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I. Overview of this Summit

“Nesting Peace: Creating Infrastructures to Sustain Diversity” was the sixth Summit of the Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP). This conference took place from 16th to the 20th of September 2013 at the Centre de Conférence Varembé, part of the Centre International de Conférences Genève (CICG), and at the United Nations Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland.

This Summit brought together 212 participants from 54 different countries across the globe representing various groups from civil society, governments, as well as United Nations institutions and agencies. The event was designed to enhance awareness and understanding of peace infrastructures and their essential role in sustainable strategies of peace promotion, utilizing the event itself as an experiment in creating one such structure. Further, this Summit was designed to connect participants in innovative ways in order to catalyze engagement bringing together various models of infrastructures for peace to be experienced during the week. Innovative formats and spaces such as Hatching Time and Open Space Activities were used to encourage participants to elicit participant-generated content, Hand Signals were utilized across the whole event to facilitate large group dialogue, and several other activities and methods were used to enhance the group’s experience and learning.

The Summit was preceded by the weekend learning event “Walking Towards Conflict: an Introduction to Restorative Systems” facilitated by Dominic Barter at the Collège Voltaire in Geneva on September 14-15. This pre-Summit learning event was an introduction to Restorative Circles and restorative systems as an excellent example of an infrastructure for peace. With this exposure, participants thus learned about a specific method that has proven very effective, and also had an introduction that would support them in holding the space of the restorative system to be created during the week of the Summit. In fact, a live restorative system was then created during the Summit, supported by participants and a few more experienced facilitators, including Dominic Barter himself.
For the first time in GAMIP history, this Summit was organized jointly by GAMIP and two other non-governmental organizations, namely Pacicultura, a local NGO tasked with developing the event concept and logistics, and the United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders), an international NGO contributing the youth dimension into both the organizing team and the conference itself (see Appendix 1 for more information about the NGOs organizing the Summit).

This Summit also included a Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate, organized together with the International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace. This unprecedented collaboration of the two existing global organizations focusing specifically on infrastructures for peace created the first public, global Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with so many high-level representatives from all over the world, including countries that have established peace infrastructures such as Ghana, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, and Costa Rica. We thus saw the presence of several government representatives, including those from the Vice-Ministry for Peace in Costa Rica and of the Ministry for Peace and Reconstruction in Nepal, the National Peace Council in Ghana and the Ministry of Peace and Reconciliation of the Autonomous Region of Bougainville in Papua New Guinea, three out of the four existing ministry for peace in the world, who shared their history, challenges and achievements.

With an innovative concept, rich in events and with the number and diversity of participants, this Summit created unprecedented momentum for initiatives around infrastructures for peace. Also, all the innovative aspects of this event organized by youth have now established an important precedent for events in peace and other domains alike.
II. HISTORY OF GAMIP

The Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP) is a global network established in London in October 2005 and formalized as a non-governmental organization in Geneva in August 2011. GAMIP brings together individuals and organizations from many countries who are working toward a Culture of Peace by promoting the development of infrastructures for peace at the local, national and regional level.

One of the main activities of GAMIP is the organization of a biennial Summit, which took place in the UK in 2005, Canada in 2006, Japan in 2007, Costa Rica in 2009, and South Africa in 2011. These previous Summits have gained the support of such noted champions of peace as Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Oscar Arias, His Holiness the Dalai Lama, the Most Reverend Desmond Tutu, and former member of the US House of Representatives Dennis Kucinich.

GAMIP had an essential role in the creation of two of the current four Ministries for Peace in the world, those in Nepal and Costa Rica. The Ministry for Peace in the Solomon Islands also benefited from this pioneering experiences. GAMIP also functions as support system to those institutions and individuals all over the world, allowing them to share experiences and learn during Summits to further initiatives in their own context. GAMIP supports these peaceworkers, facilitate exchanges between them, raise awareness on infrastructures for peace and generates engagement.
III. Nesting Peace: Creating Infrastructures to Sustain Diversity

A. Innovative aspects

This conference applied the principles of gift economy and crowdsourcing. The Summit was completely funded through donations and sponsorships in order to be truly inclusive and not impose financial constraints on individuals' participation.

This Summit featured interactive and innovative formats throughout, in order to maximize interaction and engagement on the issues at hand, using World Café methodology, Hatching Time alongside other artistic and creative spaces.

Beyond conceptual understandings, the Summit featured various kinds of live infrastructures for peace to be experienced throughout the conference, providing transformational learning and a deeper understanding of peace processes.

The event was entirely organized by youth committed to applying the principles and practices of peace in their own work. The team relies on peace tools and methods as resources in creating this event.

The Summit took advantage of Geneva’s unique character to gather a heterogeneous group of actors, coming from governments, civil society organizations, the United Nations system, academia, business, youth, artists, the justice system, religious groups, the police and others.

In the following sections of this report, we will develop each innovative aspect of the conference mentioned above and explain our thinking process with each one. These parts are aimed at providing the kind of information necessary to further use the model we developed in the future, and to understand its rationale.
1. Gift Economy

We live in a world where economic factors constitute some of the most important impediments to participation in gatherings and collective initiatives. Instead of taking this as an inevitability, we decided to turn the assumptions of such a system on their heads. It was only trusting that people would come through with their own generosity and willingness to give that we could create such a space for giving. In turn, it was only by creating such a space for giving that we could allow individuals with few or no financial resources to participate in the event, supported by the group.

In fact, hosting an event on a topic related to inclusion, participation, diversity and conflict could not be done with integrity without trying to address those issues in the very organization of the event itself. This stems from the deep belief in the importance of starting change with ourselves and with the means available to us, as well the importance of experiencing such innovation first-hand as the best learning experience. The event itself thus because an example of what participants gathered to discuss.

The event had no fees for participation. At the same time, the event’s costs were communicated openly and updated regularly on the conference website. While not forced to pay anything, participants were informed of the costs involved and were asked to make a donation of any amount they could afford in order to support the financial viability of the event. Further, by registering, participants agreed to the principle of financial co-responsibility to acknowledge collective responsibility for the event. In essence, this was not an obligation to contribute financially, but an agreement to engage in discussions to find creative solutions and take action to cover any outstanding costs present at the time the event started. We viewed this financial co-responsibility also as a worthwhile exercise in developing solidarity, listening, mutual support and creativity. If, on the other hand, we had raised all necessary funds before the beginning of the Summit, we may have included an optional session to share our creative and inclusive funding strategy with others.

The strategy adopted before the event included:

1. communicating with participants and asking for donations via bank transfer and PayPal
2. developing a crowdfunding campaign on Indiegogo
3. using social media to ask for small donations and passing on the call for support online
4. traditional applications for grants from foundations, public institutions and similar organizations
5. developing sponsorships with the Canton of Geneva to benefit from substantial sponsoring of travel, accommodation and per diem costs for 30 participants (20% of the total) coming from "Least-Developed Countries" according to the OECD

6. establishing partnerships with several organizations and companies for in-kind donations

The innovative nature of such an approach translated into consistent difficulties in communicating with potential sponsors and donors. Firstly, institutions seemed largely unresponsive to the intent behind an application of gift principles, and wary of the financial sustainability of such an enterprise, resulting in very few institutional grants. Secondly, the strong youth component of the event, while of interest, also made for cautious responses. Youth are seen as a very important target group, but hesitation creeps in when they are the generators of change, possibly because of issues of credibility. Thirdly, the topic of the event, infrastructures for peace, was itself innovative and we found it difficult to find institutions that would respond to the importance of fresh approaches to peacebuilding, perhaps precisely because of the lack of widespread knowledge around those topics. The challenge here was that learning that was to happen at the event also had to happen, at least in part, in very limited and structured exchanges with institutions who often preferred to devote money to more commonly understandable projects.

The success we nevertheless had in obtaining a sponsorship from the Canton of Geneva, as well as establishing many partnerships with organizations and companies was counterbalanced by the difficulties in carrying out a successful crowdfunding campaign. While certainly affected by the issues present in communicating the value of the event to potential donors already mentioned, crowdfunding also requires constant updating and followup on social media websites to build a movement. At the same time, the high goal set meant a higher tipping point needed to be reached before the “crowd” could feel confident that we had sufficient support to make it happen. The strong focus on new, commercially-viable products on the crowdfunding scene (as opposed to events or other projects) and the still-dominant mentality of scarcity also made it difficult to truly benefit from our online crowdfunding campaign on Indiegogo (you can access it by following this link: http://www.indiegogo.com/projects/nesting-peace-co-create-a-pioneering-conference-on-new-approaches-to-peace).

All of this contributed to a negative balance as of the start of the event. However, it was just the beginning of creating an experience that would touch participants in deep ways and motivate them to contribute beyond expectations – the live crowdfunding during the event was extremely successful.

During the pre-Summit Learning Event on Restorative Systems, we took some time on the second day to discuss the financial situation and asked for donations in envelopes to be placed in a box in the middle of the room during lunchtime. After tallying the donations made or pledged, there
was still a small difference to be covered with respect to the Learning Event costs. In the afternoon, we reiterated our call for donations and invited participants to make additional contributions. At the close of the day and of the Learning Event, we had received CHF 2'484.60 over what was needed to cover the outstanding costs. This success was a wonderful and encouraging surprise for the Summit that lay in the days ahead.

The main reason for doing a first exercise in collecting donations was that many participants attending the Learning Event were not coming to the Summit, though a good number were attending both.

At the start of the Summit, the remaining event balance sheet showed considerable outstanding costs. Again we facilitated conversations on the financial sustainability of the event, on Day 3 and on Day 5. These conversations relied on an open format, where participants connected with the meaning their experience at the event had for them and freely spoke to the whole group on that, sharing their thoughts and their ideas for the financial sustainability of the event. At the end of the last day, we had again collected sufficient pledged donations to cover all event costs, with an excess of CHF 1'779.14! The details of each session facilitated in the appropriate days is described in the program below.

Despite this success, we encountered some last-minute letdowns. While other sudden, surprising retreats by institutional funders took place before the event (thus resulting in an otherwise even more positive balance sheet), here we will focus only on the ones that occurred either during or soon after the event.

We unfortunately did not receive a few substantial pledges that had been made during the event. At the same time, we had purchased certain airline tickets for sponsored individuals who did not inform us that they had finally decided not to come and did not want to reimburse us for our expense, or for whom we have not received a reimbursement from the insurance company. This resulted in a final negative balance of CHF 7'764.54, reflected in the graph below. While this is a relatively large amount, it is nonetheless notable that it only represent 3.77% of the total budget of CHF 206'190.80, which means that we were able to cover 96.23% of costs through voluntary contributions and donations alone!

It should be noted that the pledges we did not receive included a single amount of CHF 11'400 that was offered and taken into account. During the rest of the event and the discussions on the financial situation, this affected the clarity on what overall amount still had to be covered, and potentially the amount of subsequent donations. If we had received this amount, we would have had a surplus of CHF 3'635.46, in line with the result obtained after the final round of donations on the last day of the Summit. If we add to this surplus the airline tickets that should have been reimbursed to us, we would have a surplus of CHF 6'848.57. Instead, the lack of follow-through on the part of a few individuals created a deficit of CHF 7'764.54.
Despite the current situation, we hope to recover this amount through late refunds and further donations. In fact, since CHF 7'764.54 only refers to live expenses incurred for the event, we hope to receive more than that to sustain the organizers’ and facilitators’ livelihoods.

The whole event was created through gifts, and what payments had to be made were due to organizations or individuals who did not respond to our invitation to contribute of themselves freely. We thus needed financial donations to pay for those bills - but without these costs there would have been even more financial resources to share among all those who joined forces and gave of themselves freely to make the event happen. We hope that more projects will be inspired by our approach in the future, and that they will be able to gather not only sufficient funds to cover bills received, but to support the livelihoods of those who desire to devote their gifts to peacework. Taking into account the facts above and other funding that would have most likely come through, had it not been for a peculiar set of circumstances, we estimate that this youth-led event on new, sustainable approaches to peacebuilding for which no fee was charged and 30 participants were fully sponsored to attend, with an additional 10 partially sponsored, could have generated a surplus of at least CHF 31'848.57 and potentially even CHF 60'802.57 or more.
2. Innovative and Interactive Formats

Too many events replicate modes of interaction that often result in an experience akin to attending a series of lectures which may just as effectively be read or seen on video. The useful moments of these events tend to be the “cracks” in the program such as coffee breaks and lunchtime.

Believing in the importance of this event, we worked to make the most out of the presence of participants in the same physical space. In fact, from the beginning we intended to design the program of the event itself as an example of an infrastructure for peace insofar as possible. As much as peace is related to dialogue, and dialogue is both a consequence as well as a cause of learning, we ventured to create a space that would enhance learning. At the same time, the kinds of interactions among participants were to provide an experience that would mark that learning. In fact, experience is the best form of learning – and we started with the belief that understanding the complexities of peace required having first-hand experience of the processes facilitated by infrastructures for peace, beyond hearing about them.

Creating such a peace learning community was an exciting experiment that took the form, among other things, of composing a program characterized by innovative and interactive formats. Among other things, this required having faith in the contributions that participants can make to each other’s experience, rather than seeing the event as a transfer of knowledge from the organizers to the attendees. We designed and created program frames that would facilitate the participants' interactions with each other. Given the innovative nature of the topic, however, we also blended in a few moments of input-giving. Following are some of the highlights of how the program was designed:

Instead of focusing on pre-established content for the sessions, we left a lot of space for participant-generated content and processes. The talks foreseen in the program were in no case longer than 10-15 minutes, with more time devoted to discussion.

We tried to maximize “free” time, outside of plenary or small-group sessions, in order to stimulate interaction among participants. This was done within certain a structure (see below) designed to support interaction if needed, and not stifle what interaction was already taking place.

We called upon participants to offer sessions, content and facilitation ahead of time in order to co-create the program with them and involve them in shaping the conference experience.

We asked participants to propose methodologies and formats that would be interactive and useful for their purposes. We also did our own research and gathered the experience present in the team to come up with a mix of interactive formats.

While some of those are becoming better known, we did not simply include as many as possible in order to increase the interactive nature of the event. We included some, we
combined or adapted others, and we created some new ones, trying to create a cohesive and balanced experience. We thus had a number of formats, including World Café, Open Space, Pecha-Kucha, Welcome Spaces, Reflection Time, a teambuilding session, Empathy Buddy sessions, Morning Connection circles, a question-based conversation, a marketplace, a visit to a museum, “Open House” receptions, a cross-hatching activity, an event at the UN Palais des Nations on the side of the Human Rights Council, and a regular Hatching Time including several spaces and activities. We also used Hand Signals for large-group interaction and tried to intersperse art and performances throughout. You will find details on the formats used most often below in this section, while the remaining formats are mentioned in the relevant days of the program.

Although these formats were appreciated by participants and allowed for new ways of interacting and learning, we encountered the difficulty of having participants fully embrace some of the new formats and play along with the guidelines and modalities we had developed. The same was true of participants or others not involved in the event organization to whom we had entrusted sessions as facilitators or moderators, in the spirit of co-creating the event. While we integrated several individuals’ input on how to adapt formats and find creative solutions, we also faced the difficulty of other individuals facilitating sessions in less intentional ways and not making use of the new methods we had devised. We depended on participants to fully activate the potential of these methods, and we unfortunately cannot know how the event would have been if there had been closer alignment with our vision. While these methods were still very successful overall, we believe that they at least nudged participants into unexplored territory, and we hope that the formats we designed will serve as inspiration for future events they will be involved in.
**Morning Connection circles**

In our communication-filled, delocalized lives, it was not a given that participants would be fully present to experience the event and each other’s presence. We thus looked for ways to allow the group to mark the beginning of each new day together, bringing their full attention to the gifts of the day and sense the group they were part of.

Every morning, we invited participants to come for a morning session where we would greet each other, look at the point we are at in the event (what we have done so far and what we are about to experience), and do a brief activity to center ourselves and be ready to experience a new today together. This activity was a HeartMath exercise, which aimed at connecting the heart and the mind, and which was also conducive to the empathy buddy session that followed (see below). The Morning Connection circle was facilitated by Birger Norup from Peace Alliance Denmark and GAMIP Board member.

![Morning Connection circle](image)

**Empathy Buddy sessions**

Within a vision of creating a framework that would be conducive to learning, dialogue, deep connection and that would facilitate some of the experiences that might be supported by an infrastructure for peace, we decided to have regular Empathy Buddy sessions in the morning.

Leveraging the quality of presence developed in the Morning Connection circle, Empathy Buddy sessions allowed participants to get to know each other better as well as have a space to be heard and find support. After a pairing-up activity that changed every day, new pairs of participants were formed every morning. These pairs would then find a place where they could sit one in front of the other and they would take turns at giving and receiving empathy.

In practice, one person would share how she was feeling, her concerns, her needs and her satisfactions openly related to any aspect of her life, whether related to the conference or not. The important aspect was to be present to how one was feeling right then and there. The other person simply listened attentively, trying to connect with the underlying needs and feelings of the one sharing. After about seven minutes, the listener would briefly share what she heard in three minutes.
or so. After this ten-minute period, the roles would switch and there would be another ten-minute period of empathy giving and receiving.

Besides providing the experience and practice of active listening, and beyond helping to clear out emotional blockages to full participation during the conference, this exercise was useful to create deeper relationships among participants, gradually creating a group feeling over the course of the week. This would then be conducive to more open dialogue, more effective learning, and collaborations and joint initiatives looking into the future.

Empathy Buddy sessions were entrusted to Kristin Famula of the National Peace Academy and Vishal Sunny Dhawotal of the Mauritius Red Cross Society as facilitators.

**World Café**

We used World Café at the beginning of the Summit in order to support people in knowing each other better, and in order to focus the group’s energy on the different concepts of peace and infrastructures for peace. World Café is a conversational process to engage large groups in meaningful conversations. The process combines a series of small group conversations with 4 – 6 persons in each group and plenary sessions with the whole group to harvest the results of the many conversations. Within a short period of time, participants meet many other people and their ideas – a powerful recipe for innovation, creativity and emergence. One person at each table is assigned the role of a table host and is responsible for welcoming the guests in each round of conversation and reporting the main results to the plenary during the harvesting session.

As one of the methods that we adapted to our event, we meant to have short, 10-minute inputs before each World Café round as replacements or vehicles for the questions to be asked at each round. However, logistical issues related to the venue made us change our plans and have a more traditional World Café session with three rounds, followed by the inputs. Nevertheless, we maintained some adaptations. For example, we asked the table hosts to generate 5 tweets synthesizing what has been discussed at their table, tweets that were then further synthesized into a single drawing per table with the help of a cartoonist. By this “tweets” approach, we helped participants to grasp the experience of each table, without being lost in too much information nor losing its meaning. The
drawing then allowed to go to the essence of the meaning of each table, immediately. The 25 drawings were then put up on the board and used during the conclusions session on the last day to help the reflection process. Further description of how the World Café concretely worked during the Summit can be seen in the section on Day 2. World Café outcomes were also discussed during the conclusion of the Summit, in Day 5.

For more information about the world café methodology: [http://www.theworldcafe.com](http://www.theworldcafe.com)

---

**Pecha-Kucha**

Pecha-Kucha is a method to deliver interesting, visual presentations in a very short time. Structured in 20 slides advancing automatically every 20 seconds, this method gives a total presentation time of 6 minutes and 40 seconds. While this may seem very short, the fact that the slides are mostly images help create a storyboard-like show to support the presenter in telling a story. This format allows for concise presentations meant to stimulate interest and discussion while allowing time for it.

Because of the novelty of this method, and because of the preparation required on the part of the presenter to deliver an effective Pecha-Kucha, few presentations actually used the method. Nevertheless, participants got in touch with this increasingly popular methodology and benefited from the time devoted to discussion.
Hand Signals

Hand signals are a nonverbal tool of communication in order to encourage all the people in the room to share their opinion, steer the process during group discussions, take decisions on a consensual basis or check who everybody are feeling at that moment in the room. The advantage of this tool is the ability to have large group discussions and have everyone’s input without interrupting the person speaking.

Every participant received a Hand Signal sheet in their participant kit (see Appendix E), which was explained in the first session of the Summit, and then revised a couple of times in the plenary. Using this tool made the sessions very dynamic, generating an environment of co-creation, where the participants felt being heard on many levels, supporting the community building process, supporting trust and clarity throughout the whole week.

Reflection Time in Home Group Nests

On the first day, we created “home group nests” of six or so people. These groups were created to accompany participants in their week-long learning journey. Although participants would be constantly shuffled for most activities, these same groups came together at the end of each day in order to share their experience during the day and their reflections. After choosing a meeting place on the first day, groups met in the same place and self-directed the sharing in the group. A journal was also provided to home group nests in order to record any specific moments, ideas or experiences that they thought particularly important. In essence, Reflection Time in Home Group Nests was meant as a support to personal reflection and learning throughout the week in a way that would allow for everyone’s participation, take advantage of their different experiences, while at the same time creating shared understandings and experiences.
Open Space Activity

Open Space is an interactive process where participants flow freely across concurrent sessions around various themes or issues. The cross-pollination that occurs when moving from group to group and topic to topic in a non-linear way allows participants to jump quickly from familiar ways of thinking into innovation and action. Participants were free and encouraged to come and go between presentations, hence the 'open' nature of the sessions.

The Open Space activity we did was an adaptation of Open Space Technology (OST), meant to encourage all the participants and staff to propose a session, a talk, a circle on a topic of their own interest. OST can be used to organize whole events, and given the presence of other methods we wanted to use, we decided to adapt OST into an Open Space activity. The description of this activity was handed out together with the Hatching Time Handout in the participants kit (see Appendix E).

Before the first morning sessions on Days 2 and 3, participants were invited to propose a session and write it on a Menu Card (see Appendix E). This card was then posted on the Open Space Offerings board. During the morning breaks, all participants received three colored stickers to vote which the sessions they had most interest in. By the lunch break our staff had counted the votes and written on the Open Space Menu flip-chart which 3-5 sessions had received the most interest and what room they would take place in. At lunchtime, participants could then choose which session(s) to go to.
Hatching Time description

Hatching time was a space created to engage the participants to experience various forms of infrastructures for peace and to stimulate their own visualization and creation of new ones. During Hatching Time, several spaces and activities were proposed, serving to support dialogue and interaction among participants. Most stations had a board with material and a description of what was being proposed in that space. While we included Hatching Time in a particular slot during lunch breaks, all spaces, stations and materials were available to the participants during the entire day and throughout the week. The explanation of Hatching Time and all its activities were given in a folded handout in the participants kit, which you will find below. Each element is also further explained in this document.

Hatching time included the following activities:

**Cartooning for Peace**

The Cartooning for Peace initiative started in 2006 at an UN symposium entitled “Unlearning Intolerance”. It aims to promote a better understanding and mutual respect between people of different cultures and beliefs using editorial cartoons as a universal language. A Cartooning for Peace exhibition was integrated within the Summit venue as a permanent inspiration for dialogue about peace throughout the week, while at the same time allowing participants to experience concretely how cartoons can act as catalysts for dialogue and the development of a culture of peace. Besides creating a friendly environment, many participants mentioned that they were amazed at the depth of the cartoons. For more information about Cartooning for Peace, see: [www.cartooningforpeace.org](http://www.cartooningforpeace.org)
**Peace Resource Corner**

This was the community resource space, a standing live input give and take space for sharing practical tools, methods, articles and other resources related to infrastructures for peace among all the participants. GAMIP members’ country reports, articles from many of the participants and a background paper on Infrastructures for peace along with UNDP publications were shared, some of them written specifically for the Summit. To access some of the documents shared on this corner see: [www.gamip.org/summits/switzerland-2013-nesting-peace/summit-documents/](http://www.gamip.org/summits/switzerland-2013-nesting-peace/summit-documents/)

Across from the Peace Resource Corner, a table was also made available for flyers, brochures and other information on organizations either present at the Summit or of interest to Summit participants.

**Pop-up Discussions**

Every day, at a certain time during the lunch break, home-made wire structures and Pop-up Discussion cards were distributed on all tables. Those at the table could then write the subject they were discussing on the card and place it at the top of the wire structure on their table. This allowed others wandering about to see what topics were being discussed at the various tables and join the group that most interested them if they wanted. As a way to make visible small discussions and inviting other people to be part of it, Pop-up Discussions stimulated interaction and dialogue in an open and flexible way.

**Musical Crosswalk**

We sewed carpet-like fabric stripes into a pedestrian crosswalk, which we then placed in a certain place within the venue with a speaker and a running playlist. Participants were invited to cross it dancing in their own style, following the music or not. This proposal to walk differently between rooms was intended to allow for beautiful and unexpected interactions.
Art Corner

The art corner was indicated by an exhibition board, two big tables and art supplies that were available to encourage the participants to express themselves beyond words. It was a station to encourage the processing and expression of the participants’ experiences and emotions during the week in a creative way. Many drawings were created, especially later in the week, when more of a community feeling had being developed, and they were all posted on the board: “Welcome to your vernissage”.

Meditation Room

This room was the silent room of the venue, where any participant could go anytime to meditate in their own style or just take a break in silence. Set up very simply with cushions on the floor arranged in a circle (and a fold-up futon sofa in the corner), we placed in the middle of the room “The Ball Reloaded”, a sculpture gifted to the Summit by Swedish artist Lasse Kjellberg. This space allowed participants to take a step back from the conference, slow down for a few minutes, and find time for themselves at any point during the event.

Yoga Space

“Change leads to disappointment if it is not sustained. Transformation is sustained change, and it is achieved through practice.” -B.K.S. Iyengar

Yoga practice was another one of the elements of the infrastructure for peace represented by the Summit itself, helping the development and understanding of thoughts and ideas by changing the physical position of our bodies, besides changing the mental perception of the one who practices. In this logic, the practice of yoga helps to find flexibility beyond the body, considering that movement and flexibility are integral to the process of finding solutions within ourselves to unexpected questions and in conflict situations. Yoga mats were lend by Yoga 7 (www.yoga7.com) and yoga sessions were facilitated by Courtenay Mastain as well as Manjushri Sharma.
**Analog I4P Discussion Forum**

This station consisted of a board where participants could ask and respond to questions about infrastructures for peace. Individuals would use cards of one color to write their questions and would post them in the questions section. Others would then see the questions and they could take one of them, place it at the top in the discussions section of the board, and use a card of a different color to write their response, which they would then post right underneath the question.

Others could then continue the thread with their own response, or perhaps the discussion would inspire new questions. The idea was to provide a standing space for reflection and discussion about infrastructures for peace that would not depend on who was there at any given moment, but would serve as a repository of questions and issues to be addressed regarding infrastructures for peace throughout the week, reflecting the development in participants’ understanding of sustainable strategies of peace promotion.

**One World, Many Perspectives**

We pinned a large Buckminster Fuller’s Dymaxion AirOcean World map (2.10 m x 1.37 m) onto a board, inviting participants use a white thumbtack to indicate where they were from and place a blue thumbtack where they wanted to do peacework or on a place they wanted to know more about. If they found a white thumbtack there, they could look for that person and start a conversation! The board allowed participants to see at a glance the geographical diversity of the community present during the event. Buckminster Fuller’s map itself was chosen bring an unusual perspective of our countries and our planet, showing the continent’s unity beyond the political divisions of the world.

For a better visualization in this report of this geographical diversity of participants, we decided to use the Dymaxion Woodcut World map (for more information about the story of this map: [http://www.bfi.org/mapcontest](http://www.bfi.org/mapcontest)). You will find this map in the section on the diversity of participants below.
**What Is Everybody Talking About?**

In their registration form, participants were asked to share their views and understanding of ‘peace’ and ‘infrastructures for peace’. We chose the most interesting responses and collected them in a visually appealing board, with the names of their authors. This board was there to welcome participants on the first day, stimulating interaction and discussions on the topic of the event (see Appendix E).

**Speak Your Mind on Nesting Peace**

We designed the event to be as participatory as possible, asking participants to be co-creators of the event. We offered a dedicated board for participants to express their feelings, impressions and feedback on the conference. At the end of the week, unfortunately the board was empty. Participants told us they already had so many spaces available to express themselves that the board felt extra.
Restorative Circle Space

As part of the live restorative system created during the Summit, the Restorative Circle Space was intended as the place where circles (facilitated meetings) would take place in the course of the restorative system’s functioning. While circles ended up taking place not only in the Restorative Circle Space but in many other places across the venue, this space hosted a board showing various elements and characteristics of the system as designed and tweaked by participants over time were also written on this board, representing a way to communicate updates and changes in the restorative systems. Also, the board had a dedicated space to be used at any time by anyone who was experiencing a conflict as a way activate the restorative system. Facilitators regularly checked the board so they could start the process with the individuals who expressed a conflict. During the week, the system evolved to allow a more private way of calling a circle, and a notebook was placed at the info point for this purpose. Other elements of the system also evolved over the course of the week. Many circles were called during the week and many participants participated, giving them a first-hand experience of this infrastructure for peace with live conflicts taking place among people at the event itself.
3. Experience of live infrastructures for peace during conference

Since first-hand experience is the best form of learning, we wanted to create an event that would not only talk about infrastructures for peace, but that would demonstrate how they work by creating one around participants in order to support their conflicts. While this claim needs to be qualified (i.e., the “infrastructure” only lasted for the duration of the conference, and participants in the group were generally not linked by other elements besides their participation in this event and thus did not reflect a pre-existing community), this experiment proved very successful.

Depending on one’s understanding of infrastructures for peace, many features of the conference and the event as a whole may be considered an infrastructure for peace. Many of the spaces, boards and other supports contributing to dialogue and learning are described under the “Hatching Time” section above on formats. (Others are described on the specific day in the program.) However, the element most clearly recognizable as an infrastructure for peace was the restorative system that ran throughout the week.

Working on the basis of the introduction on restorative systems carried out during the pre-Summit Learning Event, at which many Summit participants were present, we did an overview of the weekend Learning Event and the nature of restorative systems for the Summit plenary. We then asked the group if they would be willing to co-create a live restorative system for the duration of the week in order to support the group’s learning on infrastructures for peace and restorative systems in particular. In order to be effective, the system was meant from the beginning to deal with real, live conflicts that participants would have during their time at the conference, whether related to the conference itself or not. This would provide an effective space for learning about the potential of infrastructures for peace, and an intimate knowledge about the processes involved, their effects on social relationships, as well as the design of the system itself.

With the initial group agreement to create such a system, the group went on to design the system in ways that would be most beneficial and acceptable to its members. Participants took ownership of the system and made it their own by changing various aspects of its functioning. These included:

Physical space

The circles called via the restorative system took place in various spaces, depending on the circle that had been called and the spaces that were available. First, a particular space was designated for circles, but as many circles took place simultaneously, the entire venue was quickly used. A specific area was designated as the Restorative Circle space, where all the information about the organically evolving restorative system was posted, discussed and rearranged. This included part of the system’s activation mechanism described below.
Mechanism to activate system (call circles)

This was initially represented by a board in the Restorative Circle space, where individuals would write their name and the time at which they expressed that they had a conflict. Later, the group decided to also have a notebook at the info point, which would provide more privacy to those expressing they had a conflict.

Trained facilitators

Many of the participants had participated in the pre-Summit Learning Event on restorative systems and had had some exposure to the method, which they used to support circle facilitators and the general functioning of the system. Certain individuals were also present who had considerable experience with Restorative Circles. While an effort was made to encourage participants to take on the system and the facilitation of circles, Dominic Barter and Sissi Mazzetti were present to facilitate circles or provide support where needed. With this setup, several circles were called and facilitated to address live conflicts that participants were having. In fact, the system was created for the whole community present during the week, including participants, organizers, volunteers, guest facilitators, etc., as distinctions between those different groups were blurred in multiple ways to form a diverse and comprehensive learning community.

One of the main challenges of this system in this context in our perspective was to be able to set the time inside the schedule to have all the people necessary for each circle without affecting the other activities of the Summit, or to have enough time to unfold all the process involved in each subject in such a short period of time together (the week of the Summit).

Many participants who had participated in one of the circles during the week shared that they felt that it was a very enriching experience, creating bounding connection, new perspective and a new way of seeing conflict and giving a new meaning to restorative responses to it. For more information Restorative Circles: http://www.restorativecircles.org

or you can check their Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/RestorativeCircles
4. Youth-organized

For the first time in the history of GAMIP Summits, Nesting Peace was fully youth-organized. This meant that the local team in Geneva was solely composed of seven youth working full-time or part-time on top of their studies for several months. It was a vibrant example that youth are not the future, but are the actors of today, engaging in peacework in innovative ways.

The Nesting Peace team was also supported by the Global Summit Planning Team (SPT) through monthly Skype meetings. With a role of support and advice, the SPT was formed of GAMIP members who shared their experience in organizing previous Summits and gave their valuable input to the planning of this Summit. While the innovative concept of the conference and the details of implementation were developed by the Nesting Peace team, the SPT provided general guidance as well as advice and assistance on specific issues.

Besides the Nesting Peace team, a large group of youth volunteers also helped during the event itself. Mobilizing youth to volunteer for the organization of a peace conference during their summer holidays is not an easy task. We sent internship offers through the UNOY Peacebuilders network and the internship website of University of Geneva, emphasizing that it was a truly unique opportunity and that they would not be treated as interns but as co-creators of the event, bringing their own touch to it.

There were advantages and challenges to being a youth group. First, we had all to learn about conference organizing. Even though Luiza and Oliver had some experience, no one had organized an event of this nature and scale - this is what we co-created using our passion and imagination. The endorsement and support of GAMIP and UNOY Peacebuilders was instrumental to our work, as it helped counter the lack of credibility that is too often attributed to youth initiatives. Using youth creativity to the fullest, we took time to generate new ideas, let our imagination run far in order to see the practical possibilities from a different point of view. Youth characteristic openness made the work so much easier, as we were all willing to try new ideas instead of of following a business-as-usual” approach to conference organizing. Participants were very grateful to feel throughout the conference true engagement in part of youth volunteers to peace, which is not commonly seen.
Additionally to the youth character of the organizing team, we made special efforts in ensuring that more than a third of the participants be youth, and sought to increase the engagement of youth in peacebuilding and violence prevention by:

- Reaching out and involving youth from the University of Geneva, local high schools, IHEID and others as volunteers and participants, as well as eliminating the financial barriers to participation for youth from developing countries and conflict zones
- Highlighting the unique role of youth in developing creative approaches to the design of infrastructures for peace and the development of sustainably nonviolent societies
- Emphasizing the importance of a cultural approach to peace and youth’s role in generating alternatives to co-create a culture of peace
- Strengthening the United Network of Young Peacebuilders, co-organiser of the event and the main global organisation for youth involved in peacebuilding
- Empowering youth to develop their own projects, both in conflict zones and locally in Switzerland, at their own level
- Providing ongoing support for projects and initiatives arising from the event
- Modeling how youth can carry out a project for peace by utilizing peace tools and methods as resources in the organization of the conference itself

The section on the outcomes of the conference shows that we managed to engage with youth, and we keep supporting their initiatives after the conference.

5. Applying peace processes and infrastructures for peace to our own work

We designed the Summit as a space dedicated to transformative learning and aware of the importance that it be an example of the kinds of infrastructures for peace that it was about. In the same way, we realized that our own work in organizing such an event needed to be characterized by open dialogue and learning, and that we had to develop infrastructures for peace within our own team in order to support that. Not only were we committed to working in accordance with the principles we wanted to promote, but we also worked on the supports that would make that possible. The Nesting Peace team strived to experience what living daily in a culture of peace meant. Even though the stress levels and tensions were often high because of the difficulties of organizing such an event, we were constantly aware of our stress level and were doing our best to constantly renew the energy levels thanks to the support system we established between colleagues. We held weekly empathy sessions during which we all found the space to express ourselves and reconnect. Some
sessions lasted for an entire afternoon. We also tried to use Nonviolent Communication, as developed by Marshall Rosenberg, to avoid judging or blaming others but only expressing our needs and feelings.

The way we worked was transformative. This quality of listening and care is very rare in society, and the amount of personal involvement can be very challenging. In fact, two youth joined the team briefly and found it very difficult to contribute their own feelings and ideas to the group process, participating in the empathy sessions as well in the work discussions. Even though this realization was difficult for all of us, we believe that the system we experimented with supported us in understanding that this was happening and in finding solutions that would be good for everyone involved. So much learning took place through conflict because of the tools we devised to be able to explore conflict - all before the Summit had even started!

Coherently to what we wanted the participants to experience during the conference itself, we gave ourselves the time and the space to live the way we intended to live, and that was in a culture of peace. We took care to celebrate each of our successes, to reconnect to the broad picture, to the reasons that pushed us to all volunteer for this event.
6. Diversity of participants

A core objective of the Summit was to invite an unprecedented diversity of actors. Peace conferences are held on a daily basis in Geneva, but most of them invite individuals sitting in Geneva, and the well-known and already heard international actors. We considered that if we wanted to launch the next phase in the development of infrastructures for peace, we needed to reach out to a broader spectrum of human society, to develop and transform the concept with all those for whom peace matters. We see infrastructures for peace not as a domain specific to peacemakers, but a social project in which everyone has a role to play.

We wanted to create, for a week, a community of peacemakers coming from all walks of life, from all continents, who will co-create the concept together, in an inclusive manner. The very title of the conference was “creating infrastructures to sustain diversity”, and the event itself was designed to be an infrastructure for peace. Diversity was a key element for the conference to be qualified as an infrastructure for peace and we made a lot of efforts to reach out a diverse group of participants:

- Government representatives from capitals as well as diplomatic Missions in Geneva from countries with experience or interest in developing national capacities for peace
- Personnel from UN institutions involved in peacebuilding
- Members of the GAMIP network
- Members of the UNOY network
- Members of local and international NGOs interested in peacebuilding
- Students of universities in Geneva (UNIGE, IHEID)
- Local, regional and national policymakers
- Marginalized individuals such as those living in poverty, immigrants, indigenous groups
- The public at large through social networks, live streaming and news media
The following two charts show what group of actors participants represented and where people came from, respectively:

The chart above does not show the subdivision of participants at the Summit. Rather, given the fact that individuals belong to multiple groups, it shows the relative presence of the various visions and experiences of the world at the event. Despite the challenges described below, we are glad to say that every group we envisioned on the registration form was represented! This diversity is encircled by a ring indicating the actual proportion of youth participants who joined the event overall.
WOODCUT Dymaxion Map

White pins represent the countries of residence of the participants and red pins represent their country of origin. The pins are placed on the capital of the countries that the participants had specified in their registration form, one pin per country. At the bottom of the page you can see the name of the 54 countries represented in the Nesting Peace community. The size the name of each country is proportional to the number of the participants from that country.
The diversity of participants at the event was also greater than in previous Summits. Nevertheless, here too we found difficulties communicating the importance of attending to many groups who do not usually consider themselves relevant for such events. Those who did attend, however, are the ones who most appreciated being contact with other groups, confirming the value of our vision of infrastructures for peace as an enterprise of social development.

Although we had a waiting list of participants for the Summit, we unfortunately ended up with several empty seats in the conference center. Having capped participants at 150 people, we had about 100+ present every day, with about 212 people having participated in the week overall. While still more than doubling the number of participants per day and quadrupling participants overall compared to previous GAMIP Summits, we wondered why we ended up with empty seats when we had an extensive waiting list of others who wanted to join the event. Here are some possible reasons:

Some participants may have been unable to come the whole week because of other commitments

Some participants may have also been attending the Human Rights Council session happening at the same time

Some participants may not have given importance to their registration and attendance because of the openness and inclusion of the event

Some participants may be used to attending events with the attitude of a receiver, without realizing the importance of their active participation for the realization of the event’s objectives.

Some, though not many, did not come because of unforeseen circumstances
B. Objectives

In the previous sections of this report, we described the innovative formats that were used during the conference's preparation and proceedings. The gift economy, the experience of live infrastructures for peace during the conference, the fact that it was youth-organized, that we applied peace processes to our own work, along with the diversity of participants were all constitutive elements of a conference designed to fulfill ambitious objectives, which are presented in this section of the report. Looking at it as a design effort, the innovative aspects of the conference were meant to facilitate the fulfillment of the Summit objectives.

The Summit had the following objectives:

- **Increase awareness and understanding** about infrastructures for peace and their essential role in sustainable strategies of peace promotion.

- Provide **practical tools** for the development of infrastructures for peace

- **Give visibility** to current infrastructures for peace, as well as peace infrastructure campaigns and projects around the world

- **Strengthen the engagement** of the international community working on infrastructures for peace and launch a Multi-Stakeholder Platform on Infrastructures for Peace

- **Serve as a bridge** among participants and potential partners to further infrastructures for peace at the local level in various countries

- **Plant the seeds** of initiatives to create infrastructures for peace at the local, cantonal and federal level in Switzerland
IV. PROGRAM

The objectives outlined above require learning, connection, initiative, creativity and mutual support. Approaching the whole event as an exercise in experience design, we thought about what would enable these group processes, focusing specifically on the creation of a learning community. Within this wider one-week journey, each day then took on a function that built upon the previous day and contributed further to the group experience.

Starting with a Learning Event right before the Summit allowed for participants to meet in Geneva and to learn about methods and projects related to the theme of the Summit. We chose restorative systems and Restorative Circles as an excellent example of an infrastructure for peace. Moreover, participating in the Learning Event would give some introductory training in the methodology, useful for the facilitation of the live restorative system to be created during the Summit itself.

For the Summit, we realized that the discourse on infrastructures for peace is increasingly preoccupied with the distinction between governement-sponsored peace infrastructures and those developed within civil society. Nevertheless, infrastructures for peace remained a new concept even within peacebuilding, and events rarely if ever focused on developing the concept of peace infrastructure but tend to focus on concrete projects without a conceptual understanding of the purpose of an infrastructure for peace.

The Summit was thus designed to develop a sense of community and direction on the first day, to then explore the concepts of infrastructures for peace on the second day, shifting into practical peace infrastructure projects being carried out by civil society and government during the third and fourth days, concluding on the last day with a reflection on the learning carried out, its practical application to peace infrastructure projects in the participants’ contexts, and a final celebration of the International Day of Peace at the UN Palais des Nations.

Handout given to the participants (see Appendix E)

“Walking Towards Conflict: Introduction to Restorative systems” was the pre-summit learning event, offered and facilitated by Dominic Barter during the weekend before the summit, September 14 and 15 at Collège Voltaire, in Geneva. The work of Dominic Barter on Restorative Circle and restorative systems developed in the favelas of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil is an exciting approach that has been showing amazing outcomes in the past 20 years. Dominic’s work on Restorative Circles was created in order to recreate the connection between the all the people involved in the conflict within the community involved, building trust and support systems inside of it. The pre-Summit event was meant to give participants a primer on a very good example of an infrastructure for peace, while laying the foundations to create the live restorative system to be experienced during the Summit. (To know more about Restorative Circles: http://www.restorativecircles.org you can also see their facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/RestorativeCircles).

“Walking towards conflict” could not start in a more innovative way, making all of us to stretch our capacities in seeing conflict, dealing with it and transforming it, even before we had started the learning event. Saturday morning, we had to face our first conflict: the doors of the school were supposed to be open at 8:00, but we only got the key at 10:00. Meantime, participants were coming, we had all the material, food for the break with us, people ready to start, some people having sometime to catch up since the previous Summits. Once we were inside, Dominic use this situation to discuss the structure that we take for granted and usually do not question (in this case the setup of the room, which we had not had time to change), going a step further in exploring ways of dealing with conflicts and what conflict means, using this discussion to bring to awareness the key elements to conflict transformation. During the weekend he was able to highlight the steps in creating a restorative system inside a community, sharing some examples showing how deep this methodology can go in so many levels in the process of conflict transformation, translating some abstract ideas into a very practical and effective approach. This experience created a space where everybody was able to make parallels with their own context seeing the similarities and uniqueness inside of our cultures, gathering ideas, examples and co-create the that would fit our community, understanding the guiding principles of the system that was going to be applied and tried in the following days during the Summit.

The pre-Summit learning event also included a first discussion about the financial sustainability of the event that was very successful. For more details, see the section on “Crowdfunding” among the innovative aspects of the conference above.
B. Summit (Sept. 16-20, 2013)

Day 1 – Welcome Day

The first day of the Summit was dedicated to setting the tone to create the space that would allow the kind of transformative learning we aspired to. We wanted to welcome the participants to Switzerland, to Geneva, and to the Sixth GAMIP Summit by putting them immediately in the mood and spirit of the conference. We aimed at slowly shaping the community living in Culture of Peace that would further develop during the week.

The opening ceremony in the afternoon started with a musical performance by L’Étoile which was well appreciated; it was a first for many participants to listen to three traditional alphorn players. This musical piece succeeded in gathering participants into the plenary room. The official welcome was given by Pascal Rubeli, President of the City Council of Geneva. We wanted the City to welcome the participants in Geneva and it was also a way to involve the local government in our event, to let them know what kind of alternative peace event was happening in their city. In fact, Mr. Rubeli’s speech was very much supportive of the infrastructure for peace approach to peacebuilding that we developed in our presentation of the event, which was said to be fully coherent with the City’s approach.

Karen Barentsché, President of GAMIP, gave a short welcoming speech, explaining the background of GAMIP, and how this Summit was both a continuation and a change compared to the previous Summits. In this context, participants did an exercise to connect with their inner self, the Dalai Lama’s letter of support was read, giving a broader and spiritual perspective to the Summit. Karen introduced the need for openness, to contribute to the development of a culture of peace at our very own level.

Barbara Lee, Representative in the House of Representatives of the United States, endorsed the Summit and infrastructure for peace approach to peacebuilding in a video shared during the opening session. This video was to show the support of a lawmaker, of someone in the government of the United States to support the development of this innovative concept. We wanted to give the legitimacy for those who needed to trust this new concept, to open the field for open discussions. Rep.
Lee presented the bill she introduced in favor of a Department of Peacebuilding in the United States government, stressing that the US should invest as much in peace structures and conflict prevention as it is now investing in the military.

Victoria Fontan, professor and researcher at the UN-mandated University for Peace (UPEACE), presented a critical viewpoint of the United Nations’ approach to peace, building on Oliver Richmond’s work. She started by showing that when her young daughter makes the confusion between building peace and giving napkin to poor children it may be considered cute, but when it is done by an international body it is not so cute anymore. Victoria stressed the contradiction in a liberal setting between wars and human rights promotion, promoting liberal economies and growing inequality in the world. On the other hand, post-liberal peace bring about alternative approaches, based on hybridity and peace formation processes, a peace not co-opted by power, to do away with the idea that Westerners know how to build peace and should teach others through endless workshops.

As Dominic Barter talked, participants realized that the format of the room, the way the chairs were arranged in a circle, was creating a safe space to speak the truth, an equal space for all. Those participants who were not part of the pre-Summit learning event got the chance to learn that Restorative Circles can be one of the best representation of the kind of permanent infrastructure for peace that could be built to sustain the transformation at each level of society. Restorative circles are the system of what the Nesting Peace nest can look like, which proved so useful in the extremely violent environment of Rio’s favelas. Participants received the invitation to experience and develop restorative systems for the community that they would be forming during the week, and Dominic offering to facilitate these processes if needed, encouraging participants to support the system and the facilitation themselves. They were asked to walk toward conflict, to go deep into conflict to harness its transforming capacities.

After the break, Oliver Rizzi Carlson and Luiza Oliveira, co-organizers and hosts of Summit, introduced the conference’s innovative formats that participants would use and interact through during the entire week. They showed the tools that were made available to the participants to help create a culture of peace at the event, explaining that the conference was designed to be an infrastructure for peace in itself. A culture of peace required such a design, Oliver and Luiza thus showed that participants could not simply hope for it, but needed to use and build the tools that will enable that environment favorable to peace. All the elements that are written in the “innovative aspects” section of this report were presented in an analog pecha kucha - yet another on-the-spot
innovation sparked by technical difficulties with the digital pecha kucha presentation.

Their presentation was followed by a visualization on the week ahead, a guided meditation by Saul Arbess and Penny Joy from the Canadian Department of Peace Initiative. Saul is also co-founder and former Chair of GAMIP (2006-2011). This moment was designed to directing energies toward “what do they want to happen”. It reinforced the idea that the event will be what they make of it. The kind of inner connection that was facilitated by this mediation prepared participants to be open to conversation, to opportunities to learn, and put them in a state of mind to generate new ideas. This preparation proved very useful during the Welcome Space activities later in the afternoon.

Moving away from a mediation phase to teambuilding exercise proved essential to wake up the participants, to get them out of their chairs and prepare them to move to the Welcome space activities. Vishal Sunny Dhawotal (Mauritius Red Cross Society) and Kristin Famula (National Peace Academy) made a series of exercises and games to get participants to know each other, through which the Home Group Nests were formed at the end. These exercises aimed at creating the community that will journey together during the week. It built trust and formed a safe space in which to reflect and have exchanges with a smaller group of participants, the Home Group Nests.

An innovative format that was developed specifically to this first day of the summit was the Mini Welcome Spaces. Three of these Welcome Spaces were prepared in different rooms, each with a similar structure. Within each Welcome Space, five stations were designed to allow participants to start to grasp the different aspects of the conference, to discuss them with and the get to know the organizers and each other. Through exploring this space, participants found out what will happen during the week and how. They had total freedom to move between the stations, but were asked to stay around 10 minutes at each station. One Nesting Peace team member or volunteer was at each station to explain how it worked and facilitate the discussions around that subject.
One station was designed to help participants discover more about the people around them, as they were asked to draw a portrait of an other participant as they interviewed them, then creating a title for their work of art that would summarize their impression of the other person. In the Program station, participants had a chance to learn about and start discussing the topics of the week, and to express what excited them about the program along with their apprehensions by writing them on different-colored post-it notes and posting them on the appropriate session on the program board. In a complementary station, participants could directly ask questions and learn about the innovative formats and spaces at their disposal, and how to use them during the week. This was important for them to make the most of their experience at the Summit. At another station called “Contributions”, participants were asked to write on a piece of paper their name, where they had come from, and what they wanted to offer to others during the week, in the spirit of co-creation of the event. The process of thinking about what they could bring was aimed at personalizing the Summit, but also reinforcing the idea that the event was theirs and they are co-creators, not mere participants. The last station on “Objectives” was a discussion space to remind participants of the objectives of the Summit, the Seminar on Day 4 as well as the UN event on Day 5, to further think about how each individual would contribute to achieving those objectives.

Just as we opened the day in music, it felt harmonious to close it with a performance by Jack Savoretti, singer and songwriter, whose emotions touched the participants and prepared them for a final reflection in their respective home group nests.
The second day of the Summit embraced an exploration of concepts related to infrastructures for peace (I4P), incorporating World Café discussion sessions among Summit participants, informative presentations by infrastructure for peace visionaries and experienced practitioners, and a thought-provoking reverse panel conversation in the plenary.

Following the morning’s connection circle led by Birger Norup (Peace Alliance Denmark) and empathy session co-facilitated by Vishal Sunny Dhawotal (Mauritius Red Cross Society) and Kristin Famula (US National Peace Academy), Summit participants engaged in a dynamic process of dialogue and sharing by way of World Café methodology facilitated by Ulrich Soeder, Stanley Nyoni, facilitators of large group dialogues and processes, together with Sara Flores. (More information about World Café methodology is available in the section above on innovative formats.)

The intention for the World Café dialogue in the morning was to set the stage for the reflection on infrastructures for peace and to familiarize the participants with each other. We intended to create a shared understanding of what we mean by the word peace and learn from each other about what proved to be successful in creating peace in the past. After an introduction to the method in plenary, the following three rounds of conversations took place in two break-out rooms. The whole group gathered again by noon for harvesting the results of the conversations.

The conversations started with the first question: “Introduce yourself by telling an adventure in contributing to peace. How does this relate to who you are today?” Right from the start the participants engaged in deep conversations, and the atmosphere in the rooms was alive and concentrated. While the facilitation was provided in English and French, we heard many more spoken languages during the conversations at the tables. At the end of the first round we asked everyone to find a new group for the next conversation.
The second round of conversation was introduced by a meditation exercise. The participants have been invited to imagine to be living in a peaceful society. “How do you feel now? How does it feel like to live in a peaceful society? What did we need to learn to get there?” After this guided imagery, we asked the participants: “What are the elements / characteristics of a peaceful society?” and invited them to agree on three important characteristics in each group.

The third and last round of conversation was guided by the following question: “In your experience what strategies and practices have contributed to creating peace?” Each group was asked to report out no more than five examples. During the break, table hosts also condensed the three rounds of conversations into five tweets, which were shared with a young graphic artist who then created a drawing expressing the core discussions taking place at that table.

After a break the whole group gathered for sharing the results of the morning. We created one moderation wall for harvesting the results on the characteristics of peaceful societies and another moderation wall for strategies and practices for building peace.

As elements CHARACTERISTICS of peaceful societies have been mentioned, among others: diversity, dignity, respect, trust, space for choice, social justice, equity, holistic security, vision of peace, shared values, celebration, dialogue, understanding, education, inner peace, love, introspection, conflict resolution, transforming conflict, integrating conflict.

As strategies and processes that proved to be successful in building peace include, among others: various aspects of peace education, non violent techniques, nonviolent leadership, dialogue, speak your disagreement and listen to understand, spaces for dialogue, peace forum (World Café), communication, mediation, introspection, self mastery, silence, healing inner wounds, inclusiveness, pluralism, legitimate legislation process, forgiveness, reconciliation, freedom, celebration.
On top of generating a lot of content, on a personal level these conversations helped everyone to reconnect with his or her personal vision with respect to peace and how to best contribute to building peace, or in other words, to reconnect everyone to his or her individual source (re-sourcing). On the interpersonal level the process helped to create an environment of respect, of listening to each other, of connectedness and of learning with and from each other among the participants of the summit.

Lunch followed these World Café activities, during which Open Space activities were taking place which allowed several participants to present on the following subjects: “Peace Education Programs”, “UN Resolution – Encouraging member states to establish governmental peace infrastructures, departments and ministries”, “Journey to the Center – Documentary and Discussion”, “Ending the ‘war on evil’ - as a habit of mind and a hidden strategy” and “Women’s contribution on Infrastructure for Peace”. After lunch, hatching time and open space sessions, Heather Grohe performed "The Lotus", an original composition, sharing her gifts of song and simultaneous sign language as a welcoming introduction to the afternoon’s activities.

Presentations began with Victoria Fontan, Professor at the University for Peace and author of Decolonizing Peace, whose exposé of the challenges associated with contemporary efforts in international peacebuilding shed light on the ways in which dominant systems and global power relations discourage local peace practices and initiatives from emerging organically, and frequently undermining viable opportunities for lasting peace. Victoria’s provocative work calls into question the dominant discourse and practices of global peacebuilding, encouraging those working for peace to support diverse, non-traditional and local peace efforts as a foundational tenet for strengthening infrastructures for peace.

Summit host Oliver Rizzi Carlson, representing Pacicultura and the United Network of Young Peacebuilders, continued the presentation series with the topic “Designing Learning Spaces for the Culture of Peace,” offering deeper insight into the many intersections between education and infrastructures for peace in their vital contribution to creating a global culture of peace. With a background in peace education and leadership experience working with youth internationally, Oliver’s discussion touched at the roots of the need for re-envisioning and designing spaces and practices for creative interaction, learning and sharing to support young people in their diverse roles as agents for sustainable peace and positive change – infrastructures for learning and being peace.
Charles Eisenstein, internationally renowned speaker and author of *Sacred Economics, The Ascent of Humanity and The More Beautiful World Our Hearts Know is Possible*, elicited heartfelt emotion among Summit participants by sharing inspiring examples of individuals and groups stepping into the New Story of the People, catalyzing the transition toward an economy and culture of peace. Charles offered insight into the disconnects between existing norms, structures and systems that seem out of sync with what we know in our hearts as beautiful and possible. His gift for storytelling resonated with a deeper understanding of how people are bravely embodying new ways of being and relating, effectually rendering the old Story of Separation increasingly irrelevant.

Following a spontaneous, original acoustic guitar and vocal performance by Charly Lanthiez, day two of the Summit ended with a dynamic finale, bringing together infrastructure for peace visionaries and practitioners for an interactive conversation on Conceptualizing Infrastructures for Peace. Presenters Victoria Fontan, Charles Eisenstein and Oliver Rizzi Carlson were joined by GAMIP President Karen Barendsche and Paul van Tongeren, founder of the International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace as primary discussants, fielding questions in a two-way flow between panelists and Summit participants.

This method was again one designed specifically for this day of the Summit, and its intention was to have substantive input from the panelists while also allowing for interaction from other participants. After an initial questions asked to the panelists, the person answering would do so by trying to uncover a deeper layer within themselves and about which they had a question. They would thus respond and make their way to their own question, which they would then ask of either the audience or the panel. After that, if the responder was a panelist, their question would then be directed at the audience, and vice-versa. This allowed for a dynamic exchange that also pointed to the deeper aspects of the topic.

As moderator, GAMIP Assistant Secretary and Doctoral Candidate at the University for Peace, Tara Ruttenberg, posed an initial question to the five panelists: *How do you conceive of infrastructures for peace contributing to the deconstruction of old systems and structures while at the same time supporting the creation of new paradigms for a culture of peace?* Panelists responded and interacted with the plenary, whose own questions guided the conversation, providing insight into the diverse and inspiring ways that the concept of “peace infrastructure” has coalesced into one that nests a multiplicity of practices and visions toward cultures of peace.

The day ended with an inspiring, original performance by London-based singer-songwriter Jack Savoretti, whose songs ‘Dreamers’ and ‘Better Change’ speak of the transformation and visionary idealism at the heart of Nesting Peace.

Camille Birens de Haan of EcoAttitude coordinated with us in order to organize an evening talk with Charles Eisenstein. Some of the Summit participants attended this special event to go deeper into Charles’ work and discuss new economic approaches further.
Day 3 – Experiences in Civil Society

In the planning of the conference, and looking into the different practices of infrastructures for peace, it proved helpful to distinguish between infrastructures for peace led by civil society organizations (CSOs) and those led by governments. After we explored the concepts of infrastructures for peace during the second day, the third day was dedicated to discussing and learning from concrete projects of peace infrastructures both promoted by CSOs and also carried out by non-governmental actors such as NGOs, businesses, youth, artists, religious groups, indigenous communities and others, before we moved into the governments’ experience the next day.

The day was designed to show a diversity of geographical region, and a diversity of the kinds of infrastructures for peace promoted by CSOs. As we planned the day, we wanted first and foremost to have infrastructures for peace not only promoted by CSOs, but also carried out by civil society, as opposed to civil society initiatives aimed at pressuring the government to act. It did not happen exactly as planned, as some long-standing civil society efforts were directly targeting the State, and Ayman Qwaider, a youth from Gaza did not manage to present on his work there because of difficulties at Israeli checkpoint on his way to Geneva. It would also have provided an example of youth engaging with other youth for peace in a war-like environment.

Three CSO Highlights gave notable examples of infrastructures for peace and the marketplace and open space allowed to go deeper into these examples and also to show other examples. For each CSO Highlights, we explored the context and conflict, the process of design of the peace infrastructure, the results and what we can learn for the future.

The First CSO highlight “African Alliance for Peace Efforts in Creating Local Peace Committees” aimed at presenting a case of CSO deciding to do a project with civil society, without expecting the government to do take part in the process. Jean de Dieu Basabose (Shalom Educating for Peace, Rwanda) [via video] and Paul Koroma (Action for Conflit Transformation International (ACTION) and Network Movement for Justice and Development (NMJD), Sierra Leone) talked of their work in developing local peace committees, involving local leaders, helping the community to resolve their conflict at low cost, as local justice is very expensive. A coalition of CSOs also made efforts to engage with parliament to create a ministry for peace, which resulted in the establishment of a National Peace and Mediation Commission. He made the distinction between internal security, the military and peace work, arguing that they do not correspond to the same kind of action. The Danish government’s support for Paul’s work was expressed at the end of his presentation.
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The Second CSO Highlight “Campaigns for Departments of Peace in North America” was a case study of a CSO initiative targeted at the government, aimed at creating a department for peace within the federal government in a northern country with a fairly stable society. However, Kristin Famula, from the National Peace Academy (USA) and Saul Arbess from the Canadian Department of Peace Initiative (Canada) argued that these two countries experienced a lack of coherence and coordination in their effort toward conflict prevention, and that the military budget kept rising. Only two percent of the Canadian military budget would be necessary to create an department for peace. Their presentation helped participants coming from “developed” Western countries to consider that stability do not equate peace, that infrastructures for peace can bring a lot including in those societies, as no country live in a culture of peace. A department for peace will be carrying out peace education and training, human and economic rights, nuclear disarmament, civilian peace service and domestic violence prevention. The civilian peace service will provide the personnel necessary to carry out the plan of the department.

The Third CSO highlight entitled “From Civil War to Institutions for Peace in Papua New Guinea” was given by Dennis Kuiai (First Secretary Counterpart Advisor on Peacebuilding, Ministry for Peace and Reconciliation of the Autonomous Bougainville Government (ABG), Papua New Guinea, Pacific). Dennis Kuiai currently works for local government but he used to be part of civil society. His work was exemplary of how CSOs can become part of government through peace initiatives, and how peace infrastructures can prove essential in a post-war setting, to sustain peace efforts beyond a single peace agreement. Dennis was a rebel leader during the war, where he lost his leg, his wife and his daughter. These dramatic events made him shifting to peacebuilding, which caused him to spend 24 month in prison, from both sides in conflict. This time in custody encouraged him to keep being focused on peace, instead of giving up. Using his connections, he convinced the other rebel leaders to stop fighting, dispose their weapons and sign a peace agreement. Within the autonomous government, he maintained peace efforts and connection with the government of Papua New Guinea, monitoring, evaluating and learning from the peace implementation process, and finally establishing a long term peace strategy which includes the creation of a department for peace within the national government. The strategy received the support of the UN peacebuilding fund, a first in history: “We know what the problems are and we know what the solutions are, all we need is support.”

After the three CSOs highlights, we transitioned into the Civil Society Marketplace, one of the innovative format developed for a specific day. The marketplace allowed participants to continue the discussion on the highlights with the respective speakers, as well as know about many other civil society initiatives around the world. The stands present in the different rooms allowed for networking.
and sharing of the wealth of work being done in the promotion or creation of infrastructures for peace.

Before lunch, participants were invited to the first session devoted to the Summit itself as a civil society project in the creation of an infrastructure for peace. The group came together in a plenary discussion to share their views on social and financial sustainability of the event. We wanted to create the space in which participants could realize that we designed this conference to be an infrastructure for peace in itself, which meant that we would not put any financial barriers to participation, to collaborate, to work and learn for peace in the world. It was part of the coherence that we wanted for the event, coherent with the kind of culture of peace we wanted to see developed, based on gratitude rather than price. We wanted to start this conversation at this point in time in order to have it early in the week, while allowing participants the time necessary to experience the event and develop their gratitude for it. They realized the kind of leap of faith that was required to assume financial obligations for the entire week ahead of time, trusting that we would receive their support in the form of gifts to cover any outstanding costs. In fact, while we did everything we could to cover all costs before the beginning of the event, we still had a considerable amount outstanding at the beginning of the week.

Many participants took the microphone and share their personal tales of financial difficulties, moving stories from their lives, how the event had touched them so far, their gratitude for the Summit and their ideas to cover the costs. Dominic Barter stressed that the sustainability of activists for peace greatly depend on their ability to celebrate the things that nurture them, and share the gratitude they feel to each other for the ways in which they contribute to each other: “Peace is priceless, which means it doesn’t have a price, and it can’t have a price.” Finally, we recounted the experience of the donations received for the Learning Event, and encouraged the group to make a donation. After this first round of donations for the Summit (including donations made at the registration table before this session), we were able to collect CHF 5’213 in cash or pledges out of CHF 13’114.39, leaving an outstanding amount of CHF 7’901.39. This was going to be the subject of discussion in another similar session on Day 5.

The lunch was followed by the Open Space activity. Discussions, workshops, and presentations were offered that day: “Indigenous ‘good living’ paradigm vs. systems of violence – an example from Latin America”, “Moving from peace to a culture of peace”, “Restorative circle facilitator practice”, “Designed to Change”, and finally “World cafe reflection”.

After the presentations, discussions and activities carried out during the morning, we wanted to give participants a practical example and the experience of an infrastructure arisen from civil society by including a visit to the International Museum of the Red Cross & Red Crescent. A member of the international network of Museum for Peace (INMP), this museum is a concrete example of an infrastructure for peace. As a permanent structure for learning about war and peace, the dangers of organized violence and the work of the Red Cross, the museum is a learning space functioning as a
support for the development of the culture of peace. After a museum visit during which participants could freely interact with the newly-renovated museum space, we gathered in the auditorium of the museum.

Three different aspects of the Red Cross movement were developed during the afternoon, representing infrastructures for peace at different levels: The Museum, fixed and located in an international hub; the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), a special status international organization; and finally the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) that forms the international network of all national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies. Roger Mayou, director of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Museum gave a warm welcome speech, presenting the museum as an infrastructure for peace. After a short Q&A, David Maizlish (Coordination and Support Unit, Operations for the Implementation and Promotion of the Law, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)) gave an overview of ICRC mandate and activities as infrastructure for protection of people in situations of armed violence. Finally, Katrien Beeckman, from the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) gave a stimulating speech during which she presented the IFRC’S Youth as Agents of Behavioral Change (YABC) program. To close the day at the museum, participants had a chance to experience a sample of the set of exercises and games that YABC use to develop a culture of peace with youth participating in their program, led by Charlotte Tocchio (IFRC) and Vishal Sunny Dhawotal (Mauritius Red Cross Society). This gave, yet again, an understanding of how the IFRC functions as a wide infrastructure for peace by facilitating YABC activities that promote one of the IFRC Strategic Priorities, which is the development of a culture of nonviolence and peace.
Day 4 – Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate (Experiences in Gov’t)

The Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate was dedicated to learning about the peace infrastructures developed with a national mandate in various parts of the world by governments as well as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). While this day served as a complement to the previous day on civil society initiatives, it also created a space for governments to speak on their peace infrastructures and connect with other actors about non-governmental initiatives and potential collaborations.

This Seminar was organized jointly by GAMIP and the International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace, the only two global organizations focusing specifically on peace infrastructures. It was the first public, global Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with so many high-level representatives from all over the world, including countries that have established peace infrastructures such as Ghana, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, and Costa Rica. If we add Dennis Kuaii, First Secretary of the Ministry of Peace and Reconciliation of the Autonomous Region of Bougainville in Papua New Guinea who presented on Day 3, the Summit and Seminar saw the presence of three out of the four existing ministry for peace in the world.

We realized that this day would see a greater presence by government representatives who are used to more traditional events. While striving to benefit from the interactive formats developed for the whole Summit, we thus designed this day trying to maximize the sense of safety that would support openness and dialogue for all participants. The result was a blend of traditional sessions framed by typical informal Nesting Peace experiences. Although this meant we had a series of presentations in the morning, speakers were asked not to focus on general aspects of the history of peace infrastructure in their countries, since those were already present in a Background Paper on Infrastructures for Peace that had been distributed to participants. Materials from individual countries
were also available at the Peace Resource Corner. In order to make the most of the morning plenary session, speakers were asked to focus on key achievements, challenges and lessons learned. Since the purpose of the morning plenary session was to provide substantive information for further conversation during the plenary discussions and the afternoon workshops, we asked speaker to limit themselves to 10 minutes and used either 10 slides or fewer, or the visually engaging Prezi presentation software.

The morning was dedicated to an overview of peace infrastructures developed by pioneer governments focused on an understanding of the processes leading to the creation and the mandates of Ministries of Peace, National Peace Councils and other peace infrastructures with a national mandate. After the usual Morning Connection Circle and Empathy Buddy session, Oliver Rizzi Carlson and Paul van Tongeren made some welcoming remarks.

Paul van Tongeren mentioned that around 90 countries are currently conflict affected and in fragile situations, most of them are also lacking an infrastructure to address conflict and promote dialogue and cohesion between governments and civil society actors. He noted that not all countries are open to such structures and that for this reason it is pivotal for local peace committees and councils to work at the local level to promote peace and consultative methods of conflict resolution.

With the able moderation of Florence Mpaayei, Ambassador Wyrsch, Chargée de Mission for Swiss Peace and Human Rights Policy, then opened the Seminar with a discussion of Swiss policy and Switzerland’s support of infrastructures for peace. She noted that the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) includes a divisions working specifically on human security, which works on the basis of a few focal points, such as performing mediation between parties who have agreed on Switzerland’s neutral role through the work of capable and extremely experienced experts. Ambassador Wyrsch also mentioned the Swiss Expert Pool, composed of citizens working in different sectors who are available for short-term commitments around the world (e.g. election monitoring). Noting the importance of human rights and development cooperation in Switzerland’s approach, she emphasized the cooperation of the FDFA with NGOs and the business world. In fact, she said, elections and the business community are pivotal elements for the creation of infrastructures for peace, as it is important to restart economies in post-conflict areas and therefore for commercial enterprises to produce shared value for societies.

Most Rev. Prof. Emmanuel Asante, Chairman of the National Peace Council of Ghana followed by speaking about his country’s experience in developing a model infrastructure for peace by a government. He mentioned various factors influencing the establishment of this infrastructure for peace in Ghana: the existence of land and resource dispute, the important role of religious bodies and how they work together, the ethnic diversity of the country, chieftaincy disputes as well as the different political affiliations which are not necessarily ideological in nature.
Prof. Asante mentioned that in Ghana, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) worked together with the government and civil society to develop a mechanism and institutionalize it through a bill passed by the parliament. He informed the plenary that at the meeting that took place just a few days earlier in Accra on September 10, 2013 all ECOWAS countries decided to establish similar mechanisms within 3 years’ time, following the process through national consultations in order to address the existing challenges.

Aware that social conflicts need multidimensional and interactive approaches and processes based on the needs of the people and given the different contexts, Prof. Asante presented an overview of Ghana's National Peace Council (NPC). The NPC was created as an independent body in 2011 with a very clear mandate (establishing regional and district peace councils), which sets both legal backing and limitations. The NPC has a board of 13 members, and administrative staff. Its mission is promoting peace and people’s engagement through different activities. Its core specific objectives are: networking and coordination, strengthening capacities of peacebuilding institutions, developing conflict prevention mechanisms while including indigenous perspectives, women and youth. Although Ghana’s trajectory and the very recent developments are pioneering for a government, Prof. Asante emphasized that formal and informal mechanisms need to work together.

Guyo Liban of the National Cohesion and Integration Commission of Kenya spoke about the history of infrastructures for peace in Kenya, which started at the local level in the Wajir District in the 1990s through an initiative led by local women, which then spread to other pastoral areas. After the 2007 post-electoral violence, which affected 90% of the country, the government thought it would be important to establish District Peace Councils (DPCs) in all districts. The National Peace Policy of July 2012 aims at strengthening the visibility and performance of DPCs and elders’ councils; improving coordination; including the UWIANO platform for peace and other platforms; improving early warning and response systems; increasing capacities for mediation, negotiation and conflict resolution through the training of stakeholders; engendering peace work through the increased participation of women in teams heading DPCs (Nairobi, Mombasa, West Pokot); infusing the peace dividends concept in peace work (rehabilitation of vandalized schools and health facilities); developing the peace-development nexus; increasing research and intervention studies; developing the engagement with media and political leadership; and documenting peace processes.

Guyo Liban mentioned the challenges of dealing with conflicts in Kenya and the importance of having political will, capacity and technical support, together with the presence of early warning systems. Although infrastructures for peace started at the local level, he said, the involvement of the national government in Kenya was important in order to apply the mechanisms for peace to other parts of the country.
Ozonnia Ojielo, Head of Conflict Prevention and Recovery at the Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction of UNDP discussed UNDP’s role in supporting the development of peace infrastructures in various countries. He asked how we can be more proactive in supporting communities and national stakeholders in developing infrastructures for peace. Making reference to the Accra meeting mentioned by Prof. Asante, he said that the outcome was declaration; and that a similar meeting in South Africa also had as outcome a declaration on sustainable and peaceful development. Following a similar template, both documents call for the need for development based on the involvement of all actors. Kenya succeeded in its project as all national actors spoke as one and supported Kofi Annan in his dialogue with the politicians.

There are many best practices, which other countries can learn from while paying attention to the differences between contexts. Ozonnia Ojielo said that it is important to act both at the community level in order to mobilize people and at the political level in order to mobilize the necessary political will and increase the understanding of the concept of peace infrastructure. Mentioning that States should not develop solutions by speaking to UNDP but to their national stakeholders, Ojielo emphasized the importance of creativity and innovation in order to find spaces to create and support peace in different contexts that present different challenges.

Responding to questions, Ojielo mentioned that UNESCO and the African Union are now framing a strategic agenda in order to collaborate both at the continental and the national levels. On the topic of women's initiatives, he noted that it is important to recognize women's role as victims but also as perpetrators of violence, mainstreaming gender in all programs, policies and legislation (e.g. the “2/3 majority” rule in Kenya). Responding to a question on the pre-existing conditions for success in Kenya and Ghana, he noted the importance of having legislation and policies anchored in the constitution. Nevertheless, the key challenge of conflict analysis and identifying the stakeholders remains, as there is no template.

Referring to the role of Ghana's National Peace Council, Ojielo noted that it was initiated bottom-up and then given legitimacy by the government through a bill in parliament, in order to reproduce the good work done locally and raise funds. In fact, the Civil Forum Initiative, including different stakeholders, managed to bring together political parties in a proactive manner in order to cooperate with civil society produce concrete results. In Ghana in particular it was fundamental to involve religious institutions as 95.5% of the population identify themselves as being religious. Another question revolved around the level of institutionalization of UNDP's commitment to infrastructures for peace. Mentioning the importance of who is leading the agency, Ojielo stressed that the narrative of partnership needs to change, as UNDP should focus on giving technical and policy advice through data and analysis shared with the national governments. On the subject of UN
Security Council resolution 1325 on women and peace, he noted the importance of women’s formal and informal activities, as well as the challenges of engaging them as agents in polarized groups.

Mira Karybaeva, Chief of Division of Ethnic and Religious Policies and Interaction with Civil Society of Kyrgyzstan, presented her government’s organized approach to dealing with inter-ethnic tensions. While Kyrgyzstan is surrounded by powerful countries who were also part of the Soviet Union, Kyrgyzstan was the first to declare independence in 1990. The ethnic and religious composition of society has changed over time (1989-2013) but nothing has been done for the integration of minorities. Despite the fact that ethnic violence had already occurred in 1990, inter-ethnic conflict followed the regime change between June 10-14, 2010. The fact that the episode was simply forgotten and not addressed didn’t prepare the country for other similar incidents. After the 2010 events, more attention has been given to ethnic violence both internationally and nationally (e.g. reports to be submitted to the UN to show actions taken).

Karybaeva expressed a view of infrastructures for peace as sustainable development strategies to strengthen the unity of people and inter-ethnic relations through various structures. Among these are the Defence Council, the Department of Ethnic, Religious Policy and Cooperation with Civil Society of the Presidents’ Office created in 2010 and the State Agency on Local Self-Government and Inter-Ethnic Relations within the Government created in 2013. The cooperation of these structures with civil society through regional consultative peace committees was noted as pivotal. The achievements of this approach include the fact that the violence stopped after 4 days, that a consensus was reached on a development model, and that there was a change of attitude also in State bodies. As for the challenges, the cultural context is characterized a multi-ethnicity in contrast with the idea of one country of Kyrgyz citizens. The reform of law-enforcement agencies is yet to be completed, integrating the various ethnic groups, an approach of early violence prevention is not yet systematic, and the results of the monitoring are not shared widely enough. Karybaeva stressed that citizens need to feel part of their State in order to perceive and take ownership of the processes put into place to solve conflicts.
Dulce Umanzor Alvarado of the Vice-Ministry for Peace of Costa Rica, who had participated in the 4th GAMIP Summit in Costa Rica as the country gave birth to its Ministry for Justice and Peace in 2009, discussed her country’s long-standing commitment to developing institutional capacities for peace. Umanzor recalled the creation of the Ministry of Justice and Peace through Law 8771, which defines peace as an inalienable right. Prevention is seen as necessary to promote the life conditions necessary for the fulfillment of basic needs. The National Plan for the Promotion of Peace (2011-2014) includes special protection of children, adolescents and families, communication for peace projects, disarmament projects, and the peaceful resolution of conflicts. The Observatory on Violence provides useful statistics and data, while the Peace Network (Red de Paz) promotes civil society’s involvement in peace processes. Highlighting Costa Rica’s role in “exporting” its approach of peace internationally, Umanzor mentioned UN General Assembly resolution 55/282 establishing the International Day of Peace that came from a proposal of Costa Rica and the United Kingdom. As a country with no army, no arms industry and a policy of neutrality, Costa Rica has a long history of peacebuilding that has most recently created yet another important institutional structure for the promotion of peace in the form of the Ministry of Justice and Peace and the Vice-Ministry of Peace. These and other infrastructures for peace in Costa Rica arose from a realization of the importance of developing such infrastructures in the daily life of local communities.

After ample time for lunch and hatching time, two rounds of workshops in the afternoon created the space to explore more in depth the experience of each pioneer country as well as learning about other important country case studies from around the world. Besides deepening the discussions on Costa Rica, Kyrgyzstan, Kenya and Ghana, the workshops focused on the experience of developing peace infrastructures in Nepal, Guatemala, Bolivia, Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Colombia. Local peace committees, a session on peaceful elections and early warning & response systems as well as initiatives at the local level in government were also on the program. You will find notes from the afternoon working groups in Appendix C.3.
In order to provide an opportunity to learn about and have an exchange among the workshop groups, we developed a custom-made format. We asked workshop leaders to find a small group from their workshop prepare a poster outlining the main points raised, ideas discussed and draft conclusions. In the “Open House” Reception immediately following, participants were then invited to wander into other workshop rooms to discover what was discussed and contribute fresh perspectives. The posters served as a way to record information and make it available in case no one from the original workshop group was present in the room. Hosts/facilitators were also responsible for noting on the poster or otherwise onto a cohesive record any further ideas emerging from the “Open House” Reception that would be useful for the peace infrastructure in that country and to contribute to the draft conclusions. The “Open House” Receptions happened at the end of each of the two rounds of workshops, as you can see from the program.

After a day of intense learning about peace infrastructures with a national mandate, soprano Claire Giulini, accompanied by Ben Slade, delighted participants with a wonderful repertoire of lyrical pieces related to peace. Claire’s wonderful talent, offered freely for the event, was thus a gift in more ways than one. After a long day, only a few of the groups took advantage of the reflection time before going for dinner in Geneva.
Day 5 – Conclusions, Closing Ceremony and Celebration

After having created an environment conducive to the development of a learning community, explored participants’ concepts of peace and peace infrastructure, and learned about concrete initiatives both in civil society as well as by governments, the last day was devoted to a reflection on the week’s experience. This was meant to draw conclusions from the Summit, define future directions and launch joint initiatives to support participants’ work further.

We did this by starting with the home group nests that had been meeting at the end of every day, in order to begin by eliciting participants’ own reflections and ideas from their experience during the week. The home group nests were part of a hybrid format in which we leveraged them as a World Café-style discussion groups utilizing guiding questions. We asked participants to think about the following: “What kinds of infrastructures for peace can I develop in my own context?” and “What kind of support do I need, what strategies can I develop?” The questions were more explicit than those asked on the first day, going further and pointing not only to concrete infrastructures for peace, but the support (or “infrastructure”) needed in order to develop them.

After a time in their own home group nest, participants were invited to move individually to other groups to learn about their discussion, with some group members remaining. Individuals would thus visit another group and come back, then go to another one and again come back. This “cross-hatching” was meant to create exchange on the above questions while still maintaining and benefiting from the relationships developed in the reflection groups. The cross-hatching then transitioned organically into a break for even more informal interaction among participants.
We then came together in a plenary, bringing together the results of the discussions with the outcomes of the World Café conversations carried out on Day 2 and using both of them not only to develop new understandings and initiatives, but also to define GAMIP’s strategy moving forward.

Drawing the discussion closer to the members present in this way, we then intended to talk as a group about the infrastructure for peace represented by the Summit itself and ways to support that, financially and otherwise, both in the present and in the future.

Before doing that, however, we devoted a little bit of time to Ayman Qwaider from Gaza, who had experienced difficulties at Israeli checkpoints that did not allow him to travel to Geneva in time for the when he was supposed to speak at the Summit. Thus unable to present on his work on “Creating a Support System for Youth in Gaza” during the civil society highlights on Day 3, Ayman did make it to Geneva eventually. In the spirit of focusing on the strategies and support needed to carry our work forward on this last day of conclusions, Ayman briefly spoke on the importance of the very concept of “support system” in his work with youth in Gaza. As a young person himself, he said that the creation of a support system for youth is a very useful approach in working with other youth in a context with so many factors contributing to conflict as the situation in Gaza.

The support system or infrastructure we created during the Summit required being supported itself. The Nesting Peace team, also completely formed by youth, took the floor to tell the story of their work together. One by one, they said two or three sentences describing how and why they got involved in the organization of the Summit, and then sat down in a circle in the middle of the room. Once every team member had spoken, volunteers and all those who helped were also acknowledged for their contributions. At this point, the discussion turned to the wider group of participants, moving to how to financially sustain this event that had no fees and was based in very real concrete ways on inclusion and a very participatory approach to both event content and form.

Just as on Day 3, participants were asked to connect with the meaning this experience had for them. Through the undirected large group discussion the emotion was palpable, and after many moving speeches by participants, the group spontaneously burst in song, making the session a celebration of community, learning, new relationships and the gift of the event to make all of them happen. Without any direction on our part, participants started placing donations and pledges in envelopes in a box in the middle of the room, while others danced and sang to keep the donations flowing. After lunch, we communicated the result of the counting to the group, which showed we had collected CHF 6’740 out of CHF 7’901.39 of outstanding costs, leaving a small deficit of CHF 1’161.39.
Again we asked for donations and pledges, and this final collection generated an additional CHF 2'940.53, resulting in an excess of CHF 1'779.14 over the live costs of the whole event with an overall budget of CHF 206'190.80! At this point we did not know about the last-minute shortfalls described in the section on crowdfunding above, and we consider that the crowdfunding strategy worked very well.

The session on participants’ gratitude for the event took on a life of its own and pushed back the other events scheduled for the morning. After a late lunch, we had a more formal closing ceremony still at the conference venue, at which participants announced the creation of the Asia Pacific Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (APAMIP), the APAMIP Declaration was read, and the new GAMIP Board was announced. After words of thanks and closing by Karen Barenscné, GAMIP President, we were delighted by two performances offered by participants.

Lyla June Johnston, a youth from the Navajo nation in New Mexico, created a spoken word poem about her experience during the week. Lyla performed her poem and gifted the group with her beautifully formulated reflections. You will find the poem she crafted and performed during the week in Appendix Heather Grohe then performed the song “Colors of the Wind” from Pocahontas. Just as for the song she performed on Day 2, Heather sang and signed the lyrics in American Sign Language at the same time. Once again, art provided a wonderful addition to the session and a way to close the Summit with beautiful contributions by participants.

Already behind schedule, we then moved quickly to the UN Palais des Nations not far from the conference venue. After a smooth transfer through the security check, the schedule gods enabled us to still be in the room perfectly on time for the final event.
a) **High-level meeting on the Role of National Institutions in the Promotion of Education for Peace and Peace as a Human Right**

Event in celebration of the 2013 International Day of Peace on the theme “Education for Peace” at the Palais des Nations, UNOG (Sept. 20, 2013)

Envisioned as a celebration of the International Day of Peace, we co-organized with a coalition of other organizations a side-event during the 24th Session of the Human Rights Council at the Palais des Nations. This high-level meeting focused on “The Role of National Institutions in the Promotion of Education for Peace and Peace as a Human Right” and served to bring the attention of other actors and participants not at the Summit to infrastructures for peace and concepts and practices related to the sustainable realization of peace. While emphasizing the role of “national institutions” instead of more local, civil society initiatives, the event was a great opportunity to involve State and intergovernmental organizations by utilizing the 2013 International Day of Peace’s theme on “Education for Peace” to focus on the support structures needed to facilitate the process of creating the culture of peace. After a video message by the UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, participants from the Summit had a chance to outline the conclusions of the Summit for other attendees at the Palais des Nations, while government and UN representatives were also asked to express their views on the creation of institutions for peace. The event had simultaneous interpretation in English, French and Spanish. You will find a more detailed report on this special event in Appendix D.

For a list of conclusions and outcomes of the Summit, please refer to the appropriate section below.

**V. GAMIP EVENTS DURING SUMMIT**

**GAMIP News and Events at the Summit**

GAMIP held its Annual General Meeting on the morning of Monday, 16 September with 13 governance members present in person and 5 governance members present by proxy nomination. In addition to the reports by GAMIP President Karen Barenscbe (South Africa Peace Alliance) and
Treasurer Birger Norup (Peace Alliance Denmark), the new GAMIP Board of Directors was created through a process of self-nomination.

GAMIP expresses gratitude for the outgoing Board of Directors who served from 2011-2013:

Karen Barenrsche, South Africa (President)
Birger Norup, Denmark (Treasurer)
Oliver Rizzi Carlson, Switzerland (Secretary)
Michael Abkin, USA
Saul Arbess, Canada
Dot Mauer, USA
Binnie Degli Innocenti, Italy
Oseremen Irene, Nigeria
Peter Lukwiya, Uganda
Suresh Prasad Acharya, Nepal
Shola Olumola, Nigeria
Reginald Ansah Adjaye, Uganda

GAMIP welcomes the new Board of Directors presently serving the GAMIP community:

Karen Barenrsche, South Africa
Jahangir Piara, Pakistan
Victor Ogunmakin, Nigeria
Saul Arbess, Canada
Dot Mauer, USA
Oseremen Irene, Nigeria
Peter Lukwiya, Uganda
Suresh Prasad Acharya, Nepal
Binnie Degli Innocenti, Italy
Birger Norup, Denmark
Ehtisham Rana, Pakistan
Paul Koroma, Sierra Leone
Oliver Rizzi Carlson, Switzerland

The new GAMIP Board convened a meeting on Friday, September 21 to nominate Board officers, effectively establishing the executive committee as follows:

Karen Barenrsche (South Africa) and Birger Norup (Denmark), Co-Presidents
Suresh Prasad Acharya (Nepal), Treasurer
Dot Mauer (USA), Secretary
Oliver Rizzi Carlson (Switzerland), Assistant Treasurer

Additional non-Board member of the executive committee:

Tara Ruttenberg (Costa Rica), Assistant Secretary

An inspiring outcome of the networking opportunities made possible by the Nesting Peace Summit was the creation of the Asia-Pacific Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (APAMIP), whose regional representation serves as a support network for GAMIP members and peacebuilding practitioners in the Asia-Pacific region. APAMIP joins the African Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (AAMIP) as GAMIP’s established regional affiliates.

**Changes in GAMIP membership**

Prior to the Summit, GAMIP had a total of 102 community members, 52 of whom were also governance members. Following the Summit, the GAMIP Board approved 65 new community members and 8 new governance members, contributing to a current total of 167 community members, including 60 governance members.

As of December 2013, GAMIP’s membership spans all inhabited continents, with representatives from 49 countries: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of Congo, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Haiti, India, Italy, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestine, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Puerto Rico, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States
VI. Event Outcomes

Nesting Peace triggered immediate results, along with planting seeds in all the participants to move forward in the construction of infrastructures for peace. These are difficult to quantify and we believe we are not aware of most of them, but here are some of the outcomes we have identified so far as resulting directly from Nesting Peace.

The Asian Pacific Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (APAMIP) was launched as the event came to a close, resulting from the discussions, co-creation and collaboration that the conference allowed. As the second regional grouping within GAMIP, APAMIP will be able to learn from the formation of the pre-existing African Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (AAMIP). The Regional Secretariat of APAMIP was established in Nepal, and is in the process of developing the APAMIP website. Both of the GAMIP members and APAMIP founders present in Nepal, MIREST and Pro Public, are very much involved in peacebuilding efforts in Nepal in partnership with Nepal Peace Trust Fund Secretariat under the Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction (MOPR) of the government of Nepal, which will likely help the Nepalese government to engage with APAMIP in future. Discussions with officials of the Nepalese government are already underway for this purpose. We also know that several rounds of discussions in emails have been undertaken within APAMIP seeking its members' views and advice on creating peace infrastructure for peace in the region and formulating projects and the way forward for APAMIP. After a discussion paper to be approved by December 2013, APAMIP will seek to organize an Asia Pacific regional Summit, for which a regional validation meeting may take place in March or April 2014 in Nepal.

The impact in the Asia Pacific region is also felt within the governmental sphere, as becomes clear from Dennis Kuiai’s own report on the Nesting Peace Summit. As First Secretary of the Ministry of Peace and Reconciliation of the Autonomous Region of Bougainville in Papua New Guinea, Dennis Kuiai wrote the report to inform the Autonomous Bougainville Government (ABG) on his and Nicholas Peniai’s attendance and participation in the Sixth GAMIP Summit, including its outcomes; to present to ABG their analysis of the content of the Summit and Lessons Learnt, and to recommend immediate and long-term actions in light of lessons learnt for effective implementation of the Bougainville Peace and Security Strategy. As one of the four existing governmental Ministries for Peace in the world and the only Autonomous Region in the world to be approved to benefit from the UN Peacebuilding Fund, the potential impact on the further development of the peace infrastructure and peacebuilding work of the ABG is notable. Including an appreciation of the value of the innovative aspects of the Summit and several recommendations to the ABG, the report has been acknowledged. By the government. The next step is to develop policies developed on the recommendations as guided by the lessons learnt included in the report. Dennis Kuiai’s report also details the content of the entire Summit, highlights and Summit outcomes. When available for distribution, the report will be accessible under “Summit Documents” on the GAMIP website.
Besides in Asia and in the Pacific, the international outreach of the conference is particularly visible in Africa with the creation of the Nesting Peace Coalition in Sierra Leone. As Paul Koroma says, “Sure indeed the Nesting Peace Coalition is an outcome of the Geneva Summit. The name inspired me so much as I was happy to know that peace, which is represented by the dove, needs a resting place to consolidate, which is the nest. That was very creative. On my return back from the Summit, I engaged with various Civil Society Groups and Networks that are involved in Peace building, Governance and Human Rights work to share the outcomes of the summit and see where to take thing forward. We held several meetings and agreed to organise a National Consultation on Infrastructures for Peace to get CSOs understand the concept and for us all to revive the campaign for the establishment of that infrastructure. The Organizations that came together agreed to adopt the name Nesting Peace Coalition for Infrastructures for Peace. It comprises of about 10 Organizations originally, but after the Consultation the membership increased. We adopted crowdfunding and organised the Consultation for two days (5-6 December 2013). The outcome was a communiqué which we have published and will use it to engage and lobby our political authorities for the establishment of our infrastructure for peace in the country. The Coalition also included the CSO representative who participated in the Ghana meeting on Infrastructure for Peace organised by ECOWAS, the AU and UNDP, about which Ozonnia Ojielo had told us about at the summit. We all are working on the campaign together.” You will find the Nesting Peace Coalition communiqué under “Summit Documents” on the GAMIP website.

General Pereira from Senegal also attended the Summit, where he found the inspiration to launch the “Centre des Hautes Etudes de Défense et de Sécurité (CHEDS)”, a center dedicated to sharing experiences between experts from various fields, academics, media professionals and civil society activists. In this context, Dominic Barter has been invited to share his approach to conflict transformation.

Thanks to and inspired by the learning event on Restorative Circles, a “guide for preventive and restorative school justice” is being elaborated by the Ministerial delegation for the prevention of violence in schools of the French Ministry of Education.

Thanks to the personal connections made at the Summit between Sara Flores Carreño and Dulce Umanzor Alvarado, the Ministry of Justice and Peace of Costa Rica decided to implement Vision 2050 and the Action 2020 project in the country by engaging with the WBCSD regional network AED Vision 2050 aims at creating peace with the planet and all those who inhabit it. The practical guide developed by Sara Flores Carreño aims at helping companies reach the objectives of Vision 2050. Because the nexus between the environment and peace contributes to the development of a better world and an increased quality of life for the country’s inhabitants, this is closely linked to the ultimate purpose of the Costa Rican government, and especially the Ministry of Justice and Peace. The idea is to develop a national plan towards achieving the Action 2020 goals engaging with other organizations and different sectors from society. This could become a pilot model of what Action 2020 and Vision
2050 could become at a national level, and hopefully other countries will get inspired by it and follow suit.

Thanks to the event, GAMIP saw its number of members almost double, and an Academic Committee was formed, dedicated to research specifically on infrastructures for peace, unique in its kind. GAMIP was also transformed in other ways by this Summit, and members expressed the desire to base future ones on the design model developed for Nesting Peace, especially the use of crowdfunding and crowdsourcing.

Another initiative that was revitalized thanks to the Summit is the campaign for a UN General Assembly resolution on infrastructures for peace, which received a lot of support at the conference. At the same time, a PeaceNow petition calling for Departments of Peace in governments worldwide was also given fresh impetus at the end of the Summit.

During the Summit itself, we managed to reach a diversity of individuals to an unprecedented extend. More than 200 people from over 55 nationalities participated in the conference, before returning in their respective communities. In itself, the conference allowed to raise awareness for infrastructure for peace development at a global level, reaching way beyond Geneva’s international community. Several participants told us they received in Geneva the energy they needed to continue their important work back home.

Moreover, the 212 participants of Nesting Peace came from all walks of life, teachers, lawyers, students, etc. allowing infrastructures for peace to further develop in a broader professional sector’s spectrum than NGOs and peacebuilding. Thanks to the Pre-Summit workshop, a greater interest and support from College Voltaire in Restorative Circles has been sparked.

Seeds that were planted during the week are starting to bloom, some nests are starting to hatch. A practice group on Restorative Systems has been created in Geneva, dedicated to the practice of the transformative justice system that has been taught and applied during the week. It is composed of 15 members, half of them youth. Complementarily, a Youth Peace study group composed of former Nesting Peace youth volunteers has been formed, to sustain the engagement and reflection around peace issues. Vincent Verzat, co-organizer of the conference, inspired by the topic of infrastructures for peace wrote several papers on it, pending publication. The conference also inspired him to talk to students of international relations about a Culture of Peace, which he did during the 2013 Youth Perspective Conference of the Geneva International Model of United Nations.

Finally, We The Trees, a crowdfunding website, created a section dedicated to restorative systems thanks to the efforts of two Nesting Peace participants. Nesting Peace was the first peace conference funded through crowdfunding, and as such it affected the world of crowdfunding, which now offers new openings for this kind of events.
VII. FEEDBACK AND REACTIONS TO SUMMIT

Dennis Kuiai, First Secretary, Ministry of Peace and Reconciliation, Autonomous Region of Bougainville, Papua New Guinea

“To majority of us; the Summit was impressively beneficial as it empowered and encouraged us in our diversified peacebuilding careers. It also provided the unlimited space and opportunity to connect and network with other resource individuals, organisations and governments. The Summit was an amalgamation and portrait of an Infrastructure for Peace that surely would achieve and sustain a Culture of Peace in our today’s world of societal diversity.

“Without any reservations, I can confidently say that the Summit was a great success for all the participants. This is proven by the emotional expressions and commitments made by the participants to co-create and support infrastructures for peace to achieve and sustain culture of peace within their respective societies and the world. Participants were relatively equipped and encouraged to be constructively engaged in their peacebuilding efforts through a variety of processes that include; peace education, conflict transformation, restorative systems of justice, nonviolent communication, networking and partnerships and peace museums.”

Matida Flemming, UNOY Peacebuilders:

“The main thing I got from the summit was that I was convinced of the power of inner peace an mediation. I met a number of very interesting people that told me about how meditation was strengthening the “external” peacebuilding they are involved in. So direct impact: I have recently started meditating :)

Luiz Alberto de Salles Oliveira, participant:

“My dear ones, congratulations for the wonderful fruits of your work, idealism and initiative. It is beautiful to see the results that start to sprout from this event in a world so in need of peace. I felt very honored, proud and glad to participate in such a rich experience. Ana and I shared many stories about the event with various groups of people. This was really a wonderful experience in our lives.”

Saskia Heijne, participant and interpreter:

“I found the GAMIP conference really worthwhile. I enjoyed the varied ways of interaction created by different games, exercises and ways of presenting, and I was inspired by the variety of people who attended. I mainly came to see how a restorative circles system could be applied and learned valuable things in that process. I enjoyed the weekend of the pre-summit. Thanks for a wonderful venture!”

Claire Graillot, participant:

“A mon retour du week-end, je voulais écrire pour vous remercier de ce week-end qui fut un très bon moment mais, au delà des cercles restauratifs et de leur découverte, ce qui m’a le plus ému, enrichi, pulsé, c’est cette communication non violente qui régnait parmi les organisateurs et, particulièrement, chez Luiza et Oliver. Bravo à tous.”

Roland Bec, Lucie Moisan, Marie-Claude Lemasson, Jacques Masraff (respectivement président et membres de l’association Une Voix pour la Paix- Genève):

“En premier lieu, nous avons particulièrement apprécié l’organisation faite par une équipe de jeunes personnes enthousiastes et professionnelles, la méthodologie de travail dynamique et respectueuse des individus et des points de vue de chacun - une méthodologie qui a permis un maximum de rencontres et d’échanges constructifs (World Café, Market place, la pierre de parole, code gestuel pour se manifester, etc…”

Initial version of Jan. 10, 2014
Ces rencontres se sont prolongées lors des pauses conviviales et des repas copieux offrant une 
nourriture de belle qualité. Nous avons par contre trouvé un peu court le temps imparti pour la 
présentation des activités de chacun au Market place: pas facile de faire un tour complet et bien 
informé des différents stands exposés.

Nous avons été impressionnés par la diversité et l’engagement des personnes présentes, 
venant de pays du monde entier : diversité de races, de cultures, d’occupations, de langues, de 
religions et d’âges, tous réunis autour du sujet de la paix. Nous avons aussi aimé l’ouverture du 
Sommet à une grande variété de conceptions de la paix, allant de son acception au niveau individuel, 
à des notions de désarmement, de paix politique, en passant par les aspects communication et 
gestion de conflits interpersonnels.

Cette semaine passée ensemble est un modèle de ce que l’on voudrait voir dans le 
fonctionnement des différentes structures de notre société. Ce modèle de vie et de partage est un bel 
exemple d’infrastructure pour la paix.”

_Ulrich Soeder, World Café facilitator:_

“First of all, I’d like to congratulate you for a very special and interesting conference. I know 
from organizing international meetings myself how much work is involved before, during and after 
the event!

I liked the overall structure and the combination of cognitive input and reflection and the 
sharing of case examples from many parts of the world during these days.

While I liked the cognitive input (and the process of digesting is not finished …), what touched 
me most was meeting the people from all over the world and listening to their stories. This gave me a 
kind of physical or visceral experience that we all are on the same side concerning the topic. And that 
we can learn from and with each other to master the huge challenges we are facing. Together.

The most important learning for me during the conference was a reframing process 
concerning my own facilitation work. I was invited to join the summit as an expert for communication, 
not because I am involved in peacebuilding. I learned that creating spaces for dialogue is one very 
important aspect of peacebuilding and an infrastructure for peace in itself. This is kind of broadening 
my own horizon, and I can not foresee how this will change the way I work.

There are some constructive thoughts I’d like to feedback – Some activity could have been 
helpful (at least in my view) to review/reflect the rich input of case examples on Wednesday and 
Thursday, like an hour in the afternoon of shared meta-reflection on the concept of 
infrastructure for peace in relation to what we shared during these days. This might have helped to 
anchor this language even more, and by this, start to create a shared culture of peace. I remember 
your idea was that this reflection might have happened in a self-organised way in the home group 
ests. I trust self-organisation as well, but sometimes some guidance is needed for providing 
direction.

Thank you again for your wonderful work!”

_Saul Arbess, Co-founder and former Chair of GAMIP, then the GA, from 2006-2011:_

“I want to say that it was a profoundly successful event for all of us who attended. As a veteran 
of conference development, I had difficulty believing that crowd funding would be a valid way of 
funding an event of this magnitude. Yet, it did work out well, with additional support from the Canton 
of Geneva, foundations and other contributions.
This was the best food I have seen at a conference anywhere, even including a sweet table. I doubt that anyone lost weight during the week!

We, in North America, were pleased with the brief time allocated to our presentations, together with the amplified opportunity given during the successful marketplace that followed. Day 4. on infrastructures for peace with a National Mandate, moved GAMIP to a new level as we heard of the significant progress being made in Africa, Costa Rica, Bougainville, New Guinea, Kyrgyzstan and the work of UNDP in support. Your collaboration with Paul Van Tongeren, in bringing this day off, was outstanding. The Museum visit and talks were extremely valuable and gave GAMIP an even more global forum, as we celebrated the IDP.

The spirit of youth carried the day and every day and the level of organization was very high, despite a few audio-visual glitches. Although I only attended the first day of the workshop, Dominic was superb, especially for me, his philosophical approach to the meaning of justice, walking toward conflict and the importance of spatial relationships in determining outcomes that work for all participants.

I am also very grateful for the video recordings that I am using in our department of peace initiative work. This is the first time that we have had such an invaluable record that allows us to build on the momentum that the Summit created.

I again congratulate all of you for this momentous achievement."

Corina Simon, GAMIP, Romania:

“In Cape Town as the formalization of the association was finalized with a seat in Switzerland, we were talking with Oliver and Luiza: “Wouldn’t it be awesome to have it in Switzerland next time?” It came to be organized by a vibrant team of young people with amazing international support from the Summit Planning Team. Although my personal life took such a turn that I was not able to support as much as I had hoped, I was close by in spirit with the Geneva team. Congratulations to all for a successful summit that brings GAMIP to new levels of outreach and visibility. Unity in diversity and peace for everyone! Peace Infrastructure at all levels are vital for the sustainable support of peaceful initiatives. If you want peace, prepare for peace.”"

Manon Mariller and Laetitia Picardh, CICG and MIP, Switzerland

“This event was for among the most enjoyable to organize because of the positive mood in your organization. Collaborating with a young and motivated team such as yours was really enjoyable. The new life you have intended to bring to business tourism made sense to us. In fact, we need to look at this industry from a new perspective. We are happy to have contributed to the preparations for an event focused on such a topical subject.”

FEEDBACK FROM STUDENTS FROM COLLÈGE VOLTAIRE in Geneva

“The most important and the most interesting activity were the « World Cafés ». We spoke about our experiences, but from a student point of view, not really with an adult’s view. It was different for us, students, to speak about some « simple » experiences and to have in front of us a man who spoke about something more concrete, like creating an association. It was generally a wonderful experience and I liked it ! The presence of people and the generally « peaceful atmosphere » touched me.” - Céline

“On each table [of the World Café] there was a rock and those who had it had the right to talk and the others needed to listen to that person. I think these world cafés were a good experience for
me because the people in my groups made me feel listened to even though I was younger than them and we were discussing things that matter.

The best moment was when a lady talked about her experience with peace and how it affected her. If I remember well she said that her mother, who's a teacher, had prejudice against Muslims, that she was afraid and that she didn't want to teach them. And this lady, who was against what her mother was saying, introduced her mother to her Muslim friend.

The mother learned to understand them and she ended up attached to them (her Muslim students) and liked them, and she is still teaching them now I think. The lady is amazing! She helped her mother by pushing her to a new level of understanding, and it wasn't that difficult. But that story reminded me of one of the biggest problems of Humanity, I think: human beings fear what they don't know and don't understand.

In the afternoon the guests and the organizers of the conference openly discussed important questions. I have hopes that these guys will definitely change the world. They are already doing it. When I see all these people who ’fight’ for peace I have hopes that the whole world will one day understand. So why don't each of us start, from where we are? “– Niki

“When the participants of the conference go back to their homes, they will tell the people of their country what they learnt in the conference and apply the infrastructures that have been mentioned and thus continue the path toward nesting peace. I admire so many people from all over the world who traveled miles to come to this conference to learn about peacemaking (...) there is no doubt that one day wars will stop and peace will be nested.” – Priyanka

“In the second World Café (characteristics of peace), we talked a long time about constructive conflict. It seemed important to us that conflicts exist because it is a way to show that we aren’t okay with what is happening around us. But it has to be constructive. It’s important to discuss things. In the third World Café (infrastructures for peace) we talked about what we thought was important to institute peace. We all agreed on the importance of education. If parents or teachers educate children to be peaceful, it’s better than if the father says that if somebody bothers his son, his son should hit the person. Many conflicts are inherited. A guy in the group spoke about his experience in prison, he said that he practised meditation and sang there. It had been beneficial.” – Victoria

“It was very interesting to be sitting at a table with people who came from from other cultures such as Africa, Australia and other countries/continents. It was sometimes impressive to be with a person older than us who, I think, had experienced some very difficult conflicts in their own country. For me it was kind of an honor for us as students to be at the same level as these persons and to be able to express ourselves on subjects of this importance.

Some students in the class has some difficulties about being listened to. For me it wasn’t the case. Even in the tables with very important persons, we always had the right to speak and share our
ideas even if our way of talking wasn’t perfect or if we were saying wasn’t as ‘deep’ as what they were saying. I never felt lower or put aside by anyone in each group. On the contrary I felt a sort of desire of sharing and curiosity about what I could feel or think as a youth.” – Elodie

“The first Café was about our experience with peace. At our table we had a middle-age man who was from Canada. He has tried to work with the government to set up a peace department. In this department they would try to build peace in Canada. It made me think that in Switzerland we didn’t have one. This made me wonder how peace has been maintained in Switzerland for such a long time.

The 2nd World Café topic was: what is your vision of a society built around peace? I really liked to see the others’ vision; it helped me to think about other aspects of this type of society. At the beginning, for me, this type of society was one where everybody was friendly to each other and there wasn’t any conflict. But the others gave their opinion; they said that there will always be conflicts because our human nature is like that. This changed my vision of what a peaceful society is. (It is a society where there are effective mechanisms to resolve conflicts when they arise).

The only problem came with the 3rd World Café. The topic was about strategies to build a peaceful society. I spoke at the beginning and after that, the adults just kept speaking among themselves. I felt like “the token youth”.” - Benjamin

“It was the very first time that I ever attended a conference and I was very scared. I was thoughtful, I was asking myself “How will it be? Are we going to sit for the whole day in a chair? Are they going to ask us questions?” I was stressed. But the minute we entered the hall, my fear was gone. Everybody was looking nice and when I saw the Dove of ‘nesting peace’, I calmed down. I remembered that my class had gotten ready for this event.

In this conference, everybody could participate. There were no restrictions about ages. People could voice their opinion about peace, share their thoughts and find common ground. We also talked about the restorative circles and we formed one, in a way.

In the afternoon, we had a real conference where the panel members and the audience were exchanging their mutual experiences. It was a session of questions and answers. At the beginning it was nice and interesting, but after a few hours I found it hard to understand some of the things that were being said. I think it was a little bit heavy and difficult to understand.

In conclusion, this project was just wonderful. It was amazing for me to see so many people gathered to talk about peace. Usually Peace is a subject which is difficult to understand but the people who gathered at that conference, gave us differing aspects of peace flowing from their diverse experiences. It made me realise that if so many people are there to support Peace, it means that there is still hope for us to stop all the wars and live in peace and harmony so that this human existence will not be in vain.” - Amal
I have a confession to make. Just two days ago, I was thirsty for fame. I wanted to be the female Gandhi of the 21st century. I wanted to be the Princess of Peace. I wanted to be a Martin Luther King! I wanted to be GREAT. You see I wanted to save the world.

I wanted to soar across the land scooping up hungry children by the thousands with my infinite wings and bring them to my nest to feast on food I prepared for them. I wanted to be the greatest hero the world had ever seen! In fact, just two days ago, I swore that I would settle for nothing less.

And so, needless to say, when only three people came to my open space in Room C for a prayer for peace, I was a little disappointed. Before I got on the plane, I imagined it would be hundreds.

But as the four of us prayed in a circle together I began to feel something developing deep in my heart. “Shhhh...” it said. “God is trying to teach you something...”

So we prayed and we sang and we prayed and we sang and we traveled up and out into the stars. Then, in the middle of the song I could clearly see the whole world spinning inside of this circle of women.

Something whispered: You are saving the world. Right. Now. A heavy burden was suddenly lifted from my shoulders and I knew God’s Grace was working through us.

-Later, I had an opportunity to ask the one, the only, Charles Eisenstein, a single question. And so, I asked my hero, “Who is your greatest inspiration?”

He replied simply, “I cannot rank inspiration the way that economists rank the value of people and things. But I can tell you this: There was once a woman who spent fifteen years caring for her daughter who was completely paralyzed in a car crash. For fifteen years she fed her, washed her body, and turned her over in her bed to prevent bedsores. After fifteen years of this work, without ever saying a single word to her mother, for she could not speak after the crash, the daughter finally died. This mother! This is who inspires me,” he said.

-Later, the director of the Red Cross Museum explained to us all: “We are an organization of 12,000 employees and 13 million volunteers. But at the end of the day it is about one human being helping another human being. This is what is important about humanitarian aid.”

-At this point God is not whispering. No, God is shouting for me to wake up to fact that no act of love is greater or less than another. And I am changing.

After these events I asked myself: “Who is the greater person? Mahatma Gandhi? Or a mother who diligently cares for her invalid daughter for fifteen years and then dies, nameless?”
The answer arose in my heart and roared through my mind: “They are both equally beautiful, precious and important people and each of their jobs are essential to the sheer wonder of the universe!”

Then an Angel whispered in my mind and said:

“God has ears that hear the cry of a fly that is stuck in a cup of water on the kitchen table.
God has ears that hear the gunshots and bomb blasts of a civil war in a country on a continent between the oceans of a planet that spins around a star the shines like an ember in the spiraling galaxy of your eyes.
God has ears that hear the thundering applause that is built of the nuts and bolts of slaps and claps of people who adore the way piano keys and strings sing beneath the fingertips of a man named Amadeus; of a man named Stevie; of a man named Elton John.
And God heard it the moment your heartbeat was born deep in the belly of a woman you call ‘Mom’.” And suddenly I realized that my mom and Elton John are mothers of a same song.
I cry out to this Angel of God: “Can I, too, carry this love inside me?!?! Can I too carry this love in my heart? A love that not only works for Peace on Earth, but also for Peace Within and Peace directly between me and all beings? A love that sits and folds red pieces of paper into the shape of a cranes for the sick woman next door. Can I, too, have ears that hear the cry of a fly trapped in a glass of tap water? Ears that hear the cry of each star in the sky, thousands of them begging for someone to just come and watch them shine? For too long I have compared and ranked acts of love as either great or trivial. For too long I have silenced the woman in my mind who cries for more music, more joy, more beauty as if I have ‘more important’ work to do than save my own world and dance in the streets. For too long I have passed the woman begging on the street because I was too busy becoming the Princess of Peace!” --

“Yes,” replies the Angel. “You, too, can be this Love.”

-And so I walked outside the conference building and suddenly I could see the galaxies spinning inside the eyes of a little boy! The boy fell hard against the pavement and began to cry. I ran to his side and held him in my arms like a mother holds her child and I knew that he represented the entire universe. I knew that in that moment I was holding the whole world in my arms. Who knew that enough love for all of humanity could fit in these little hearts of ours?! Who knew it could all fit inside of a single teardrop falling from your eye?

-Now I know! Whether I am the next Marin Luther King or I simply sing a song of hope to an audience of one and then die, I will be happy with my life. For on an infinite continuum, all worlds are of equal size and worth. For in God's eyes, every world is equally significant. Whether it is a world we see in pictures taken from outer space or the world seen by a child’s eyes. Whether it is a world documented by the BBC or the world that lies within an Edelweiss flower on the hillside or anything in between. Now I feel that that no task is too small, and no task is too large, for the incredible soul that you all are.
I am happy to say that the thirst for fame I carried into this conference like a burden on my back has evaporated! All that remains is an inner peace imbued with a golden hue of profound gratitude to you all. Now I realize that this isn’t just some random group of people in some random city in the world. I see now I am sitting amongst entire worlds of their own. I am sitting amongst kings and queens, princes and princesses of peace in their own right, beautiful mothers and fathers, sons and daughters with fiery hearths of passion and compassion residing within. I see now that I am amongst a galaxy of stars in the sky of God's mind and it brings me to my knees. There is no poem I could write, no sequence of words, that could ever explain the beauty I see in each of you. Thank you all, truly, and deeply, from the bottom of my heart, for all the ways in which each one of you saves the world.

© Lyla Johnston 2013 soundcloud.com/lylajune 😊
VIII. OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

The intentional design of this Summit, in all its aspects, made possible an extraordinary event. The diversity and number of participants, the formats used, the youth dimension, the innovative nature and importance of the topic for peacebuilding, the embodiment of the ideas discussed and the financial strategy based on donations alone are only some of the threads woven together in this experience. Having thus created such an effective and creative space for connection, dialogue and learning, and having stimulated several concrete initiatives, how can we build upon this going into the future?

Looking at the potential of the event’s outcomes to date, we envision many ways in which the momentum generated by the Summit can be leveraged. The group of youth that worked on the organization of the conference, having created a peace study group and being part of the newly-formed Restorative Circles practice group, has the potential to gather even more youth into peace learning and around concrete peace projects in Geneva. APAMIP, together with the African Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (AAMIP), could strengthen the involvement of actors in the Asia Pacific region, and inspire new regional groups and activities to take shape.

In fact, positive developments creating a host of opportunities for the newly-formed APAMIP include the fact that the National Planning Commission of Nepal has recently included Infrastructures for Peace in its 13th Approach Paper. Also, Nepal has recently organized its second Constituent Assembly election, and now Nepal will embark upon drafting a new constitution for the country as per the Comprehensive Peace Accord (CPA) of 2006. GAMIP members and APAMIP founders MIREST and Pro Public will advise the Nepalese Government on public policy issues on peacebuilding and provide input for the constitution-drafting process to the Constituent Assembly. Further, Dennis Kuiai of the Ministry of Peace and Reconciliation of the Autonomous Bougainville Region in Papua New Guinea has shared the encouraging news that the United Nations Department of Political Affairs (Asia Pacific Division) has assured to support APAMIP’s commitment.

The gift principles applied in the event could also spark many new initiatives were social equality and inclusion are not only discussed, but experienced. And GAMIP itself can use its unprecedented exposure and reach to divulge its work, including that of the freshly created Academic Committee and its scholarship, including by developing further successful collaborations with the International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace and other actors up to the UN level.

These few examples give a taste of the possibilities we could now work towards. We hope that whatever venture event participants or GAMIP members may embark on, they will not only benefit from the opportunities created by the Summit, but they will learn the apply and adapt the many useful strategies pioneered in this event to their own initiatives. In fact, perhaps the most important learning from the event that made all the others possible is the vision of designing the experience intentionally, looking at all of its aspects, generating alternatives creatively and not being afraid to
make mistakes. Doing this requires looking at our assumptions about social dynamics, human nature, learning itself… if there is something that we confirmed in this endeavor, it is that working on ourselves is an essential first step in any effective peacework. Peace starts with us - and the supports we create for our own learning.

This Summit opened the door to a world of possibilities for future Summits, especially regarding funding, scholarships and truly embodying an infrastructure for peace. The challenge for upcoming Summits will be in incorporating the practices implemented at Nesting Peace into new contexts, building on lessons learned and maintaining continuity with the fresh approaches made possible in Geneva through the co-creation of planning team members committed to the vision and practice of infrastructures for peace. We trust that as GAMIP evolves, we can integrate the novelty in possibility pioneered at Nesting Peace, adapting its successes to new contexts and opening into even greater depth of building Summits themselves as infrastructures for peace. It is our hope that the beauty in diversity of GAMIP’s global membership will continue being a fundamental aspect of all future Summits.
IX. Thanks to...

As we described in this report, the Sixth GAMIP Summit was largely crowd-sourced, crowd-funded, and applied the principle of the gift economy. This Summit wouldn’t have been possible without all the individuals who gave their time, their energy, their creativity and passion, their money, their products or services to this project. It is our time to thank them back.

Thanks to everyone who contributed in one way or another and made this event possible!

A. Nesting Peace Team

Vincent Verzat, France:

“Nesting Peace electroshocked me into peace activism. Even though organizing this transformative event was the hardest and most tiring thing I have ever undertaken, it lit a flame that is not going to vanish any time soon. With the things I’ve learned and the support of our amazing team, I dedicated my life to sustain a culture of peace in my own life and to build structures in my environment that will facilitate peace learning.”

Arianna De Marco, Italy:

“I was introduced to the concept of infrastructure for peace less than one year ago and thanks to Nesting Peace I developed my knowledge and interest about the topic. However, my learning experience went much further than the simple study of the concept from a theoretical point of view. Indeed, I am extremely happy to say that Nesting Peace taught me how to live infrastructure for peace in my everyday life and how powerful it can be to build a respectful society. During the 6 months I worked with the Nesting Peace Team, together, we blossomed as a team and I recognize an amazing personal growth. Nesting Peace has been an energetic, magical and inspirational experience and I always try to apply what I learned in different contests. I love you all!!!”

Laura Aldrighetti, Italy:

“The first time I heard about it I thought that 'Nesting Peace' was a very curious name for a conference. But soon I came to realize how appropriate it was! Working on this project, I realized the importance of constantly building and nourishing the process of Peace, which needs to be cultivated in every moment, in every aspect of our life, and inside all of us. It was great to discover that the 'nesting peace' which we were building was not only the conference, but something more, something extraordinary! Thanks to the guys of the team, I have found a lovely nest, in which I could grow and be enriched by an inspiring and constant exchange. All the people of Nesting Peace, in different ways, have spread in me many seeds of Peace, and a beautiful feeling of sharing and union! I’m sure that the common project for peace will make this Peace Nest bigger and bigger!”
**Sarah Gingerella, USA:**

“Having the opportunity to work with this group toward the creation of the Nesting Peace conference was a blessing in ways I never anticipated. Not only was the experience incredibly valuable in terms of what I learned and was involved in firsthand, creating a conference alongside such an incredible team was just plain good for the soul. I continue to take courage in the stories of those I met during the week, and I try to live my life according to Nesting Peace’s principles of communication, trust, and empowerment. Now I know how interconnected these three practices are, and that they make extraordinary things possible. Here's to a nest in every community!”

**Karine Renard, France:**

“This experience was one of the most important of my life so far. Nesting peace changed my view of working in a team and in a peaceful environment where everyone can be the person he is. Nesting Peace and the team taught me a lot about myself and what I would be able to do if I believe in myself. The people I worked with made me trust myself and trust others too. Moreover, it made me realize that there are a lot people in the world who care about peace in the sense of a realistic and possible idea and not some idealist or utopian project. This experience gave me hope and strength to pursue the projects I believe in.”

**Oliver Rizzi Carlson, Italy, Switzerland, USA:**

“Organizing this event was a wonderful opportunity to explore and experiment with peace spaces and elements that can support peace, turning peacework into something very practical. It’s not just an imaginary society – it really works! Having been through all the challenges and difficulties of this process, and with the many things that I was hoping we would be but were not able to do, I am very proud of the wonderful event we managed to co-create with participants and with each other as a team. Most of all, I am deeply grateful and inspired by the energy, commitment and mutual support that we expressed for each other. I learned a lot from the others in the team and so appreciate the relationships that we have developed not only by working together, but by working together on a peace project. What we created was possible only because of everyone’s contribution, and I can’t wait to do more wonderful and inspiring things together.”

**Luiza de S. Oliveira, Brazil:**
“Nesting Peace means much more than a one-week summit. Nesting Peace was 2 years of intention of preparation, 1 year of intense work and 6 months of eating, breathing and sweating Nesting Peace. This work went much further than the office hours and space. The process of designing Nesting Peace made me rethink my entire life and the way I relate with the world on various levels. This experience made me see that infrastructures for peace are needed in our daily life, in order to support the process of the deconstruction and awareness of the culture of violence to create and nurture the culture of peace that I aim for. Apart from the philosophical part, I found in the Nesting Peace Team a new family that I am so proud to be part of :).”
B. Volunteers


**Plus Special Thanks to:**

JP Eason, Dario Solina, Noriko Hashimoto, Farida Moradi, Jackie Chan-Kam, Clem Chan-Kam, David Fernandez Puyana, Lasse Kjellberg, Romain Matarfi, Myriam Radhouane, Clare Blenkinsop, Klaus Keller, Kevin Karlen.

**Volunteer Professional Interpreters:**

Mme Poffet, Mme Camoletto, Patrick Lehner, Mr Leveillé, Leila Kherbiche

**Facilitators and Moderators:**

Birger Norup (Denmark), Peace Alliance Denmark and GAMIP Board member
Vishal Sunny Dhawotal (Mauritius) Mauritius Red Cross Society
Kristin Famula (USA): National Peace Academy, United States
Florence Mpaayei (Kenya), Nairobi Peace Initiative and INUA Kenya Foundation
Tara Ruttenberg (Costa Rica/USA): GAMIP Assistant Secretary and Doctoral Candidate at the University for Peace
Ulrich Soeder (Germany), Integral Development
Stanley Nyoni (Switzerland / Zimbabwe), The Natural Step
Sara Flores (Spain)
Courtenay Mastain (USA), TASIS
Charlotte Tocchio (France), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
Ricardo Espinosa (Colombia), UNOG NGO Liaison Unit
Oliver Rizzi Carlson (Switzerland), UNOY Peacebuilders
C. Global Summit Planning Team

Birger Norup, Denmark
Corina Simon, Romania
Dot Maver, USA
Eryl Kort, Canada
Godifri Mutindi, Mozambique
Jean de Dieu Basabose, Rwanda
Jo Berry, UK
Karen Barentsche, South Africa
Kelsey Visser, USA
Kristin Fumula, USA
Luiza Oliveira, Brazil/Switzerland
MAM Sajeer, Sri Lanka
Muhaned Habeeb Alsamawee, Iraq
Oliver Rizzi Carlson, Switzerland
Paul van Tongeren, The Netherlands
Penny Joy, Canada
Reginald Ansah Adjaye, Ghana
Saul Arbess, Canada
Suresh Acharya, Nepal
Vincent Verzat, Switzerland
D. Speakers

Pascal Rubeli (Switzerland) President of the City Council of Geneva
Barbara Lee (USA) House Representative in the US Congress
Roger Mayou (Switzerland) International Red Cross and Red Crescent Museum
David Maizlish (USA) Coordination and Support Unit, Operations for the Implementation and Promotion of the Law, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
Katrien Beeckman (Belgium) International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
Charlotte Tocchio (France) International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
Florence Mpaayei (Kenya) Nairobi Peace Initiative and INUA Kenya Foundation
Nicole Wyrsch (Switzerland) Ambassador Chargée de Mission for Swiss Peace and Human Rights Policy, Human Security Division, Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs
Emmanuel Asante (Ghana) Chairman of the National Peace Council
Guyo Liban (Kenya) Assistant Director for Reconciliation and Integration, National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) and Uwiano Peace Platform Secretariat
Ozonna Ojiebo (Ghana) Head of Conflict Prevention and Recovery, Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction, United Nations Development Programme
Mira Karybaeva, (Kyrgyzstan) Chief of the Division of Ethnic, Religious Policies and Interaction with Civil Society, Office of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic
Dulce Umananor Alvarado (Costa Rica) Executive Director, Directorate-General for Peace Promotion and Civic Coexistence (DIGEPAZ), National System for the Promotion of Social Peace and Vice-Ministry for Peace, Ministry of Justice and Peace, Costa Rica
Raisa Kadyrova (Kyrgyzstan) Foundation for Tolerance International
Sadhu Ram Sapkota (Nepal) Joint Secretary and Director, Nepal Peace Trust Fund, Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction Nepal
Barbara Unger (Germany) Berghof Foundation
Masood Karokhail (Afghanistan) Director of The Liaison Office (TLO)
Ulrike Hopp-Nishanka (Germany) Deputy Head of the Afghanistan/Pakistan Division at BMZ
Dominic Barzer (Brazil) Restorative Circles
Jean-Pierre Mfuni Mwanza (DRC) Central Africa Conflict Prevention (CACOPA)
Eric Mongo Malolo (DRC) Réseau Haki Na Amani
Borja Paladini Adell (Colombia) Head of REDES-ART Nariño, UNDP
Sedad Alshaziliž (Sweden) Head of the Elections and Conflict Project, International IDEA
David Adams (USA) New Haven City Peace Commission and former Director of the International Year for the Culture of Peace, UNESCO
Christophe Barbey (Switzerland) APRED
Ayman Qwaider (Gaza/Palestine) Palestinian Association for the Culture of Peace
Luiza de S. Oliveira (Brazil) Pacicultura
Saul Arbess (Canada) Canadian Department of Peace Initiative
Penny Joy (Canada) Canadian Department of Peace Initiative
Vishal Sunny Dhawolal (Mauritius) Mauritius Red Cross Society
Kristin Famula (USA) National Peace Academy
Jean de Dieu Basabose (Rwanda) Shalom Educating for Peace
Paul Koroma (Sierra Leone) Action for Conflict Transformation International (ACTION) and Network Movement for Justice and Development (NMJD)
Birger Norup (Denmark) Peace Alliance Denmark
Kerstin Holst (Unknown) UNESCO Liaison Office in Geneva
Sylvia Poll (Costa Rica) Deputy Permanent Representative of Costa Rica to the United Nations in Geneva
Luca Lupoli (Italy) Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
Jun Sasamoto (Japan) Representative of the Japanese Committee on the Human Right to Peace
José Luis Gómez del Prado (Spain) Spanish Society for International Human Rights Law
Aaro Rytkönen (Finland) Director of Advocacy of the Finn Church Aid
Tara Ruttenberg (USA) GAMIP
Ulrich Soeder (Germany) World Café facilitator
Sara Flores (Spain) World Café facilitator
Stanley Nyoni (Switzerland) World Café facilitator
Oliver Rizzi Carlson (Switzerland), UNOY Peacebuilders
Victoria Fontan (France/Costa Rica), University for Peace of Costa Rica.
Charles Eisenstein (USA), author
Ricardo Espinosa (Colombia) UNOG NGO Liaison Unit
Karen Barendsché (South Africa) GAMIP Co-President
Paul van Tongeren (The Netherlands), International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace
Dennis Kuiai (Bougainville, Papua New Guinea), First Secretary and Senior Advisor on Peacebuilding for the Ministry for Peace and Reconciliation of the Autonomous Bougainville Government (ABG) in Papua New Guinea.

E. Performers

Heather Grohe (USA), singer-songwriter
Jack Savoretti, life-long poet and London-based singer-songwriter
Charly Lanthiez (Switzerland/France), guitarist and singer-songwriter,
Claire Giulini (USA), soprano
Ben Slade (Australia), piano
Kiyoshi Adashi, violin, Music Club of the United Nations
Janet Weiler, Double bass, Music Club of the United Nations
Michael Wiener, piano, Music Club of the United Nations

And all the other participants!
F. Special Thanks to...

We would like to express our gratitude to the following individuals working behind the scenes within the institutions mentioned to make the event happen:

Centre d'Accueil Genève Internationale (CAGI), Canton of Geneva
  Service ONG – Mme Anastasia Outkina
  Accueil Délégués – M. Yann Bovey
Office Fédérale des Assurances Sociales (OFAS), Programme Jeunes et Violence
  Mme Liliane Galley
Ville de Genève
  Nicolas Kerguen
  M. Pascal Rubeli
Centre International de Conférences Genève (CICG)
  Luca Pellandini
  Manon Mariller
MIP Restaurants
  Laetitia Picard
  Anthony Schwarz
OuBien?
  Florence
MuFood
  Timour Yildirim
Département de l’urbanisme – office des bâtiments, Canton of Geneva
Département de l'instruction publique, Canton of Geneva
Collège Voltaire
  Manuel Faure
  Marie-Claire Pret
  Margarita Ferro
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NGO Liaison Office, United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)
   Ricardo Espinosa
Swiss Federal Department of Federal Affairs (FDFA)
   Francesco Quattrini
   Nicole Wyrsch
Planète Evasion
   Ramon Gonzales
Gasser Media
   Raphael Gasser
Officeinter
   Mme Patricia
Cartooning for Peace
   M. Tobias Clerc
ODT maps
   Bob Abramms
Association des Étudiants en Traduction et Interpretation (AETI), Université de Genève
   Alice Debiolles
   Dorian Guinot
for Charles Eisenstein
   Marie Goodwin
   Ramon Mullis
   Camille Bierens de Haan, association EcoAttitude
and the Swiss Peace Education Network (www.educationalapaix.ch)
H. Sponsors
X. APPENDIX

You will find additional Summit documents besides those in the Appendix on the GAMIP website

A. Organizers - GAMIP, UNOY Peacebuilders and Pacicultura

Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP) www.gamip.org

GAMIP is a non-governmental organization regrouping 50 members from 35 different countries, all of whom work towards establishing ministries for peace at government level, as well as setting up other peace infrastructures.

To achieve these goals, the Alliance facilitates for its members the exchange of their resources, information, and support, towards the setting up of national campaigns for the establishment of peace infrastructures. The Alliance also seeks to enhance understanding by civil society and governments of the importance of ministries and infrastructures for peace. Since its creation, the Alliance has played a critical role in the establishment of two of the four existing Ministries for Peace, namely the ones in Costa Rica and Nepal. The other two, in Solomon Islands and Southern Sudan, have also benefited from those dynamics.

One of the main activities of GAMIP is the organization of a biennial conference, the main objectives of which are to share experiences, successes and challenges, to establish relationships between member organizations, to broaden knowledge and competencies within GAMIP, and to raise awareness within civil society and governments on the concepts of ministries and infrastructures for peace.

There have been 5 Summits to date (UK in 2005, Canada in 2006, Japan in 2007, Costa Rica in 2009, and South Africa in 2011). «Nesting Peace: Creating Infrastructures for the Promotion of Diversity» is thus the sixth GAMIP Summit.

United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY) www.unoy.org

The United Network of Young Peacebuilders is a global network of young people and youth organisations committed to establishing peaceful societies. Since its inception in 1989, UNOY has developed a multi-dimension expertise in its main areas of activity: advocacy and campaigning, capacity building and gender. Additional core activities are networking, sharing information, research, and fundraising. UNOY now has 65 member organizations around the world.

UNOY implements different projects and activities aimed at building the capacity of its members. These activities combine methodologies of non-formal education in youth work, peace education, community development and intercultural learning. Operating outside formal education, the non-formal approach we opt for includes a focus on equal (peer to peer), friendly, innovative, attractive, and involved relationships.

Pacicultura

_Pacicultura_ is an experiential application of peace culture. As such, it strives to enable diversity within itself as an incubator for the development of the culture of peace. Our purposes are thus manifold and related:
* We work to raise awareness about the culture of peace, the nature of violence, diversity and conflict; the relevance of education as a lens, and peace as a process.

* We play to develop a support system among young peaceworkers in order to create nourishment for their ideas and their work: a hand between seed and terrain.

Contact and bank details

Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP)

chemin de la Caracole 68

CH-1294 Genthod (Geneva)

Switzerland

+41 (0)22 535 73 70

Email: summit@gamip.org

Website: www.gamip.org

Bank details:

IBAN: CH33 0839 0032 1020 1010 8

SWIFT/BIC: ALSWCH21

Banque Alternative Suisse SA

Rue du Petit-Chêne 38

Case postale 161

CH-1001 Lausanne

Switzerland
B. Program of Actual Events
C. Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate

1. Recommendations

Observations & Recommendations from the Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate, 19th September 2013

The Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace and the International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace organised a Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate, as part of the 6th GAMIP Summit.

It was the first public, global Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with many high-level representatives from all over the world, including countries that have established peace infrastructures such as Ghana, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, and Costa Rica.

It is worth mentioning that recently two regional meetings on establishing national infrastructures for peace were held in Ghana and Lesotho. The first regional meeting in Ghana was organised by the government of Ghana, in cooperation with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the African Union and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The second meeting in Lesotho was organised by the government of Lesotho, the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the African Union and UNDP.

The outcome of both meetings was the signing of declarations aimed at commitments by member states of the two regional organisations to establish national infrastructures for peace. The Declaration from Ghana is aiming to create such an infrastructure within three years.

During the Seminar, the following observations and recommendations were made:

* Infrastructures for Peace may be defined as a network of interdependent systems, resources, values and skills held by government, civil society and community institutions that promote dialogue, and consultation; prevent conflict and enable peaceful mediation when violence occurs in a society.

* Important building blocs of a Peace Infrastructure are:
  - Peace Committees, in which respected civil society leaders participate. These can operate at all levels and are interdependent. Peace Committees may operate in different countries under different names or modalities.
  - National Peacebuilding Platform with main stakeholders.
  - Conflict Analysis and an Early Warning & Response system
  - National capacity-building.
  - Enhancing indigenous conflict resolution mechanisms and transitional justice.

* Establishing an Infrastructure for Peace is a process which takes time. A process, starting at the local level, a bottom-up approach, has advantages.

* A National Peace Infrastructure has no legislative or executive power. It has soft power and is building bridges. It has a networking and coordination role. Strong partnerships are key.
* A National Peace Infrastructure needs the capacity to build bridges in a divided society. This may be compromised, when it is part of the government. Therefore, the independence of a peace infrastructure is very important.
* It is crucial to mobilise both sides: government and civil society.
* Equally crucial are social cohesion, citizen participation and ownership.
* Dozens of countries are fragile or conflict affected and lack the capacities, mechanisms and structures to deal adequately with those conflicts. Infrastructures for Peace can provide possible solutions.
* The issue of elections is key. Elections are structured processes of competition for power and make deeply rooted social conflicts visible. Prevention of electoral violence can be enhanced by Peace Infrastructures.
* Important is the Peace & Development Nexus: aiming for sustainable and peaceful development.
* A Peace Trust Funds may be a useful instrument for funding the peace infrastructure.
2. Concept Note

Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate

part of the Sixth GAMIP Summit at CCV & Palais des Nations
Geneva, Switzerland (19-20 September 2013)

Infrastructures for Peace

Traditional approaches to peacebuilding have tended to concentrate on one-off activities without a coordinated, systemic approach. Peacebuilding requires multi-level and long-term investments targeted at building capacities and structures that can help prevent, transform and address the roots of violent conflict. Peace processes—dialogue, reconciliation, mediation, peace education, restorative justice, etc.—require a framework that provides continuity, social support and opportunities for the involvement of all stakeholders. Infrastructures for peace are an emergent and effective framework focusing on the sustainability of peace by developing capacities for coordinated responses to conflict.

According to UNDP, infrastructures for peace are “[a] network of interdependent systems, resources, values and skills held by government, civil society and community institutions that promote dialogue and consultation, prevent conflict and enable peaceful mediation when violence occurs in a society.” Further, “Recurring conflicts and extended, turbulent, transitions cannot be addressed through discrete one-time mediation or a single peace process. They require standing and sustainable mechanisms for mediation and dialogue—‘infrastructures for peace’—at local and national levels within the country itself.”

Organizers

The Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP) is a worldwide community of individuals from civil society, business and government who are working toward a Culture of Peace by promoting the development of infrastructures for peace.

The International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace works to collect and exchange experiences and best practices of local peacebuilders on infrastructures for peace (I4P) and local peace committees (LPCs); broaden the knowledge on I4P and LPCs, nationally and internationally; facilitate a dialogue on the potential of I4P and LPCs with different stakeholders; and enhance the position of LPCs and NGOs within I4P.

These are the two global organizations specifically focusing on infrastructures for peace.

Sixth GAMIP Summit and the Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate

The Seminar on September 19, 2013 is part of the Sixth GAMIP Summit. Previous GAMIP Summits have been held on five continents and have gained the support of such noted champions of peace as Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Oscar Arias, his Holiness the Dalai Lama, the Most Reverend Desmond Tutu, and former member of the US House of Representatives Dennis Kucinich.

The Seminar will take advantage of Geneva’s unique character to gather an influential and varied group of actors, including government representatives, BCPR/UNDP and CSOs, to learn about and discuss a wide variety of infrastructures for peace with a national mandate. This Seminar will provide a wonderful opportunity for government officials who have direct and unique experience of creating and supporting infrastructures for peace to come together and share their experiences and discuss institutional approaches for the targeted promotion of peace.

Aims

The Seminar aims to:

- Exchange experiences in different countries, focusing on achievements and challenges
- Give visibility to current infrastructures for peace, underlining their role in sustainable strategies of peace promotion
- Reach out to a broader, diverse community of State Missions to the UN, CSOs, international organizations and press in Geneva in order to strengthen the engagement of the international community in supporting infrastructures for peace
- Gather governments of countries affected by violence, (potential) donor countries, as well as those with current or future initiatives in infrastructures for peace
- Serve as a bridge among governments and CSOs to further infrastructures for peace at the national and sub-national level
Provisional Program Overview

**September 19, 2013**
The seminar will include short presentations (10’) by UNDP and high-level representatives of governments that have established or are pioneering national peace structures such as Ministries of Peace, National Peace Councils, networks of Local Peace Committees, National Peace Academies and other infrastructures for peace with a national mandate. There will be ample time for discussion, followed by lunch. In the afternoon, the first round of parallel workshops will focus on small-group discussions with morning speakers comparing infrastructures for peace in various countries. The second round will focus on local initiatives such as Local Peace Committees in different countries without a government mandate.

**MORNING**
- **Welcoming Remarks** by Paul van Tongeren, Founder of the International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace
- **Opening of the Seminar** by Nicole Wyrsch, Ambassador Chargée de Mission at the head of Swiss Peace and Human Rights Policy, Human Security Division, Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs
- **Moderator:** Florence Mpaayei, immediate former Executive director of the Nairobi Peace Initiative (NPI-Africa) and INUA Kenya Foundation, Kenya

**Speakers:**
- **Emmanuel Asante**, Chairman of the National Peace Council, Ghana
- **Dickson Liyayi Magotsi**, Head of UNDP/Government of Kenya Programme, National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC) Secretariat, Office of the President, Kenya
- **Ozonnia Ojielo**, Head of Conflict Prevention and Recovery, BCPR/UNDP, New York, USA
- **Emmanuel Bombande**, Executive Director of WANEP, Ghana, and Chair of GPPAC
- **Mira Karybaeva**, Chief of the Division of Ethnic and Religious Policies and Interaction with Civil Society, Office of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic
- **Dulce Umanzor Alvarado**, Executive Director, Directorate-General for Peace Promotion and Civic Coexistence (DIGEPAZ), National System for the Promotion of Social Peace and Vice-Ministry for Peace, Ministry of Justice and Peace, Costa Rica

**AFTERNOON**

**First Round of parallel workshops**
1. **Infrastructures for Peace in Ghana and Kenya** – Emmanuel Asante, Dickson Liyayi Magotsi, Ozonnia Ojielo and Emmanuel Bombande
2. **Infrastructures for Peace in Kyrgyzstan and Nepal** – Mira Karybaeva, Raisa Kadyrova (Foundation for Tolerance International, Kyrgyzstan) and Sadhu Ram Sapkota (Joint Secretary and Director, Nepal Peace Trust Fund, Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction, Nepal)
3. **The Vice-Ministry for Peace in Costa Rica and other Peace Infrastructures in Guatemala and Bolivia** – Dulce Umanzor Alvarado and Barbara Unger (Berghof Foundation, Germany)
4. **Peace Shunas in Afghanistan** – Masood Krokhail (Director of the The Liaison Office (TLO), Afghanistan) and Ulrike Hopp-Nishanka (Deputy Head of the Afghanistan/Pakistan Division at BMZ, Germany)

**Second Round of parallel workshops**
1. **Local Peace Committees in the Democratic Republic of the Congo** – Jean-Pierre Mfuni Mwanza (Central Africa Conflict Prevention (CACOPA), DRC), Henri Bura Ladyi (Centre Résolution Conflits, DRC), Eric Mongo Malolo (Réseau Haki Na Amani, DRC)
2. **Local Peace Communities in Colombia** – Borja Paladini Adell (Head of REDES-ART Nariño, UNDP Colombia)
3. **Peaceful Elections and an Early Warning & Response System** – Guyo Liban (Assistant Director for Reconciliation and Integration, National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) and Uwiano Peace Platform Secretariat, Kenya) and Sead Alihodžić (Head of the Elections and Conflict Project, International IDEA, Sweden)
4. **City Peace Commissions and Local Government Initiatives** – David Adams (New Haven City Peace Commission and former Director of the International Year for the Culture of Peace, UNESCO) and Christophe Barbey (APRED)

**September 20, 2013**
The last day of the Summit will gather the experience of the week to draw conclusions, identify steps forward and catalyze engagement. The final event will be at the Palais des Nations, UN Office in Geneva, on the side of the 24th Session of the Human Rights Council. As a celebration of the International Day of Peace, whose theme is “Education for Peace,” this event will provide a platform to discuss concepts and practices related to the sustainable realization of peace, including infrastructures for peace and a presentation of the outcomes of the Summit.
3. Reports from Afternoon Working Groups

Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate
September 19, 2014

Notes on afternoon working groups

**Case study working groups (1st round)**

**1. Infrastructures for Peace in Ghana and Kenya**

**Emmanuel Asante** (Chairman of National Peace Council, Ghana)
**Guyo Liban** (Assistant Director for Reconciliation and Integration, National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) and Uwiano Peace Platform Secretariat, Kenya) on behalf of **Dickson Liyayi Magotsi** (Head of UNDP/Government of Kenya Programme, National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC) Secretariat, Kenya)
**Ozonna Ojielo** (Head of Conflict Prevention and Recovery, Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction, United Nations Development Programme)

Following on the morning discussion on the infrastructures for peace in Ghana and Kenya, the working group allowed for participants to go deeper into the case of those two countries. One question revolved around how communication was used for peacebuilding, with what available tools in particular, and whether there are language barriers. In the case of Kenya, it there are 42 ethnic groups officially recognized in the country, plus ‘others’. English and Kiswahili are the official languages and most of the population speaks them both. The strategy there thus included using written material, Internet, social media (despite the danger of their use for hate speech). As for Ghana, one of the speakers mentioned that one of the advantages of colonialism is having a national language. Despite the presence of different language groups, there is always an available translator in case someone doesn’t speak English. The Information Service Department has been used to network and reach out to people. They use FM radio, which offer both advantages (reaching out to people in different areas) and disadvantages (can misinform people and inflame conflict); media through the Media Commission that set a code of conduct on how to report as, for example, tabloids work on the basis of sensationalism; drama, especially as one of the board members is a well-known actor; literature.

Another question asked, “How are traditional and modern conflict resolution mechanisms used?” The response related to Ghana highlighted that, since many conflicts are land-related, it is essential to use traditional methods to solve issues of chieftaincy (e.g. the National House of Chiefs). Religious leaders and elders are also key actors in conflict resolution given the specific context of Ghana. Responding about the situation in Kenya, it was mentioned that ironically traditional mechanisms are defined in the West as Alternative Dispute Resolution mechanism, when in reality they are not an alternative to those who implement them. District Peace Committees have worked to incorporate both youth and elders, the latter as highly respected within the community. The National Commission has been facilitating having elders travel in a secure way to move from one community to the other to negotiate conflicts. Modern mechanisms are used in case of reports filed at the police station, which is not how issues are normally dealt with locally.

On funding, it was explained that, in Ghana, the fact that mechanisms are institutionalized translated into the fact that funding comes directly from taxpayers. Moreover, the legal backing also allows receiving funding from other sources (e.g. governments, private ventures, donors, etc.)

Regarding elections, in Ghana, Art. 64 of the Constitutions affirms that the validity of the election of the President may be challenged only by a citizen of Ghana who presents a petition for that purpose to the Supreme Court. After the results of the 2012 elections proceedings were aired on television so that everyone could watch the development of the case, people were afraid of what the Supreme Court would decide. The nation had to learn to accept the decision made, the rule of law and move on. Peace councils help people exercise their rights within the context of the rule of law. The fact that the country lives in political duopoly is translated into the fact that when the opposition loses the
elections, it is wiped out. An electoral reform is needed, as well as dialogue between political parties and civil society. A national agenda is currently being developed.

Commenting on the transnational aspect of conflicts, it was noted that in Kenya ethnic conflicts often go beyond borders arbitrarily drawn by colonialists. For this reason Cross Border Peace Committees have been created to deal with issues related to tribes divided by national borders (e.g. between Kenya and Ethiopia).

 Asked how one creates legitimacy for the peace councils, speakers responded that legitimacy comes from the fact that the selected members are neutral and highly respected. So is chieftaincy both the problem and the solution? In Ghana, the issue is addressed by the fact that there is a hierarchy within the chieftaincy system, which means that chiefs have to answer on their actions to those who are above them.

2. Infrastructures for Peace in Kyrgyzstan and Nepal

Mira Karybaeva, (Chief of the Division of Ethnic, Religious Policies and Interaction with Civil Society, President’s Office of the Kyrgyz Republic)
Raisa Kadyrova (Foundation for Tolerance International, Kyrgyzstan)
Sadhu Ram Sapkota (Joint Secretary and Director, Nepal Peace Trust Fund, Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction, Nepal)

After the presentation in the morning on Kyrgyzstan, space was given to Nepal to present. As one of the four countries in the world with a Ministry of Peace, its history is interesting. Sadhu Ram Sapkota of the Nepal Peace Trust Fund explained that the Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction (MOPR) was created in 2006 and mandated to facilitate all peace building processes in the country. Ancillary to this are various Peace fund instruments, notably the Nepal Peace Trust Fund (NPTF), comprising the local government and 8 donor partners. The NPTF has invested EUR 140’000’000 in 63 projects. It has been mandated to implement a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) by managing cantonments and combatants, peace dividend to conflict victims, transitional, justice, security strengthening, elections, CPA and peace building initiatives at national and local levels. The donor partners are UN agencies, which comprise Denmark, Finland Germany, Norway, Switzerland, the UK and US. The World Bank has also provided support for conflict victims, capacity development and so too has the Asian development bank supporting local peace committees. Further international support has come from the UN Peace Fund for Nepal (UNPFN), while other international NGOs advise on technical support to several areas of peace building, elections in the CA, etc.

Local Peace Committees have been established in all 75 districts, along with 457 Community Mediation Committees (donor/NGO) at village level, offering training to mediators in accordance with human rights norms. These empower the communities where they work. There is also a dialogue facilitator pool (donor/NGO pool) – in 4 communities, which is being extended to new 6 communities to ease the process of integration of ex combatants - but implementation is pending due to the Supreme Court.

The latest steps to avoid future conflict is the Commission on Disappearance and Truth and Reconciliation. The ordinance that created this Commission was ratified in March 2013. This is supported on the ground by peace-focused persons, streamlining of a peace-sensitive development approach in planning and programming in respective organizations, declaring schools as Peace Zones, and reaching a consensus among political parties not to mobilize school and children for political purposes.

Sapkota stressed that instruments such as the NPTF, led and managed by the Government of Nepal are exemplary. They enhance ownership and act as an effective form of a government-donor policy dialogue, contributing to the infrastructure for peace. Non-governmental actors at the grassroots are influential in carrying out mediation and peacebuilding activities at local level. Government organization such as the Ministry for Peace and Reconstruction will have to gradually pull out from IFP responsibilities and play only the role as an enabler.

Mira Karybaeva then took the floor expressing appreciation for the idea of a Peace Trust Fund. In fact, with a population of 5 million people, Kyrgyzstan faces the problem of having unclear funds from international donors. Instead, having a real and transparent fund would provide legitimacy to peace efforts, as well as more clarity on the amounts available, how to spend them, and the know the results
of the various programs. Another challenge is represented by the fact that Kyrgyzstan is 97% mountainous, and digital media struggles to take off, together with the lack of funds to sustain the media.

Shifting to the social dynamics in the country, Karybaeva stressed that inclusiveness is very important. As a post-Soviet country, Kyrgyzstan struggles to know emotionally and psychologically what its identity is, and ethnic identity tends to come first. Thus problems such as poverty, the lack of resources, or joblessness tend to be blamed on other ethnicities. The challenge of the parliamentary State is now to build a national identity beyond ethnic divisions. Despite the existence of District Peace Councils (DPCs), unfortunately projects are dependent on donors and when the funding dries up, they close. The overall direction for Kyrgyzstan, Karybaeva said, should be to shift from looking at the past to directing its attention toward the future as country with the objective of national cohesion.

3. The Vice-Ministry for Peace in Costa Rica and the other Peace Infrastructures in Guatemala and Bolivia

Dulce Umanzor Alvarado (Executive Director, Directorate-General for Peace Promotion and Civic Coexistence (DIGEPAZ), National System for Promotion of Social Peace and Vice-Ministry for Peace, Ministry of Justice and Peace, Costa Rica)
Barbara Ung (Berghof Foundation, Germany)

Barbara Ung, while part of Berghof Foundation, also has experience working within the German agency for Development Cooperation. Ung started with a reflection on peace structures perceived as separate elements, and the importance of understanding how they are related to each other. The focus of her work is on local structures and how they deal with domestic affairs. Specifically, she is currently looking at how bureaucracies deal with conflicts in Bolivia. From 2000 to 2003, protests and violent confrontation followed the privatization of water in Bolivia. After the uprisings, in 2005, Evo Morales won the elections and became president in 2006. The government was formed by a coalition of different movements. In this particular case, conflict turned out to be a medium to achieve political changes. The Bolivian government demonstrated the political will and need for institutional change, the willingness to develop capacities to diagnose, sensitize, find new routines and structures. So they decided to get support from the German Development Cooperation with experts in these specific fields.

Between 2007 and 2010, four units of the German Development Cooperation have each been inserted into a ministry of the Bolivian government (Presidential Ministry, Governmental Ministry, Labour Ministry and the Ministry of Road Construction, Services and Living) to undertake a row of conversations in order to mediate conflicts and to create a dialogue. They classified and analyzed the conflicts and then tried to search for structures to deal with the conflicts they had found. What made the development of the units and a certain degree of linkage possible, was the political will to take risks. These units assess and rate the conflicts in order to determine their scope and gravity. Making a daily report, these units inform the policy makers. Moreover, every Saturday, the people from the concerned parts of the government received trainings in order to know how to monitor conflicts. These trained persons constitute now four different units and have a network of collaborators. These units are also working with powerful indigenous organizations, in order to raise awareness on how to avoid and deal with conflicts. A challenge is that there still is no guarantee that the decisions of the leaders will be taken with peace as a priority. In fact, whether the analyses are taken into account depends on many factors. An important factor is certainly the linkage of the different governmental structures, both horizontally and vertically. After the intervention inside of the governmental structures of Bolivia, the work of the GDC presently focuses on indigenous communities and tries to implement changes on this smaller scale.

The Guatemalan case is different in many ways. The base conflict in Guatemala followed the end of a civil war which ravaged the country for 36 years, from 1960 to 1996. Ever since there have been tensions. The real change only started since the beginning of the 21st Century with a creation of an unit especially dedicated to peace, the National Reparation Program. This program created huge expectations in the Guatemalan society. Unfortunately, in the past years the National Reparation Program has been discredited : almost 290 of the 300 initial employees were dismissed following a change in government, the future of the program is uncertain.
These two cases taught the German Development Cooperation that not every intervention of external actors can be expected to be a success. Modesty and support are the two main characteristics an external actor has to have in order to be accepted in such an environment, as the memories of the colonial age are still present in everyone’s minds. In conclusion the political will of the governments is unambiguously the most important factor for the success of peace infrastructures in this governmental point of view, as the simple change of a government can have a crucial impact on an organization.

The role of infrastructures for peace in Costa Rica is fundamentally different, as it is one of the only countries in the world to have a Ministry for Peace (Ministerio de Justicia y Paz), which was established in 2009. Dulce Umanzor Alvarado of the Office for Peace Promotion explained the everyday work of the Viceministry for Peace. The Costa Rica Peace Ministry consists of the four following offices: the Peace Promotion Office, the Office for Conflict Resolution, The Office for Public Events, and the Administration.

When the National Reconciliation Program was founded in 2000, it had a staff of 300 people. However, when the government administration changed, only 10 individuals remained and the rest of the employees were fired. Considering these events, what guarantee do we have that the structures will remain and not fall apart? Umanzor said that their aim is therefore not to work for the government, because it changes— but to work for the people.

There are currently 37 functionaries working together to accomplish the current National Three Year Plan for Violence Prevention and the Promotion of Social Peace. Umanzor went on to explain the content of this 2011-2014 three year plan. Working as the Director for Peace Promotion within the Ministry for Justice and Peace, Umanzor and her team try to develop a culture of peace, providing the population with non-violent tools and methodologies, as well as opportunities for taking action. They work with different communities and ethnic groups and reclaim public spaces, which is important. In fact, they use public space to promote peace.

A crucial part of the peace promotion happens in schools, where the focus lies on Education for Peace, a wide program. For example, the “Weapon-Free Schools” program tries to show school children in all grades that guns aren’t toys. The children are also taught to deal peacefully with conflicts. Until July 2013, more than 29,000 children in more than 100 schools have participated and more than 250 so-called “multipliers” have taken part in the promotion of peace. These multiplies are police officers, volunteers, teachers and youth. In the end of such a program, a school gets awarded with the “Peaceful School - We don’t need weapons” label. • The “Art For Peace” program, which was established in 2012, has included more than 1,400 children. Here the children paint murals in their schools to overpaint graffiti, and they also decorate their own chairs and desks in order to take care of them in the future, as they become their personal masterpieces. The “Sports For Peace” program teaches children important social values such as teamwork and fair-play. This program also works against violence in sports generally, such as martial arts or hooliganism, by promoting participative and not competitive sports. While also giving children sports supplies such as soccer balls, they have a hard time getting funds from the government to buy such supplies.

The Office for Peace Promotion supports peacebuilding with four essential tasks which are the following : Local Peace Offices, promotion of a Culture of Peace, the Youth Network for Violence Prevention and the Violence Observatory. Facilitators help to form local committees in villages which try to diagnose and analyze conflicts and then work on projects and prevention programs. The population itself can thus participate in the elaboration of peace infrastructures, such as for example in public spaces. Risk factors and necessities are looked at to define priorities in the work of peace promotion. With local plans and agendas the local committees involve the municipal and district councils and either involve existing institutions or create the necessary ones.

To promote a culture of peace, the Office for Peace Promotion organizes demonstrations for peace and fosters the creation of a more peaceful society. The Culture of Peace Division also organizes the non-violence season, which takes place from the 30th of January to the 4th of April and celebrates the legacy of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr.. During this season, the public nominates laureates for the “Peacemaker Award,” an annual prize that distinguishes those who worked for peace and its promotion. In 2013, the 16th Season was been celebrated. The Culture of Peace Division also is charged with the development of the “Peace Network” (Red de Paz) which fosters the relations between civil society movements for the creation of a culture of peace. This network currently includes 45 organizations. The ambition of the network is a channelling of synergies between organizations in Costa Rica. Also they organize the celebration of emblematic days such as the
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International Day of Peace on the 21st of September. Further, National Campaigns aim to raise awareness and participation in peace promotion. Campaigns such as “Pinch Yourself,” “Living With Values” or “For A Righteous Country” emphasize specific issues in peacebuilding.

The National Youth Network for Violence Prevention is a platform for projects created by young people. In order to enter the network, the teenagers need to propose and elaborate a project related to peace in their respective communities. During these events, Umanzor mentioned that they give people bracelets which symbolizes a promise people make to themselves they’ll have a positive and peaceful attitude, and that this contributes to encouraging youth to meet without becoming part of gangs. Within this program, 72 projects have yet been formulated by youth and executed in 2013, out of which 21 are priority projects. The projects look into themes such as human trafficking, drug prevention, domestic violence, sexuality, alternative ways of conflict resolution and social values.

The fourth task of of Umanzor’s department, the Observatory on Violence, consists of statistical research on the current situation of violence in the country of Costa Rica, but in the specific Cantons of Costa Rica as well. The Observatory on Violence produces two annual reports.

We have seen the wide range of activities a governmental actor can work on to foster a culture of peace. The ministry certainly occupies an important role in the whole peacebuilding sector of Costa Rica, if not the most important. A big advantage of a peace ministry is the legitimacy given to peace promotion activities, as well as the platform available to organizations from all over the country in order to promote their specific model of infrastructures for peace. Furthermore, a large number of projects such as the concrete teaching of social skills can be carried out in schools. As a matter of fact, school age is a crucial stage in the development of a human being and intervening here already can be an important instrument to create a culture of peace in our society.

4. Peace Shuras in Afghanistan

Masood Karokhail (Director of the The Liaison Office (TLO), Afghanistan)
Ulrike Hopp-Nishanka (Deputy Head of the Afghanistan/Pakistan Division at BMZ, Germany)

Masood Karokhail started this session speaking on local peace infrastructures in Afghanistan. Being an Afghan citizen, Karokhail explained at the beginning the rich culture of the Afghan population’s traditions concerning bodies for conflict resolution. He showed that diverse local practices developed mainly due to the absence of the modern State justice system in the distant rural regions of Afghanistan. During the last decades the local informal councils and structures under the direction of elders were gradually formalized on different levels (district, province, region). Nevertheless, a proper connection has historically been missing between the national institutions on the top and the local and regional community structures at the bottom.

In this context, Karokhail explained, elders from the Southeast requested in 2003 to found an infrastructure to fill gaps in the peace- and Statebuilding process, which lead to the creation of the TLO Liaison Office. The tasks of this Office were to:
1. Fill the information gap through conflict analysis and research
2. Fill the inclusion gap through dialogue facilitation between traditional governance mechanisms and the modern State structure
3. Fill the peace and justice gap through alternative dispute resolution infrastructures
4. Fill the survival and resilience gap through alternative livelihoods

There followed the creation of peace conflict resolution bodies on the local, regional and provincial level, which mainly dealt with resource conflicts.

At the same moment, Karokhail told the group, the Afghan High Peace Council was initiated as a body of the Afghanistan Peace and Reintegration Program, appointed by President Hamid Karzai. The aim of the creation of this body was to ameliorate the communication between the Taliban, the government and the international community. According to the Afghan expert Karokhail, two major problems emerged due to the nature of this body. In the first place, the council didn’t relate to the domestic problems of the country but discussed rather macro issues, such as the security of the border with Pakistan. Thus, the Afghan population felt that only external problems irrelevant for their everyday life were addressed and that on the other hand their local problems were neglected. Secondly, the NGOs and CSOs couldn’t join the dialogue table. As Karokhail said, CSOs were regularly accused of being foreign-sponsored and thus not legitimately representing Afghan interests. Through constant lobbying and proving their close cooperation with local structures in 40 areas in the country,
the TLO Liaison Office recently managed to be recognized as a genuine Afghan CSO, and thus succeeded in entering into dialogue with the institutions at top of the country’s government structure.

During his ten years of work, the Liaison Officer followed a set of principles to successfully achieve his goals. Most importantly, he said, was the principle of co-creation. In order to gain legitimacy on the grass-root level, he followed an inclusive bottom-up approach through utilizing the existing local structures. He conceived his activities as participatory and inclusive as possible, bearing in mind that peace can only come when local ownership is achieved, by including men and women, young and old, modern and traditional, religious and secular, majority and minority (especially marginalized communities such as Kuchi nomads and internally displaced populations). He explained the importance of local structures to resolve minor problems that risk to gradually grow into a violent conflict. He experienced a great desire for peace and conflict settlement but understood that the general impression of the populations is that the existing justice structures finally only achieve elite settlement to the detriment of the rest of the population even if respecting the constitution and civil rights.

TLO thus tried to start from the existing informal infrastructures and link them to the formal justice system, for example by reporting the outcomes of the informal conflict settlement structures to official authorities. Secondly, TLO adhered to the humanitarian principles of independence, impartiality and non-discriminative practices, which is of utmost importance when it comes to facilitating between the Afghan government and other stakeholders. Being allied with the government would reduce TLOs credibility and the confidence of local communities and thus complicate dialogue. Thirdly, they encouraged a top down rapprochement and called on the High Peace Council to show greater political will and improve its uneven and ad hoc engagement with CSOs into more systematic, sustained and transparent cooperation, especially at provincial and district level.

Next, Karokhail mentioned the most important successes of the last ten years of work. As a matter of fact, TLO has always been confronted with strong traditional patriarchal structures. Nevertheless, openness was gradually achieved so that discriminative practices such as the exchange of women as a way of resolving conflict could be reduced. Since 2012 TLO has recorded the resolution of 47 conflicts in the areas of Khost, Paktia and Logar, which were mainly resource conflicts or family cases (heritage etc.), thus creating peace on the basic level of Afghan society.

Finally, Karokhail explained the key challenges TLO has to face in the years to come. Most recently the Afghan government acknowledged the important role that civil society organizations play for governance in provinces and districts with shadow governments. They proved to be useful impartial mediators in case of insurgence. According to Karokhail, this is an important step towards a better communication between institutions at the bottom and on top of the Afghan society. The question that now arises is how to balance the cooperation with the government and the HPC in order to stay impartial and not to become co-opted or a tool for executing the government’s interests in the provinces. This question is of vital importance given that the legitimacy of CSOs such as TLO depends on their independence from the national government and the warring factions. Karokhail concluded by underlining the importance of humanitarian principles for the peace building process in Afghanistan.

The second part of the working group meeting was entertained by Ulrike Hopp Nishanka, German researcher in the field of infrastructures for Peace, currently working for the German federal government. As she explained in the beginning, the intention of her presentation entitled Reflection on Potential and Challenges of Creating Infrastructures for Peace was to raise 4 major considerations: the broader context, inclusion, different levels of integration and relevance of I4Ps. According to Hopp-Nishanka, peace infrastructures consist of diverse domestic, inter-connected forms of engagement between conflict parties and other stakeholders. Their organizational elements can be established at all stages of peace and dialogue processes, at all levels of society, and with varying degrees of inclusion. The objective of peace infrastructures is to assist the parties (e.g. through capacity building or advice), the process (e.g. through mediation between the conflict parties or facilitation of public participation), or the implementation of process results (e.g. through monitoring and coordination of agreement implementation). These functions can be complementary and depend on the stage on which the I4P wants to work.

After having discussed the concept of infrastructures for peace, the researcher showed the broader context in which Local Peace Committees have to be considered. According to Hopp-Nishanka, they usually emerge at an early point in time when the level of escalation is still low, similar
to early warning mechanisms. This was the case of many Local Peace Shuras in Afghanistan that were put in place already during the decades before the NATO intervention in 2001. In contrast, secretariats for peace negotiation are usually put in place just right before the moment when conflict escalates. That was the case when the Afghan Peace Council was put in place by President Amid Karzai as a platform for peace negotiation between the warring parties after 2001. Many parties and stakeholders missing, the High Peace Council didn't reach a high level of inclusion.

Hopp-Nishanka stressed the importance of inclusion, of which two forms can be distinguished. In the first case the stakeholders who establish the peace infrastructure and decide its mandate and functions will govern and “own” its elements. In the second case others might be invited to participate in activities but without a governing role. Hopp-Nishanka believes that different conflict stakeholders should be included and help shape the infrastructure, since this will allow for their ownership and acceptance, which in turn makes infrastructures effective. Ideally, more than one would be involved in establishing the peace infrastructure; the peace process in South Africa and many other places suggest that inclusivity is a precondition for effectiveness. On the other hand, she pointed out that inclusion leads to various challenges. In some situations, it concerns including non-State armed groups. Strengthening their capacities is often a requirement for their participation in peace processes and contributes to reducing asymmetry in negotiations. In other situations, it means finding ways to involve so-called spoilers, or stakeholders that others wish to exclude. In Afghanistan, there is both a concern regarding the Taliban, one the one hand, and regarding women, who in some situations establish their own women’s peace shuras.

Furthermore, Hopp-Nishanka suggested that various combinations of inclusion and participation can be conceived. These can range from “conflict parties only” (often found in the context of peace negotiations – peace secretariats or working committees), to “government-civil society” (as in the case of consultative platforms), to “government-all stakeholders” (as found in peace departments or ministries), to “all-party forums” (like local peace councils or truth and reconciliation commissions). This aspect distinguishes peace infrastructure from anything established by civil society alone. The latter could be part of a peace infrastructure but do not suffice for infrastructure establishment.

Closely linked to the aspect of inclusion is the level of collaboration between the included parties. The three aforementioned functions of I4Ps represent increasing levels of collaboration between the conflict parties. Whereas the first function does not involve collaboration between the parties, the second one does: here, organizations often serve as a go-between or a bridge-builder. The third group of functions shows the highest level of collaboration, when conflict parties work together to implement the results of peace agreements or monitor them jointly.

Contrary to the holistic peace building structures in countries such as South Africa, Afghan peace building structures are extremely fragmented with the High Peace Council at the top and many local infrastructures at the bottom. Hopp-Nishanka suggested different levels of integration, namely:

- Vertical integration between different tracks: engaging different societal levels (top, middle, grassroots) and administrative units at local, district, regional and national levels.
- Horizontal integration within the tracks: by bringing together all local peace council activities, or by establishing a regional platform for consultation, collaboration and coordination among stakeholders.
- Consolidation at national government level: providing a legal foundation and appropriate budget for peace infrastructure; establishing a government department or ministry dedicated to peace building and providing guiding policy

Nevertheless, she pointed out that it is crucial to understand that a peacebuilding process has not necessarily to be managed by one single, all-encompassing structure but that it’s also possible to have different elements in an infrastructure, i.e. different organizations that cover different roles. For instance, one organization engages with just one conflict party, such as the insurgents, whereas the other one engages with the government. Finally, there can be others that can try to bring the aforementioned parties together.

Hopp-Nishanka concluded by stressing the relevance of local Afghan I4Ps to manage conflict, de-escalate violence, enhance resilience on the ground, facilitate conflict settlement and dialogue, help to deal with root causes and to contribute to conflict transformation and wider change processes.
CASE STUDY WORKING GROUPS (2ND ROUND)

1. Local Peace Committees in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Jean-Pierre Mfuni Mwanza (Central Africa Conflict Prevention (CACOPA), DRC)
Eric Mongo Malolo (Réseau Haki Na Amani, DRC)

Report unavailable at this time.

2. Local Peace Communities in Colombia

Borja Paladini Adell (Head of REDES-ART Nariño, UNDP Colombia)

Borja Paladini Adell spoke about local peace committees in remote areas of Colombia. He mentioned the importance given by the people to maintaining control over their indigenous peace and decision-making processes. He noted that youth violence is a problem as well. One interesting initiative is the “Leadership school” where women actively form, present, lead process, giving space to the voice of women in national peacebuilding arenas.

Using a natural metaphor, Paladini Adell explained his view of infrastructures for peace. If we think of the image of a forest and the canopy, we realize that there are many roots in the soil, and that every tree grows vertically, competing for sunlight. However, at a certain point the trees stop competing and start cooperating, the branches intertwine, and the canopy is created. If there were no cooperation, the sun would be too strong, the air would be too windy for the trees to thrive.

Talking about his work, he then explained that he focuses on medium- and long-term projects. He uses the idea of “disuendo” - a pun in Spanish between diseño and sueño – which expresses the idea of designing one's dream.

Going over the context of Colombia, Paladini Adell reminded us that there are many actors in conflict in Colombia, with criminals on all sides. Besides the well-know opposition between the national government and the FARC guerrillas, other actors also often evolve into criminal gangs. Within this context, there are many Local Peace Committees (LPCs) in Colombia, as well as regional peace and development programs.

Within the state of Nariño, there are 1.5 million people and 7 indigenous groups. The autonomy is recognized by the State, and the judiciary combines traditional peace and conflict mechanisms with the modern State procedures. However, the LPCs are not functioning well anymore and are weak. This is in part because it is important to support the indigenous processes that LPCs resemble, and not reinvent the wheel. These indigenous processes can in fact be used also to promote local humanitarian development.

Stressing the importance of using local resources to strengthen the relationship with the UN, Paladini Adell said that many are active in the peacebuilding field and there are many initiatives – what is missing is a joint strategy, so that they may also evolve from a forest into a canopy of cooperation and mutually-beneficial support.
3. Peaceful Elections and an Early Warning & Response System

Guyo Liban (Assistant Director for Reconciliation and Integration, National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) and Uwiano Peace Platform Secretariat, Kenya)
Sead Alihodžić (Head of the Elections and Conflict Project, International IDEA, Sweden)

Focusing on the specific issue of elections and early warning and response systems, Guyo Liban started by recounting the conflict that followed the Kenyan elections in December 2007, after which a mediation was carried out. There was a change in the Kenyan constitution and a new governance system was implemented. Following this event, the need for a coordinated approach in conflict intervention was answered with the creation of the UWIANO platform. Its mission is to provide strategic leadership and coordination in Kenya’s peace agenda. It is supported by the United Nations Development Programme, which provides it with funding and technical support. It has links with civil society organizations and two organs named the National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) and the National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC).

Liban explained that their work is to collect data and analyze it, to report and transmit information about any conflict which might happen in the country in order to avoid it. They act like watchers. They also are building a network, in order to optimize their work and their interventions across the country. In this sense, they function as an early warning and response mechanism. They also raise awareness in Kenya on the issues they are working with using newsletters, SMS updates, social networks and the media. They have an emergency response system as well as an emergency response fund, which enables people to quickly transfer funds.

The results of their approach include the fact that they were able to make efficient partnerships at a local and national level. Their strategy for conflict prevention and resolution has been successfully tested. They facilitate dialogue among communities and ethnic groups and try to discourage the use of hate speech.

A big lesson they learnt was that peace building and conflict management should be inclusive and involve all the affected stakeholders in addressing the issue. Moreover, the role of women is key and efficient inter-agency collaboration is necessary. Additional challenges relate to financial limitations, the capacity to respond, and decision-making within the organization.

Sead Alihodžić works to prevent and monitor election-related violence, which manifests in acts of psychological and physical harm. When it happens, the consequences are devastating for the country, especially its economy. In many cases, the perception of the election by the population reflects the election. One of the infrastructures for peace has to do with electoral processes. Elections are made of many components or building blocks, which are all a potential factor of conflict. For instance, contested legislation might provoke ethnic and religious conflicts; inadequate education and training might result in neighborhood or local violence.

Alihodžić emphasized that an early-warning response system is cost-effective. This is an advantage because countries often lack resources. Here are the key components of this concept: to operate in the region of the conflict, to collect micro level data, close to real-time analysis in order to report on them, those who have a mandate to act must manage these operations, to manage elections by organizing meetings with local actors of a given country, to define regions where, during the election, there are conflicts rushes in order to specifically manage these problems.

As recommendations, Alihodžić mentioned enhancing the understanding of electoral processes (electoral phases, linkages and mandates), including election experts in the process, partnering with electoral management bodies and creating incentives for collaboration, as well as collecting and analyzing micro-level data to ensure an early and coordinated multi-layered action.
4. City Peace Commissions and Local Government Initiatives

David Adams (New Haven City Peace Commission and former Director of the International Year for the Culture of Peace, UNESCO)
Christophe Barbey (APRED)

After having talked about his life experiences, David Adams went on to articulate his view on peace. He believes that cities can be containers for creating peace as opposed to nation-States. In terms of States, it is well documented that the larger a State is, the harder it is to create a container for peace. Instead, cities are are densely populated, have well regulated internal governance and the ability to leverage that to create initiatives for peace.

Christophe Barbey went on to explain how in the Canton of Vaud peace has been imbedded within the cantonal constitution. “In all its activities the State [the Canton, not the federal government] shall See that Justice and Peace prevail, and it supports conflict prevention”. § 6.II.c (2003). Even the Constitution of Geneva reads, “In conflictive situations, it is a priority to avoid the use of force, or to limit it. Involved persons ought to cooperate” § 184. Barbey believes that other considerations should also form part of such constitutions:
- A human right to peace
- A participative democratic practice
- A civil peace service
- Peace in education
- International cooperation and development
- A peace ministry
- Policies for the prevention of violence
- Non-violent conflict solving methods
- Methods to avoid, limit or control the use of force.

Barbey believes that Peace is a fundamental right and this again is incorporated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Article 28: “Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.” This legal frameworks show that local governments can do much to promote peace through their structures.

Continuing with a discussion of what national governments are tasked with, which includes national defense and the armed forces, Barbey addressed the relationship between armament and peace. Looking at the countries in the world that are without armies and how they are doing, we see that there are 26 of them, 25 of which are democratic. Comparing these countries with countries with armies of similar size, we notice that the situation of women is better, education is better, and the economy is doing better as well.

“Educating the mind without education the heart is not education at all.” - Aristotle
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Side-event during the 24th Session of the Human Rights Council
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the 2013 International Day of Peace on the theme “Education for Peace”
at the Palais des Nations, United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)

In the context of the 2013 commemoration of the International Day of Peace, a meeting
took place at the Palais des Nations (Geneva) on 20 September focused on the education
for peace and peace as a human right. It was organized by the Global Alliance for
Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace, Spanish Society for International Human
Rights Law, United Network of Young Peacebuilders, International Civil Society
Network on Infrastructures for Peace, Finn Church Aid, Foundation for Dialogue among
Civilizations, World Council of Churches, Japanese Committee on the Human Right to
Peace, International Association of Peace Messenger Cities, Foundation Peace without
Borders, and the support of the Non-Governmental Liaison Unit of the United Nations
Office at Geneva and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent
Societies. The meeting was attended by some 200 participants, among them
representatives of Member States, International Organizations and CSO.

The Moderator, Mr. Ricardo Espinosa opened the commemoration by inviting three
members of the Music Club of the United Nations. The performers were Mr. Kiyoshi
Adachi, violin, Ms. Janet Weiler, double bass and Mr. Michael Wiener, piano

Following this, a video recorded in New York with the message of the Secretary General
of the United Nations, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, on the occasion of World Peace Day was
screened.

The Secretary-General stated that on the International Day of Peace, that the theme for
the Day this year is “Education for Peace”. The United Nations will examine the role
education can play in fostering global citizenship. It is not enough to teach children how
to read, write and count. Education has to cultivate mutual respect for others and the
world in which we live, and help people forge more just, inclusive and peaceful societies.
This kind of education is a central focus of my Global Education First Initiative, which calls on governments to place education at the top of their agenda. He called on everyone – whether governments, parties to conflicts, religious institutions, community leaders, the media, academics, or civil society groups – to play their part. We must support peace education programmes, protect students and teachers from conflict, help rebuild schools destroyed by war, and ensure all girls and boys have access to a quality education that includes learning about resolving and preventing conflicts.

Ms. Kerstin Holst, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Liaison Office in Geneva stated that international day of peace is devoted this year to peace education. This message embodies UNESCO’s founding values: since wars begin in the minds of women and men, it in the minds of women and men that the defences of peace must be constructed. Education is the foundation of any lasting peace. It is the driving force behind freedom and tolerance. It stems the tide of ignorance and mutual misunderstanding, the means by which disagreements all too often degenerate into violence. Education fosters the culture of dialogue that is necessary to resolve conflicts.

After, H.E. Ms. Sylvia Poll, Deputy Permanent Representative of Costa Rica to the United Nations in Geneva, said that 192 years ago, on 15 December 1821, Costa Rica became independent. The whole villages of Costa Rica enacted a constitution called the Concorde Agreement, based on principles of freedom and equality, and, for the first time, established a republican and democratic government. He said that the promotion of coexistence cannot be limited to preventing war and defending political freedoms. Having true independence means for us to work responsibly for a more just, prosperous and safe Costa Rica. She added that a half century ago Costa Rica had a civil war. When the war ended in 1948, Costa Rica took the voluntary decision to abolish the army and to declare peace to the world. Doing this, Costa Rica promised its people not to invest in arms, but in schools, hospitals and areas of preservation of our environment: “Our country promised to dismantle the institutions of violence and to invest in progress and development. Security cannot be achieved with weapons and armies. It is only reached with human development. For this reason, in our society we have eliminated military spending and decided to invest in social affairs instead”.

Mr. Luca Lupoli, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in Geneva, recalled that the first session of the Open Ended Working Group on the right to peace was held in Geneva from 18 to 21 February 2013. At its first meeting, Mr. Christian Guillermet (Deputy Permanent Representative of Costa Rica to the UN in Geneva) was elected as the Chairperson-Rapporteur, by acclamation. He added that on 13 June 2013, the Human Rights Council adopted resolution 23/16 . The Human Rights Council “decided that the working group shall hold its second session for
five working days in 2014, before the twenty-fifth session of the Human Rights Council”. It also “requested the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the working group to conduct informal consultations with Governments, regional groups and relevant stakeholders before the second session of the working group”. Finally, it “requested the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the working group to prepare a new text on the basis of the discussions held during the first session of the working group and on the basis of the inter-sessional informal consultations to be held, and to present it prior to the second session of the working group for consideration and further discussion thereat”.

Dr. Katrien Beeckman, Head of the Principles and Values Department at the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), stressed that education is a way of learning about and understanding the world. It is not religious or political, but is centrally concerned with our shared humanity. At the core of humanitarian action and thinking is a desire to contribute to saving lives and reducing suffering. It helps students examine what motivates people, including themselves, and extends to other societies, times and cultures. It explores the wider issues, sometimes surprisingly complex, that arise when people help each other.

Mr. Oliver Rizzi Carlson (United Network of Young Peacebuilders), co-organizer of *Nesting Peace: Creating Infrastructures to Sustain Diversity*, the Sixth GAMIP Summit, talked about the importance of creating structures for peace learning. Making reference to the theme of this year’s International Day of Peace on “Education for Peace,” Mr. Rizzi Carlson talked about the importance of peace learning for the development of the culture of peace. Although this term can often seem very abstract, there are in fact practical ways to create peace, to institutionalize and support these peace processes. The *Nesting Peace* Summit, in fact, tried to show that – if peace is symbolized by a dove – then that dove needs a place where it can grow and be nourished, rest and procreate. That environment is the nest, and these are the structures that we need to be developing. UNOY Peacebuilders co-organized the *Nesting Peace* event, which was completely organized by youth as an example of an infrastructure for peace itself, which goes to show the important role of youth as peace designers. The pivotal role of sustaining structures for peace learning was reiterated, as well as the idea that even national institutions can function as such structures. Mr. Rizzi Carlson then touched upon the fact that, while infrastructures for peace take many forms, as became evident during the Summit, it is important to be aware of the process that these infrastructures facilitate or “nest,” and the level of government involvement that would be effective in the specific case.

Mr. Rizzi Carlson went on to discuss the main elements that characterize such infrastructures for peace and that make them crucial in the creation of the culture of peace. First, they provide continuity over time, which is essential in a project of cultural
change. Cultures do not change overnight. Second, infrastructures for peace are effective when they are socially supported, as they are meant to form part of the very fabric of the society or community they are in, and to be seen as important and viable systems for conflict transformation. Third, the people affected by conflicts are directly involved in the composition of such systems and their functioning, providing legitimacy and ownership, as well as adaptation and relevance to the local context. Fourth, peace infrastructures need to be flexible and self-changing – not only structures for peace learning, but truly learning structures, i.e. structures that learn.

Mr. Paul Van Tongeren (founder of the International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace) talked about the outcomes of the Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate that took place on September 19, 2013 as part of the Sixth GAMIP Summit. [see outcomes and recommendations in relative appendix.]

Ms. Dorothy J. Maver (President of the US National Peace Academy) talked about the GAMIP Geneva Summit 2013 and the Outcomes for Sustainable Peacebuilding within Governments and Civil Society. [see outcomes in relative section of report.] The Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP) is a worldwide community of individuals from civil society, business and government who are working toward a Culture of Peace by promoting the development of infrastructures for peace. GAMIP had an essential role in the creation of two of the current four Ministries for Peace in the world, those in Nepal and Costa Rica.

Mr. José Luis Gómez del Prado, member of the Spanish Society for International Human Rights Law, stated that one of the latest developments has been the 2010 Santiago Declaration elaborated and presented to the UN Human Rights Council by civil society. The other is the 2012 Draft declaration on the right to peace elaborated by the Advisory Committee at the request of the Human Rights Council. This new instrument based on the 2010 Santiago Declaration has been drafted in consultation with Member States, civil society, academia and all relevant stakeholders. The draft declaration, which is being negotiated by an open-ended intergovernmental working group for its adoption, focuses on standards relating to international peace and security as core standards such as the absence of war and violence. But it also includes standards in the areas of peace education, development, the environment, victims and vulnerable groups as positive elements of peace. He referred to the recent declaration made by former UN Officials on “The Case for Peace” in the context of the Syrian conflict. This declaration is based on the Iraq experienced and the ambiguous and evasive, “right to intervene”.

Mr. Aaro Rytkönen, Director of Advocacy of the Finn Church Aid, stated that the Declaration to be adopted by UN will be focused in the field of peace building and in particular the involvement of religious and traditional leaders and women in peace
mediation, conflict prevention and long-term development cooperation in order to support the premises for peace.

Mr. Jun Sasamoto, Representative of the Japanese Committee on the Human Right to Peace, referred to the Preamble and art. 9 of the Japanese Constitution which are focused on the right to live in peace.

Next, a classical musical piece was performed. The commemoration was then closed by the Moderator after having acknowledged to the organizers, the interpreters, the musical performers, the speakers and the participants.

The original concept note for the event follows.
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1. Introduction

The International Day of Peace, also known as the World Peace Day, occurs annually on 21 September. It is dedicated to peace, and specifically the absence of war, and the Secretary-General calls on a temporary ceasefire in combat zones. It is observed world-wide by many nations, political groups, military groups, and peoples.

This year marked the 31 years of the adoption of resolution 36/67 (1981) and 11 years of the adoption of resolution 55/282 (2001) on the International Day of Peace by the General Assembly. Costa Rica not only recognizes the International Day of Peace, it also was the sponsor of the original resolution establishing the Day in 1981 and 2001 before the General Assembly.

Education for Peace – the official theme for this year's International Day of Peace – provides an opportunity to reflect on the cultural change that peace requires, and the infrastructures that sustain this change towards a Culture of Peace. This is the basis of a truly pragmatic approach to the realization of peace.

2. Background

On 5 July 2012, the HR Council adopted resolution 20/15 on “The promotion of the right to peace”. The resolution welcomed the contribution of CSOs and established an open-ended working group (OEWG) with the mandate of progressively negotiating a draft UN Declaration on the right to peace on the basis of the draft submitted by the Advisory Committee, and without prejudging relevant past, present and future views and proposals.

The adoption of this resolution was a landmark event since a UN resolution on the right to peace was first adopted with the abstention of eleven European States belonging to the HR Council and only one vote against (United States). This achievement was facilitated by the positive role played by multiple actors, including governments and CSOs, along with a very intensive negotiation process. In addition, the new resolution paved the way towards a future work more transparent and constructive within the new OEWG.

The first session of the OEWG was held in Geneva from 18 to 21 February 2013. At its first meeting, Mr. Christian Guillermet (Deputy Permanent Representative of Costa Rica to the UN in Geneva) was elected as the chairperson-rapporteur, by acclamation. He had been nominated by Ecuador on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries.
At its 23rd session (June 2013), the HR Council had before it the first progress report of the OEWG. On 7 June 2013 the plenary of the HR Council discussed the report of the first session of the OEWG on the draft United Nations Declaration on the right to peace prepared by Mr. Christian Guillermet, chairperson-rapporteur. In the general debate, representatives of seven States¹, two International Organizations² and eight CSOs³ took the floor.

On 13 June 2013, the HR Council adopted resolution 23/16 at the initiative of the Community of the Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC) by 30 votes in favor⁴, 9 against⁵ and 8 abstentions⁶. The HR Council “decided that the working group shall hold its second session for five working days in 2014, before the twenty-fifth session of the Human Rights Council”. It also “requested the chairperson-rapporteur of the working group to conduct informal consultations with Governments, regional groups and relevant stakeholders before the second session of the working group”. Finally, it “requested the chairperson-rapporteur of the working group to prepare a new text on the basis of the discussions held during the first session of the working group and on the basis of the inter-sessional informal consultations to be held, and to present it prior to the second session of the working group for consideration and further discussion thereat”.

3. Commemoration

____________________________

1. Algeria, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Holy See, Morocco and Venezuela

2. Organization of the Islamic Cooperation and the Community of the Latin America and Caribbean States (CELAC)


4. Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Ecuador, Guatemala, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Uganda, Uruguay

5. Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Japan, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Spain and the United States of America

6. India, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania and Switzerland
In the context of the 2013 commemoration of the International Day of Peace, a meeting will take place at the Palais des Nations (Geneva) on 20 September 2013 focused on the “The Role of National Institutions in the Promotion of Education for Peace and Peace as a Human Right”. It will be organized by the Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace, the Spanish Society for International Human Rights Law, the United Network of Young Peacebuilders, the International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace, Finn Aid Church, Foundation for Dialogue among Civilizations, World Council of Churches Japanese Committee on the Human Right to Peace, International Association of Peace Messenger Cities and Foundation Peace without Borders, with the support of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation, the African Union, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and the Non-Governmental Liaison Unit of the United Nations Office at Geneva.

The main objectives of the commemoration will be:

• To analyse the topic of the UN 2013 commemoration entitled "Education for Peace".

• To study the role played by the national institutions, and in particular Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace.

• To assess the Human Rights Council resolution 23/16 on "The promotion of the right to peace" of 13 June 2013, which extended the mandate of the open-ended working group on the right to peace.

• To study the role of peace movements in the development and promotion of a sustainable peace based on the respect of all human rights worldwide.

The meeting’s working languages will be English and French. It will be held on 20 September 2013 from 16:30 to 18:10 at the Palais des Nations (Room XXIII).

4. Sixth GAMIP Summit: Infrastructures for Peace

The Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP) is a worldwide community of individuals from civil society, business and government who are working toward a Culture of Peace by promoting the development of infrastructures for peace. GAMIP had an essential role in the creation of two of the current four Ministries for Peace in the world, those in Nepal and Costa Rica. The Ministries for Peace in the Solomon Islands and South Sudan also benefited from this.

National Ministries for Peace, Peace Councils, city peace commissions, restorative justice systems, local peace committees, mediation centers, peace museums and peace academies are all examples of infrastructures for peace.

Infrastructures for peace are social structures that support and facilitate peace processes. Peace processes - including dialogue, reconciliation, mediation, peace education, restorative justice, and many others - need to be implemented within a framework that provides continuity, social support and opportunities for the involvement of all stakeholders. Infrastructures for peace provide that framework, by functioning as implementing mechanisms or as enabling environments of peace.
Infrastructures for peace are establishing a coordinated approach to fostering peace in society, utilizing and modeling conflict resolution and transformation in the regular, sustained manner required for long-term change.

The Sixth GAMIP Summit will take place at the CCV (at CICG) in Geneva on 16-20 September 2013, at a historic moment in the development of infrastructures for peace and peace-building. The Summit will include a Government Seminar on September 19-20, 2013. For the first time, government officials with direct and unique know-how in creating and supporting infrastructures for peace will come together to share their experience and deepen the understanding and practice of infrastructures for peace.

Beyond the governments that have created Ministries for Peace, those that have developed other kinds of peace infrastructures, such as those of Kenya, Ghana, the Philippines, and Kyrgyzstan, as well as UNDP, will also be attending. Numerous similar initiatives by civil society will also be highlighted at the GAMIP Summit, which will thus provide a platform from which to build momentum on this very important approach for the sustainability of peace-building.

Previous GAMIP Summits have been held on all five continents and have gained the support of such noted champions of peace as Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Oscar Arias, his Holiness the Dalai Lama, the Most Reverend Desmond Tutu, and former member of the US House of Representatives Dennis Kucinich.

5. Civil society initiative

Since 2006 the SSIHRL has led a worldwide civil society campaign to promote the adoption by the UN General Assembly of a Universal Declaration of the Human Right to Peace. From 2007 through 2013, the SSIHRL convened around 100 meetings of experts in Asia, Africa, Europe and the Americas, including the participation in all relevant sessions of the HR Council and its Advisory Committee, thus submitting oral and written CSO joint statements on issues related to the human right to peace.

The CSOs international legislative initiative successfully culminated the consultation process with international civil society in the International Congress on the Human Right to Peace, which took place in Santiago de Compostela (Spain) on 9 and 10 December 2010 in the context of the World Social Forum on Education for Peace. On 10 December 2010 two important resolutions were approved by consensus, namely:

Firstly, the Santiago Declaration on the Human Right to Peace, which encapsulated the aspirations of the international civil society aiming at the codification of the human right to peace. It was then submitted to the consideration of the HR Council and its Advisory Committee.

Secondly, the Statutes of the International Observatory of the Human Right to Peace (IOHRP), which is operative since 10 March 2011 provisionally as a part of the SSIHRL, benefiting from the wide experience accumulated throughout its five-year World Campaign on the human right to peace. It has received the support of some 2,000 CSOs, as well as of numerous public institutions and 22 Member States of the Ibero American Summit.
DRAFT PROGRAMME OF WORK

COMMEMORATION of the INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PEACE

Geneva, 20 September 2013

16:30 - 16:35

The commemoration will be opened with a classical musical piece performed by a soprano and an ensemble of three musicians (UN Music Club)

Ms. Claire Giulini, soprano
Mr. Amaryllis Roper, cello
Mr. Olivier Murray, flute
Mr. Michael Wiener, piano

16:35 - 16:45

Broadcasting of the Secretary-General video message on the occasion of the International Day of Peace.

H. E. Mr. Kassym-Jomart Tokayev, Director-General of United Nations Office at Geneva (invited)

"The role of the United Nations in the promotion of education for peace"

16:45 - 17:15

Meeting on "The Role of National Institutions in the Promotion of Education for Peace and Peace as a Human Right"

Moderator:

Mr. Ricardo Espinosa, Chief, Non-governmental Liaison Unit, United Nations Office at Geneva.
Speakers:

H.E. Mr. Manuel Dengo, Permanent Representative of Costa Rica to the UN Geneva in Geneva (to be confirmed)

“The role of Costa Rica in the promotion of peace and education as fundamental human rights”

Ms. Kerstin Holst, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Liaison Office in Geneva

"The Culture of Peace as a means to promote peace, dialogue and human rights"

Ms. Maria Vivar, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in Geneva

“The regulation of peace and human rights under the international law”

Dr. Katrien Beeckman, Head of the Principles and Values Department at the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)

“The contribution of Red Cross Red Crescent National Societies to the promotion of a culture of peace through non-formal education”

17:15 – 18:00

In addition, the following CSO representatives will brief the audience on the progressive development of education in and peace as a human right:

Mr. Oliver Rizzi Carlson, United Network of Young Peacebuilders and Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace

“Realizing peace systematically through sustaining structures for peace learning”

Mr. José Luis Gómez del Prado, member of the Spanish Society for International Human Rights Law

"The right to education for peace in the 2010 Santiago Declaration and the 2012 Advisory Committee’s declaration on the right to peace”

Mr. Aaro Rytkönen, Director of Advocacy of the Finn Church Aid
Why people and Governments will benefit from human right to peace?

Mr. Jun Sasamoto, Representative of the Japanese Committee on the Human Right to Peace

“The Japanese perspective of the Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace”

Mr. Paul Van Tongeren, founder of the International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace

“Increasing interest in 'Infrastructures for Peace' (I4P) in many countries: conclusions from Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate of September 19, 2013”

Mrs. Karen Barensché, President of the Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP)

“GAMIP Geneva Summit 2013: Outcomes for Sustainable Peacebuilding within Governments and Civil Society”

18:05 - 18:10

The commemoration will be closed with a classical musical piece performed by a soprano and an ensemble of three musicians (UN Music Club).

Ms. Claire Giulini, soprano
Mr. Amaryllis Roper, cello
Mr. Olivier Murray, flute
Mr. Michael Wiener, piano

Simultaneous interpretation into English and Spanish shall be provided.
E. Handouts and Innovative Formats Descriptions