



# **Good Practices in Nonviolent, Unarmed, Civilian to Civilian Protection**

Summary of the Documentation of the  
Workshop in Beirut,  
18 – 20 June 2018

Christine Schweitzer



## **Abstract**

This paper summarizes the important discussions, issues and findings of the Workshop with the title “Good Practices in Nonviolent, Unarmed, Civilian to Civilian Protection” that Nonviolent Peaceforce organized in Beirut, 18-20 June 2018. This workshop brought together practitioners from various local, national and international nongovernmental organizations working in Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Palestine.

Nonviolent Peaceforce thanks all those who facilitated and/or took notes, all participants and the private donors who financed it.

The full documentation is available online under: <http://www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org/what-we-do/about-3/new-report-good-practices2>

Nonviolent Peaceforce

Summary of the Documentation of Workshop on Good Practices in Nonviolent, Unarmed, Civilian to Civilian Protection; 18-20 June in Beirut

Author: Christine Schweitzer

Photos: Christine Schweitzer

Hamburg, July 2018

# Good Practices in Unarmed Civilian Protection

This report documents the workshop: “Good Practices in Nonviolent, Unarmed, Civilian to Civilian Protection” that Nonviolent Peaceforce held between the 18<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> of June 2018 in Beirut. Unarmed civilian protection (UCP)<sup>1</sup>, sometimes also called civilian peacekeeping or protective accompaniment, is the practice of deploying specially trained unarmed civilians before, during, or after violent conflict in order to prevent or reduce violence, to provide direct physical protection to civilian populations under threat, and to strengthen or build resilient local peace infrastructures.

The workshop was one element in a four-stage good practices process the INGO Nonviolent Peaceforce has started in order to improve and expand UCP, and to influence policy for protecting civilians, preventing violence, supporting local initiatives and sustaining peace. After the publication of four case studies (“Wielding Nonviolence in the Midst of Violence”<sup>2</sup>, edited by Ellen Furnari, 2016), six workshop organized on a regional basis are being held. They are made up of UCP practitioners, field partners, beneficiaries and academics who meet for three-day sessions to review their work, analyze findings of stage one and validate good practices and emerging themes as well as identify dilemmas or challenges raised but not answered by the cases. This then will be followed by an international conference and, as the last step, the publication and dissemination of the findings. This was the second of these workshops, the first being held in December 2017 in Manila.

## The Workshop

The workshop in Beirut had 32 participants from 14 different countries and 19 different organizations, international, national and local. In addition, there was an activist from India, and academics and researchers from Europe, Australia and North America whose work is focused on UCP and/or the Middle East. The participants of the workshop were carefully chosen for their current or previous work doing civilian to civilian protection; receiving protection from such organizations; and/or their academic research and writing on the topic. Most were interviewed before the workshop took place, to get their input on the most pressing topics to address.

The workshop was carried out through a mixture of panel presentations, in-depth small group work, and plenary discussions of group findings, putting specific focus on good practices, but also on potential challenges and dilemmas of UCP work. The documentation was done on the basis of notes and recordings of the various workshops and plenary discussions.

The workshop started with an introductory plenary which ended with participants given the task to mark on a “wheel of UCP practices” developed by Nonviolent Peaceforce (NP), which activities they were involved in and what practices they would like to learn more about. This was followed

---

<sup>1</sup> Unarmed civilian protection (UCP) is the practice of deploying specially trained unarmed civilians before, during, or after violent conflict in order to prevent or reduce violence, to provide direct physical protection to civilian populations under threat, and to strengthen or build resilient local peace infrastructures.

<sup>2</sup> Furnari, Ellen (2016): *Wielding Nonviolence in the Midst of Violence*, Institute for Peace Work and Nonviolent Conflict Transformation, Norderstedt: book on demand.

with a “world café” on principles of accompaniment/UCP – a method where participants move from table to table to discuss certain points.

Then the participants broke into the first of five rounds of working groups which stretched over the next 2.5 days. Each of the group discussions was followed by a plenary where the groups reported on good practices and challenges identified. (See the agenda of the workshop as appendix 2)

## The Outcomes

The participants of the workshop formulated a number of lessons and good practices which can be read in the appendix (1).

The workshop looked at various issues and themes. With the exception of the host, Nonviolent Peaceforce, the character and the way of working of the groups meeting in Beirut were quite different from those in Manila. The five perhaps most striking differences were:

1. The distinction between international and local organizations was not easy to make – there was rather a continuum between “purely international in regard to staff” through “international but with many local volunteers and staff”, “locally based but operating with international volunteers” to “purely local without any international around”. Funding for most if not all the groups came from abroad.
2. There were organizations that understand themselves as nonpartisan to actors and issues of conflict and organizations that came to the work openly as activists supporting one side in a conflict – in particular the Palestinian struggle for self-determination.
3. The internationals involved in UCP were – with the exception of staff of Nonviolent Peaceforce – mostly volunteers from the USA and Europe, coming for a short-term service of a few weeks to perhaps three months, with a few people staying longer term intermingled.
4. The level of day-to-day violence experienced was probably higher, and in two countries included bombings from parties to whom the people on the ground have no direct access (the international forces operating in Syria and Iraq).
5. The level of acceptance of the UCP groups could be considered between at best “medium” to being basically tolerated, with the exception of the UCP groups in Palestine being welcomed by the Palestinian Authority (but not by occupying Israel).

With this in mind, it may not be surprising that the motto of the workshop that became quoted again and again was “it is all context-specific”. Accordingly, it was not easy to identify common good practices that all groups shared. Rather, the impression arose that were different practices may be “good” in the sense of “working for those who apply them”.

Having said that, there were many “good practices” suggested in the various groups, and described in the documentation. Among them were:

1. Analysis before, during and after a deployment, with different methodologies, including participatory ones involving the local communities and beneficiaries, was emphasized.



2. Working with IDPs is a complex task and accompanying potentials IDPs through the whole cycle: seeking to prevent displacement, accompaniment during the flight, dealing with conflicts and doing peacebuilding in camps, and support and accompaniment during an eventual return.
3. Similarly, there were many good practices collected regarding gender practices – both within teams and on the policy and implementation level with communities.
4. As in Manila, relationship-building with actors was considered important but some organizations set boundaries to that, expressing that they would lose trust with their partners if they built relationships with the other side in the conflict.
5. Another main theme was again the complex relationships between local and international actors who undertake and/or receive UCP. It was generally recognized that local and international UCP practitioners have different roles, and that attention to these differences, maximizes respective strengths.

As in Manila, many challenges were named and discussed as well. Outstanding were:

- Dealing with power asymmetries between conflict parties and how they impact the UCP work
- Navigating internal conflicts in communities – power structures, gender-based violence, friction in communities
- Relationships to the governments in the countries the groups were operating in.

## **Outlining the Framework of UCP**

### Principles

The workshop discussed five principles that had been suggested either in the study “Wielding Nonviolence” or in the first workshop on good practices in UCP in Manila: nonviolence, nonpartisanship, primacy of local actors, independence and Do No Harm. All organizations in Beirut declared that they were committed to three of them: nonviolence, primacy of local actors and Do No Harm. For these principles however, many challenges were identified – nonviolence not being a common concept in the region; breaking down “local actors” to concrete groups or individuals to work with - especially if there is conflict in the communities: and often having to choose between options that all might do some harm.

Independence and nonpartisanship were not commonly shared. Some organizations working in Palestine, declared themselves not independent and partisan to the liberation of Palestine from the occupation. This went beyond the doubts local organizations in Manila expressed regarding nonpartisanship.

The workshop report draws the conclusion that there are two basic approaches to UCP which mingled in the workshop and which led to what participants came to call the motto of the workshop, “all depends on the context”.

### Two Paradigms

While some of the main methods of most UCP groups in this conflict and also the operational objectives on the ground may be similar – protecting people from violence, the wider goals are different: The nonpartisan approach (in lack of a better word for this) aims at contributing to a

settlement of the violence but is not as interested in influencing what such a settlement would look like. From the results of Beirut, it may seem that it usually comes hand in hand with emphasizing relationship-building as a basic strategy. (However, this may not be the case overall when thinking of the work of Peace Brigades International for example, whose work is much more based on deterrence.) The activist approach sees the protective work as a contribution to a social struggle. To make the point, two ideal types have been proposed in the conclusions to the report:

	<b>Activist</b>	<b>Nonpartisan</b>
Objectives	Protect activists engaged in a struggle	Protect civilians
Basis of legitimacy	Solidarity with a shared cause	IHL, human rights covenants etc.
Context	Uprisings/revolutions; resistance (civilian-based defense)	Civil or international war, armed conflict
Position towards conflict issues and actors	Partisan	Non-partisan/impartial
Main values	Nonviolence Primacy of local actors	Nonviolence Nonpartisanship Independence Primacy of local actors
Belief basis	Often religious	Secular, neutral towards religious beliefs
Strategies	On the ground: Deterrence, relationship building only with limited range of actors  International: Building pressure on the opponent through reporting to decision-makers and/or wider public	On the ground: Relationship-building with all sides and deterrence  International: At best reminding all sides of the obligations they entered through signing IHL / HR covenants
Activities	protective presence, accompaniment, monitoring, documentation, interpositioning, advocacy with wider public and decision-makers	Whole UCP wheel  Advocacy: On the micro-level. With decision-makers more limited to finding (political & financial) support for UCP
Practitioners	Volunteers	Staff
Organizational structure	Consensus-based	Hierarchical

### Official Government Recognition or Informal Acceptance

In all the countries covered in this workshop, getting permission to work is a challenge for international as for national/local organizations. There seems to be – with the exception of the Palestine Authority that obviously welcomes the different UCP organizations – at best informal

acceptance for the practitioners of UCP, due to various factors. Decisions made by organizations regarding the relationship they seek to the government(s) in the country where they operate depend:

- on the situation in the country where the UCP organization is working, in particular the legal requirements for registration and the attitude of the government towards the kind of work the UCP organization is doing.
- on the structure and ways of working of the (I)NGO, for example the citizenship of its volunteers and staff. For local organizations, the situation is different than for international or mixed groups. “Mixed” here means not only a mix of staff, but organizations that have a strong local identity without being purely local. Muslim Peacemaker Teams for example are registered in the U.S. but are mostly or exclusively Iraqi Muslims.
- on individual choices the organization makes based on what it deems to be most feasible for its particular mandate or to be a requirement stemming from its principles and statutes.

Here scale also matters. For small organizations or organizations with few personnel it seems easy to get by without full formal registration, but in case scaling-up is intended, the requirement for formal acceptance increases as well.

### Advocacy and Donor Relationships

The need for advocacy (in both broad and narrow meanings of the term) was recognized by all in the workshop. For those following a more activist approach, a representative from one organization working in Palestine put the relationship between accompaniment and advocacy in very clear words: “Accompaniment may deter violence at a school or help individuals to pass check-points. But we need a change of policy – that there is no military at the entrance of schools and no more check points. For the second, advocacy is needed.”

These organizations generally seek to combine accompaniment and advocacy in a broad sense of addressing and informing the wider international public (churches, newspapers, talks at schools as well as diplomats), in spite of repercussions they suffer (denial of visa). This sometimes also lead to tension and internal debates in the teams, it was reported – some team members wanting to be more vocal, for others not endangering the presence was more important. However, the rapporteur had the impression that some groups might lack a clearly formulated theory of change – how general communications and information on what is happening in the country would lead to the resolution of the conflict.

At the opposite side of the range of options, NP is an organization that has a principle never to “blame and shame”. In-country it does very specific advocacy work which is usually very quiet, and directed at donors or diplomats. In the field, it doesn’t do advocacy itself with high-level persons but tries to influence the behavior of those who influence policy-makers. Most of its ‘real’ advocacy work takes place at the UN and with UN member states to adopt UCP as a tool.

Advocacy at the local level is generally the most effective advocacy done by UCP organizations. This is focused on influencing the behavior of local leaders, military and others. This kind of advocacy is achieved through direct relationship-building.

Another topic the group looked at was international funding. Generally, all organizations ask how much a particular donor might affect its work on the ground. And it was also remarked that “donor education” was needed, and the need for alliances to do so. The point in question was that many donors, with some fixation on firmly defined projects and one-year funding cycles are

not flexible enough for the work of UCP, which often has to quickly respond to changing circumstances.

### Deterrence and Encouragement

These are two basic strategies to address potential perpetrators of violence. Comparing the outcome of this group to the similar discussion in the workshop in Manila: In both workshops people agreed that both strategies “work” and are contextual. In Beirut there was much more emphasis on deterrence as the dominant strategy, while in Manila more organizations emphasized the importance of relationship-building. But the discussion failed to clearly work out the criteria of what is chosen under which circumstances –what is the context? It could be hypothesized that use of internationals has a direct relationship to deterrence – local groups will probably find it much harder to play a deterrent role unless in special circumstances where they have a role recognized by all conflict parties (like Bantay Ceasefire has in Mindanao). Some organizations mentioned that this is the reason why they work with internationals. But this is only one aspect, and there are also internationals (like NP in some deployments) that try to focus on relationship-building and minimize the deterrence factor.

### **Tactics of Protection**

#### Beneficiaries and Kinds of Violence to Tackle

While it is difficult to formulate ‘hard’ criteria for decisions regarding whom to protect and whom not, it was clear that such decisions require both good analysis, strong partners to consult with and being clear about the capacities of one’s own organization. It is also important to have policies regarding what kind of violence to deal with. In the workshop the participants all agreed that the focus must be on political violence, leaving domestic and GBV to other organizations that are more specialized on it. However, participants also agreed that it is important to be aware of these other kinds of violence since they may easily trigger larger scale political violence.

As in Manila, there was no good answer to how to deal with violent political extremism. While CVE was considered important, none of the organizations present in Beirut saw a way to approach such organizations as ISIS in their contexts, for example.

#### Local Organizations Protecting Local People

The activities described were of various kinds – from capacity-building in protection tools for villagers, to evacuating civilians, mediation, and promoting social cohesion. Both Syria and Iraq are countries where UCP (unlike Palestine) was unknown until recently. The situation of some local groups is so volatile and risky that participants preferred not to share details about their work, or requested that this was not reported.

It was pointed out that just distinguishing local and international groups may be an oversimplification, given that international organizations may have a strong local component, and that local organizations may use international volunteers and be dependent on international funding. It became clear that the situation of the local groups is quite different from that of the groups in South East Asia that came to Manila. The latter were well-organized and experienced while many of the groups that work in Iraq and Syria are new and fragile and working under very volatile circumstances. For them, it is also a challenge that most are dependent on international support while at the same time they are problematizing this dependence.



## Protection of IDPs and Refugees

There was a wealth of experiences in working in refugee camps and with IDPs among the participants. Working with IDPs is a complex task and may involve accompanying potential IDPs through the whole cycle: seeking to prevent displacement, accompaniment during the flight, dealing with conflicts and doing peacebuilding in camps, and support and accompaniment during an eventual return. The activities (which are fully described in the full documentation of the workshop) can be categorized into three types:

1. Preventing displacement through rumor control, approaching fighters to move away, and other supportive measures.
2. Protective accompaniment or presence to directly prevent violence, be it from external forces or among the IDPs/refugees themselves, and in various situations, from fleeing through camps to returning.
3. Peacebuilding activities, empowerment, capacity-building etc. with refugees/IDPs to lessen tensions and to strengthen people's capacity, and reconstruction activities where people came from.

## Local Mediation, Negotiation and Shuttle Diplomacy

Mediation and what is called “good offices” (background support to mediation processes) are an important element of the work to protect civilians, because it engages the various parties. UCP organizations are mostly – at least this was true for the examples given in this workshop – active on the grassroots or middle level. Sometimes they try however to influence track one (high level) negotiations by advocacy in favor of civil society groups, to facilitate their participation or input. It was emphasized that mediation processes are long-term processes and an organization should ask itself if it is able to maintain the long-term commitment necessary. Not all UCP organizations get involved in mediation efforts. For those who do, different approaches or roles were distinguished:

- Training individuals to then work as mediators.
- “Good offices” in the background, for example finding people in the community who take on a mediating role, technical support, transport, we also raised the concerns of women.
- Getting engaged in mediation efforts themselves, often local staff playing the role of mediators.

## Gender in Protection Work in the Middle East

The group explored various issues: gender and the teams, gender norms, women rights and dealing with harassment. The level of awareness about gender aspects as they relate to women (as staff or beneficiaries) was rather high among all organizations present in Beirut, and a number of good practices collected. Themes in gender that relate to men (like expectancies to be fighters) did not however, play much of a role, nor addressing LGBTQI issues. Gender is still often a synonym for “women”, also in the UCP discourse.

## Dealing With Power Asymmetries

The group looked at three situations in particular: The struggle of the Palestinians against the Israeli army and settlers in the West Bank; Northern Iraq with bombings by international powers (Turkey, Iran) and unequal power between the local population and Sunni population vs. Iraqi

military and militias in the area and in Bagdad; Syria with the local population vs. the various armed forces and militias and changing control of the territories.

Situations of asymmetrical powers have some elements in common:

- Groups are being labelled terrorist which makes it difficult to approach them.
- Ignorance about nonviolent actors and nonviolent resistance from the side of power holders and the wider public.
- Legitimacy of state actors is questioned by the UCP organizations.
- The concern to work with non-state armed groups is high.

Looking at the good practices identified in the group, generally it can be concluded that “internationalization” of the issue seems to be the only viable strategy that actors could recognize. However, given that often international powers have stakes in the asymmetrical conflicts – even in cases where they are not directly involved as actors as they are in the war against ISIS in Syria and Iraq – internationalization translates to taking the political struggle to third countries.

### De-escalation of Armed Shootings

The group discussed first what sort of escalation may warrant an intervention, and under which circumstances an intervention may be feasible. The group concluded that larger scale fighting (war, or when one side is a state army) is hard to intervene in. Non-state armed actors tend to be more responsive. In gang or clan violence intervention may be possible if it can be done safely. In confrontations it also matters if the actor, for example a military commander, is known. Relationship-building is key here. Another criteria is how much discipline there is in an armed group – the more discipline, the more predictable a situation becomes. It is extremely dangerous if soldiers are drunk – this makes the situation unpredictable.

## **Managing UCP Projects**

### Security Management

The issues of security and safety in this workshop reflect that organizations are dealing with much more escalated, violent situations than the workshop for South-East Asia. Shootings with live ammunition, bombings and shelling are common in three of the four countries covered. All organizations, local as well as international, have – written or informal – SOPs how to deal with such threats. A number of common good practices as well as challenges were identified. Interesting enough, quite different organizational models seem to work in the eyes of their protagonists. Both strict line management and consensus found in teams are ‘good practice’, it seems. It also became clear that security issues look different for international and for local groups and practitioners. While many SOPs may be similar, for locals the situation has become their daily life from which they can neither withdraw nor can expect to be rescued by international agencies in case something goes wrong.

As to IT security, it was recommended to do trainings with IT experts to minimize risks.

### Effect of Media and Social Media Use

A good media strategy is required for all UCP organizations. The examples given in Beirut focused on the activist groups working in Palestine who are particularly challenged by powerful narratives and media campaigns against them. But spreading of rumors and false information on the UCP

organization are also a challenge in other places. It is essential to be aware of such risks and monitor to counter them in time.

### Evaluation and Learning

The participants had an exchange about different methods and occasions for evaluation. The groups discussed both internal and external evaluations with their different pros and cons (like misunderstandings by external evaluators vs. greater credibility for donors) and other kinds of analysis and studies undertaken before and during the work in the field.

### Staff/Volunteers Training, Length of Service, Support, and Post-Deployment/Service

As to recruitment as well as length of service, the organizations follow different models, from short-term volunteers coming in after short trainings to professional staff staying at least for two years. It seems that the organizations look for rather similar qualities in the persons doing the work. Intercultural skills and ability to work in teams were considered paramount here.

More challenging for the organizations – again this seems to be a commonality – is to stay in contact with volunteers or staff after they have left. If there are good practices around that other than giving people access to psychological aid if needed, they still need to be explored in further workshops.

### Scaling Up

Scaling up was mostly understood as having “more people” on the ground – more teams, covering more regions, larger teams. This may be more volunteers or staff working with the organization, it also may be increasing the number of partners who practice elements of UCP.

A few major determining factors need to be considered:

- Resources.
- Access (visa, permissions).
- Strategic decisions (what to focus on in the work).

# Appendices

## 1. Summary of Good Practices

### Use of Principles

Generally, as in Manila people agreed that it is important to have principles. They help to inform decisions in difficult situations. But organizations should be aware that principles may contradict each other, forcing UCP organizations to make choices regarding which principle has priority. The two principles everyone fully agreed on were nonviolence and primacy of local actors, and in general also “do no harm” was agreed. Nonpartisanship and independence were not shared by all.

### Nonpartisanship

- Being aware that nonpartisanship begins with language. In many conflicts, certain terms - like “human rights” or “occupation” in the Palestine-Israel conflict, are codes indicating taking a side in the conflict.
- Nonpartisanship should be expressed through diversity in teams, including members from all groups (sectarian, ethnic)

### Independence

- Independence can be expressed through visible markers like uniforms (vests, caps etc.)
- Having more than one donor for a project.

### Primacy of local actors

- Letting local actors determine the agenda of what needs to be done and how.
- At the beginning working through local hierarchies to gain access to a community, but then spread out and involve those not represented by these local (mostly male) leaders, including

women.

- Being aware of power structures in communities, including the possible existence of certain personalities or families that seek to build and monopolize relationships to internationals.

### Reference to international law

- International law might not always be the best starting point – in some conflicts it is seen as an indicator for being on one side. And in some places there may be much stronger local norms that are quite similar and more acceptable.

### Encouragement and Deterrence

- Deciding depending on context which strategy to choose
- Reaching out to individuals by appealing to their humanity and expressing empathy no matter what the strategy is otherwise.

### Advocacy and Donor Relationships

- Internationals helping local voices to get access to track 1 negotiations.
- Tailoring language in a way that it is acceptable to the audience.
- Organizing visits for policy makers and donors so that they can see for themselves.
- Donor policies that leave it to the local recipient of a grant to define what it does and be flexible to adapt when situation changes.

### Responding to Different Kinds of Violence

- Consulting with the local community about who to prioritize because it has the best analysis. Doing so using existing communication channels

within local civil society.

- Concentrating on armed conflict and political violence.
- Referring GBV to specialized (local or international) organizations while recognizing that one kind of violence may lead to another.
- Making alliances with third parties to reach groups that cannot be contacted directly.

#### Local and International UCP

- Winning trust with security forces is an asset.

#### Protecting IDPs

- Preventing displacement through rumor control, approaching fighters to move away, and other supportive measures
- Using protective accompaniment or presence to directly prevent violence, be it from external forces or among the IDPs/refugees themselves, and in various situations, from fleeing through camps to returning.
- Conducting peacebuilding activities, empowerment, capacity-building etc. with refugees/IDPs to lessen tensions and to strengthen people's capacity. This also includes socio-economic support in the region of origin is important: If there is no infrastructure created, people hesitate to go back.

#### De-escalation of Armed Shootings

- Understanding the situation very well.
- Involving credible mediators.
- Having key resources (like cars, cameras) available.
- Making sure that there are media present.
- Speaking the language, using

considerate language.

- Trying to use relationships to commanders, soldiers, heads of protests, and media.
- Acting with confidence.
- Using the element of surprise (doing something unexpected).
- Knowing the individual threshold.
- Being visible (esp. at night).
- Trying to evacuate civilians.

#### Mediation Roles

- Building strong relationships with a diverse range of leaders and knowledge of existing local context, including if there may already be mediation taking place.
- Allowing time to build trust and relationships, and sticking to the process once started. Successful processes are long-term.

#### On Other Activities

- Using local legal processes when beneficial. For example calling police.
- Given the complex picture of different organizations with different political interests, partnership management and transparency are crucial.
- Being aware that capacity development and capacity recognition are different and both important.
- Reporting and monitoring violence at a granular level.

#### Gender

- Diversity of identities in a team makes it stronger. If there is only one gender, then women-only teams are preferable than men-only teams: Women can meet with men, but a male team may not meet with women.
- Women are often perceived as less threatening which may open access.

- Cultural sensitivity is essential, not opposing perspectives. However, employing women in roles that traditionally men take (for example as mediators) may work. (There were some examples given where it did.)
- In some communities, both men and women are needed to access their peers in the community.
- Men can contribute to the safety of their female colleagues by for example, intervening if there is bad language.
- Capacity-building about 1325 to overcome resistance to inclusion of women in communities.
- Most organizations end volunteer or staff contracts if there are charges of harassment. But before doing so, both sides need to be heard. (Avoid the tendency to automatically side with the accuser and assume the accused to be guilty.)
- Speaking openly about harassment issues, normalizing the subject to overcome the taboos around these issues.
- Creating opportunities for learning and resolution of issues, including peer to peer coaching.
- Disclosing relationships in teams.
- Bringing (international) politicians to local communities to publicize what is happening.
- Important for world to see peace movements calling out abuses.
- Modelling respectful relationships, rejecting divisions and manufactured tensions, connecting across divides as human beings.

#### Security Management and IT Security

- Making sure that there is agreement and buy-in of SOPs.
  - Preparing for worst-case scenarios.
  - SOPs need to match local context.
  - Consider impact of SOPs.
  - Training individuals for hostile scenarios both mentally and physically.
  - Including recognizing weaponry and first aid in training.
  - Having good communications with local people, and doing a background check with each area before entering.
  - Having SOPs for security and following them. They should include a list of equipment to always carry (like phones, for some also medical kits and flak jackets).
  - Never having a team member go alone – work at least in pairs.
  - Assessing risk vs. impact: When is it necessary to go to risky area?
  - Preparing plans for evacuation.
  - Having knowledge of weapons being used and be able to distinguish them.
  - Using the privilege of being a foreigner to move embassies and the UN to help.
  - Learning from previous situations.
  - Always being prepared for trauma,
- Power Asymmetries
- Committing to advocacy work and informing the general public about such asymmetries and abuses.
  - Activists from “opposite” sides working together, acting in solidarity across countries
  - Using privilege as internationals to bring civil society representatives together with parties participating in political negotiations.

and having methods ready for first aid when traumatic situations occur.

As to kidnapping, it was listed:

- Having a manual on kidnapping.
- Using local contacts and connections to ease situation and to imply pressure.

IT:

- Assuming any e-mail is open communication which can easily be read by third parties.
- Using own server.
- Restricting access to certain information.
- Not revealing location when using real-time social media, apply a time lag in posting articles and photos.

Media

- Being careful with language, focusing on facts and avoiding comparisons to other situations; keeping emotions out of such communications.
- Creating and making available a list of words and phrases not to use.
- Having someone review articles that are written (HQ for example).
- Being aware of attacks and misuse of information on social media. For example, tracking hashtags on social media to see what people are saying.
- Committing to truth telling and transparency, but not divulging secrets.
- Giving sources to support what is said.
- Having a media strategy for quick response if needed to counter disinformation, for example regarding ceasefire breaches.

- Training community members to constantly monitor rumors that would affect the government, region, on social media.
- Having credible messengers available who have influence.

Analysis, Evaluation and Learning

- Careful analysis of past failures to plan new strategies.
- Mapping of all actors' interests to find common ground.
- Not just focusing on vulnerability indicators, but also changes and trends on threat / perpetrator behavior / indicators.
- Integrating / including indicators of peace (rather than only perceptions).
- Doing an initial analysis that can disaggregate risk factors and associated indicators. This helps to be able to measure changes.
- Doing continuous monitoring and analysis.
- When there are external evaluation processes: Work with the evaluators to prepare them and give them feedback on their findings before the final report is written.
- Collecting baseline data when possible (perceptions, fears, levels of violence).
- Conducting post-activity evaluation meetings.
- Using participative assessment methodologies, communities participating in their own monitoring and giving them feedback after the evaluation is finished.
- Need to educate donors on what to expect rather than contort ourselves to their expectations, proactively

- show them the best methods. Helps to shape expectations.
- Analyzing the behavior of soldiers / fighters and everyone in the community on regular basis to see how perceptions are changed, how actions are changing throughout time.
- Piloting conflict monitoring framework, constant monitoring, co-designed with USIP (in Iraq).
- Organizations found it useful to work with direct testimonies from interviews with impacted people regarding how the work has impacted them.
- Israel/Palestine lay down their guns to work for peace, model this for other soldiers, can monitor number of soldiers that join.

#### Staff learning and information capturing and maintaining

- Having an overlap of some time (e.g. two weeks (10 days) for volunteers.
- Tracking of information (having a data system) by the office or HQ.
- Debriefing of volunteers after they have left.
- Writing documentations as team.
- Developing three-month-work plans which are then assessed.
- Encouraging staff journals.
- Using database for information.
- Setting aside time for staff to reflect.

#### Recruitment, Training and Post-deployment

- Choosing people who are trustworthy and good at teamwork, have good intercultural skills, are well-versed and experienced in working in other environments.
- There are benefits of having longer training and a probationary period.

- Trainings: Simulations and role plays are very good.
- Training people in self-awareness and awareness of others in team. Easing people into violent or high-pressure situations.
- Applying mentorship and guidance by respected senior staff members.
- Conducting daily team meetings. This is also the moment for context analysis for most groups.
- Having some form of regular access to professional counselling or therapy, on-site or offsite.
- Applying mandatory or highly recommended breaks.
- Longer terms of service are preferable because of relationship building.
- After service, giving former team members access to support structures (counselling and medical insurance).

#### Scaling up and Closing Projects

- Capacity-building (trainings) in local communities so that they can use some of the tools of UCP, perhaps including supporting people wishing to start a local initiative.
- Trying to learn from the history of closing other projects and the mistakes made there.

The full documentation of the workshop contains also a list of challenges that participants identified, and recommendations for future workshops.



## 2. Attendees

Organization(s)	Country the organization is based in	Country (countries) they work/ have worked in with a UCP organization
Academics from the following universities and research institutions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aberystwyth University</li> <li>• Georgetown University</li> <li>• IFGK</li> <li>• InterAction</li> <li>• Norwegian University of Technology and Science</li> </ul>	UK, , US, Germany Norway	n/a
CPT	USA / international	Iraqi Kurdistan
EAPPI	International	Palestine
Gulf Peace Team	International	Iraq
Iraq Peace Team	USA	Iraq
ISM	International / Palestine	Palestine
Kafa team in Salamiye	Syria	Syria
Local CSOs	Syria	Syria
Madani	Lebanon/Syria	Syria
MEND	Palestine	Palestine
Meta Peace Team	USA	Palestine?
Moubaderoon	Syria	Syria
Muslim Peacemaker Teams	USA/ Iraq	Iraq
Nonviolent Peaceforce (NP)	International	Sri Lanka, South Sudan
NP Iraq	UK	Iraq
NP Syria	International	Syria (Lebanon)
Operation Dove	Italy	Israel – Palestine, Lebanon - Syria
Permanent Peace Movement	Lebanon	Lebanon
Sanad for Peacebuilding	Iraq	Iraq