D7.8 Dissemination Seminar with the European Commission

	CORE Coordinator: Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO)	PO Box 9229 Grønland NO-0134 Oslo, Norway	T: +47 22 54 77 00 F: +47 22 54 77 01	www.projectcore.eu

Notice

On 3 December 2013, CORE organized its final events in Brussels, being the dissemination seminar and the international conference.

The main aim of the dissemination seminar with the European Commission was to discuss the results of the project with representatives from the European Commission. This was broadened up and also representatives from other European institutions and Brussels based think tanks and academics were invited to engage in dialogue with the participants of the project.

Representatives from the EC (DG Devco, DG Elarg, DG ECHO, DG Empl, DG JUST, DG RTD, DG TRADE) as well as from EEAS were invited to participate. The different delegations at the European Parliament, working with the relations with the countries of South Asia, India, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Georgia, were addressed individually. The networks of the consortium were used to spread the invitations on a personal level. Still, response and participation from EC representatives to this event was rather limited.

This deliverable includes the agenda, a report on the discussions during the seminar and a list of participants. It does not include a word-for-word reporting of all interventions, but summarizes the main interventions, reactions and directions of the discussions.

Report of the Dissemination Seminar

3 December 2013
Brussels, Belgium

Table of Contents

1. Agenda

Dissemination seminar towards EU institutions

"CULTURES OF GOVERNANCE AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN EUROPE AND INDIA"

Tuesday 3 December 2013
Fondation Universitaire, 11 rue d'Egmont, 1000 Brussels

08:45 - 09:00   Registration and Coffee

09:00 – 09:10   Welcome and opening of the seminar
by J. Peter Burgess (PRIO – Peace Research Institute Oslo)

09:10 – 09:25   "Cultures of Governance and Conflict Resolution" - Introduction to the concepts of the project
by Oliver P. Richmond (UNIMAN- The University of Manchester) and Ranabir Samaddar (MCRG - Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group)

Session I: Conflict and Governance:
Findings from Indian Case Studies in North East India, Jammu and Kashmir, Bihar and Jharkhand
Chaired by Hans-Joachim Giessmann (Berghof Foundation)

09:25 – 09:35   "Governing conflict and peacebuilding in India's northeast and Bihar"
Presentation by Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury (MCRG)

09:35 – 09:45   "Village council elections in Jammu and Kashmir"
Presentation by Sumona DasGupta (PRIA - Society for Participatory Research in Asia)

09:45 – 09:55   "Interrogating peace in Meghalaya"
Presentation by Anjoo Sharan (BHU -Banaras Hindu University)

09:55 – 10:05   "Conflict, Governance and Development"
Presentation by Amit Prakash (JNU - Jawaharlal Nehru University)

10:05 - 10:40   Comment on the presentations reflecting on how to translate the research results into policy recommendations by Maria Castillo Fernandez, Head of Division 'India, Nepal, Bhutan', EEAS
Q&A

10:40 – 10:55	Coffee break

Session II: Conflict and Governance:
Findings from European Case Studies in Georgia, Cyprus and Bosnia and Herzegovina
Chaired by Priyankar Upadhyaya (BHU -Banaras Hindu University)

10:55 – 11:05	"Opening the Russian-Georgia railway link" Presentation by Nona Mikhelidze (IAI - Istituto Affari Internazionali)
11:05 – 11:15	"Ensuring political representation in a restructured Bosnia and Herzegovina" Presentation by Elena B. Stavrevska (CEU - Kozep-Europai Egyetem)
11:15 – 11:25	"Enabling civil society in conflict resolution" Presentation by Birte Vogel (UNIMAN -The University of Manchester)
11:25 – 12:00	Panel discussion reflecting on how to translate the research results into policy recommendations with comments from - Angela Liberatore, EC, DG Research - Günther Rautz, EURAC Q&A
12:00 – 12:10	"The importance of dialogical relations and local agency in governance initiatives for conflict resolution" Presentation by Janel B. Galvanek (Berghof Foundation)
12:10 – 12:30	"Cultures of Governance and Peace: A Comparison of EU and Indian Theoretical and Policy Approaches"- Looking beyond the CORE project: Future prospects and conclusion of the seminar Presented by Oliver Richmond (UNIMAN) and Ranabir Samaddar (MCRG)
12:30	Lunch

2. Report of Seminar: Introductions, Discussions and Conclusions of the workshop

Last minute changes to the agenda:
Due to illness, J. Peter Burgess was replaced by Kristoffer Lidén, researcher at PRIO.
Due to administrative issues, Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury (MCRG) could not travel to Europe. The presentation was done by Priyankar Upadhyaya from BHU.
Due to administrative issues, Nona Mikhelidze (IAI) could not travel to Brussels. The presentation was done by Nathalie Tocci (IAI).

Welcome and opening of the seminar:

Kristoffer Lidén (PRIO) welcomed the participants and opened the seminar. He explained that the seminar was structured around the policy briefs that are resulting from the project. The policy brief series is based on relevant policy output from the research undertaken. These briefs are available on the CORE and PRIO websites and through the CORE consortium network.

2.1. "Cultures of Governance and Conflict Resolution" - Introduction to the concepts of the project, by Oliver P. Richmond (UNIMAN- The University of Manchester) and Ranabir Samaddar (MCRG - Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group)

Oliver Richmond and Ranabir Samaddar explained the concepts of the project to the audience. The starting point of the project was the idea that conflict resolution agendas should take the complex social and cultural contexts of the local level into consideration. The project aimed to analyze governance initiatives in conflict transformation processes. Through fieldwork, qualitative analysis and theory development, CORE has critiqued and reviewed current approaches to conflict resolution and peace building.

Ranabir Samaddar commented in brief how concepts get modified, enriched, and transformed through research, because the process of research is also a critique in operation. He also pointed out how the absences in the concepts are marked out through this process. The absence of certain realities in our understanding, which we realize through our research, acts in this way as an active present. He concluded by remarking that the post-colonial scenario of conflict, governance, and peace should not be seen as complete opposite to the European reality, or delinked from the evolving global governance model. The post-colonial scenario is marked however by its own contestations. Therefore in as much as we can say that a rigorous comparison between Europe and India cannot be made, a loose comparison of two experiences is gainful. The project by deploying the concepts creatively and skillfully has enriched our understanding. Europe will do good by learning from the specifics of the post-colonial experience.

After the presentation, there was a discussion about which approach to peace was more successful, given the theory, concepts, and cases the project has examined. There was some sense that both had important lessons to offer, but the scale of Indian approaches to peace and development, through governance, had perhaps succeeded in conflict resolution far in excess of what the EU has achieved, during the period of the last 20 years or so.

The consortium presented the policy briefs of the project: Session I concentrated on the Indian cases, Session II focussed on the European cases.

2.2. Session I: Conflict and Governance: Findings from Indian Case Studies in North East India, Jammu and Kashmir, Bihar and Jharkhand. Chaired by Hans-Joachim Giessmann (Berghof Foundation).

"Governing conflict and peacebuilding in India's northeast and Bihar", presented by Priyankar Upadhyaya.

Priyankar Upadhyaya stepped in to present this policy brief that was written by Atig Ghosh or the Calcutta Research Group.

The policy brief is based on the Calcutta Research Group's study within CORE, which was aiming to discuss several themes in the context of India's North East and Bihar, among others the question of mode of governance and its relation with conflict management and the issue of peace; features of the colonial mode of governance – continuities and discontinuities; peace processes and peace accords; territorial reorganisation (state reorganisations, creation of autonomous areas and home-lands) and peace building; political economy of development, social governance, and peace build-ing; and new subjects of developmental governance – women and other subjects.

 Taking India's political inheritance into consideration, we can state that colonialism's culture of governance hardly expired with the parcelling out of the world into independent nation-states. At least in India, colonial foundations are actively invoked to resolve conflicts and build peace. The colonial history of peacekeeping, pacification (colonial origins of extra-ordinary legislations), lim-ited franchise, techniques of negotiations, divide and rule, borders and boundary-making exercises, and finally constitutionalism.
In short, peace-building in India is founded on several uncertain political premises, being (a) the state is strong; (b) conflicts may therefore be allowed to linger; (c) peace-building measures should not be initiated until a suitable moment arises; (d) the state's adversaries must be softened up through a mix of strong responses and delays in addressing demands; (e) peace accords work;
(f) a limited grant of autonomy is the best solution; and(g) struggles for justice are in essence inter-group conflicts for parity.

One of the chief casualties of the aforesaid style of governance is the dialogic culture of society. The Indian society, like all societies, has dialogic aspects of its culture of conflict resolution. How-

ever, these dialogic aspects are not institutionalised in governance structures, or are to only limited extent. If we take up the need for legal pluralism we can see the need for research in this field in the interests of conflict resolution. Society needs legal pluralism, while the governmental recipe may be Panchayat (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act (PESA), 1996, with regard to the Common Property Resources (CPR). Or, let us take the theme of peace accords — one of the main features of the conflict resolution scenario in India which form the middle-ground in a 'no-war-no-peace' situation. These sites of dialogues need further investigation.

There is also the critical need to study how peace accords become a part of the governance tool kit. In India we need to investigate how peace-making feeds into the state-making agendum. The processes and structures of governance — the science of governing conflicts — need to be re-interrogated. In the development of this 'science', global trends are marshalled and implemented to grapple with local particularities. Similarly, restoration of government machinery has also a global model, though it has been a huge failure globally. The discourse of anti-terrorism again is a global discourse. Even thirty years ago, the governments used to acknowledge poverty, inequality, and injustice as causes of conflicts. Now all insurgents are terrorists, all agitators are enemies of development, and all dissenters are enemies of national integration. Visits of counter-insurgent experts are regular features.

In this sense, governance policies in India today carry the mark of politics of globalisation. Mindless importations of models of conflict resolution from Europe or elsewhere may not always be useful; rather a critical comparative approach is valuable. The divide between the governments and dissenters is as true of India as of Europe. There is, in that sense, no classic "European" archetype, as possibly there can be no "Indian" archetype. Diversity of conflicts and diversity of approaches (think of two different approaches to the Balkan problem and the Irish one in Europe, and the two different approaches to conflict with regard to Maoists and Hindu fundamentalists in India). Yet it is true that these diverse approaches finally feed into a grid of power exercising through what is known as "democratic channels". This is where we may find commonality, namely studying how democracy manages and governs conflicts.

A recognition that conflict prevention depends on gender equality and a commitment to respect individual citizen's rights notwithstanding their race/religion/caste/colour is also necessary. Coupled with this, there needs to be a true commitment to non-violence. India's Northeast, in particular, has shown how women groups — the Meira Paibes or the Naga Mothers — have played a critically important role in bridging a three-way gap between the government, the insurgent groups, and the civilian community at large. As such, funding and technical assistance for the implementation of existing national gender strategies, policies and plans of action, especially for women's economic empowerment, should be increased significantly. Security organs of the state — the face of the state, so to speak, in conflict resolution — are extremely masculine, such as the Indian Peace-keeping forces. Regular gender-sensitisation and training programmes for the security forces is necessary. Research should be undertaken to study the customary laws of different indigenous communities and look for codifying laws that are most respectful of women.

The civil-society groups and other activist groups and grassroots organization in conflict-prone areas need to be supported and not merely groups who are only visible in metropolitan zones. Em-

phasis on awareness/knowledge, advocacy, capacity-building, and programme design and implementation with focus on economic empowerment is also necessary.

To sum it up, the Indian nation is constantly mutating by changing forms, re-forming, and renewing. This is possible because of new inclusionary and exclusionary strategies. Further, Indian democracy is marked by a grey theme of 'no-war-no-peace'. These two features of the Indian situation suggest a necessary agenda for further research into conflict and governance.

"Village council elections in Jammu and Kashmir" Presentation by Sumona DasGupta (PRIA - Society for Participatory Research in Asia)
This policy brief is based on extensive field work and it was a challenge to summarise it into a policy brief. It concentrates on the Indian area in Jammu and Kashmir and the post-election period.

In 2011 elections to village councils (henceforth referred to as halqa panchayats) were conducted in Indian administered Jammu and Kashmir. This governance initiative has unleashed a host of intended and unintended consequences. This policy brief analyses the implications and consequences of the initiative from the perspective of institutional changes and new processes. The analysis is framed in the context of:
•   Differences among the understandings of various stakeholders of the significance of the halqa panchayat elections of 2011 and their role in ushering in change in Jammu and Kashmir; and
•   The institutional challenges inherent in the process of devolution of funds, functions and functionaries to the grassroots in a conflict area.
The policy brief makes recommendations both to the state government and to administrative functionaries in order to ensure that this governance initiative achieves its full potential.

"Interrogating peace in Meghalaya" Presentation by Anjoo Sharan (BHU -Banaras Hindu University)

The policy brief examines claims regarding the peacefulness of India's north eastern state of Meghalaya. It highlights the triggers and dynamics of the state's ongoing conflict, which continues to smoulder beneath the veneer of so-called peace. The brief critically evaluates governmental and non-governmental initiatives for defusing and resolving the ongoing conflicts, and puts forward some recommendations for how to engender sustainable peace in the region.

During the presentation, attention was given to different aspects of conflict scenarios.
1. Predicated on the cultural superiority of two tribal communities – the Khasis and the Garos – over the nontribal population, politically motivated ethnocentrism led to the commission of many dreadful acts against members of Meghalaya's non-tribal population. This trend was more conspicuous in the Khasi Hills, where the elevation of the Khasis to a dominant political position in the newly created state led them to challenge the hitherto ascendancy of the nontribal population, who were often branded as 'Bangladeshis' – nationals of Bangladesh.
2. The ethnic disaffection between the Khasis and the Garos is another subdued yet potent

conflict issue in Meghalaya. Although it was a joint initiative by the Khasis and the Garos that led to the formation of Meghalaya, the dominance of the Khasis over the other tribal groups has since been a constant source of friction. The main bone of contention between Khasis and Garos was the implementation of the 1971 Reservation Bill that specified quotas of 40% for Khasis and Jaintias, 50% for Garos, and 10% for minorities in government jobs and educational institutions.

3. Insurgent activities often linked to the attempts by ethnic groups to advance their own claims have posed a constant challenge to the peace and security of Meghalaya. The state first witnessed insurgent activities in the early 1980s, and these took on a virulent aspect in the 1990s with the emergence of the Achik Liberation Matgrik Army (ALMA) and the A'chick National Volunteer Council (ANVC) in the Garo Hills, and the Hynniewtrep National Liberation Council (HLNC) in the Khasi Hills. While the insurgency in the Khasi Hills was mainly targeted against the non-tribal populace, the insurgency in the Garo Hills had its roots in the economic instability of that backward region. And, while the insurgency in the Khasi Hills could be pacified through a combination of forceful means and promises of economic benefits, the insurgents in the Garo Hills remained recalcitrant despite varied efforts, including monetary incentives. The emergence and rise of the Garo Liberation National Army (GLNA) and of ANVC (B), a splinter faction of the ANVC, amply suggests that the insurgency in the Garo Hills is set to be a prolonged affair that will warrant structural reforms and will not be pacified through short-term diversionary tactics.

Several peace initiatives were commented:

1. The Garo Baptist Church, for example, was instrumental in bringing the insurgents of both the ALMA and the ANVC to the negotiating table. During 2003, the Garo Baptist Church, along with Mothers Union, another prominent civil society organization, also helped to bring peace to the Garo Hills at a difficult time.
2. Efforts to curb insurgent activities in the Garo Hills have largely been unsuccessful owing to the region's grim economic conditions and poor communication infrastructure, as well as the seeming indifference of political leaders towards the people's woes.
3. Strategies for appeasement that rely on the provision of monetary benefits should be avoided, as they have only added to the growth of insurgent outfits. Instead, the government should focus on development in the region, increasing job opportunities and improving educational opportunities in more backward areas.

"Conflict, Governance and Development" Presentation by Amit Prakash (JNU - Jawaharlal Nehru University)

Based on the policy brief, the presentation delineated the context of conflict in Jharkhand and Bihar, underlining the role played by the various actors and institutions involved, which in turn impact the character of conflict. Underlining that the twin rationalities of security and socio-economic change that underpin the policy initiatives in Jharkhand and Bihar, the presentation explained the transition in the governmental view of the conflict. While the Naxal challenge was earlier seen as only a 'Law and Order' issue to be addressed by the respective States using their policing apparatus, the policy view gradually evolved to characterising the Naxal conflict as that rooted in development-deficit and then to stress the institutional deficit at the local level as lying on the

root of the problem. The character and activities of contemporary Naxals was underlined as one anchored in the 'levy-economy' with interlocking interest with other local actors in a low-level equilibrium of conflict owing to the Naxals ability to deploy demonstrable violence as the lynchpin. Locating the new Panchayati Raj institutions (PRIs) as the institutional site of the conflict, the presentation explained how participation becomes the key to understanding and arguably, addressing the conflict. Further, it was explained that the local socio-cultural and political contexts structures the efficacy and relevance of the policy response, wherein issues of social justice – both, those of recognition as well as redistribution, are central. Besides, it was argued that the various bureaucratic and procedural limitations in the functioning of the PRIs hold the key to policy effectiveness in addressing the conflict. While on the one hand, the Naxal participation in PRIs elections underline the institutional relevance of PRIs, gatekeeping of PRIs by the governmental functionaries and procedures promise to undermine their role in addressing conflicts at the local level. Thus, the low-level equilibrium of conflict in the two States can be only be unlocked by a more maximal implementation of PRI policy involving greater devolution of funds, functions and functionaries to PRIs that has been the case until now.

Comment on the presentations reflecting on how to translate the research results into policy recommendations by Maria Castillo Fernandez, Head of Division 'India, Nepal, Bhutan', EEAS

Ms. Castillo Fernandez was invited to present the EEAS' view on the issues. She started with shortly introducing the EU-India strategic partnership.

• The EU and India decided to upgrade their 50-year relationship and engaged in a Strategic partnership in 2004. The focus shifted from a "donor-recipient relationship" to a "partnership between equal global players".

• The two world's biggest democratic spaces decided to promote common values globally and to pursue shared interests together (political/security issues, trade/economic/sectorial cooperation and people-to-people contacts).

• The objective is achieving mutual and global prosperity, stability and peace. The EEAS' tools are dialogue and cooperation, which are activated at bilateral, regional and multilateral level.

• Even if India is no longer a recipient of EU's bilateral development assistance, the EU is still politically and financially active in promoting its key values (solidarity, human rights, peace) in India.

➢ The EU provides substantial financial support to various civil society initiatives aimed at promoting human rights and conflict resolution.

➢ Also, humanitarian assistance, based on solidarity, needs and neutrality, supports populations affected by natural disasters and crises. The Humanitarian Assistance Office (ECHO) has reserved €6million for India in 2014, foreseeing humanitarian needs in Jammu and Kashmir, the naxalite crisis, conflict in the North East states and possible natural disasters in the country.

➢ Regular dialogues are also the opportunity to address political and human rights issues of common concern in the EU, in India, in their respective neighbourhoods and globally.

➢ The EEAS also supports supranational integration. The EU itself is an example of this. It is firmly believed that regional integration is key to achieve prosperity, stability and peace between nations.

> South Asia is said to be the less integrated region in the world. Some of the world's hottest existing or potential violent conflicts and crises (Afghanistan, India/Pakistan or consequences of climate change in Bangladesh or the Himalayas) are easily identified in the area. The question could be a possible correlation between lack of regional integration and potential for conflict in South Asia.

She then turned to the policy briefs with some comments. She also identified some possible issues and questions from an EU perspective.

"Governing conflict and peace building in India's northeast and Bihar"
This article addresses two situations which have evolved very differently. While Bihar is going through an economic revival (not mentioned in the article), usually attributed to policies implemented by Chief Minister Nitish Kumar, the North East states seem to be still lagging behind. She read in The Hindu of 22nd Nov[1] that "The Union government began a fresh round of negotiations with leaders of the largest Naga insurgent group on Thursday, hoping to hammer out a political settlement to the decades-old conflict ahead of Lok Sabha elections next year". She would be interested in authors' views on the potential of Bihar's economic growth as a factor for conflict resolution there and also about prospects for the Nagaland conflict.

"Village council elections in Jammu and Kashmir"
The situation in Kashmir is possibly the only one that is echoed in the European press or in public debates in the European Parliament. It is very complex and still largely unknown here. The article analyses the 2011 local elections. They were not followed by the expected empowerment of elected authorities, or the expected transfer of resources. They created frustration and generated violence, according to the authors.
Her question would go beyond the "internal" situation in Kashmir to address the Indo-Pak discussions: in which way decentralization processes on both sides of the Line of Control could contribute to normalizing the situation?

"Interrogating peace in Meghalaya"
The article refers to the apparent peaceful situation in the north East state of Meghalaya. It highlights the potential for conflict due to limited sustainability of mitigation initiatives undertaken by the central and the state government.
She noted the recommendations, which range from civil society participation to better connectivity with the rest of India. Her question is related to transnational cooperation and better integration between Meghalaya and its southern neighbour, Bangladesh. How should it be brought and articulated into the conflict resolution equation?

"Conflict, Governance and Development"
The Authors seem to criticise that security–related measures for anti-naxal operations prevail over and come before a "development package" for the populations deprived. They propose empowering local institutions (Panchayati Raj Institutions – PRI).
Without knowing the details of the naxal issue, she tends to agree on the importance of balancing security and development in the policy response. She noticed that terrorist attacks decimated recently the leadership of the Congress party in one of the states where naxalites are active.

Her question would be on what needs to be done to improve counter-terrorism responses in India, as she understands that competences in that area correspond to states rather than to the central government. How important is this to comprehensively address the naxal confict?

Issues for the way forward
The policy briefs show a number of shortcomings in the conflict resolution processes launched in different States across India. They formulate very relevant policy recommendations. None of them is explicitly addressed to international partners. She outlined what the EU is doing to promote human rights and conflict resolution/reconciliation as well as to reply to humanitarian needs and wonders whether the authors think that the EU could do more or do better?
2014 will mark the 10th Anniversary of the EU-India strategic partnership. This upgrading of the relationship is widely considered as having a lot of potential but having produced less deliverables than expected. The EU tends to be perceived as a trade block but it is much more. What needs to be done to further upgrade the relationship, to rebalance it beyond trade, to bring it closer to citizens in Europe and India?
2014 will also mark the renewal of the political leaderships both in India and in the EU. Most observers note that the outcome of the general elections in India will be a government of coalition or "coalition-of-coalitions" where State based parties will have an even more prominent role. Should the EU complement its engagement with the central government with a more intense relationship with the States? How this should be articulated?

She finished by coming back to regional/supranational integration in South Asia. She thought that there is a correlation between the lack of integration and the high potential for conflict in South Asia. What are the perspectives for regional integration and what could be the EU role in supporting the process?

2.3. Session II: Conflict and Governance: Findings from European Case Studies in Georgia, Cyprus and Bosnia and Herzegovina Chaired by Priyankar Upadhyaya (BHU -Banaras Hindu University)

"Opening the Russian-Georgia railway link" Presentation by Nona Mikhelidze (IAI - Istituto Affari Internazionali)

Soon after the parliamentary election in 2012 Georgia's new government declared its willingness to reconstruct and reopen the former railway communication link with Russia through Abkhazia, which was interrupted as a result of the Georgian–Abkhaz war in 1993. With its confidence-building character, the initiative is part of a broader Georgian foreign policy strategy aimed at re-establishing political and economic relations with Russia, a development that would represent a significant geopolitical challenge for the countries of the South Caucasus. The initiative will test Tbilisi's ability to prevent any changes to Abkhazia's current political status and to keep the project

purely economic in nature.

"Ensuring political representation in a restructured Bosnia and Herzegovina"
Presentation by Elena B. Stavrevska (CEU - Kozep-Europai Egyetem)
This policy brief highlights a largely overlooked problem in Bosnia and Herzegovina related to ficti-
tious residence registration. In order to secure better social benefits or enable their children to
receive an education in their mother tongue and instruction in the religion they practise, many
citizens have opted to register themselves as residing in one entity while living in another. This is
mainly the case among internally displaced persons, returnees and people living near the inter-
entity boundary line. There are three primary issue areas that have motivated people to register in
a different entity than the one they live in: pensions, health insurance and access to health care,
and primary and secondary education. In so doing, they not only lose their eligibility to vote and to
be represented politically where they live, but also affect the budgets of the entities and im-
portantly, limit their interaction with people of other ethnicities – and, accordingly, the possibility
for reconciliation and genuine conflict resolution. This practice, encouraged by the lack of coordi-
nation between the entities, thus undermines the possibilities for democracy and sustainable
peace in the country.

"Enabling civil society in conflict resolution" Presentation by Birte Vogel (UNIMAN -The Universi-
ty of Manchester)
Despite international interventions, a solution to the Cyprus conflict remains elusive, particularly
since national elites use the conflict to maintain their own positions of power. Only the peace-
related segment of Cyprus's civil society has found ways of escaping ethno-nationalism. By
prioritizing elite talks and linking funding to conditionality, donors are losing out on opportunities
to achieve society-wide mobilization and reconciliation away from the limitations of elite-level
negotiations. International donors continue to underestimate the importance of peace-orientated
civil society and instead attempt to institutionalize, co-opt or marginalize them. As a consequence,
civil society has been confined to an isolated political space. Only through the moving of such a
'peace space' from the periphery to the centre of society will it be possible to facilitate a locally-
accepted rather than an internationally-driven peace process. Accordingly, this policy brief offers
recommendations as to how international donors could be more helpful than harmful by guarding
the 'third space' rather than trying to manage it. This would include to provide core support rather
than project-based short term funding and removing international conditionality and project
agendas.

"The importance of dialogical relations and local agency in governance initiatives for conflict
resolution" Presentation by Janel B. Galvanek (Berghof Foundation)

Two aspects were examined in the policy brief: 1) positive dialogical relations among all actors in-
volved in conflict resolution initiatives and 2) the importance of acknowledging local agency in the
design and implementation of initiatives. Communication and dialogue between the conflicting
parties, but also between different peacebuilders active in the conflict are a basic requirement of
conflict resolution processes. However, based on the field research, we can assess that proper
communication and dialogical relations are often insufficient or missing. As an example, the local

government elections in Jammu and Kashmir in 2011 were examined. These elections evoked great expectations for self-governance, but the promised devolution to the local representatives has in many cases not yet happened. Field research revealed a severe lack of communication and dialogue between the citizens, the newly elected representatives and the state government. Another important finding is how essential the acknowledgement of local agency is in the design and implementation of governance initiatives for conflict resolution. However, local agency is not only not taken into sufficient consideration in the design of many initiatives, but in some cases it is widely disregarded. Examples used in the policy brief include an examination of the policy document of the Georgian government, the 'State Strategy on Occupied Territories'. No Abkhazians were consulted in the drafting of the document, which does not even recognize Abkhazia as being a party to the conflict. This is a blatant denial of Abkhaz agency. Another example is the everyday resistance to certain governance initiatives for ethnic separation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is often disregarded as insignificant, but which can be seen as an attempt to criticize the ethnic separation and its effect on the peacebuilding process. In this context, agency is speaking by resisting, but it nevertheless continues to be disregarded. Positive examples of the acknowledgement of local agency were also given in the brief including the bi-communal civil society initiatives in Cyprus, and the initiative of the Garo Baptist Church in Meghalaya state in northeast India. The Church was asked to help facilitate negotiations between the Indian government and one of the insurgent groups, and had complete ownership over the process.

Panel discussion reflecting on how to translate the research results into policy recommendations with comments from

- **Angela Liberatore, EC, DG Research**

Angela Liberatore, who has been the former project officer of CORE and therewith has a good knowledge of the contents of the project, formulated some questions and comments on the policy briefs. She wondered whom the authors had in mind when writing the policy briefs. Did they have in mind that they needed to empower local actors, or basically aimed at informing the broader public? Also a question on timing was raised: what is the time horizon of these briefs? How long are the recommendations formulated valid or did they have contingent frames in mind? Thirdly, a question on the assessment was posed: what did the authors learn and did they have an influence on the actors? Finally, the role of research as a vehicle of dialogue was questioned. Was the project 'understandable' to external participants?

- **Günther Rautz, EURAC**

Günther Rautz added several recommendations regarding implementation and dissemination.

At the level of the partners within the consortium, he suggested that the partners should create a trans-regional platform with NGOs, Universities and partners from former EU-India or EU-South Asia projects. This network should create a common database to build up an "observatory" on EU-India/South Asia issues on Human Rights, Minority Protections, Autonomy Regimes, Rule of Law, conflict management and reconciliation. Data collection and should be one pillar, a second one could be an "Open Center for Peace Studies" to exchange scholars and offer trainings for staff before they go on mission. He suggests the publishing of a "Transregional EU-South Asia Journal".

On the EU level, he suggested that the EU should create a training center for EU officials and information offices (info points) in some of the Member States and in some South Asian capitals (Core's "Open Center for Peace Studies" could take over some of the tasks).

Regarding the time frame, he stated that the EU as a normative power is doing standard setting (e.g. Copenhagen Criteria regarding minority protection in the frame of the EU enlargement process).

The elaboration of indicators was missing in the CORE activities. Therefore – as follow up – indicators should be elaborated in order to be able to measure the minimal standards.

On Political level the EU-Presidency of Lithuania had Rule of Law on its agenda. Greece will take over on 1 January 2014 (Cyprus case) and Italy is following in the second half of the year (IAI could do some lobbying on political level in Rome).

Q&A and general discussion

During the Q&A, several interventions on the comments were expressed.

Regarding the audience of the policy briefs: it was suggested that they should be aimed at policy makers, but experiences learned that policy makers actually rather consult their networks than reading policy briefs. The effort of writing policy makers oriented policy briefs is often undermined by the fear that these briefs will remain unread. One of the bigger challenges for researchers is 'how to make research results understandable'. The academic part of the project is just finished, so how can these results now be transformed into concrete, understandable, policy maker oriented output? This is a big challenge for academia now that the dissemination part of the project is really starting.

Ms Liberatore wrapped up by stating that it is evident that researchers have to remain truthful to themselves while being relevant for policy papers. The liberty of research remains at the center of all research activities. But sometimes researchers and policy makers do not listen well enough to each other. Academics will be respected if they can show that communication of research is based on integrity. The methodology and terminology however should be understandable to the policy makers.

Annex I: List of participants

Basu Ray Chaudhury(excused)	*Sabyasachi*	*MCRG*
Burgess (excused)	*J. Peter*	*PRIO*
Cameron	Fraser	EU-Asia Centre
DasGupta	*Sumona*	*PRIA*
Eberlen	Mathias	European Parliament
Fanari	Eleonora	European Institute of Asian Studies (EIAS)
Fernandez	*Maria Castillo*	*EEAS*
Galvanek	*Janel B.*	*Berghof Foundation*
Giessman	*Hans-Joachim*	*Berghof Foundation*
Hatzigeorgopoulos	Myrto	ISIS Europe
Karammel	Susy	Arcor
Koops	Joachim	VUB, Global Governance Institute (GGI)
Liberatore	*Angela*	*EC DG Research*
Lidén	*Kristoffer*	*PRIO*
Liebl	Josephine	European Peacebuilding Liaison Office
Loose	Olivier	Global Network for Change
Martin de Almagro	Maria	ULB
Manharsinh	Yadav	Indian Embassy (+ collegue)
Mikhelidze (excused)	*Nona*	*IAI*
Mørkved Aavatsmark	Paal Ivar	Mission of Norway to the EU
Pascual	Alfonso	EEAS
Pogodda	*Sandra*	*UNIMAN*
Prakash	*Amit*	*JNU*
Pritti	Rana	EIAS
Richmond	*Oliver P.*	*UNIMAN*
Samaddar	*Ranabir*	*MCRG*
Sharan	*Anjoo*	*BHU*
Stavrevska	*Elena B.*	*CEU*
Tocci	*Nathalie*	*IAI*
Upadhyaya	*Priyankar*	*BHU*
Visoka	Gizem	Dublin City University
Vogel	*Birte*	*UNIMAN*