic priest from the region of Cacheu
Since the Liberian civil war ended in 2003, the country has undergone a period of economic reconstruction and largely avoided major violence. The 2014 Ebola crisis in West Africa, however, exposed weaknesses in Liberia’s systems and institutions and revealed both fractures in society and a lack of trust in the State.

Between 2010 and 2012, Interpeace and its Liberian partner, the Platform for Dialogue and Peace (P4DP) conducted nationwide consultations in which communities identified obstacles to peace, a process of participatory research broadly representative of Liberian society.

Since 2014, P4DP has engaged people in a nationwide discussion to identify the sources of resilience that exist in Liberian society – methods people currently use to overcome violent conflict and peacefully transform the threats to peace. This work is part of Interpeace’s Frameworks for Assessing Resilience (FAR) programme, which holds that peacebuilding is more effective when based on assets and strengths already present within a society. The initial project design sought to look at how Liberians cope with the structural threats to peace that persist more than ten years after the end of the civil war.

However, with the steepening of the Ebola crisis in July 2014 came the challenge to understand the society’s resilience in the face of a threat of a different nature, and how it interacts with strategies for coping with the structural threats to peace. After a temporary suspension of activities, during which time P4DP worked with Interpeace to re-orient the programme, consultations resumed in October, with outreach and research methods carefully revised to address health and security risks.

Despite daunting circumstances, more than 700 people from all sectors of society in Liberia’s 15 counties took part in the consultations in 2014. In interviews and focus group discussions, they identified existing capacities for resilience in the face of violent conflict and also discussed ways to cope with the devastation caused by the Ebola crisis.

Overall, most people relate to their immediate communities as primary sources of resilience. In the face of a State that does not deliver basic public goods, they rely on solidarity initiatives and traditional customs to resolve conflicts and provide livelihoods. P4DP is currently working on a report on the findings, which will serve as the basis for the programme’s second phase, in which stakeholders from a variety of sectors will convene regularly to propose strategies for strengthening resilience.

“When you begin to use local resources, you settle problems quickly, but if you start to look down on your own people, you will never know their qualifications.”

– Participant from Margibi County, FAR Consultation, November 2014
CÔTE D’IVOIRE

Involving urban youth in defining the dynamics of violence and how to break away from it

Since the end of the socio-political crisis in 2011, Côte d’Ivoire has seen continuous economic growth, numerous major infrastructure projects, and a reduction in insecurity. Despite these positive developments, the country remains divided between the people and political actors close to the regime of former President Laurent Gbagbo, and those supporting the current President Alassane Ouattara. In advance of the October 2015 elections, there are signs of increased tensions between the ruling majority and the opposition, as well as within political parties. Especially troubling are regular episodes of violence involving youth, especially in the urban areas, which is often driven by ex-combatants awaiting demobilization and by youth gangs. Meanwhile, the mandate of the Commission on Dialogue, Truth and Reconciliation (CDVR) came to an end, leaving a mixed sense of accomplishment, its contribution to reconciliation being limited.

Interpeace and its partner, the Initiative for Dialogue and Research Action for Peace, known as Indigo, are conducting joint participatory research to identify the obstacles to social cohesion and the dynamic of violence involving youth in Abidjan. To date, Indigo has consulted more than 700 people, mostly youth, through 30 focus groups and individual interviews in three communes of Abidjan: Abobo, Yopougon and Treichville.

Preliminary findings suggest four main obstacles to social cohesion:
• Socio-political dynamics around identities;
• Changing parental models and valorized images of the successful life;
• A bankrupt education system and a culture of violence in the schools; and
• The role of the transport sector in fostering youth violence.

The consultations demonstrated that youth, including those taking part in the violence, are capable and willing to come together to address these issues. Indeed, among participants’ requests for Indigo, was an opportunity for youth affiliated with political parties to engage in dialogues during the electoral period. Such work will be important to prevent the incidence of youth violence incited by political leaders.

The programme plans to conduct participatory research in other parts of the country and explore ways to open lines of communication around the elections and on land issues, which emerged in previously conducted participatory research as a main obstacle to peace in the West.

“You have a lot of things in your heart. But you have no one to talk with, because fear has invaded you and you do not know who you’re talking to.”

– B.E, a youth from Abobo, Abidjan, in appreciation for the chance to engage in the youth dialogues
THE GREAT LAKES REGION

Supporting local and regional actors to build peace across borders

Since around 1960, the Great Lakes region has been marked by violent conflicts with shifting epicentres, and with major cross-border consequences. Burundi was shaken by violent conflict with clear ethnic connotations from the early 1970s until the Arusha Peace Accords in 2000. The 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda escalated conflict on a regional level by forcing millions of people to flee and settle in adjacent countries. Today, the inability of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) to enforce control and rule of law in all of its territory, and especially the eastern provinces, favours the continued presence of national and foreign armed groups. Their fight for economic and political power causes immense suffering for civilians.

Interpeace’s regional programme works in four zones, comprising Rwanda, Burundi and the DRC provinces of North Kivu and South Kivu. The countries all face elections in the next few years, in a context marked by controversies about presidential term limits. Regional stability will largely depend on ensuring that each country administers them in a free, fair and inclusive way. The fragility of the situation, however, was seen in the spring of 2015, as the unfolding pre-election violence caused thousands of Burundians to seek refuge in Rwanda and the DRC.

In the face of tactics politicians use to manipulate people on the basis of ethnic and community identities, Interpeace and its partners aim to build cooperation and trust between citizens who will then be able to act as change agents for peace at the regional level. Our partners include Never Again Rwanda, and the Conflict Alert and Prevention Centre (CENAP) in Burundi. In the DRC, our partners include the Réseau d’Innovation Organisationnelle (RIO) and l’Action pour la Paix et la Concorde (APC) in South Kivu province, as well as Pole Institute and the Centre d’Etudes Juridiques Appliquées (CEJA) in North Kivu province.

This regional work gained traction in 2014 as the programme carried out launch meetings attended by hundreds of people from all walks of life in the four zones. The resulting locally led working groups and steering committees conducted research and advocacy during the second half of 2014. Significantly, the programme engaged top Government decision-makers from the three countries in the process, who clearly expressed their continuous support for the programme, increasing its potential for positive impact.

The programme also created a regional platform for civil society organizations, which then hosted a number of community dialogues on identity-based stereotyping and the need for tolerance, especially among youth. Regional institutions such as the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (CIRGL) and the Economic Community of the Great Lakes Countries (CEPGL) also took part in the Interpeace programme.

The partners conducted more than 60 focus groups and more than 30 individual interviews on “land, identity, population movement and conflicts in the Great Lakes region,” which will be presented in mid-2015 at a forum in which a diverse group of key stakeholders from across the region will create the mandate for the next phase of the programme.
Burundi stands at a critical juncture in its peacebuilding and democratization process as the 2015 elections approach. In March 2014, the Parliament defeated a constitutional amendment to allow the President to run for a third term, and since then the ruling party has often obstructed the functioning of the opposition parties. What’s more, youth wings of the main political parties have engaged sporadically in politically motivated intimidation and violence.

In this atmosphere of rising tension and shrinking political space, Interpeace and its partner, the Conflict Alert and Prevention Centre (CENAP), have continued to foster dialogues, keeping open – and sometimes initiating – critical lines of communication across the political divide. Facilitated by CENAP, these dialogues have involved government representatives, the ruling party, opposition parties, civic groups and the people. A national meeting in March 2014 attended by top political leaders and Burundians from across the society set priorities for peaceful elections in 2015 and initiated accountability reviews of elected officials.

“A key achievement was the June 2014 adoption of a Code of Conduct for the 2015 elections in which political parties, political actors and the United Nations committed to a certain number of principles to ensure credible multi-party elections. CENAP contributed to this result by facilitating an inclusive process,” a role it also played in reforming the country’s electoral law.

In later months, as national political actors grew less interested in dialogue, CENAP’s provincial work took on more importance. Radio debates alongside six provincial dialogues not only brought people’s solutions for peaceful elections to a wide audience but reportedly made authorities more responsive. These dialogues also gave recognized and non-recognized wings of political parties a rare chance to interact. The five permanent dialogue groups begun by CENAP in 2013 brought together youth affiliated with different political parties, and hundreds of youth were trained in the peaceful resolution of conflict, communication and democratic values.

“We commit to holding regular meetings with representatives of all parties in the province at least once every three months, to enhance a healthy political climate and to be able to discuss everyone’s preoccupations.”

– Provincial Governor

“...We are honored to participate in the accountability meetings because it gives us a chance to learn about the life in our municipality and to contribute to improving it.”

– Participant from Mwumba in northern Burundi
Empowering citizens, consolidating peace

Twenty years after the 1994 Rwandan genocide against the Tutsi, the country has made substantial progress in the social, economic and political realms, yet several challenges to sustainable peace remain. Chief among these is a viable multiparty system, which many consider fundamental to the country’s stability. The ruling political party’s control of the civil society landscape means there is limited space to openly discuss issues vital for democracy, including residual tensions from the Gacaca reconciliation process, which, in addition to playing a foundational role in post-genocide statebuilding, also re-opened old wounds.

The Interpeace programme in Rwanda aims to contribute to the consolidation of a peaceful and inclusive Rwandan society, able to peacefully manage conflicts, embrace diversity, and enact policies that are responsive to citizen priorities.

Achievements in 2014 include the finalization of a Local Governance Barometer, a tool to engage citizens in the process of defining what is meant by good governance and monitoring progress using indicators measuring people’s trust in public institutions, transparency, service delivery, citizen participation, accountability and the rule of law. The barometer, as well as participatory research on poverty reduction strategies, was finalized during the closing phase of Interpeace’s partnership with the Institute of Research and Dialogue for Peace in the first half of 2014.

Interpeace and its current partner, Never Again Rwanda, are implementing a new programme focused on societal healing and participatory governance. It will empower citizens to use new and existing ways to communicate with decision-makers at local, district and national levels. The programme facilitates dialogues in which community members can openly discuss sensitive topics, identify solutions and reach consensus on priorities for peace.
Societies that have recently emerged from conflict are often fragile, susceptible to being drawn back into violent conflict. This was the case in Libya in 2014, when fighting between pro-government and Islamist militias reached a new level of intensity with the July battle for Tripoli International Airport, and soon spread more widely, from Tripoli to Benghazi to Sebha. Elsewhere tribal clashes are wreaking havoc on the country’s already fragile social fabric as community relations further disintegrate along regional, tribal, city and even neighbourhood lines. Regional and tribal allegiances are gradually dictating general attitudes and political outlooks.

This development made it increasingly difficult for Interpeace and our partner, Assabil, to proceed with our joint programme to explore ways to develop an infrastructure for peace in Libya. The challenges were many. The legitimacy of the new government was in question by a majority of Libyans as the parliament, largely confined to Tripoli, lacked the ability to consolidate peace. The state of internal fragmentation was compounded by other nations vying for Libya’s oil and other assets, already a keen source of internal competition.

Nevertheless, by mid-2014, the programme had been able to make important progress:

• A diverse team used Interpeace methodology to map people’s views on the obstacles and priorities to lasting peace. They began with local communities in the South and moved on to urban centers in the North such as Tripoli, Misurata and Benghazi. Assabil engaged community wisemen, formal authorities and militias, gaining growing respect for the work, and included women and youth, ensuring multiple voices were heard despite widespread marginalization.

• When high levels of mistrust among tribal groups in of the Sebha region made them reluctant to come together for dialogue, the team involved groups trusted by all parties. And when travel in and around Sebha became unsafe, the team reoriented their strategy, for example, expanding further in the south into Murzuq and Ubari, where social dynamics were similar and access was easier.

• The mapping process concluded with more than 500 Libyans consulted in the south. A document capturing the broad array of perspectives has been written and will inform future planning.

Expanding acts of violence and deteriorating security conditions, however, led Interpeace to significantly reduce the scope of the program. While initially, the programme intended a gradual national coverage, the context only allowed for a consultation process in the South with numerous interruptions. Interpeace will continue to assess the situation with an eye toward resuming the work in the future. Meanwhile, the programme’s work in 2014 provides a window onto what is possible for peacebuilding in Libya.
The devastating losses from the Israeli assault on Gaza in July 2014 have compounded a sense of desperation within Palestinian society stemming from the failure of all peace talks since the Oslo Accords in 1993. Lessons from these failures have yet to be drawn, including the fact that large segments of Palestinian society remain excluded from the peace process.

Since 2004, Interpeace’s programme in Palestine, Mustakbalna (“our future” in Arabic), has worked towards a common vision for a future state that represents people’s concerns and is supported by the leadership. To this end, Mustakbalna formed working groups of influential members of society, such as ex-detainees, members of Parliament, mid-level leaders, members of civil society, women and youth. The aim is to empower agents for change to act with influence and to reach out to those who are tired of internal political divisions and are thus keen to exert popular pressure on the leadership.

Highlights of the programme in 2014:

• In an important step toward a common vision, Mustakbalna engaged a cross-section of society in discussions on the shape of a future state. In the first half of 2014, seven workshops across the West Bank and Gaza brought experts and politicians from across the political spectrum together with the Mustakbalna working groups. The discussions provided participants, especially youth, with more clarity and opened the possibility for them to consider different scenarios.

• In light of rising attention to the international recognition of the state of Palestine, it became important to identify points of convergence among the different political factions. Mustakbalna’s team interviewed the secretaries-general and other officials of the 13 political parties in the West Bank and Gaza for a study that explores each party’s vision on statehood, a step that encouraged politicians to attend Mustakbalna workshops and to listen to the other parties’ viewpoints. The programme also sought the views of ordinary people, producing a short documentary that showed widespread support for a free state, but a lack of consensus around the aspired shape of state.

• A broad-based national gathering in May reviewed the outcomes of the local discussions, the political parties’ visions and the viewpoints of ordinary people. Its presentation of the pros and cons of the different scenarios led to further community discussions. Some 70 key participants included high-ranking representatives from all political parties, members of Parliament, ex-detainees and civil society members. Palestinians from Jenin, Hebron, Ramallah, Nablus, the areas of 1948, and Gaza joined through video conferencing.

• As the July assault on Gaza affected working group members, Mustakbalna provided a space for them to deal with the crisis. They came together to conduct joint outreach but also to process the losses they and their families were suffering.

“"It is not an intellectual luxury to discuss the future shape of the Palestinian state; it is mandatory to do so, in order to define strategies to achieve our desired homeland.”

– National workshop participant from Jenin

The programme team also produced on-the-ground analyses of the political dynamics and the ceasefire agreement.

• Seeking public input into the reconstruction of Gaza, the programme team interviewed citizens from the heavily hit areas as well as analysts and politicians from Fatah, Hamas and other parties, sharing their report with key stakeholders. A subsequent report focused on the humanitarian crisis of displaced people living in Gaza.

• Mustakbalna continued to create opportunities for political factions to come together to discuss key issues. At two December workshops in Hebron and Jenin, for example, politicians from all parties joined members of Mustakbalna working groups to address media incitement between Hamas and Fatah, the larger political situation, diplomatic efforts and the stalled construction in Gaza.
Using new tools to gauge people’s priorities and move toward reconciliation

The Cyprus conflict remains one of the longest-lasting, unresolved issues of the international community. Since 1977, the negotiations for a bi-zonal, two-community federation have been the basis for a settlement. Should these negotiations be successfully concluded, the Greek-Cypriot community in the south and Turkish-Cypriot community in the north will be called upon to ratify the agreement through simultaneous and separate referenda on both sides of the Green Line.

Yet, what has been passed as a Cypriot-led process over the past four years falls short of the participatory ideal it promised. It has alienated people, limiting the leaders' scope for negotiation as political compromises remain a hard sell to a skeptical public. The gap is not limited to Cypriot communities and their authorities; there are also deep ideological rifts between various segments of society and within the respective communities. As a result, many issues are taboo, including the subject of reconciliation, and there is currently little space to address them.

Interpeace’s partner in Cyprus is the Center for Sustainable Peace and Democratic Development (SeeD), the country's first bi-communal think tank. Our joint programme consists of two main lines of work:

• First is participatory polling, in which people take part in designing the surveys and interpreting the data. The process enables the voices of ordinary citizens to be heard and considered by the negotiators — and enables SeeD to gauge public priorities and analyze which policy options might be part of a comprehensive settlement in Cyprus.

• The second line of work measures the impact of peacebuilding activities through the use of the Social Cohesion and Reconciliation (SCORE) Index. It also captures social and political trends between and within the two communities in Cyprus over time.

Highlights in 2014:

SeeD contributed to regional peacebuilding by creating a six-country consortium of think tanks to promote dialogue on energy cooperation and sustainable development in the Eastern Mediterranean; SeeD’s expert policy analysis and briefs were used by key actors in the Cyprus peace process; and SeeD was invited to implement the SCORE Index in Nepal in order to produce policy recommendations for consideration by Nepal’s Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction.

“The U.S. government is very proud to have supported the creation of the SCORE. There is no substitute for informed debate, particularly on an issue of such burning relevance for the people of Cyprus and of such significance for regional developments as a Cyprus settlement.”

– U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus, John Koenig
Decades of violence and failed peace initiatives have left public opinion within Israel sharply divided on key issues related to peace. In addition, most peace initiatives have focused on those in Israel who are already part of the peace camp. If a future accord is to bring lasting peace, it is essential to bring sidelined groups into the peace process.

The overall goal of Interpeace’s programme in Israel, Base for Discussion (B4D), is to address this gap by contributing to the development of a common vision for peace within Israeli society. Since 2004, the programme has been facilitating discussions on possible scenarios for a peaceful resolution to the conflict with key sectors of Israeli society. These are groups who have been excluded from peace efforts, but nonetheless have a stake in making or breaking the peace. They include Palestinian-Arab citizens of Israel, the ultra-Orthodox community and the Russian-speaking population. Together they represent more than half of the Israeli population. B4D engages with people who are in mid-level leadership position, meaning that they have influence with their leaders and with the grassroots and may assume top leadership in the future.

Through the BD4 programme, the ultra-Orthodox community, Palestinian-Arab citizens of Israel, and the Russian-speaking community have become constructive change agents within their communities.

Recently, BD4 has created a space in which the three communities interact and discuss their visions for peace. Now B4D is starting to engage with the influential traditional right wing, from political figures and community leaders to pro-settlers and average voters. The programme is also beginning to reach out to religious Zionists. It is hoped that broader participation can lay the groundwork for seeking common positions on the country’s vision for peace.

“What people do not realize is that we have to be with those who lost the path to peace and hold their hands even tighter than we do anyone else.”

– Adina Bar Shalom, ultra-Orthodox community leader, founder of the Haredi College for women and recipient of the 2014 Israel Prize

David Glass, an influential figure in Israeli politics and religious affairs, passed away in August 2014. Interpeace greatly appreciates the insights and support he provided the programme over the years.
Since its independence from Indonesia in 1999, Timor-Leste has faced successive political crises and cycles of violence. These crises reflect a deep divide between citizens and the government authorities, a plague of corruption and nepotism, and widespread poverty and unemployment, especially for youth. Recurrent tensions between armed forces and a weak under-resourced judicial sector offer little in the way of stability or resolution of local conflicts such as land disputes, and decision-making is dominated by an elite based in the capital, Dili. As Timor-Leste launches a decentralization process, political analysts fear that patronage will extend even further, making it more difficult to combat.

Interpeace and its partner, the Centre of Studies for Peace and Development (CEPAD), have been supporting peacebuilding in Timor-Leste through a joint programme since 2007. After conducting a nationwide consultation that identified corruption as one of the major challenges impeding lasting peace, the programme created an advocacy coalition to press for legislative and policy reform. Called the Group Promoting Change, it includes leaders in academia, civil society, the Catholic Church, the press, the judiciary and the armed forces. It is complemented by programme efforts to raise the voice of citizens in support of reform.

Timor-Leste is also one of the three countries where Interpeace is piloting Frameworks for Assessing Resilience (FAR), a programme that looks at a country’s capacities for resilience in pursuit of peace.

In 2014, the programme:
• Began to construct the country’s fifth Peace House, a neutral space for dialogue and community-based activities. The Peace Houses were created at the request of local communities, who also run them. The important role of the Peace Houses is recognized by high-level leaders such as former President Ramos Horta and the Prime Minister, whose Civil Society fund supported the construction of the fifth one in the district of Manufahi.
• Launched a civic education campaign and citizen action networks on the negative effects of corruption, collusion and nepotism in collaboration with FOTI Timor-Leste, a USAID funded anti-corruption project. It reached a significant milestone in February 2014 when the Ministry of Education agreed to incorporate the storybook, Baino & Binoi, which was part of the campaign materials, into the national curriculum.
• Advanced policy reform through the Group Promoting Change (GPC), which is advocating for an improved anti-corruption legislative framework, stronger control systems and regulation of political parties. The GPC was invited by the President of Timor-Leste and the President of Parliament to work with parliamentarians to draft a more comprehensive anti-corruption law.

“We can’t keep thinking of obstacles [to peace], of how difficult this is. It’s time to start talking about what makes us strong.”

– Jose Guterres, the National Directorate of Peacebuilding and Social Cohesion, Ministry of Social Solidarity at a CEPAD meeting on Frameworks for Assessing Resilience.
In 2014, Interpeace undertook strategic operational assignments in Colombia, Myanmar and the Middle East and North Africa. We also continue to monitor political developments in several countries in Africa, Asia and Europe and the Middle East and North Africa to assess whether Interpeace could help lay the foundation for more peaceful societies in those places.

**MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA**

The tremors of the Arab Spring continue to shape the region’s socio-political outlook, with Tunisia as the exception of peaceful political transition in a region defined by political polarization, recurring clashes and worsening levels of violence. Looking ahead, the role of the international community will be critical to the region's efforts to effect stable transitions. Rushed institutional milestones, however, will need to be replaced by wide-reaching societal dialogue processes. Only by addressing local populations' socioeconomic grievances can the region move beyond the dynamics of conflict.

In 2014 Interpeace continued to explore options for engagement in the region, monitoring developments and producing research and analysis of the changing dynamics. An analytical paper on the Tunisian political transition, for example, provided strategic input to several missions to that country to assess the situation and to identify opportunities for an Interpeace initiative there.

**COLOMBIA**

After the launch of formal peace talks in November 2012 in Havana, Cuba, between the Colombian Government and the Colombian rebel group Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), there has been steady progress towards a comprehensive peace deal to conclude over five decades of conflict in the country. While issues such as the proliferation of paramilitary groups and criminal activity remain outside the scope of the peace talks, several concessions made by both sides have created a new sense of hope that the current peace talks might well be successful.

Towards the end of 2014 and in early 2015, Interpeace carried out research and organized an initial exploratory mission to Colombia. The team sought to deepen Interpeace’s understanding of the local dynamics and to explore how its approach could help lay the foundation for a robust peacebuilding process in synergy with other institutions involved in post-conflict assistance.

---

**ON THE HORIZON: PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT**

Creating a culture of inclusion and showing that everyone has a role to play in building peace
MYANMAR

Ceasefire negotiations between the Government and rebel groups dominated Myanmar’s political landscape in 2014. While democratic reforms have made impressive progress since the opening of the country in 2011, the upcoming elections have for the moment overshadowed the democratization process. In late 2014, the authorities’ commitment to reform was called into question in view of the slipping deadline for a national ceasefire and the shrinking likelihood of key constitutional amendments before the late-2015 elections.

Responding to a growing number of requests by our donors and local and international organizations, Interpeace deployed a team to Myanmar in two missions in late 2013 and 2014. The aim was to gain greater understanding of the complex socio-political dynamics and the peacebuilding needs. Interpeace continues to explore opportunities to strengthen local capacities to build sustainable peace, and will closely monitor the peace process as well as political developments during the presidential elections.

SWEDEN

As Europe has become more diverse over the last decades, dynamics of social, economic, and political exclusion have taken hold, resulting in grievances and, at times, violent unrest in London, Paris, and recently, Stockholm.

The district of Tensta, a suburb of Stockholm that is home to a large number of immigrants, experienced social unrest and protests in 2012 and 2013. Young people took an active part, demanding that their voices be heard.

These incidents brought to light a significant gap between people with an immigrant background and other Swedes. Many perceive Tensta as one of the most dangerous areas in the country, and it is often portrayed negatively in the media. Its residents, however, are proud to live in such a multicultural and diverse environment. This gap in perception has become an obstacle to social cohesion.

In 2014, we launched a pilot project to explore whether Interpeace’s approach could be useful in addressing the emerging tensions in the suburbs of Stockholm. The project engaged residents and members of local government and civil society in a process to better understand the sources of tension and identify options to address them. Following positive feedback, Interpeace is exploring long-term programming aimed at contributing to a culture of dialogue based on participation and inclusion. It will seek to involve youth and other marginalized groups in defining a better future.
Interpeace created its International Peacebuilding Advisory Team (IPAT) in response to an increasing demand from governments and international agencies for technical assistance and advice. IPAT advisers draw on Interpeace’s approach to help peacebuilders apply new skills and insights and broaden the quality of their engagement.

In 2014, IPAT engaged in a number of advisory and capacity-strengthening initiatives with United Nations agencies, foundations, national governments and local organizations.

- Papua New Guinea: The UN Country Team and Peacebuilding Support Office engaged IPAT to provide guidance on conducting a broad-based, participatory Peace and Development Analysis under the auspices of the Government of Papua New Guinea and the Autonomous Bougainville Government.
- Egypt: IPAT provided technical advice on designing a youth project on democratization and reconciliation in Egypt carried out jointly by the MADA Foundation and Cairo University.
- Ethiopia: IPAT supported the analysis of the relationship between violence, conflict and the educational sector in four regional states under its partnership with UNICEF and in collaboration with the Ministry of Education, and the University of Addis Ababa Centre for Federal Studies. This also included advising on field-based research and analysis.
- Comoros Islands: IPAT supported UNDP’s peacebuilding programme through consultations with governmental and civil society actors and exploring local perceptions on the challenges and the opportunities for enhancing social and political cohesion across the Islands. IPAT advised on multi-stakeholder approaches and a possible national dialogue process.
- Central African Republic: IPAT advised the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs on potential peacebuilding initiatives through consultations with government, civil society and international organizations as well as mapping the conflict dynamics and actors.
- Ukraine: IPAT conducted two missions with Brussels-based mediatEUr and the Kiev-based International Center for Policy Studies on implementing a national dialogue process. We consulted with a range of government and civil society actors and advised on the design and facilitation of two workshops in Kiev and Kharkiv, bringing together a group of actors to discuss dialogue opportunities in Ukraine.
- Great Lakes region: IPAT supported the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs in developing its regional strategy. This included advisory support and a workshop for senior staff from Dutch embassies in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda.
- Kenya: IPAT advised the National Cohesion and Integration Commission on its dialogue and reconciliation work in northern Kenya and facilitated workshops to support the design of a pilot process to promote equal opportunity and peaceful co-existence between ethnic communities in Mandera County.

IPAT also led a range of customized courses and facilitated dialogues on such topics as:

- Conflict analysis and leadership dialogue – for the Joint UNDP/DPA Programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention.
- Effective advising in complex and fragile situations – a pilot course for technical experts (civilian or uniformed) supporting public sector reform.
- Enhancing leadership for peacebuilding – an annual senior-level peacebuilding course given in collaboration with the Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP) on behalf of the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs and with the support of UNITAR.
- Conflict sensitivity – a reflective learning event based on a scenario of a significant influx of refugees in a fragile and highly politicized environment for staff of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

“The IPAT adviser created an excellent atmosphere for critical reflection and analysis, while keeping an eye on the required end result and the way forward. This resulted in well-balanced discussions... Having someone who is both an expert in the field we are working in, and a very experienced facilitator of such planning processes, proved to be of great added value.”
– Focal point for the regional Great Lakes programme, Government of the Netherlands
STRATEGIC ADVISING

Working hand in hand with each client to address their specific needs, IPAT’s advisers support the development of peacebuilding strategies, policies, and processes. We provide:

• Guidance to help clients take forward their peacebuilding initiatives.
• Technical assistance in designing and carrying out a range of activities.
• Accompaniment throughout the cycle from assessment to implementation by providing guidance and assistance when and where it is needed.

Examples include support to design and carry out:

Participatory Conflict Analyses • Peace and Development Analyses • Post-Conflict Needs Assessments • National and Regional Peacebuilding Strategies • Reconciliation Processes • Social Cohesion Dialogues • Constitution-making Processes • Strategic Design and Planning

CAPACITY STRENGTHENING

IPAT provides training to enhance the ability of teams and individuals to engage effectively in their peacebuilding roles. Through our approach to reflective learning, both our annual courses and customized workshops are designed to help participants:

• Deepen their awareness of critical issues such as the value of multi-stakeholder processes; the role of emotional and relational aspects of peacebuilding; and the importance of gaining broad-based support through an inclusive national process.
• Strengthen their skills to address these issues, for example, how to close the gap between external analysis and local experience.
• Improve their know-how to bring together knowledge and skills to engage in a more strategic and effective manner.

IPAT’s Annual Courses are highly interactive and incorporate participants’ specific practical challenges. Courses include:

• Effective Advising in Peacebuilding Contexts equips advisers working in a range of contexts by honing skills in interaction and navigating the broader political and institutional environments in which they operate.
• Enhancing Leadership for Peacebuilding is a five-day course in which current and potential leaders enhance their understanding of sustainable peacebuilding and leadership styles.

IPAT’s Customized Learning Events are designed in close cooperation with the needs and goals of our clients.

Customized Diplomatic Training Courses • Increasing the Ability to Work with Conflict-Sensitivity • Participatory Assessment Skills • Peacebuilding Dialogue Skills • Planning for Local Ownership
In 2014, Interpeace launched the Frameworks for Assessing Resilience (FAR) programme in the context of a growing international awareness of the need to better assess and address the key sources of fragility and resilience within fragile countries.

Governments, the societies they serve, and the international community have been asking such questions as: What makes societies fragile and prone to violent conflict as opposed to resilient and able to respond creatively to conflict and crisis? How do some societies steer social change in ways that foster shared benefits of peace and development? What constitutes progress on the path to greater resilience – and lasting peace – for both states and societies?

Interpeace’s FAR programme operates in Timor-Leste, Guatemala and Liberia. We use participatory and inclusive processes to engage a wide range of stakeholders in discussing the factors of resilience in their society. The aim is not just to identify existing capacities people use to cope with violence, but to capture ways people assess their resilience as an alternative to top-down approaches. Rooting assessment processes in the perspectives and experiences of those being assessed will provide a stronger foundation for peacebuilding. In this way, FAR seeks to complement efforts to measure and compare resilience across societies, such as that of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS).

In 2014, the programme:

• Implemented consultation processes in Timor-Leste, Guatemala and Liberia. Following a mapping phase to identify key actors, areas of conflict and elements of resilience from April to June, Interpeace’s country partners undertook a broad consultation process to learn how resilience is understood by communities and individuals. In Liberia, the worsening of the Ebola epidemic led Interpeace and its partner, P4DP, to reorient the focus on how the crisis interacted with longer-term issues of conflict and violence and to revise methods of consultation in response to health and security risks.

• Presented the findings from the consultation phase to national stakeholders in Timor-Leste and Guatemala. Representatives from all sectors of society came together to review and validate the factors of resilience that had been identified during the nationwide focus group discussions and key informant interviews. They also did some planning for the FAR programme’s second phase, which is to develop concrete strategies to strengthen resilience for building peace.

• Designed a survey to supplement the qualitative data from the consultations with quantitative data. Each survey will collect data from a randomly selected group of people using rigorous statistical methods to assess trends, compare results between different population groups, and identify relationships among variables. Designed together with the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, Interpeace’s partners in the pilot countries and national stakeholders, the survey will be rolled out in Guatemala and Timor-Leste in 2015.

“When talking about actions taken to face difficult situations, people do not view this as resilience. They talk instead of resistance, dignity and combativeness.”

– FAR researcher, Guatemala

FAR is a global programme that looks at a country’s capacities for resilience in pursuit of peace

FRAMEWORKS FOR ASSESSING RESILIENCE

“When talking about actions taken to face difficult situations, people do not view this as resilience. They talk instead of resistance, dignity and combativeness.”

– FAR researcher, Guatemala

understood by communities and individuals. In Liberia, the worsening of the Ebola epidemic led Interpeace and its partner, P4DP, to reorient the focus on how the crisis interacted with longer-term issues of conflict and violence and to revise methods of consultation in response to health and security risks.

• Presented the findings from the consultation phase to national stakeholders in Timor-Leste and Guatemala. Representatives from all sectors of society came together to review and validate the factors of resilience that had been identified during the nationwide focus group discussions and key informant interviews. They also did some planning for the FAR programme’s second phase, which is to develop concrete strategies to strengthen resilience for building peace.

• Designed a survey to supplement the qualitative data from the consultations with quantitative data. Each survey will collect data from a randomly selected group of people using rigorous statistical methods to assess trends, compare results between different population groups, and identify relationships among variables. Designed together with the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, Interpeace’s partners in the pilot countries and national stakeholders, the survey will be rolled out in Guatemala and Timor-Leste in 2015.
• Shared the programme’s approach to resilience in key global processes and international forums. These included an Expert Group Roundtable on Resilience in New York (which we co-hosted with UNDP, UNICEF and the Rockefeller Foundation) and a presentation at a two-day strategic workshop with Humanity United. We advocated for a more systematic representation of civil society actors in the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS) and also in the country-level implementation of the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States. Interpeace also took part in the Civil Society Platform on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS) as a member of the executive committee.

INITIAL FINDINGS

• Developed in the fields of engineering, ecology and psychology, the concept of resilience has more recently been applied in humanitarian fields. The initial FAR research, however, indicates that the ways in which resilience is applied in these fields are not always applicable to peacebuilding. In disaster recovery, for example, resilience is seen as the capacities that enable communities to respond to external shocks such as floods or earthquakes. Violent conflict, on the other hand, is often rooted in more internal or human-made processes and social behaviour. In fact, the solidarity and socio-political cohesion that is critical to resilient recovery from humanitarian or natural disasters is itself the primary casualty of violent conflict. The damage wrought by violent conflict rends the social fabric, decimating trust between people and between society and the state.

• Resilience to violent conflict is often implicit, revealed only in times of crisis or evidenced by the lack of such violence. It is thus all the more important to bring existing capacities to light in fragile societies and to provide individuals, communities and institutions with incentives and conditions to enhance these capacities. Such a process will not only help prevent violent conflict but also help them better respond to external shocks.

• An increasing number of international peacebuilding initiatives aim to strengthen resilience in conflict-affected societies and fragile states. However, FAR findings show that not all manifestations of resilience are benevolent: coping mechanisms can also be negative. In the three FAR programme countries, the phenomenon of youth and criminal gangs has been observed as a response to youth marginalization. In other words, their exclusion from society is a factor leading them to forge alternative places of belonging and livelihoods. The systems of patronage and corruption that often become entrenched in state structures and embedded in relationships to the state are another example of negative resilience. This more nuanced understanding of resilience presents additional challenges for how peacebuilders relate to resilience as an organizing principle.
GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS AT INTERPEACE

In 2014, Interpeace developed its first-ever communications strategy, a process involving extensive consultations with staff, Interpeace partners, members of the Interpeace Governing Council, Advisory Council and its donors. Expert communication advice was provided by an international communications and leadership consulting firm. Our Global Engagement and Communications team was operationalized as per the strategy, which includes communications Officers/Focal points in each of Interpeace’s regional offices.

GLOBAL LEARNING AT INTERPEACE

Interpeace’s Global Learning Team was created in late 2013 to foster cross-institutional sharing and learning about our work and to promote reflection on Interpeace’s rich peacebuilding experience. In 2014, the team, located in Geneva and in Interpeace’s regional offices, worked with staff to document important programme results to be shared internally and externally, for example, through our Peacebuilding in Practice series. Interpeace’s renewed emphasis on learning is also illustrated by the regular training sessions that were organized for staff and partners. In 2014 these included: a training on Participatory Action Research (PAR) for six partner teams and 13 civil society organizations in the Great Lakes region; finance trainings for staff and partners in Nairobi, Abidjan and Bamako; and audio-visual research training for teams in Mali, Côte d’Ivoire and the Great Lakes region. In addition learning workshops were held on key tools used by Interpeace programmes such as participatory polling, Participatory Action Research and creating a Local Governance Barometer and various technologies for peace.

Peacebuilding in Practice is a series of publications produced by Interpeace in which we share innovations from our peacebuilding programmes worldwide. The first case study, “Influential ultra-Orthodox Women Are Change Agents for Peace,” discusses how Interpeace’s partners in Israel, Base for Discussion (B4D), reached out to one of the groups often overlooked in the peace process despite their potential to make or break the peace. Some of the most contentious issues in the peace negotiation (such as the status of the holy sites) have religious implications, thus involving this community is vital for reaching a solution to the conflict. The case study testifies to the need to go beyond the political level to engage key societal groups.

The second case study, “An Innovation to Engage People in Peace Processes: Reflections from Cyprus,” explores the practice of participatory polling in which the general public is consulted on policy issues. Mediation efforts have failed because they have not taken into account public opinion in the two communities, the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots. This tool, which was implemented by Interpeace’s partner in Cyprus, the Center for Sustainable Peace and Democratic Development (SeeD), allows decision-makers to identify the issues citizens consider most salient. The poll results thus serve as a basis for public dialogue and the policy-making process. This case study also shows that participatory polling can be applied in diverse contexts.

Additional Peacebuilding in Practice issues are in progress.
Interpeace’s Youth Programme produced two cases studies on work in El Salvador:

“Santa Tecla: A Fertile Ground to Reduce Violence” is about one of the communities that have declared themselves violence-free. This case study investigates the prevention efforts that were undertaken by various actors to reduce violence in the community.

“Ilopango, One Year Later” analyzes the changes that happened in Ilopango after it was declared a “town free of violence.” It was the first town to join the transformation process that was started by the truce between the two major gangs in El Salvador in March 2012.

**CONSTITUTION-MAKING AND REFORM**

Constitution-making and Reform: Options for the Process is a how-to guide for constitution-makers around the world. It contains comprehensive discussions about risks, opportunities, and options for each phase and step in a constitution-making process. More than 120 practitioners and experts with first-hand field experience contributed to the handbook, which consists of over 100 case studies. This seminal work is now in Arabic, English, French, Vietnamese and soon to be in Ukrainian and Russian. By Michele Brandt, Jill Cottrell, Yash Ghai, Anthony Regan.

More resources on constitution-making, including our in-depth Guidance series, are available at constitutionmakingforpeace.org
In 2014, Interpeace celebrated two decades of peacebuilding around the world through a series of events and an anniversary journal featuring Interpeace’s work to reduce and prevent violent conflict. Below are some highlights.

**AN ANNIVERSARY JOURNAL**

Interpeace’s regional office in Latin America produced an anniversary journal highlighting its work in the region. They are available in English and in Spanish on Interpeace’s website.

In the first edition: an interview with Edelberto Torres Rivas, sociologist and former Interpeace director, on the value of dialogue in achieving sustainable peace in Guatemala; an article by Bernardo Arévalo de León, peacebuilding expert and former Interpeace director for Latin America, on transforming security institutions in Guatemala; and an article by Isabel Aguilar Umaña, who directs Interpeace’s work on Central American youth, on sports clubs as a hope for community building and violence reduction in Honduras.

In the second edition: an article by Francisco Jiménez Irungaray on the relationship between the armed forces and the people in Guatemala and the region; an interview with Adam Blackwell of the Organization of American States (OAS) on a more holistic approach to security; and an article by Scott M. Weber, Director-General of Interpeace, analyzing the efforts that have been undertaken to reduce youth violence in Central America and the need to unlock the potential of youth as positive change agents in their societies.

In the third edition: an article by Necla Tschirgi, Professor of Practice, Human Security and Peacebuilding at the University of San Diego and member of the Interpeace Governing Council, reviews major shifts in peacebuilding over the past two decades and the lessons learned that have become the guiding principles of Interpeace; an article by Otto Argueta and Arnoldo Gálvez on Interpeace’s contribution to the process of violence reduction in El Salvador; and an interview with Max Loria, former Vice-Minister for Peace of Costa Rica, on the importance of the participatory processes to reduce violence among youth.

**A THOUGHT-PROVOKING DEBATE**

In November, Interpeace hosted an evening of debate with Intelligence Squared, the world’s premier debating forum. Scott M. Weber, Director-General of Interpeace, moderated a discussion on the motion: “Cancel the cruise missiles: military intervention cannot build peace between warring parties.” The debate was important, he explained, “because military interventions after September 11th are polarizing the world and provoking a wider discussion about what it takes to build more peaceful societies.”

Speaking in favour of the motion were Dr. Rubén Zamora, Ambassador of El Salvador to the United Nations, New York and Philip Wilkinson, retired Colonel in the British Army. Speaking against the motion were Oliver Kamm, leader writer and columnist for The Times of London and Prof. Colleen Graffy, former United States Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy.

The audience had the chance to vote on the motion before and after the debate. Before, 60% were in favour of the motion, 20% were against and 20% were undecided. After listening to the arguments, 61% of the audience voted for the motion, 29% against, and 10% remained undecided.

The debate aimed to provoke a productive discussion about why we need alternatives to military intervention. “The nature of conflicts is still evolving,” said Matthias Stiefel, founder of Interpeace, “and we have to find new solutions and constantly rethink how we can respond to challenges.”

**AN EVENING OF REFLECTION AND APPRECIATION**

In Nairobi, Kenya, Interpeace hosted a reception in conjunction with a meeting of Interpeace’s Governing Council to celebrate 20 years of peacebuilding that included testimonials from Interpeace’s partners working in the Eastern and Central Africa Region.
PEACE DAY 2014

Interpeace uses the International Day of Peace – celebrated every year on 21 September – to raise awareness on the need for peace and the role each individual can play in promoting peace. “Peace Day,” as it is more commonly known, was established in 1981 by a United Nations General Assembly resolution. In 2002, the General Assembly unanimously adopted a second resolution establishing it as an annual day of non-violence and cease-fire. In 2014, Interpeace marked Peace Day with conferences and events across the globe highlighting successful peacebuilding approaches.

GENEVA PEACE TALKS

On 19 September 2014, Interpeace organized the second edition of the Geneva Peace Talks in partnership with the United Nations Office at Geneva and the Geneva Peacebuilding Platform. Speakers from conflict areas and divided environments as well as from the fields of science, art, and business addressed the theme “Let’s Talk Peace!” They shared their personal stories of peace and how communications tools and techniques have made a difference in their peacebuilding efforts, from peace negotiations to discussions with perpetrators of violence. The event took place at the Palais des Nations, the UN headquarters in Geneva, with over 700 people in attendance, and was webcast live. (The talks can be viewed at peacetalks.net in English and French.)

Other Peace Day events organized by Interpeace and its partners included:

• In Geneva - For the third year, Interpeace teamed up with the Services Industriels de Genève to illuminate Geneva’s most prominent landmark, the Jet d’Eau, in blue to honour Peace Day.

• In Cyprus, our partner, the Centre for Sustainable Peace and Democratic Development (SeeD), supported a series of events organized by the Association for Historical Dialogue and Research. This included dance performances, music shows, and other artistic activities that transformed the Buffer Zone into a celebration of peace and mobilized Cypriots to support local peace initiatives.

• In Honduras, as a part of ongoing efforts to reduce youth violence, Interpeace’s Latin America team, with the support of the Berghof Foundation, brought members of two rival football clubs together to discuss their role in violence prevention and peacebuilding. During the football games, members from both clubs held a huge banner with a call for peace.

• In Mali, the fact that Peace Day falls the day before the country’s Independence Day provided a chance to give it national visibility. Interpeace’s Malian partner, the Malian Institute of Action Research for Peace (IMRAP), organized a series of events under the theme “Dialogue for Peace.” Activities included a radio programme by Studio Tamani and an evening of music organized with the Tumast Cultural Center.
• In Juba, in the Somali region, the community celebrated Peace Day in the port city of Kismayo, a milestone after years of open conflict. Cultural dances were a reminder of a shared Somali heritage, local and regional officials led a marathon for peace, and the first football tournament since the civil war gave spectators something to cheer about.

• In Puntland, our partner, the Puntland Development Research Centre (PDRC), organized a forum on the “Right to Peace” in which the President of Puntland, together with elders, emphasized the importance of putting a stop to ongoing conflicts. A panel discussion on the right to peace and on peace in the Somali tradition was broadcast on local media.
OUR SUPPORT AND FUNDING

Our Funding
Our Donors
2014 Financial Report
Interpeace receives funding support from governments, the European Union, the United Nations, foundations, the private sector and individuals.

In 2014, Interpeace income was US$23.8 million. US$17.7 million was for specific projects (restricted funding) and US$6.1 million was unrestricted funding. Interpeace received both restricted funding (which is limited either by region, programme or specific earmarking within a programme) and unrestricted support (which goes toward the organization’s programme of work without restriction as to its use). Both types of funding are vital to Interpeace’s ability to pursue its mission.

Interpeace not only reaches out to different sectors of society in its peacebuilding programmes, but also tries to involve a wide range of actors in supporting peacebuilding.

For example, Interpeace and Mirabaud & Cie, banquiers privés, a Geneva-based private bank, have a partnership which gives people an opportunity to invest in emerging markets while supporting peacebuilding work in conflict-affected countries. This partnership is an example of how the private sector can play a role in making the world a safer place.
In addition to individuals, the following donors supported Interpeace in 2014.

**GOVERNMENTS AND MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS**
- International Development Research Centre of Canada (IDRC)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark
- European Union
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France
- Federal Foreign Office of Germany
- German Institute of Foreign Relations
- Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Ireland
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway
- State of Qatar
- Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden
- Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland
- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
- United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID)
- United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO)
- United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF)
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)

**FOUNDATIONS AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS**
- Adessium Foundation
- Berghof Foundation
- Brownington Foundation
- Swedish Postcode Lottery through the Swedish Postcode Foundation
- United States Institute of Peace (USIP)

**CORPORATE AND OTHER DONATIONS**
- T3 Risk Management SA
- Mirabaud & Cie, banquiers privés

Interpeace is very grateful to our donors for their support and partnership.
LETTER FROM THE AUDITORS

KPMG SA
Audit Western Switzerland
111 Rue de Lyon
CH-1203 Geneva

P.O. Box 347
CH-1211 Geneva 13

Telephone +41 58 249 25 15
Fax +41 58 249 25 13
Internet www.kpmg.ch

Report of the Independent Auditor on the Consolidated Summary Financial Statements of
International Peacebuilding Alliance (INTERPEACE), Geneva

The enclosed consolidated summary financial statements of International Peacebuilding Alliance (INTERPEACE), which comprise the consolidated statement of comprehensive income, balance sheet, statement of cash flows, statement of changes in equity and explanatory note are derived from the audited consolidated financial statements of International Peacebuilding Alliance (INTERPEACE) for the year ended 31 December 2014. We expressed an unqualified audit opinion on these consolidated financial statements in our report dated 8 June 2015.

The consolidated summary financial statements do not contain all the disclosures required by the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). Therefore, reading the consolidated summary financial statements is not a substitute for reading the audited financial statements of International Peacebuilding Alliance (INTERPEACE) as a whole.

Governing Councils’ Responsibility
The Governing Council is responsible for the preparation of the consolidated summary financial statements in accordance with the basis of preparation described in note 1.

Auditor’s Responsibility
Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the consolidated summary financial statements based on our procedures, which were conducted in accordance with International Standard on Auditing (ISA) 810, “Engagements to Report on Summary Financial Statements.”

Opinion
In our opinion, the consolidated summary financial statements derived from the consolidated audited financial statements of International Peacebuilding Alliance (INTERPEACE) for the year ended 31 December 2014 are consistent, in all material respects, with those consolidated financial statements, in accordance with the basis of preparation described in note 1.

KPMG SA

Hélène Béguin
Licensed Audit Expert

Karina Vartanova
Licensed Audit Expert

Geneva, 8 June 2015

Enclosures:
- Consolidated summary financial statements (statement of comprehensive income, balance sheet, statement of cash flows, statement of changes in equity and explanatory note)
## FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
### CALENDAR YEAR 2014 (IN US DOLLARS)

### CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>US$</td>
<td>US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>369 992</td>
<td>375 082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>22 279 510</td>
<td>20 083 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusts &amp; Foundations, NGO and Other</td>
<td>1 162 100</td>
<td>769 055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 811 602</strong></td>
<td><strong>21 227 334</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel (incl. consultants)</td>
<td>14 209 128</td>
<td>12 981 647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Related Expenses</td>
<td>3 206 600</td>
<td>2 951 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Purchases</td>
<td>1 352 790</td>
<td>804 768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>35 959</td>
<td>46 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office, Communications, Vehicle and Finance</td>
<td>2 599 893</td>
<td>2 295 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, Reporting and Professional Services</td>
<td>2 367 546</td>
<td>1 782 080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Management Fees</td>
<td>99 152</td>
<td>70 709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 871 068</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 932 327</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLOSING BALANCE 31ST DECEMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>784 896</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 977 637</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALANCE SHEET

#### ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, Plant and Equipment</td>
<td>87 224</td>
<td>49 744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>46 546</td>
<td>90 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Income Receivable</td>
<td>13 943 639</td>
<td>11 570 020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>49 626</td>
<td>3 546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances to UN</td>
<td>357 414</td>
<td>160 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances to Partners</td>
<td>460 235</td>
<td>405 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Income Receivable</td>
<td>13 008 538</td>
<td>14 695 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Receivables and Prepayments</td>
<td>419 724</td>
<td>149 978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>12 559 484</td>
<td>11 179 951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>40 932 430</strong></td>
<td><strong>38 304 614</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LIABILITIES AND RESERVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>46 075</td>
<td>39 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>995 860</td>
<td>616 073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Income</td>
<td>13 943 639</td>
<td>11 570 020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Income</td>
<td>22 765 813</td>
<td>22 642 999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts due to Partners</td>
<td>386 978</td>
<td>265 045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income to be Repaid to Donors</td>
<td>908 808</td>
<td>59 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payables and Accruals</td>
<td>1 100 361</td>
<td>1 134 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>40 147 534</strong></td>
<td><strong>36 326 977</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Reserves</td>
<td>784 896</td>
<td>1 977 637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LIABILITIES AND RESERVES</strong></td>
<td><strong>40 932 430</strong></td>
<td><strong>38 304 614</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). The consolidated summary financial statements are prepared using the same structured presentation and measurement basis but do not contain all disclosures required by International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS).
### CASH FLOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNRESTRICTED NET (LOSS)/INCONE FOR THE YEAR</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(838 714)</td>
<td>319 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cash flow from operating activities

**Adjustments for:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>35 959</td>
<td>46 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net finance costs / (income)</td>
<td>779 248</td>
<td>(24 193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET CASH FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 381 690</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 680 684</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cash flows from investing activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest received</td>
<td>4 362</td>
<td>9 807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of property plant and equipment</td>
<td>(73 440)</td>
<td>(34 545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET CASH USED IN INVESTING ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>(69 078)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(24 738)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cash flows from financing activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrowings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 054 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing repayments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1 078 749)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest paid</td>
<td>(598)</td>
<td>(769)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET CASH USED IN FINANCING ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>(598)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(25 222)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Net Increase / (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents at 1 January</td>
<td>11 179 951</td>
<td>2 464 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of exchange rate fluctuations on cash held</td>
<td>(932 481)</td>
<td>85 066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS AT 31 DECEMBER</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 559 484</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 179 951</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes in Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpeace Headquarters</td>
<td>Interpeace Inc. Unrestricted Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening Balance</strong></td>
<td>1,937,373</td>
<td>40,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted net (loss)/income for the year</td>
<td>(837,431)</td>
<td>(1,283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items that will never be reclassified to profit or loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remeasurements of defined benefit liability</td>
<td>(451,523)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items that are or may be reclassified to profit or loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign currency translation differences</td>
<td>97,496</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Comprehensive (Loss) / Income</strong></td>
<td>(354,027)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Comprehensive (Loss)/Income for the Year</strong></td>
<td>(1,191,458)</td>
<td>(1,283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing Balance</strong></td>
<td>745,915</td>
<td>38,981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2014 EXPENSE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somalia Pillars of Peace</td>
<td>4,592,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia Youth</td>
<td>100,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia Juba Reconciliation</td>
<td>167,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia Leaders Retreat</td>
<td>56,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia President Policy Unit</td>
<td>977,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia Women (IIDA)</td>
<td>657,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia Mobile AV Unit</td>
<td>358,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia Democratisation</td>
<td>1,644,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>781,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>617,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes</td>
<td>2,421,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>96,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>52,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>2,674,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>57,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>415,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America Youth</td>
<td>364,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America Security and Justice</td>
<td>80,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America Conflict Transformation</td>
<td>31,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala UICC Secondment</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador Violence Reduction</td>
<td>265,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>94,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>475,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>365,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>56,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Peacebuilding Advisory Team</td>
<td>1,358,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution Making</td>
<td>89,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacebuilding Standing Team</td>
<td>131,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpeace Sweden</td>
<td>459,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework for Assessing Resilience</td>
<td>539,285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES

19,988,688

Less Management Fees

1,037,240

Programme Support

1,442,507

### TOTAL PROGRAMME

20,393,955
EXPENDITURE SUMMARY 2002-2014
(US$ MILLION)
OUR STRUCTURES AND PEOPLE

Our Governing Council
Our Advisory Council
Our Strategic Management Team
Interpeace Representation Offices
Partnerships
Interpeace’s Governing Council is the highest decision-making body of the organization

CHAIR
John A. Kufuor
(Ghana)
Former President of Ghana; former Chairperson of the African Union (AU); former Chairperson of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)

VICE CHAIR
Matthias Stiefel
(Switzerland)
Founder and former President of Interpeace

HONORARY TREASURER
Martin Aked
(United Kingdom)
Former Partner at PricewaterhouseCoopers and former International Treasurer of Médecins Sans Frontières
Martti Ahtisaari  
(Finland)  
Chairman Emeritus and Special Advisor  
Recipient of the 2008 Nobel Peace Prize; former President of Finland; Chairman of the Interpeace Governing Council from 2001 to 2009

Alan Doss  
(United Kingdom)  
Executive Director at the Kofi Annan Foundation; Visiting Fellow at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy; former Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in Liberia

Oscar Fernandez-Taranco  
(Argentina)  
Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General on the Governing-Council; Assistant Secretary-General for the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office

Monica McWilliams  
(Ireland)  
Professor of Women’s Studies at the University of Ulster; Member of the Northern Ireland Legislative Assembly until 2003 and contributor to the peace negotiations leading to the Good Friday Agreement

Necla Tschirgi  
(Turkey)  
Professor of Practice, Human Security and Peacebuilding at the Joan B. Kroc School of Peace Studies at the University of San Diego; former Senior Policy Advisor to the Peacebuilding Support Office at the United Nations; former Vice President of the International Peace Academy

Claude Wild  
(Switzerland)  
Representative of the Host Government on the Governing Council; Head of Human Security Division, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs
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Interpeace’s Advisory Council is a multi-stakeholder platform for debate and discussion on key peacebuilding issues

**CHAIR**

**Sweden - Ambassador Jan Knutsson**
Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations in Geneva

**France - Ambassador Jean-Marc Châtaigner**
Deputy Director-General, Global Affairs, Development and Partnerships, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**Guatemala - Ambassador Gert Rosenthal**
Former Permanent Representative of Guatemala to the United Nations in New York

**Netherlands - Joost Andriessen**
Director of the Stabilisation and Humanitarian Aid Department, Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**Tanzania - Ambassador Liberata Mulamula**
Ambassador of Tanzania to the United States

**United States - Karin von Hippel**
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Overseas Operations, Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations, United States Department of State

As of December 2014
Interpeace’s Strategic Management Team is based around the world, in accordance with our decentralized structure.

Scott M. Weber
Director-General

Renée Larivièrè
Deputy Director-General, Development and Learning

Jerry McCann
Deputy Director-General, Operations

Anne Moltes
Acting Regional Director for West Africa

Sarah Noble
Director of Global Engagement

Mike Pejcic
Director of Administration and Chief Financial Officer

Maud Roure
Head of Learning and Policy

Johan Svensson
Regional Director for Eastern and Central Africa

Ana Glenda Tager Rosado
Regional Director for Latin America
INTERPEACE SWEDEN

Interpeace Sweden is a Swedish fundraising foundation that supports peacebuilding and the work of Interpeace worldwide. It was created in 2013 to generate awareness and funding in Sweden through outreach activities. In 2014, Interpeace Sweden worked with Interpeace’s programme development team on a pilot initiative in the Stockholm suburb of Tensta in addition to outreach and awareness activities.

A key highlight was the first-ever Stockholm Peace Talks were held on 29 January 2015, at the Swedish Parliament, which co-sponsored the event. The talks sought to highlight the many ways in which people can play a more active role in creating peace. It featured a diverse range of speakers including Urban Ahlin, Speaker of the Parliament; Jan Eliasson, Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations; Forest Whitaker, actor and humanist; Timbuktu, hip hop artist; Peter Wallensteen, Professor of Peace and Conflict Studies at Uppsala University; Elaine Weidman-Grunewald, Vice President of Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility for the Ericsson Group; Ghaida Rinawie Zoabi, Executive Director, INJAZ; Deline Revend and Tomas Amanuel, young facilitators from the Stockholm suburb of Tensta, as well as musical performances by LaGaylia Frazier and Adam Tensta.

The talks were moderated by Swedish journalist Willy Silberstein and attended by HRH the Crown Princess Victoria.

The Peace Talks began in 2013 with the Geneva Peace Talks co-organized by the UN Office at Geneva, Interpeace and the Geneva Peacebuilding Platform. They are now being rolled out globally.

The members of the Board of Interpeace Sweden include:
- Tord Magnuson, Chair
- Scott M. Weber, Vice Chair
- Carin Götblad
- Peter Elam Håkansson
- Magnus Kindstrand
- Krister Kumlin
- Johan Lundberg
- Sarah Noble

Interpeace Sweden has a 90 account and is registered with the Swedish Fundraising Council FRII.

INTERPEACE USA

Interpeace USA is an independent non-profit organization that positions Interpeace in the United States and mobilizes support for our peacebuilding work.

The Director of Interpeace USA is Graeme Simpson.

Interpeace USA is supported by the US Board of Governors:
- Giles Conway-Gordon
- Jeffrey Lewis
- Howard McMorris II

Interpeace Inc. (USA) is registered with the Internal Revenue Service as a 501(c)(3) organization.
PARTNERSHIPS

BURUNDI
Centre d’Alert et de Prévention des Conflits (CENAP)

CÔTE D’IVOIRE
Initiative de Dialogue et Recherche Action pour la Paix (INDIGO)

CYPRUS
Centre for Sustainable Peace and Democratic Development (SeeD)

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
Centre d’Etudes Juridiques Appliqueés (CEJA)
Pole Institute
Action pour la Paix et la Concorde (APC)
Réseau d’Innovation Organisationelle (RIO)

GUINEA-BISSAU
Iniciativa para Consolidação de Paz (Voz di Paz)

ISRAEL
Center for Professional Arab Local Governance in Israel – INJAZ Center
Haredi College of Jerusalem
The Van Leer Institute
United Nations Development Programme – PAPP

LIBERIA
Platform for Dialogue and Peace (P4DP)

LIBYA
Assabel Foundation

MALI
Institut Malien de Recherche Action pour la Paix – IMRAP

PALESTINE
United Nations Development Programme – PAPP

RWANDA
Never Again Rwanda

SOMALI REGION
Academy for Peace and Development (APD)
Heritage Institute for Policy Studies (HIPS)
IIDA Women’s Development Organisation
Puntland Development Research Center (PDRC)
Somaliland National Electoral Commission (NEC)
Somaliland National Youth Organization (SONYO)

TIMOR LESTE
Centre of Studies for Peace and Development (CEPAD)
CONTACT US

INTERPEACE HEADQUARTERS
Maison de la Paix
2E Chemin Eugène-Rigot
1202 Geneva
Switzerland
T +41 (0) 22 404 5900

INTERPEACE REGIONAL OFFICE FOR EASTERN AND CENTRAL AFRICA
Priory Place, 5th Floor
Argwings Kodhek Road
P.O.Box 14520 - 00800 Westlands
Kilimani, Nairobi
Kenya
T +254 (20) 265 5228

INTERPEACE REGIONAL OFFICE FOR LATIN AMERICA
11 Avenida 14-75, zona 10
01010 Guatemala City
Guatemala
T +502 2381 9700

INTERPEACE REGIONAL OFFICE FOR WEST AFRICA
Villa n° 43
Cité Les Lauriers 5 Deux Plateaux
06 BP 2100 Abidjan
Côte d’Ivoire
T +225 56 62 27 785

INTERPEACE EUROPE
24 Avenue des Arts
Boîte 8
1000 Brussels
Belgium
T +32 (2) 230 0015

INTERPEACE SWEDEN
Jakobs Torg 3
11152 Stockholm
Sweden

INTERPEACE REPRESENTATION OFFICE IN NEW YORK
7001 Brush Hollow Road, Suite 214
Westbury, NY 11590 USA
M +1 (646) 643 9979.

INFO@INTERPEACE.ORG  WWW.INTERPEACE.ORG  @INTERPEACETWEET