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ABOUT THE GLOBAL ACTION AGAINST MASS ATROCITY CRIMES

The Global Action Against Mass Atrocity Crimes (GAAMAC) is a global inclusive network of states, civil society and academic institutions that aim to support states in establishing national architectures and policies for the early and permanent prevention of atrocities. As a platform, GAAMAC convenes its diverse community in-person and online to openly share good practices, expertise and experiences without pointing fingers and to look instead for concrete and feasible solutions. Since 2013, it organizes global meetings every two years.

www.gaamac.org

ABOUT THE AFRICA WORKING GROUP

The GAAMAC Africa Working Group (AWG) is one of the regional initiatives originally created during the GAAMAC II conference held in Manila, the Philippines, from 2-4 February 2016. The AWG is made up of a cross-section of practitioners, academics and policymakers working on mass atrocity prevention in the African continent. Following from the GAAMAC II meeting, the AWG produced the Manual on Best Practices for the Establishment and Management of National Mechanisms for Genocide and Mass Atrocities Prevention, from which this toolkit has been elaborated. The toolkit relies heavily on the experiences of members of the AWG, many of whom are also members of various National Mechanisms for genocide and mass atrocity prevention.

www.gaamac.org/africa-working-group
INTRODUCTION TO THE TOOLKIT

National Mechanisms have been widely acknowledged as one of the most effective means of promoting local ownership and participation towards mass atrocity prevention, building resilience and sustaining peace in the world. Based on their success in varying contexts, particularly in parts of Africa and Latin America, National Mechanisms have become a blueprint for mass atrocity prevention and local peacebuilding. In Africa, National Mechanisms have contributed significantly to preventing and deterring mass atrocity crimes in jurisdictions where they are operational, prompting a surge to replicate their success in other parts of the continent. However, these mechanisms sometimes face a gamut of limitations that include an inadequate capacity for early response, challenges with long-term sustainability and the exclusion of key stakeholders such as women’s groups, the youth and indigenous actors.

In April 2019, the Africa Working Group (AWG) under the Global Action against Mass Atrocity Crimes (GAAMAC) developed the *Manual on Best Practices for the Establishment and Management of National Mechanisms for Genocide and Mass Atrocities Prevention* to address some of these challenges by providing guidance for the establishment and management of National Mechanisms. This toolkit serves to elaborate the Manual into a practical capacity building and implementation guide for actors and practitioners in mass atrocity prevention.

The toolkit provides users with skills and knowledge that will help to navigate the processes towards understanding what National Mechanisms are, and how they function. It makes use of exercises, discussions, case examples, illustrations and additional reference material to explain and expound on concepts and structures. It is hoped that by undertaking these exercises, the user will be able to develop skills and ideas and relate them to their own contexts. To derive maximum benefit from this toolkit, the user should be familiar with the Manual, although it is not a requirement. Where necessary, hyperlinks or references to specific pages of the Manual have been included in addition to relevant portions of the Manual extracted, summarized and explained.
Documentation and Structure of the Toolkit

SECTION 1: UNDERSTANDING NATIONAL MECHANISMS

**MODULE 1** provides an introduction to National Mechanisms by highlighting conceptual issues and the mandates of existing structures as well as their relationships with global prevention architectures.

SECTION 2: ESTABLISHING NATIONAL MECHANISMS

**MODULE 2** highlights the components that enable National Mechanisms to function effectively, including values and principles, and national and international legal and institutional frameworks that provide legitimacy for their existence.

**MODULE 3** discusses the different approaches to establishing National Mechanisms, under what circumstance they are employed, and their significance.

SECTION 3: MANAGING AND REINFORCING NATIONAL MECHANISMS

**MODULE 4** addresses some of the critical functions of National Mechanisms, with preventive action at its core. It provides insights into risk identification and analysis for early warning and response measures.

**MODULE 5** provides a practical guide to conceptualizing programmes to respond to certain risks. It further touches on the important question of owning and sustaining National Mechanisms, building capacity for mass atrocity prevention and gender-sensitive programming.

**MODULE 6** covers inclusivity and harnessing the strengths of critical actors for mass atrocity prevention. The module answers the question of how and why it is important to engage certain stakeholders and some of the tools that can facilitate the process of engagement.

SECTION 4: PUTTING THEORY INTO PRACTICE

**MODULE 7** entails a practical simulation exercise developed for a fictitious African country. It presents a problem that must be addressed by participants through creative thinking and role play.
Each module opens with an overview, learning outcomes and lesson map. It also breaks down the estimated timing. Modules are broken down into four to ten units, each composed of a theoretical and a practical part. Units have their own resources list, and each module ends with a more detailed bibliography.

The annexes contain material that may need handing out to trainees:

- The details of two activities (the action plans in Module 6 and the simulation in Module 7)
- The overall evaluation questionnaire and module evaluation forms

**Who can use the toolkit?**

This toolkit is intended for actors or practitioners with an interest in building capacity to establish or promote the effective management of National Mechanisms. It is designed to address the atypical capacity needs of state agencies or officials interested in mass atrocity prevention, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community-based groups, trainers and mass atrocity prevention practitioners in Africa. Trainers looking to utilize this toolkit are required to possess at least a basic understanding of, or practical experience with, mass atrocity prevention in order to appreciate the contents.

Nonetheless, training designed from the toolkit can be tailored to the needs of actors and participants with little to no experience in mass atrocity prevention or National Mechanisms for mass atrocity prevention. Any such training will be most beneficial if participants are assembled from diverse backgrounds and experiences as the exercises have been designed with this in mind.

While cognizant of the fact that National Mechanisms may not exist in certain contexts or jurisdictions, and others are at various stages of establishment and operationalization, this toolkit is not designed for a whole-of-system application. Instead, practitioners may utilize and apply relevant modules to the needs of their specific contexts. Without being prescriptive, it is anticipated that the following contexts may fit the specific modules indicated against them to be more useful:

- Transitional countries, countries emerging from civil war and countries that have experienced mass atrocity crimes in the past: modules 3, 4 and 6;
- Functioning democracies with no history of mass atrocity crimes: modules 4, 5, and 6; and
- Countries without a National mechanism for mass atrocity prevention: all modules.

1 While this toolkit may be relevant to other contexts outside the African continent, it is specifically designed to cater to the peculiarities of stakeholders dedicated to mass atrocity prevention in Africa. All examples, cases and discussions are modelled on African experiences.
Duration and Modalities of the Capacity Building

This toolkit is planned to be delivered over a period of six days. Modules 1, 2, 3 and 5 take a maximum of five hours of teaching each and Modules 4 and 6 over six hours of teaching each. Trainers should use their discretion to compress or expand modules to fit the constraints of their time.

While the modules are interrelated and designed to convey skills and knowledge in a consistent manner, they can also be delivered independently, except for Modules 1 and 2 which should sequentially be utilized together. Modules 1 and 2 are also a prerequisite for Module 3. Modules 4, 5 and 6 can be utilized independently of one another and in no particular sequence. However, to have the full benefit of the simulation exercise in Module 7, participants must have completed all preceding six modules.

This toolkit is best utilized for training or capacity building employing an adult learning methodology. A collaborative problem-based learning approach is best suited to the delivery of the modules in this toolkit. Trainers should rely more on the experiences of participants, by acting as facilitator. Where discussion questions and exercises have been issued, corresponding responses or explanations have been provided, either directly through background notes or via reference to specific texts.

The minimum number of participants for effective delivery of training using this toolkit is at the discretion of the trainer. It is, however, important to note that the ideal class size may vary from one module to another. The trainer should ensure that the number of participants adequately reflects the diversity and experiences necessary to promote effective discussion and learning.

Comments and Suggestions

This toolkit may be reviewed periodically to reflect new updates, best practices and emerging trends in building effective National Mechanisms for mass atrocity prevention. Please send your comments and suggestions regarding this toolkit to contact@gaamac.org
SECTION 1
UNDERSTANDING NATIONAL MECHANISMS
MODULE OVERVIEW

National Mechanisms have increasingly become the main vehicle for the advancement of an organized systematic approach towards the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, collectively referred to as mass atrocity crimes. Their inclination to include and engage a broad spectrum of representatives from all aspects of society make National Mechanisms more suited to creating formal avenues to identify and assess risks, mobilize resources, build sustainable relationships and deploy timely strategies for mass atrocity prevention. While states are primarily responsible for the prevention of mass atrocity crimes, it is well established that preventive policies and actions are more effective and sustainable if they are inclusive, representative of the diverse aspects of society and locally owned and driven. National Mechanisms are relatively new, yet represents an effective means of preventing mass atrocity crimes.

This module presents an overview of National Mechanisms for the prevention of mass atrocity crimes, including their mandates and functions, common actor identification and general relationships with global mass atrocity crimes prevention architectures.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of the module, participants should be able to:

- Explain the historical background behind National Mechanisms for the prevention of mass atrocities;
- Classify different architectures, mandates and functions of National Mechanisms for the prevention of mass atrocities; and
- Categorize different relationships between National Mechanisms and global mass atrocity crimes prevention architectures including mapping of actors and their mandates.
LESSON MAP

UNIT 1
Historical Background of National Mechanisms

UNIT 2
Conceptualizing National Mechanisms

UNIT 3
Mandates, Types and Functions of National Mechanisms

UNIT 4
Mapping National Mechanisms’ Actors and their Mandates

ESTIMATED TIMING

This module should take approximately 4 hours and 30 minutes to deliver.
Mass atrocity crimes show the extent of human cruelty. Men and women have been killed in large numbers simply because of their identity or often tenuous perceived threats they pose. The movement towards advancing the norm of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) has grown from a recognition of the global community’s abysmal response to the 20th century’s grotesque and morally indefensible mass atrocity crimes. Over the decades, the desire to respond to these unacceptable assaults on human dignity has prompted the promotion of international norms and agreements including the Genocide Convention, Geneva Conventions, the Rome Statute, protection of civilians and R2P. The concept of R2P asserts the primary responsibility of states to protect their own populations from genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity; the responsibility of the international community to assist willing states develop their capacities to protect their populations; and the responsibility of the international community, under the direction of the UN Security Council, to respond decisively to situations where states fail to protect their populations. There is a general recognition that prevention is the main objective of R2P.

In implementing the R2P norm, National Mechanisms have emerged as the most effective means of preventing and responding to mass atrocity crimes on the African continent and elsewhere. National Mechanisms do not derive from a single source or history. They could be rooted in age-old cultural practices, historical experiences or evolve from states’ commitment to international and regional norms. For instance, the National Peace Council (NPC) of Ghana emerged from interventions in response to persistent local conflicts in the northern part of the country, whereas the Gacaca system in Rwanda was shaped from existing traditional practices in response to the 1994 genocide. In the Great Lakes region, National Mechanisms were established following the ratification of the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region pact by the Member States.

Other countries have also consciously established National Mechanisms in a bid to prevent and punish acts of genocide and crimes against humanity. However, the current drive towards promoting National Mechanisms for atrocity prevention developed from a general recognition of the effectiveness of inclusive, locally owned and locally led approaches to prevention. While many of these mechanisms have existed for a while, National Mechanisms have especially gained international momentum since 2009 when the UN Secretary-General, through
his report *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect*, encouraged the Member States to integrate the mass atrocity prevention principles into local values and standards.

**Further reading**


**ACTIVITY 1**

1. Engage participants for 20 minutes in interactive conversations on why the Genocide Convention and R2P norm came into being.
   - What necessitated the adoption of the Genocide Convention?
   - Why was R2P adopted in spite of all the preceding international laws on genocide and war crimes?

2. Show a short video documentary “the Genocide Convention: A Call for Action”. Summarize key points and close session.
UNIT 2: CONCEPTUALIZING NATIONAL MECHANISMS

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 60 MINUTES

20 minutes for group discussions, 40 minutes for presentations (subject to the number of groups), and 20 minutes for closing discussion.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Understand what National Mechanisms are, as well as their purpose, features and specificities.

National Mechanisms are variously defined by scholars and practitioners. The Africa Working Group defines them as “formal organizations established for the purpose of preventing atrocities and promoting the responsibility of states towards this goal. [They may include] representatives from government, civil society, academia and other sectors relevant to atrocity prevention and operating at national level”.\(^2\) Academics such as Samantha Capicotto and Rob Scharf define National Mechanisms as “officially established bodies that include representatives from multiple areas of government relevant to the prevention of atrocity crimes”.\(^3\)

The common thread in the above definitions points to National Mechanisms as the formal institutions, structures, resources and skills through which mass atrocity crimes can be prevented and peace sustained within a society. National Mechanisms are conceptualized differently in different contexts. They are often related to and described as “infrastructures for peace” or “national architecture for peace” even if they play similar roles.

In other words, National Mechanisms may differ from state to state and be known by different labels in different contexts. In Liberia, it could be a national ‘Palava Hut’ system, or in Nigeria a National Peace Committee, or in Niger a National Council for Political Dialogue. They could also look like the Gacaca system in Rwanda, or the Kenyan, Ugandan and Tanzanian National Committees for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, War Crimes, Crimes against Humanity and All Forms of Discrimination.

**Essential Features of National Mechanisms**

Creating systems that work for mass atrocity crimes prevention takes time and must be methodical. Otherwise, it would not be different from mere peacebuilding endeavours which may not address the peculiar challenges that come with mass atrocity crimes. For National Mechanisms to be effective, they must possess the following core ingredients:


- **Inclusivity**: Include representatives from different and diverse sectors of society.
- **Legitimacy**: Must be backed by appropriate legislation or widely accepted across society.
- **Institutionalization**: Must operate in a formalized or organized structure.

**Relevance of National Mechanisms**

While National Mechanisms may be complemented by other processes for mass atrocity prevention, they are preferred over other mechanisms because of the following:

- **More effective, less expensive**: The ability to identify mass atrocity risks early enables timely intervention. Early proactive intervention requires less effort and is less costly.
- **More sustainable**: Externally driven approaches to mass atrocity prevention are reactive and rarely sustainable. National Mechanisms derive from existing networks, relationships and resources, and are therefore more likely to stand the test of time.

**Relationships between National Mechanisms and Global Prevention Architectures**

National Mechanisms may be a creation of national legislation but they also enable states to fulfill their obligations under international law. While National Mechanisms may indicate states’ efforts at domesticating international norms and conventions, they should also align with global prevention architectures such as the Genocide Convention, the Rome Statute, and other relevant international treaties and regional protocols relating to the prevention and punishment of mass atrocity crimes.

**Further reading**

- Article by William A. Awinador-Kanyirige on “Ghana’s National Peace Council”.

**ACTIVITY 2**

1. Highlight the definitions of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity.
2. Show a short video documentary on Rwanda “When Good Men Do Nothing” and discuss with participants on how National Mechanisms can prevent a future genocide.
3. Initiate a plenary discussion on what National Mechanisms exist in different contexts in Africa.
UNIT 3: MANDATES, TYPES AND FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL MECHANISMS

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 80 MINUTES

20 minutes for group discussions, 40 minutes for presentations (subject to the number of groups), and 20 minutes for closing discussion.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Discuss what mechanisms are appropriate for what contexts, and the mandates that facilitate the effective functioning of specific National Mechanisms.

The mandate and functions of National Mechanisms revolve around four major themes:

- Risk and vulnerability assessments to detect mass atrocity crime patterns and trends and to inform early action.
- Building capacity of relevant national and local actors for prevention.
- Elaborating and advocating for policies to guide the mass atrocity prevention work of state and non-state actors.
- Building and sustaining partnerships between state and non-state actors, at the local and international level, on issues related to mass atrocity prevention.

It is important to note that the mandate and functions of National Mechanisms can be heavily influenced by the specific context. For instance, countries that have experienced mass atrocity crimes or violent conflict in the recent past may be more interested in mechanisms for accountability and building resilience. Those emerging from dictatorship may find a reconciliation mandate or measures at promoting dialogue more important. On the other hand, democratically stable countries may be more inclined towards measures aimed at consolidation such as preventing election-related violence and reinforcing the rule of law. These varying contexts are ultimately reflected in the mandates and consequently the functions of National Mechanisms. Nonetheless, the mandate and function of National Mechanisms require a thorough and systematic assessment of the contextual risks and vulnerabilities. Trainers should refer to Module 4 for a discussion of risk factors for mass atrocity crimes and relate it to crafting a specific mandate for National Mechanisms.
Further reading


ACTIVITY 3

1. Assemble the participants into groups of three persons, ensuring the group is balanced and diverse enough to generate different opinions.

2. Vary the context for each group (i.e. stable democracies, transitional countries, dictatorships, countries with a history of mass atrocity crimes) to test how specific environments can shape the mandate of National Mechanisms. Each group should do the following activity:
   - You are to serve as consultants to the Government of Jangiga in establishing the National Mechanism for mass atrocity crimes prevention in that country and are expected to come up with the mandate and functions of the National Mechanism.
   - Provide, in bullet point form, issues you will take into consideration to form the mandate of such an instrument for the Jangiga Republic.

3. Allow 10 minutes for each group’s presentation and for the open plenary discussion.

4. Summarize key points to close session.
UNIT 4: MAPPING NATIONAL MECHANISMS ACTORS AND THEIR MANDATES

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 80 MINUTES

20 minutes for preparatory discussions, 40 minutes for group presentations (subject to the number of groups) and 20 minutes for closing discussion.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Identify actors relevant to the effective functioning of National Mechanisms and the roles applicable to them.

The need to identify mass atrocity crimes prevention stakeholders is important. However, more important is the ability to build and manage relationships of various stakeholders across the local, national, regional and international levels. This unit would therefore enable participants to classify mass atrocities prevention actors and their mandates across multiple levels of the society. Three major categories of actors can be identified as relevant for the effective functioning of National Mechanisms:

- State actors
- Local and international non-state actors
- Intergovernmental actors

State Actors

States represent the most significant actors in the prevention of mass atrocity crimes in that they bear the primary responsibility to protect populations and can greatly influence the actions of the other two major categories of actors (intergovernmental actors and non-state actors). National Mechanisms cannot function effectively without state support in the form of providing an enabling environment for prevention. The establishment of most National Mechanisms requires significant involvement of the state to succeed. Legal and judicial processes for mass atrocity prevention, as well as crucial resources to support the operationalization of the mechanism mostly emanate from the state. State actors include, for example:

- executive bodies
- legislative bodies
- judiciary bodies
- security and law enforcement agencies
- independent commissions
Local and International Non-State Actors

Non-state actors play a crucial and diverse role in the establishment and functioning of National Mechanisms. Traditional authorities, religious leaders and other civil society groups have usually played roles ranging from mediation, early warning and conflict resolution, to the provision of funding support and local knowledge for the effective functioning of National Mechanisms. Suffice to say that whereas the state plays a crucial role in enabling the mechanism, non-state actors provide the ingredients that often underpin capacity, legitimacy, ownership and sense of inclusiveness, without which National Mechanisms cannot be effective. Non-state actors can include, for example:

- traditional authorities
- religious leaders
- civil society organizations
- media
- private corporations and businesses
- community-based organizations
- academic and research institutions
- women’s groups
- youth groups

Intergovernmental Actors

Intergovernmental actors provide strategic, political and functional support to National Mechanisms. From agenda setting through the adoption of legal frameworks to funding and advocacy, these actors have influenced the effectiveness of National Mechanisms in many ways. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), for instance, was instrumental in the establishment of the NPC of Ghana, and has been providing technical and logistical support to enable it to function effectively. Intergovernmental actors include:

- extra-continental bodies (the UN and its agencies; the European Union)
- continental bodies (the African Union and its agencies)
- regional and sub-regional bodies (Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS); Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS); Southern African Development Community (SADC); North African Regional Capability (NARC); Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD); International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR)
- bilateral institutions (other governments; foreign embassies)
Figure 1.1. Main Actors Involved in the Effective Functioning of National Mechanisms
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Further reading

- See also pages 4-5 of Ghana’s National Peace Council Act, 2011 (Act 818) for composition of the Council.

### ACTIVITY 4

1. Divide participants into groups as appropriate. This activity may also be conducted for individual participants to allow for utilization of specific country cases.

2. Task participants to identify relevant actors and group them under the three broad categories of stakeholders (state actors; local and international non-state actors; intergovernmental actors).

3. Participants will then be required to indicate the roles or relevance of the identified actors. These may include actors that form a core component of National Mechanisms (policy makers, institutional support partners, oversight bodies or other service providers).

4. Allow each group 15 minutes to present its findings.

5. Open for discussion and summarize key issues.


Eric Herring, 2012, “Rwanda ‘When Good Men Do Nothing’”, YouTube. Available at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uGvp7Jw3uAA&t=318s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uGvp7Jw3uAA&t=318s)


MODULE OVERVIEW

This module elaborates on the values and components that enable National Mechanisms to function, as well as the normative frameworks underpinning atrocity prevention. National Mechanisms function efficiently and effectively if they have a carefully planned organizational structure and strong normative foundations upon which the mandate and programming are based. Without these ingredients, it will be difficult for any national arrangement to assume the organizational form that enables it to function as a National Mechanism. This module locates the common core values and principles that guide the establishment of National Mechanisms, as well as their unique structures. It also outlines the national and international legal and institutional frameworks that inform National Mechanisms.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of this module, participants will be able to:

- Identify suitable standards that must be met in the establishment of National Mechanisms;
- Specify the operational structure of a National Mechanism in a given context; and
- Explain the national, regional and international norms and legal frameworks that reinforce National Mechanisms.
LESSON MAP

UNIT 1
Values and Principles in Establishing National Mechanisms

UNIT 2
Organs of the National Mechanism

UNIT 3
Programmes and Activities

UNIT 4
Regional and International Norms and Regulations

UNIT 5
Domestic Laws and Regulations Establishing National Mechanisms

ESTIMATED TIMING

This module should take approximately 4 hours and 20 minutes to deliver.
UNIT 1: VALUES AND PRINCIPLES IN ESTABLISHING NATIONAL MECHANISMS

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 60 MINUTES

20 minutes for mini lecture, 30 minutes for brainstorming, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Explain the values and principles that establish an organizational culture to facilitate the prevention work of National Mechanisms.

Values refer to fundamental beliefs, whereas principles are guides to conduct or behaviour. National Mechanisms must have explicit values and principles in order to be effective in adapting their tenets to their overall vision. When values and principles are clearly expressed, they influence the behaviours which will reflect organizations’ values. The creation of values and principles is the first and most important step in the implementation of change. They help to establish acceptable culture that employees of an organization will operate within. All ranks of personnel have a duty to realize these values and principles and to exemplify them in their daily engagements and relations. National Mechanisms must exhibit values and principles that are consistent with mass atrocity prevention practices such as respect for diversity, non-discrimination, dialogue, cooperation, inclusivity, transparency and accountability.

How to create values and principles consistent with mass atrocity prevention

- Assemble a multi-functional team to manage and oversee the creation of the values and principles. The team should be composed of members with sensitivity to values and principles that are consistent with atrocity prevention.
- Organize an inclusive process of listing and organizing appropriate values and principles into categories. It is important that the listed values and principles provide an overall framework within which to situate the mandate of the National Mechanism, with prevention at its core.
- Shortlist a set of values and principles appropriate to the local cultural context.
- Develop acceptable standard behaviours and actions that relate to the identified values and principles.
- Engage and sensitize employees to gain understanding and commitment.
Setting the vision, mission, functions and objectives for National Mechanisms

While some National Mechanisms have explicitly stated mass atrocity prevention in their mission and vision, there are many others that continue to perform similar functions without specific mention of the norm. However, prevention has remained a constant feature of all or most National Mechanisms, under which mass atrocity prevention can be subsumed. In practice, it is common for National Mechanisms to have broad vision and mission statements to accommodate a wide range of prevention-related functions.

The following are some of the necessary points to consider in setting the vision and mission of National Mechanisms:

- Clarity of vision, mission and objectives set by a National Mechanism to provide direction and indicating how prevention should look at local level, including a description of the intended outcomes;
- Flexibility that allows a range of actions to be taken in evolving mass atrocity situations, e.g. conducting peace forums in the short term, which can inform the development of a national policy in the long term;
- Be able to facilitate programming by allowing those responsible for implementation to understand, plan in greater detail and undertake relevant activities more effectively; and
- Utilize traditional frameworks for setting Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART) goals providing good practices to ensure that prevention is not only achievable, but also effective and can be assessed to determine progress towards peace.

Box 2.1. Case Study: The National Peace Council of Ghana

**Vision:** The National Peace Council’s vision is to have a country characterized by a dynamic environment where people can engage in their lawful activities confident that the institutions, mechanisms and capacities for mediating differences and grievance are effective and responsive.

**Mission:** The National Peace Council will facilitate the development of mechanisms for cooperation among all relevant stakeholders in peacebuilding in Ghana by promoting cooperative problem solving for conflicts and by institutionalizing the processes of response to conflicts to produce outcomes that lead to conflict transformation; social, political and religious reconciliation; and transformative dialogues.

**Objective:** The object of the Council is to facilitate and develop mechanisms for conflict prevention, management and resolution, and to build sustainable peace in the country.
Further reading

- Flipchart papers for brainstorming.

**ACTIVITY 1**

1. Brainstorm with participants on what values and principles will best support the organization and function of National Mechanisms.
2. Engage participants in plenary discussion on the necessary points to consider in setting the vision and mission of National Mechanisms.
3. End session with a summary of key issues and invite questions and comments.
The organs of National Mechanisms comprise an organizational structure that enables the management and operational performance of the organization. This includes the functional organs and hierarchical relationships between departments, managers and employees. National Mechanisms have diverse organizational structures, ranging from highly centralized to decentralized structures, from strictly formalized to semi-formal structures, and from lean to diffused structures. In the Great Lakes region, most National Mechanisms have centralized structures that are concentrated at the national level. However, National Mechanisms such as the National Peace Council (NPC) of Ghana have a structure that is decentralized to the regional and district levels.

While the organizational structure of National Mechanisms varies from one context to another, common features may include the following:

A National Board or Committee headed by a Chairperson who is supported by a Secretariat. The Board or Committee is usually composed of a diverse, multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary membership with geographic, regional, gender, religious and ethnic representation. State representation is also critical for the effective functioning and sustainability of National Mechanisms since the state bears primary responsibility for ensuring protection of the population.

Common Functional Organs, which may include the following:

- Administration and human resources
- Research
- Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)
- Early warning and response, conflict resolution and management
- Capacity development and outreach
- Finance
- Media and public relations
Further reading


### ACTIVITY 2

Invite questions and answers from participants. Discussion could focus on the following:

- What organizational structure is best suited for the effective functioning of national mechanisms?
- Are there specific cultural values that are considered more important in establishing national mechanisms?
- What functional organs would you prescribe for your National Mechanism and why?
UNIT 3: PROGRAMMES AND ACTIVITIES

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 60 MINUTES

30 minutes for presentation, 20 minutes for plenary discussion, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVES

■ Provide an overview of common programmes and activities undertaken by national mechanisms; and
■ Highlight the relevance of legal mandate to programmes and activities.

National Mechanisms derive their programmes and activities from their mandate, which devolves from the legal frameworks establishing the National Mechanism. Prevention is a critical aspect of programming. However, common programmes and activities may range from early warning and response, conflict resolution, local capacity building, dialogue and mediation, policy formulation and advocacy, and the partnering of state agencies and civil society organizations to implementing prevention initiatives. The trainer should highlight common programmes and activities undertaken by National Mechanisms. Since prevention is an evolving process, the trainer should mention the importance of ensuring that the mandate of National Mechanisms creates space for programmes and activities to be developed to respond to new and emerging issues in a given context. The programmes and activities of National Mechanisms should be guided by clear policies to ensure transparency and accountability as well as effective Monitoring and Evaluation. Module 5 of this toolkit addresses programming for prevention more extensively.

Policies and Procedures for National Mechanisms

Once established, National Mechanisms require clear policies to formalize roles, responsibilities and work procedures, the actions to be implemented and their intended outcomes. Effective governance of National Mechanisms will maintain clear strategic goals to guide performance and direct all activities to ensure they are undertaken in the best interest of mass atrocity prevention.

National Mechanisms should therefore have:

■ A vision and mission statement.
■ Clear and lean management structures.
■ Rules of procedure and lines of reporting.
■ Annual work plans and performance evaluation guidelines with monitoring indicators.
■ Job descriptions and other staff engagement procedures.
■ Financial management and reporting policies and procedures.
■ Code of conduct for members of National Mechanisms.
National Mechanisms may build on existing international law and legal obligations of states to prevent mass atrocity crimes and promote peace. These include the legal duty to prevent genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. Such legal obligations are codified in international humanitarian law which is found in the four Geneva Conventions, as well as customary international law of armed conflicts. The Genocide Convention also obligates states to prevent and punish acts of genocide under any circumstance. Membership in international human rights organizations further enjoins states to promulgate laws that protect freedoms and human dignity. Many African states have acceded to these international laws and have further domesticated them in national laws.

Other international laws and statutes such as the Rome Statute and subsequent political stipulations such as the 2005 World Summit Outcome carry various degrees of commitment to prevention and punishment of mass atrocity crimes. Through these, states are encouraged to establish mechanisms to prevent and/or respond to actual and potential mass atrocity crimes.
Table 2.1. Status of Ratification of International Instruments on Mass Atrocity Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Rep. of the Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Accurate as at January 2021.
5 UN World Summit Outcome Document 2005: This is a political commitment by the member states present and does not directly impose a legal obligation on states. “Yes” represents the member states that supported the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) during the plenary debate at the World Summit. “No” refers to the member states that opposed or did not openly support R2P during the debate. “-” represents uncertain position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of the Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé and Príncipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further reading**

- Read the Genocide Convention, Geneva Conventions, Rome Statute and World Summit Outcome Document.

**ACTIVITY 4**

1. Engage participants in a plenary discussion on the status of ratification of international laws on mass atrocity crimes by African states (Refer to Table 2.1 above).

2. End session with a brief discussion on cases where international laws have been invoked to respond to mass atrocity crimes. E.g. the cases of Darfur (Al Bashir case), Kenya (Kenyatta, Ruto and Sang cases), Libya and Côte d'Ivoire (Gbagbo and Blé Goudé case).
One of the obligations emanating from being party to various international and regional treaties and other instruments is the requirement to domesticate these instruments into national laws and create a mechanism that enables legitimate operationalization. National Mechanisms can therefore source domestic laws and regulations from international obligations. For instance, several member states in the Great Lakes region of Africa have enacted national legislation to prevent and punish acts of genocide and other crimes against humanity through membership of the ICGLR and adoption of the Protocol on the Prevention and the Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity and all forms of Discrimination. (See Box 2.2. below for a case study on domesticating regional protocols.) Further, national commissions or committees for mass atrocity prevention have been created as a result of the legal obligations imposed by regional conventions or protocols.

Nevertheless, domestic laws may also be promulgated independently of international or regional legal obligations. The following are some practical considerations in domesticating international norms to mandate the establishment and functioning of National Mechanisms:

- National dialogues and consultations with relevant stakeholders to develop measures to help apply the instrument in local contexts and to help government to comply with its obligations.
- Seek interpretation by domestic courts to ensure the instrument helps the National Mechanisms to function appropriately within state laws and facilitate decision-making when crimes are committed.
- Advocacy to help expand the understanding of obligations associated with the instrument, thereby strengthening the instrument as a deterrent tool to mobilize early response efforts.
- Demonstrate complementarity between international and state-level instruments, so that states are more capable of meaningfully and substantially contributing to prevention.
- Regular consultations and partnerships between government, civil society and community groups helps to clarify the issues, risks and threats covered by the instruments and provide solutions thereto.
Normative Considerations in Establishing National Mechanisms

In establishing a national legal regime for mass atrocity prevention, three key factors may be taken into account: prevention, punishment and restitution. The trainer should dedicate 30 minutes to explain these measures and the importance of incorporating them into national or domestic legal regimes for mass atrocity prevention.

- **Prevention:** This is the main focus of National Mechanisms. Thus national legal frameworks should dedicate significant segments to instituting measures to prevent mass atrocity crimes from occurring. These may include providing the broad mandate and legal capacity to enable the mechanism to undertake specific functions such as early warning and response tasks, research and investigations and capacity building initiatives.

- **Punishment:** National legal frameworks should institute measures to deter acts of mass atrocity by specifying the penalty for violating the laws. Many African countries have enacted domestic laws that punish acts of mass atrocity crimes. Examples from the Great Lakes region can be cited to explain this point.

- **Restitution:** Where mass atrocity crimes occur, punishment alone may not be adequate to alleviate the impact on victims. National Mechanisms should also provide compensation to victims of mass atrocity crimes in order to rehabilitate them. Reparations may help to mitigate the suffering of mass atrocity crime victims.

**Box 2.2. Case Study: Uganda National Committee Domesticating the ICGLR Protocol**

Perhaps one of the major and significant achievements for the Uganda National Committee to date includes the drafting and subsequent tabling of the Prevention of Genocide Bill (the Bill) to the Parliament of the Republic of Uganda, with financial assistance from the United Nations Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect. The Bill was the first in the region and the process provides learning experience for other National Mechanisms wishing to enact and aiming to criminalize the crime of atrocities in the domestic legal system. It also seeks to establish a National Commission for Genocide Prevention, as a statutory body responsible for carrying out activities for the prevention of genocide and other mass atrocities in Uganda.

The process took a more formal approach in March 2015 when the Uganda National Committee contracted an expert consultant to draft a bill on the prevention of genocide and other mass atrocities to be presented to Parliament as a Private Members Bill. The Uganda National Committee held various preparatory meetings on the draft bill, inviting a cross section of stakeholders on mass atrocity prevention in Uganda. During these consultations, the Hon. Jacob Booth, the Chairperson of the Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Committee at the time, was identified as the Member of Parliament to table the Bill in Parliament. Thereafter a motion was tabled to introduce a Private Members Bill called the Prevention of Genocide Commission Bill 2015, which was then referred to the Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Committee for scrutiny and recommendation.

More workshops and consultative meetings were held with other committees of parliament, including the Human Rights Committee, the Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Committee, the Ministry of Justice, the Uganda Human Rights Commission and local experts in the genocide prevention to help steer the Bill into law.
Further reading


ACTIVITY 5

1. Using the International Committee of the Great Lakes Region’s (ICGLR) Protocol on the Prevention and the Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity and all forms of Discrimination as an example, initiate a plenary discussion on how the protocol influenced the domestic laws of ICGLR member states.

2. Discuss the practical steps in domesticating international norms to mandate National Mechanisms.


International Criminal Court, Situation in Darfur, Sudan, ICC-02/005. Available at https://www.icc-cpi.int/darfur/Pages/default.aspx

International Criminal Court, Situation in Kenya, ICC-01/009. Available at https://www.icc-cpi.int/kenya/Pages/default.aspx


International Criminal Court Situation in Libya, ICC-01/11. Available at https://www.icc-cpi.int/libya/Pages/default.aspx

International Criminal Court, Situation in the Republic of Cote d’Ivoire, ICC-02/11. Available at https://www.icc-cpi.int/cdi/Pages/default.aspx


MODULE OVERVIEW

National Mechanisms are intended to support “the development and implementation of the necessary preventive policies to bolster the state’s resilience to mass atrocity crimes”.6 While sharing this common objective, no two National Mechanisms are exactly the same. Similarly, there is no single or prescribed approach to their establishment as political contexts differ from country to country.

On the African continent, National Mechanisms may be established in the following contexts:

- Countries that are making the transition from civil war to sustainable peace – for example Liberia and Sierra Leone;
- Countries emerging from authoritarian rule – for example The Gambia and Sudan;
- Countries that are contending with violent extremism or outright terrorism – for example Burkina Faso, Mali, Nigeria and Somalia; and
- Countries that are managing their vulnerabilities with a focus on prevention and resilience – for example Botswana, Ghana and Tanzania.

The specific countries within each of these categories face complex and unique challenges that require contextualized strategies in the development and implementation of National Mechanisms.

The purpose of this module, therefore, is to offer guidance for the establishment of National Mechanisms through which states could strengthen their capacity and resilience against mass atrocity crimes in different contexts or countries. Included among the important guidelines that should be considered by stakeholders seeking to establish National Mechanisms, and which underpin the four units of this module, are the following:

- Obtain a clear understanding of the unique political context of the state in which National Mechanisms are to be established;
- Identify existing needs/gaps, priorities and resources of the state prior to the establishing of National Mechanisms through the conduct of baseline research and an environmental scan;
- Explore potential approaches that might facilitate the establishment of National Mechanisms within a specific context, including the bottom-up and top-down approaches; and
- Identify effective modalities for engaging critical actors when establishing National Mechanisms.

LEARNING OUTCOME

The overarching objective of this module is to outline the main approaches to the establishment of National Mechanisms, based on existing best practices, in order to enhance the implementation of mass atrocity prevention mandates of states and complementing entities.

By the end of Module 3, participants would be able to:

- Explain why National Mechanisms differ, and why sensitivity to context matters when establishing National Mechanisms;
- List and discuss the general considerations that should be taken into account when establishing or reforming National Mechanisms;
- Identify and explain the basic approaches through which they might establish National Mechanisms in the specific countries; and
- Specify effective modalities for engaging critical actors when establishing National Mechanisms.

LESSON MAP

UNIT 1
Taking Context and Sensitivity into Consideration

UNIT 2
Steps to Take Before Establishing National Mechanisms

UNIT 3
Approaches to Establishing National Mechanisms

UNIT 4
Managing Critical Stakeholders when Establishing National Mechanisms

ESTIMATED TIMING

This module should take approximately 4 hours and 30 minutes to deliver.
UNIT 1: TAKING CONTEXT AND SENSITIVITY INTO CONSIDERATION

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 60 MINUTES

20 minutes for breakout session, 20 minutes for group presentations, 20 minutes for discussion.

SESSION OBJECTIVES

- Discuss the factors that account for the differences in National Mechanisms across countries; and
- Explain the importance of sensitivity to context when establishing National Mechanisms.

Why National Mechanisms differ

- The political situation and conflict conditions that National Mechanisms address vary from state to state. They are, therefore, deployed in different contexts with unique challenges, implying that no two mechanisms are exactly the same.
- Moreover, National Mechanisms may either be incorporated into pre-existing institutions subject to modifications, where such frameworks already exist, or created from scratch.
- The variations in political contexts may result in National Mechanisms that differ between countries and regions across Africa in terms of structures, membership or composition, mandates and roles/functions.

What needs to be done, therefore, is to design contextualized mechanisms that recognize and respond to the particularities of the specific states, based on inclusionary strategies that support broad participation.

Why sensitivity to context and stakeholders is important

National Mechanisms are unlikely to be effective if they are merely modelled on generic templates or a one-size-fits-all logic as they may not reflect national priorities, which is, in turn, critical for local ownership and sustainability.

Also, National Mechanisms are bound to face insurmountable barriers if they fail to mobilize the support of critical stakeholders in official and non-official circles.
ACTIVITY 1

1. Prepare two flipchart papers: one for Group 1, and the other for Group 2.
2. Break the class into two groups: Group 1 and Group 2.
3. Ask participants to list the National Mechanisms they know and the countries in which they can be found.
4. Ask Group 1 to explain why no two National Mechanisms are exactly the same.
5. Ask Group 2 to explain why the approaches to the establishment of National Mechanisms may differ from one country/context to another.
6. Review a selection of answers from each group and ask participants to provide further explanations or justifications for their responses.
7. Provide room for participants to challenge the responses offered prior to debriefing by the trainer.
UNIT 2: STEPS TO TAKE BEFORE ESTABLISHING NATIONAL MECHANISMS

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 75 MINUTES

20 minutes for mini lecture, 20 minutes for group discussion, 20 minutes for group presentations, 15 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Identify relevant steps to take before establishing National Mechanisms; and explain the importance of each step.

Effective preparation towards the establishment of National Mechanisms requires a thorough understanding of the dynamics that have the potential to influence the mechanisms in terms of their capacity to function as vehicles for the prevention of genocide and other mass atrocity crimes in line with state obligations under the Genocide Convention, other relevant international treaties, regional protocols and national legislations. Before the establishment or modification of pre-existing mechanisms, programme planners should consider the following four steps:

- Conduct an environmental scan or baseline research;
- Determine whether there are pre-existing institutions that have mass atrocity crimes prevention as a primary goal or whether National Mechanisms need to be built from scratch;
- Assess capacity requirements and assets; and
- Map out critical stakeholders.

Why is an environmental scan or baseline research important?

- To understand the nature and scope of the problem that is the focus of the National Mechanism, as well as the pattern of vulnerability and potential opportunities.
- To identify the priorities of states as well as the relevant approaches that can maximize the effectiveness of National Mechanisms.
- To assess the current status of conflict prevention, early warning mechanisms and justice delivery through which it is possible to identify the necessary gaps and to define the problems that need to be addressed.
- To conceptualize and formulate appropriate responses, identifying the relevant expertise needed to support the creation and management of National Mechanisms.
- To inform policy guidelines, relevant benchmarks and practical strategic proposals for the establishment, management and monitoring and evaluation of National Mechanisms.

The publication and dissemination of research-based knowledge products should normally frame the approaches to the establishment and management of National Mechanisms. In general, research is critical to understanding the political situations and needs of countries.
The objectives of the environmental scan or baseline research can be achieved by answering five basic questions:

- In which of the above country classifications do the state or societies in question belong to?
- What is the specific nature of the political challenges being encountered?
- Who are the main actors involved and what is the nature of their relationships?
- What form of interventions are being institutionalized or implemented in response to the identified challenges?
- What are the strengths and limitations of ongoing interventions being deployed?

**How to determine whether there are pre-existing institutions or whether a National Mechanism needs to be built from scratch?**

This can be achieved by asking the following questions:

- Which institutions, within the jurisdiction of the state, have prevention of mass atrocity crimes as a primary goal? These may include broad infrastructures for peace as well as institutions specifically established to prevent mass atrocities.
- What is the mandate of these institutions and where do they derive from?
- How can these institutions be adapted and strengthened to enhance state responsibility for mass atrocity crimes prevention? This can, for instance, be done through the adoption of national legislations that officially recognize them as National Mechanisms.

**How to assess existing capacities and resources?**

- Conduct an audit of existing capacities and resources in relation to the objectives of the National Mechanism;
- Explore opportunities for obtaining, strengthening and maintaining the capabilities needed to establish and maintain the National Mechanisms; and
- Determine whether it is capacity building or capacity creation that is required.

Countries may proceed through the following five processes of capacity development:

- Engage stakeholders on capacity development;
- Assess capacity assets and needs;
- Formulate a capacity development response;
- Implement a capacity development response; and
- Evaluate capacity development.

**NOTE: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT IS THE FOCUS OF UNIT 4 IN THIS MODULE OR IN MODULE 6, WHERE IT IS DISCUSSED IN DETAIL.**
General considerations when establishing National Mechanisms

- Institutionalization, involving legal leadership, structuring, administration and coordination is critical to effective engagement in prevention work and also fosters information sharing and positive relationships with stakeholders that are necessary for National Mechanisms to be transparent and accountable.

- Regulate prevention-related priorities with human and financial resources and social and political conditions, especially in vulnerable states and communities.

- Political and economic realities have shaped the work of National Mechanisms to include fundraising which occurs over extended periods of time and may come through when opportunities to prevent atrocities have been lost, making it necessary to establish stable and responsive funding options for National Mechanisms.

- Ongoing training is necessary to provide ongoing learning about prevention at a local level and transfer skills from international agencies to build local capacities.

- Draw from local knowledge and experiences to develop training programmes and materials, including when deciding on content, timing, selection of participants, trainers, location and related arrangements.

Further reading

- GAAMAC’s Manual on Best Practices for the Establishment and Management of National Mechanisms for Genocide and Mass Atrocities Prevention identifies five general considerations that should be taken into account when establishing National Mechanisms, as captured below in Figure 3.1.

ACTIVITY 2

1. Break the class into three groups: Group 1, Group 2, and Group 3.
2. Assign one of the questions below to each group, and task them to reflect and write down their answers:
   - Why is an environmental scan or baseline research necessary prior to the establishment of National Mechanisms?
   - Explain what should be considered in determining whether the National Mechanism should be built from scratch or based on an existing institution.
   - Outline the steps that should be taken in assessing existing capacity requirements and resources for the establishment of National Mechanisms.
3. Ask each group to present their answers.
4. Review the answers and open the floor for further discussion before debriefing.
UNIT 3: APPROACHES TO ESTABLISHING NATIONAL MECHANISMS

TOTAL SESSION TIME: 90 MINUTES

30 minutes mini lecture, 30 minutes group discussion, 20 minutes group presentations, 10 minutes summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Discuss the main approaches to establishing National Mechanisms.

While no universally prescribed approaches exist, the establishment of National Mechanisms may be modelled along a range of approaches, based on the contextual particularities of the state and societies in question. For example, they may be established through integrated or problem-solving approaches:

- **Integrated approaches** bring all the critical stakeholders together to ensure resource rationalization and the harmonization of processes that relate to policy articulation, agenda setting, programme implementation, monitoring and evaluation; and

- **Problem-solving approaches** entail the establishment of specific mechanisms for addressing specific issues relating, for example, to early warning and justice reform.

Bottom-up approaches to the establishment of National Mechanisms

Bottom-up approaches often begin with local communities or civil society organizations (CSOs) actively engaging in the prevention of atrocities and the promotion of fundamental human rights and other interventions that uphold justice and the rule of law.
Box 3.1. Case Studies in Liberia and Ghana

Liberia’s Palava Hut

An emerging bottom-up approach to the establishment of a National Mechanism that is deeply grounded in local or indigenous processes is the Palava Hut, which is an indigenous reconciliatory and non-adversarial process of justice and conflict transformation commonly practiced in rural Liberia. Following the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) process in Liberia, very little, if any, process of reconciliation was actually carried out by the Commission. As a result, the TRC Commissioners recommended the establishment of National Palava Hut centres across Liberia that would serve as forums for justice and reconciliation and help restore justice and broken relationships at the community and national levels. The Independent National Commission on Human Rights of Liberia was tasked with the implementation of the process following the official launch of the National Palava Hut Program by then Liberian President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. Subsequently an ethnographic study was conducted to guide the nationalization and implementation of the Palava Hut process.

An important attribute of the Palava Hut process is that it is a home-grown and context-specific mechanism rooted in local norms, values and culture that enhances direct and greater participation of communities in the prevention of atrocities. However, it is gender insensitive in that it is rooted in the patriarchal structures of communities that ensures the domination of the processes by men at the expense of women. For instance, Palava Hut panels are usually constituted by men, while women are excluded or under represented. In order to enhance the effectiveness of the Palava Hut process as a mass atrocity prevention mechanism, gender perspectives need to be integrated in ways that allow women’s voices to be heard.

Ghana’s National Peace Council

Unlike Liberia’s Palava Hut programme, which is still at an early stage of development, Ghana’s National Peace Council (NPC) is widely acknowledged as an evolving bottom-up best practice and a model to consider when establishing National Mechanisms. Its key stages, which can be adopted and modified to suit other contexts, were:

- Interventions deployed by non-state actors, including the clergy, traditional rulers and CSOs, to address the communal conflicts that erupted in the country, particularly the Dagbon conflict in the Northern Region of Ghana;
- The advocacy roles played by Regional Peace Advisory Committees established to foster peace and reconciliation in the country; such as the Volta Region, the Brong Ahafo Region, the Ashanti Region, the Western Region and the Central Region;
- The subsequent establishment of a national-level peace platform to address political issues, which polarized along the political divide in Ghana;
- Formal proposal by District Assemblies of CSOs and local leaders to Parliament through the Minister for the Interior, for the NPC;
- Writing and presentation of a bill to Parliament by the Interior Minister defining the structure, operational parameters, composition and funding of the NPC;
- Passing of The National Peace Council Act 2011 (Act 818) into law;
- Setting up community, district, regional and national organs, as well as the Secretariat of the NPC; and
- Developing strategic plans, rolling out capacity building programmes and implementing projects.
Top-down approaches

Unlike the bottom-up approaches that are grounded in and emerge from the societal or unofficial sources, top-down approaches invariably originate from official sources. Usually, top-down approaches are deployed to support the establishment of National Mechanisms in order to implement international treaties, regional protocols and national legislations.

Box 3.2. Case Study: National Committees in the Great Lake Region

The emerging network of National Committees under the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR) is a typical example of an evolving regional top-down best practice in setting up National Mechanisms to prevent mass atrocity crimes. The major steps to their establishment, which can be adopted and modified to suit other contexts, were:

- Government appoints a National Representative to the Regional Committee as per the protocol in the ICGLR Pact 2006;
- National Representatives in the member states generate proposals to their governments to form National Committees;
- Consultative meetings are held with government, local CSOs and academic institutions to nominate representatives to the Committee;
- Inaugural seminars are often followed by electing a bureau, where the National Representatives officially become the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, Treasurer and Secretary;
- The National Representatives collaborate with partners, e.g. the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide, the Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation, etc. to launch and/or conduct capacity building seminars for members towards mass atrocity prevention;
- Subsequent meetings of the National Committee consider rules of procedure, work plans, budget and other aspects of formalizing the functioning of the National Committee; and
- The National Committee acts on this mandate to develop and implement prevention projects.

ACTIVITY 3

1. Deliver a mini lecture on the main approaches to the establishment of National Mechanisms.
2. Divide participants into Groups 1 and 2.
3. Assign a different country or region to each group.
4. Ask Group 1 to identify and discuss the bottom-up approaches that would be relevant in establishing a National Mechanism in the assigned country or region.
5. Ask Group 2 to identify and discuss the top-down approaches that would be relevant in establishing a National Mechanism in the assigned country or region.
UNIT 4: MANAGING CRITICAL STAKEHOLDERS WHEN ESTABLISHING NATIONAL MECHANISMS

TOTAL SESSION TIME: 90 MINUTES

60 minutes mini lecture, 30 minutes questions and answers.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Map out and identify effective strategies for engaging critical stakeholders when establishing National Mechanisms.

Who are stakeholders?

Stakeholders may be defined as individuals, groups or organizations that may affect or be affected by the dynamics of National Mechanisms. Multiple stakeholders with their own objectives and interests often influence the establishment and management of National Mechanisms, necessitating continuous balancing and integration of multiple relationships and objectives in ways that promote wider participation, gender sensitivity, legitimacy, local ownership and sustainability. These stakeholders may include:

- State officials or agencies
- Local communities and opinion leaders
- Faith-based organizations
- Political parties
- Epistemic communities (research institutions and think tanks)
- Survivors of past injustices or atrocities
- Vulnerable populations
- Women’s groups
- The youth
- External partners or donor agencies
What does stakeholder mapping entail?

Stakeholder mapping involves the identification of relevant entities that have an interest in, or can influence or be influenced by, the establishment and management of National Mechanisms or their absence. It is a five-step process that involves the following:

Figure 3.1. Processes for the Establishment and Management of National Mechanisms

- **Step 1**: Identification of individuals, communities or organizations that either contribute to or are affected by the establishment or management of National Mechanisms and their interrelationships.
- **Step 2**: Stakeholder analysis, which involves the definition of stakeholders’ roles and expectations, for example, through the use of a matrix which maps stakeholders according to their influence and interest.
- **Step 3**: Prioritization of stakeholder needs into appropriate engagement levels.
- **Step 4**: Stakeholder engagement to obtain their buy-in and support.
- **Step 5**: Review of stakeholders on a regular basis.

**Stakeholder engagement in the establishment of National Mechanisms**

Stakeholder engagement is the process of involving them in policy articulation, ownership and implementation of National Mechanism-related programmes through broad-based participation that accommodates the views and interests of a diversity of stakeholders with the state as the principal actor.
Stakeholder engagement can be a complex process involving multiple actors operating at the policy/strategic level, the planning/technical level or the implementation/operational level.

**How can stakeholder engagement be done?**

Generally, stakeholders may be engaged through communication, consultation and relationship and trust-building.

Depending on the actors involved, a variety of channels may be used, such as:

- Organizing national stakeholder consultation workshops that bring all relevant actors together
- Policy conferences and strategic meetings
- Town hall meetings
- Community visits
- The use of the media, both traditional and social media


SECTION 3
MANAGING NATIONAL MECHANISMS
MODULE OVERVIEW

Early warning and its related frameworks have historically been employed in military, intelligence and humanitarian crises situations. Since the 1990s, the concept has been recognized by the United Nations (UN) and other regional bodies such as the African Union (AU) and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) as crucial to effective conflict prevention and disaster management, as well as general risk reduction strategies. However, since the World Summit Outcome in 2005 on the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), the need to have specific early warning systems for mass atrocity prevention at the global, continental, regional and national levels has become imperative to anticipate and prevent the possible occurrence of mass atrocity crimes through appropriate response mechanisms.

Incorporating early warning systems in all national mechanisms in Africa is particularly important because of the history of mass atrocity crimes in countries such as Rwanda, Libya, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Central African Republic (CAR) and Guinea. The ultimate objective is that it will enhance the ability of policy- and decision-makers to make strategic decisions on the basis of improved knowledge of the environment (either in peaceful environments, conflict situations and/or peacekeeping operation theatres) and the options available for response or action and finally, the implications of each decision or option made.

LEARNING OUTCOME

By the end of this module, participants will be able to:

- Understand the concept of early warning and prevention;
- Understand the early warning monitoring processes;
- Undertake risk analysis for mass atrocity crimes; and
- Develop appropriate mechanisms for early response to mass atrocity crimes.
LESSON MAP

UNIT 1
Conceptualizing Early Warning

UNIT 2
Early Warning Monitoring

UNIT 3
Risk Analysis

UNIT 4
Early Response Mechanisms

UNIT 5
Women in Mediation and Mass Atrocity Crime Prevention

ESTIMATED TIMING

This module should take approximately 6 hours and 40 minutes to deliver.
UNIT 1: CONCEPTUALIZING EARLY WARNING

TOTAL SESSION TIME: 90 MINUTES

40 minutes plenary discussion, 30 minutes presentation, 20 minutes summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVES

- Explain the concept of early warning and how it contributes to the prevention and mitigation of mass atrocity crimes.
- Explain the importance of early warning systems in establishing National Mechanisms; and
- Discuss the need for establishing national early warning systems vis-à-vis the continental and sub-regional early warning systems.

Early warning is an important concept not only for pre-empting conflict occurrence and managing disasters, but has also increasingly become a tool recognized by the UN and other regional bodies as well as states for the prevention of genocide and other mass atrocity crimes.

Conceptualizing early warning

Early warning is defined as “any initiative that focuses on systematic data collection, analysis and/or formulation of recommendations, including risk assessment and information sharing, regardless of topic, whether they are quantitative, qualitative or a blend of both.” Early warning is about assessing the likelihood of violent conflicts, the possibility of a resurgence or escalation of violence and identifying the windows of opportunities for peace and stability. In the context of mass atrocity crimes, early warning is about putting in place necessary state structures or National Mechanisms to monitor, prevent and respond to the occurrence of genocide and other mass atrocity crimes.

There are different types of prevention such as:

- Early prevention: initiatives generated as soon as early warnings indicate a serious dispute in the context of an uneasy stability.
- Structural prevention: ongoing efforts that target issues of economic development, human rights, arms trade and governance that help build a culture of prevention.
- Late prevention: crisis diplomacy when serious armed conflicts appear imminent.
- Mitigation: measures to address the possible severity of the occurrence of mass atrocity crimes.

---

- **Preparedness**: a state of readiness to address mass atrocity crimes when they occur.

- **Data collection**: collating and recording information based on provided indicators through conflict monitoring. It is composed of qualitative and quantitative elements. Data collection can focus on specific community, state, national or international.

- **Early warning reporting**: an information management system that provides data and indicators used to forecast the potential occurrence of conflict and mass atrocities.

### Importance of early warning in managing National Mechanism

**Early warning** helps in assessing the risk of mass atrocity crimes and to pre-empt any possible occurrence, which in turn helps in understanding the level of threat (low, high and critical) as may be defined by relevant state agency. It is a tool that contributes to making predictions about the likely occurrence of mass atrocity crimes. Finally, early warning is an information collection and intelligence gathering tool for strategic decision-making in response to mass atrocity crimes.

### National early warning systems vis-à-vis continental and regional systems

When crafting an effective national early warning system as part of a National Mechanism, it is important to take into consideration the existing continental and regional early warning systems, as well those by Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) such as the West Africa Network for Peace Building (WANEP).

The existing continental and regional organizations are interconnected, but the early warning systems, while they have similarities, also differ due to regional backgrounds and conflict contexts. The AU and other regional mechanisms such as ECOWAS and the Inter-Governmental Authority for Development "utilize indicator-based statistical modelling to assess risks, while the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Early Warning Department utilizes a Geographic Information System to provide geo-spatial mapping of events and incidents that represent risks and threats."\(^8\)

In particular, the ECOWAS Early Warning and Response Network (ECOWARN), which has been operational since 2003 with four zonal bureaux\(^9\) (and is now establishing ECOWAS National Units in all countries), is deemed to have been useful in undertaking monitoring and analysis, and has contributed to conflict prevention in the sub-region. The ECOWARN is an observation and monitoring tool for early warning and early response across the West Africa region.

In addition, the ECOWAS Conflict Prevention Framework outlines the common functions of systems and these provide useful references that National Mechanisms can use to develop national-level early warning systems.\(^10\) WANEP also focuses on the indicator system to assess risks to conflicts and mass atrocity crimes. WANEP’s early warning system, which supports ECOWARN and regional systems, offers good learning experiences for establishing National Mechanisms.

---


9 The four national bureaux are Zone (1) Cape Verde, The Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Senegal; Zone (2) Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Mali and Niger; Zone (3) Ghana, Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone; and Zone (4) Benin, Nigeria and Togo.

Further reading

- See Article 12 of the Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union
- See paras 44-47 of the ECOWAS Conflict Prevention Framework (see footnote 10).

**ACTIVITY 1.1.**

1. Encourage as many participants as possible to give their definition of early warning. Write answers from participants on a flipchart, noting key words that define early warning such as “systematic data collection”, “analysis”, etc.

2. Let participants understand that these phrases capture the essence of what early warning and prevention are about. Thus, following from the discussion, participants should know some practical definitions for further interactions and discussions.

After participants’ contributions, list as many phrases as captured above as defining characteristics of early warning.

**ACTIVITY 1.2.**

1. Ask participants to highlight the similarities and differences of the various systems.

2. Review the various systems and urge participants to critically look at their country contexts *vis-à-vis* continental and regional frameworks in designing national early warning systems.
UNIT 2: EARLY WARNING MONITORING

TOTAL SESSION TIME: 90 MINUTES

20 minutes for mini lecture, 20 minutes for group discussion, 40 minutes for group presentation, 10 minutes for summary discussion.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Understand the salient issues involved in monitoring in order to develop the capacity to respond to mass atrocity crimes.

Early warning monitoring constitutes a key part of the entire early warning processes. It involves a careful study of the factors that indicate a disaster is imminent, and in this context, a mass atrocity crime.

What is early warning monitoring?

Early warning monitoring refers to the standardized collection and organization of information based on regular or continuous observation, recording and reporting (in a given region or zone). It focuses on a specific community, state or international setting and involves day-to-day close monitoring of situations and issues related to human security and stability. Monitoring helps in making information available to inform intervention through mediation and other forms of pacific settlements.

Note:

Emphasize and expand on the following terms as articulated in the definition of early warning monitoring:

- Standardized: suggests a pre-defined way of doing things which everyone who is part of the process is following.
- Continuous: suggests that we are doing it all the time and connecting all the things we are doing. In essence, what is being done is not disjointed or fragmented.
- Observation: means watching for changes taking place in a particular situation, noting the dynamics in every way.
- Recording: is writing things down as soon as you observe them. Careful and organized recording helps a lot in monitoring.
- Sustained and systematic monitoring: forms the basis for early warning. It can throw light on the status of critical and changing issues in the policy environment, which may be addressed by early response activities.
It is important to monitor to:

- Identify and prevent the root causes of conflict and mass atrocity crimes;
- Identify strategies and opportunities to maintain peace and security;
- Gather data to inform decision-making towards preventing conflicts and mass atrocity crimes;
- Identify changing trends and scenarios which will enhance early warning; and
- Identify and assess the most salient indicators for conflict and mass atrocity crimes.

What is monitored is dependent on pre-determined indicators and may vary from community to community and from country to country. The following list is not exhaustive and reference can be made to the **UN Framework of Analysis for Mass Atrocity Crimes for Indicators**:

- Changes or manifestation of specific indicators;
- Behaviours and actions of the mobilized groups and government;
- Incidents that are taking place (their frequency, trends and patterns);
- Power relations of politicians, elites, ethnic groups, religious groups, etc.; and
- Inflammatory statements of opinion leaders and decision makers.

Table 4.1. Monitoring Mass Atrocity Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who should monitor?</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Who is monitored?</th>
<th>What is monitored?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Trained personnel on conflict prevention</td>
<td>- Open or unclassified sources</td>
<td>- Stakeholders in conflict</td>
<td>- Serious human rights violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trained personnel on R2P</td>
<td>- Newspapers</td>
<td>- Government officials</td>
<td>- Religious and racial injustices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Security agencies and special government agencies</td>
<td>- Internet</td>
<td>- Political party leaders</td>
<td>- Ethnic intolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members of the community based and non-governmental organizations</td>
<td>- Radio</td>
<td>- Security agencies and actors</td>
<td>- Hate speeches by influential political actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Television</td>
<td>- Radical religious leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports</td>
<td>- Rebel groups and other youth groups</td>
<td>- Unlawful arrests and detentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social media (Twitter, Facebook, WhatsApp, blogs...)</td>
<td>- Opposition leaders</td>
<td>- Proliferation of arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Deliberate attacks against civilians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Elections-related violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- External financial and logistical support to rebels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTIVITY 3

1. Divide the class into four groups.

2. Ask each group to find answers to the following questions.
   - Why is monitoring of mass atrocity crimes important?
   - What do we monitor?
   - Who do we monitor?
   - Who should monitor?
   - Where do monitors gather information?
   - Sources of information?

3. Let group leaders present their results for interactive discussion.

4. Refer to Table 4.1. for the responses to the questions above.
UNIT 3: RISK ANALYSIS

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 2 HOURS 10 MINUTES

30 minutes for presentation, 30 minutes for group discussion, 60 minutes for group presentations, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Discuss how to use the risk management tools to determine the level of risks (low, high, critical) of mass atrocity crimes in a given community or country so as to activate a response mechanism.

Risk analysis for mass atrocity crimes requires identifying threats, assessing the threats, and identifying risk factors and early warning indicators. In this sense, risk analysis should project into the future and should be sensitive to the specific needs of different groups, including women and men, the elderly, children, youths and persons living with disabilities.

What are indicators and risk factors?

- **Indicators**: For mass atrocity prevention, indicators are different manifestations of each risk factor, which helps in determining the degree to which an individual risk factor is present.

- **Risk factors**: are conditions that increase the likelihood of a crime occurring. For example, behaviours, circumstances or elements that create an environment conducive to the commission of mass atrocity crimes. Risk factors could be structural in nature, others could be triggers.

The UN Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes provides an integrated analysis and assessment tool. It includes 14 common and specific risk factors for mass atrocity crimes and the accompanying indicators.
Table 4.2. Risk Factors for Mass Atrocity Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON RISK FACTORS</th>
<th>SPECIFIC RISK FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Situations of armed conflict or other forms of instability</td>
<td><strong>Genocide</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Record of serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law</td>
<td>- Intergroup tensions or patterns of discrimination against protected groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Weakness of state structures</td>
<td>- Signs of an intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a protected group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Motives or incentives</td>
<td><strong>Crimes against Humanity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capacity to commit atrocity crimes</td>
<td>- Signs of a widespread or systematic attack against any civilian population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Absence of mitigating factors</td>
<td>- Signs of a plan or policy to attack any civilian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enabling circumstance or preparatory action</td>
<td><strong>War Crimes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Triggering factors</td>
<td>- Serious threats to those protected under international humanitarian law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Serious threat to humanitarian or peacekeeping operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UN Office on Genocide Prevention and R2P*
To arrive at the risk score, multiply the risk likelihood by the risk impact. For instance, per the matrix above, if the risk likelihood is 5 and the impact is also 5, you will multiply 5x5, giving 25 as the risk score. This result will suggest that the likelihood of occurrence of a mass atrocity crime is high and the impact as well. On the other hand, if the risk likelihood is say 2 and the impact is 3, the risk score will be 6 suggesting low impact if a mass atrocity crime should occur.
Incorporating gender in risk analysis

Conflicts and mass atrocity crimes have had devastating impacts on peace and security in Africa, with disproportionate consequences for women and men, the elderly, children, youths and persons living with disabilities. The conflicts in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Central African Republic and Mali, and the genocide in Rwanda are glaring examples of how conflicts and atrocity crimes can have varied impacts on different groups of people, especially women within the bracket of vulnerable populations.

As a result, incorporating gender indicators in early warning risk analysis is important in helping to prevent conflicts and atrocity crimes. As acknowledged by UN Resolution 2171, “sexual and gender-based violence can constitute a serious violation of international law”, and can be “an early indication of a descent into conflict or escalation of conflict, as well as a consequence thereof”.11

This suggests that an increase in gender-based violence poses greater risk of the occurrence of mass atrocity crimes. Therefore, any risk analysis should give greater attention to gender issues, recognizing how the “systematic violation of women’s rights, gender-based discrimination, and gender inequality can exacerbate the conditions that lead to violent conflict and forewarn mass atrocities.”12 To this end, designing and incorporating gender-specific indicators — particularly economic, social and political discriminatory practices against women — in early warning frameworks is imperative. Ultimately, this will improve the capacity to predict future mass atrocities and, lead to the crafting of appropriate and sufficient early interventions.

The above notwithstanding, it is important to note that there are few, if any, early warning systems for predicting atrocity crimes that integrate gender-specific indicators. The exclusion of gender from early warning indicators is attributed to the difficulties in collecting gender-sensitive data and the inadequate appreciation of what gender-sensitive data is. This means that atrocity prevention advocates must do more to apply a gender lens to risk analysis and data collection for effective atrocity prevention.

Further reading

- UN Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes
- Chapters 3 & 12 Reconstructing Atrocity Prevention (see bibliography p. 77)
- Mass Atrocities Early Warning Systems: Data Gathering, Data Verification and Other Challenges (see bibliography p. 77)

---

**ACTIVITY 3**

1. Develop a conflict case study specific to a country and distribute to participants (use the scenario in Module 7).

2. Divide the class into four groups; each group tasked to identify indicators and risk factors for a specific mass atrocity crime and general risk factors.

3. Based on the risk factors and indicators identified, let participants rate the risk factors with values between one and five.

4. Participants should use the risk analysis matrix (including the explanation on how to calculate the risk score) to determine the risk score for the risk factors they previously identified.

5. Participants could be innovative to design a way of formulating risks. However, risks could also be formulated, using the (if/then statement) such as “if electoral violence continues in Country A, then there is likelihood of mass and targeted killings” or “if xenophobic/targeted killings continue, then there is strong likelihood of mass atrocity crimes occurring”.

6. Let participants indicate their risk scores on a piece of paper and use the information to determine which of the four crimes is likely to occur and to which target group, if that specific detail is available.

7. Let participants present their group exercises explaining the risk score, the level of risk for a particular crime and the likely impact on population for class discussion.

8. After the presentation of the group exercise, ask questions for clarification from groups.

9. Based on the presentations, give a brief explanation on the limitations, if there are any, and how participants can improve on similar exercises in future.
UNIT 4: EARLY RESPONSE MECHANISMS

TOTAL SESSION TIME: 50 MINUTES

20 minutes mini lecture, 30 minutes group work.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Discuss early warning response mechanisms for conflicts and mass atrocity crimes.

Early warning is no use when the response mechanism is weak or is not robust enough to avert potential danger. Early warning is important in ensuring that simmering tensions and conflict between and among ethnic, religious or political groups do not degenerate into violence, and consequently lead to potential mass atrocity crimes.

In the event that mass atrocity crimes are likely to occur due to social tensions, a number of responses are available. In this unit, six response mechanisms are discussed: negotiation/dialogue, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, litigation and alternative dispute resolution (ADR).¹³

Further reading

- ECOWAS Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, Resolution, Peacekeeping and Security.

ACTIVITY 4

1. Divide the class into six groups.
2. Assign each group one of the identified six response mechanisms.
3. Ask each group to explain the assigned mechanism and describe their key characteristics.
4. Let each group present their exercises for further discussion.
5. After presentations, discuss with the class how mediation can be applied in a selected conflict case study.

¹³ Detailed explanation on the above mechanisms can be found at https://www.okbar.org/freelegalinfo/disputes/
UNIT 5: WOMEN IN MEDIATION AND MASS ATROCITY CRIME PREVENTION

The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, adopted in 2000, recognizes the role of women in peace and security issues—including playing active roles in mediation and peace processes. But in terms of responding to mass atrocity crimes, perhaps it is UN Resolution 2171 that made a strong connection between women and successful mass atrocity prevention. It emphasizes the “equal, full and meaningful, participation, representation and involvement” of women in conflict prevention and mediation, as endorsed in the UN Security Council resolutions on Women, Peace and Security.\(^{14}\)

However, even before the adoption of these UN resolutions, women in some African countries had played important roles in mediation and conflict prevention efforts, contributing to the restoration of peace and stability in conflict situations. For example, the Mano River Women’s Peace Network (MARWOPNET) in Liberia and Sierra Leone played critical peace advocacy roles in the negotiations for peace agreements in 1999 and 2002 during the conflicts in those countries. MARWOPNET is a non-governmental organization dedicated to the promotion of peace and development in the Mano River countries of Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea and Côte d’Ivoire. Headquartered in the Sierra Leonean capital of Freetown, and with national offices in Liberia and Guinea, MARWOPNET was formed under the auspices of ECOWAS in May 2000, following a meeting in Nigeria of a group of women leaders from local NGOs to advance their participation in the mediation and peace processes relating to the Mano River region. The formation of MARWOPNET was largely facilitated by Femmes Afrique Solidarité (FAS), an NGO based in Switzerland. It is comprised of about 30 umbrella women’s organizations engaged in both grassroots and high-level conflict resolution and peace promotion.

MARWOPNET has participated in several international peace meetings to promote non-violent political action by state leaders, and took active part in the formal peace negotiations to end Liberia’s civil war in 2003. During the Accra Peace Talks on Liberia in June 2003, although women were not invited officially to the meeting, “they acted as a pressure group that mobilized other women and groups in their communities to appeal to warring parties to lay down their weapons and agree on negotiated settlements of disputes”.\(^{15}\) The women’s groups also put pressure on stakeholders to create space for women’s participation in the peace process.


The case study above, among other examples, indicates women can equally play active roles in mass atrocity prevention in Africa. Early warning components of national mechanisms will enhance these roles if structural barriers (for example political, legal, economic, socio-cultural) are addressed through legislations, representation, ministerial appointments, advocacy, training and sensitization workshops.

Further reading

- UN Security Council Resolution 2171.

**ACTIVITY 6**

1. Engage participants for 10 minutes in interactive conversations on what role women can play in mass atrocity prevention:
   - How can you leverage women’s participation in early preventive engagements?
   - In what specific areas of early intervention can women have the most impact?
   - How do you ensure women’s continuous involvement in the prevention of atrocity crimes particularly in volatile situations?

2. Summarize key points and close session.
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MODULE 5: PROGRAMME DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

MODULE OVERVIEW

The previous module focused on early warning and prevention of mass atrocity crimes, with the objective to enable National Mechanisms to monitor risks indicators in order to take proactive measures to prevent the actual occurrence of genocide and other mass atrocity crimes. This module will focus on programme design and implementation in setting up and managing National Mechanisms for preventing mass atrocity crimes in states in Africa. Whilst this module builds on the previous modules, it can also be used separately to guide African institutions seeking to conduct training for their national staff on programme design and implementation.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of this module, participants should be able to:

- Explain programme conception, design and implementation;
- Identify the elements of the results chain analysis;
- Discuss programme design in preventing mass atrocity crimes;
- Explain programme monitoring and evaluation;
- List and discuss the components of capacity building for National Mechanisms; and
- Discuss gender-sensitive programming.
LESSON MAP

UNIT 1
Programme Concept, Design and Implementation

UNIT 2
Programme Design, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Mass Atrocity Risk

UNIT 3
Ownership, Sustainability and Resource Mobilization

UNIT 4
Capacity Development and Building

UNIT 5
Gender-sensitive Programming

ESTIMATED TIMING

This module should take approximately 4 hours and 15 minutes to deliver.
Programme concept, design and implementation

Programmes implemented by National Mechanisms are typically informed by a specific national or institutional policy. In order to achieve its long-term goal, a National Mechanism must formulate principles and guidelines to inform standards of conduct and uphold social and legal responsibilities. A policy is usually a reflection of an institution’s values and mission. A policy must be broken down into a set of programmes, projects and activities which give meaning to the existence and relevance of National Mechanisms. This means that programme design and implementation does not occur in a vacuum, but must fit into an overarching national policy vision or objective. Thus, programmes connect policies with projects.

The benefits of an intervention are derived as outputs at the project level, outcome at the programme level and impact at the policy level. Programme conceptualization and design should clearly specify the connections between these levels of results associated with the intervention chain, and how their progress can be measured and monitored during the implementation process.

Figure 5.1. Connection between Policy, Programme and Project
When programmes are ill-conceived, projects may not achieve the intended results of the policy. Programmes to prevent mass atrocity crimes at the national level should first draw their basis from a national agenda to, for instance, uphold the rule of law, human rights and international humanitarian law. Without these overarching principles, National Mechanisms may not have a strong foundation to implement their programmes.

Thematic programmes are designed to respond to specific risks of mass atrocity crimes such as: human rights violations, use of force against segments of the population by state security forces, armed attacks by non-state actors, electoral violence, land disputes, religious clashes, ethnic conflicts, community conflicts, conflict-related sexual and gender-based violence among others. All these carry the potential for mass atrocity crimes to which specific programmes can be designed to prevent and mitigate their occurrence and escalation.

Most importantly, while treating these themes as separate and specific, there is also the need to distil linkages between each of them in order that programme effectiveness and efficiency can be enhanced. This requires prioritization of resources and activities. The results chain in programme design and implementation is further illustrated in the Figure 5.2. below:

Figure 5.2. Results Chain in Programme Design

Inputs (Measures the resource needs of the programme)
- Personnel
- Equipment
- Budget

Processes (Measures the programme activities)
- Awareness creation
- Training workshops
- Policy engagement

Impacts (Shows overall achievement or benefit for the wider community)
- Improved justice and safety for local people

Outputs (Measures the consequences of the programme results)
- Police officers trained
- Legal aid established and strengthened

Outcomes (Measures the consequences of the programme results)
- Improved criminal justice
- Availability of legal support

Author’s construct (November 2020)
Programme design and implementation follows five steps in the result chain. Inputs are the resources needed to implement a programme. They usually include personnel, equipment and funds (budget).

Personnel can include regular staff members, consultants or experts hired to perform various tasks in the programme implementation process. In the mass atrocity crime field, personnel with backgrounds in human rights, governance, peace and conflict studies, development and security studies may be required to lead the programme design and implementation. Often, programme managers or officers are assigned specific roles to lead the implementation.

Equipment may range from office computers and other machines required to process materials and information about the programme. Since technology keeps changing at a rapid rate, equipment and personnel may need constant upgrading in order to avoid obsolescence and redundancy.

Processes are a set of interconnected activities to produce the desired product or output of a programme. Activities may include research, training, workshops, among others. When it comes to reporting, there is often the temptation to report only activities without the actual outputs and outcomes. Programme reporting must go beyond activities and outputs. Activities are monitored and they are measured in terms of specific completion points or milestones achieved. When monitoring activities, the focus is often on whether inputs are being combined in their right quality and quantity, as well as tracking work schedules. Since activities link inputs and outputs together, it is often said that the process is as equally important as the output.

Output is the product or result expected to be produced from the process. Since results are expected to be measured in both qualitative and quantitative terms, programme managers need to be process-focused. Participatory-driven approaches such as gender inclusiveness and representation of minorities in programme design and implementation ensure that outputs satisfy both the qualitative and quantitative expectations in the desired results. Thus, for instance, an output statement of “police officers trained” must have a disaggregated figure of both men and women officers trained. This will give a complete picture of results achieved. Every programme output has to be utilized by the targeted beneficiaries. Without utilization, results will not bring further satisfaction and change.

Outcome is the desired change that should occur from the utilization of the output. For example, the outcome of police officers trained in human rights is the improvement in criminal justice delivery in the community. This will subsequently impact the community as justice and safety for local people improve. Beyond the output level, the programme manager does not have control over the outcome and impact. It is often assumed that other well-intended programmes or policies will fill this attribution gap.

### ACTIVITY

1. Brainstorm on the concept of programme design and implementation.
2. Note answers/responses on flipchart.
3. Comment on significant responses.
Often, key political and governance issues such as the rule of law, human rights and international humanitarian law are prioritized for policy intervention. This is monitored as a way of minimizing mass atrocity crimes in countries. In the case of the National Peace Council (NPC) in Ghana, even though its work involves conflict prevention, it has been dealing more with election-related violence in the country, especially as the violence typically involves politically affiliated organized armed groups.

**Type of mass atrocity risks and level of programme of intervention**

Mass atrocity crime risks range from root causes, to trigger factors, to crime manifestations. Each moment requires a different form of programme, and intervention from, for instance, prevention, to management, to prosecution.

Table 5.1. The Three Degrees of Atrocities Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atrocity crime prevention</th>
<th>Atrocity crime management</th>
<th>Atrocity crime prosecution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root causes of atrocity risks</td>
<td>Manifestations of atrocity risks</td>
<td>Triggers of atrocity risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource scarcity</td>
<td>mass murder</td>
<td>violation of the rule of law (eg. rigged elections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inequality</td>
<td>forced displacements</td>
<td>human rights violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrimination</td>
<td>conflict-related sexual and gender-based violence</td>
<td>violation of international humanitarian law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Degree of atrocity risk**

*Author’s construct, November 2020*
In designing National Mechanisms for the prevention of mass atrocity crimes, the institution may be given powers to assess, investigate and prosecute crimes where necessary. However, most existing National Mechanisms are rarely given legal powers beyond the preventive role. Investigation and prosecution powers still remain in the hands or control of traditional state security and prosecutorial bodies. For instance, the NPC in Ghana was designed not to have investigative and prosecutorial powers. Such design or approach requires a collaborative effort with state security agencies in order to be effective in preventing mass atrocity crimes. But often also, state security agencies are implicated in violations. When state security agencies are unable or unwilling to investigate and prosecute crimes that they are implicated in, impunity deterrence may be compromised.

**Box 5.1. Programming to Localize Prevention**

- Ensuring participation of local stakeholders to promote local ownership, buy-in and programme sustainability.
- Mainstreaming communal dialogue and reconciliation programmes in mass atrocity prevention initiatives.
- Involving local governments in projects to develop capacities for mass atrocity prevention at local level.
- Prioritizing the protection of civilians.
- Developing partnerships between the state and civil society organizations to jointly implement community prevention initiatives.
- Programming to provide basic services to meet local needs and stabilize communities to regain a normal life, e.g. health amenities, restore and improve sanitation, access to water, education and reintegration of displaced people.
- Creating opportunities to help communities become economically productive and revitalizing community-based infrastructures for service delivery and development.

**Programme Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Monitoring** involves tracking the progress of programme activities in order to check if implementation is proceeding according to set standards and work schedule.

**Evaluation** usually takes place after the completion of the programme. It identifies key lessons learnt for the organization. Such lessons are useful for future programming. Equally, mid-term or long-term evaluation is intended to assess if the programme is achieving its desired goal or impact. Often, a broader scope of purpose is involved when evaluating a programme:

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Impact
- Sustainability
Evaluation measurements cover both quantitative and qualitative indices. The performance indicators of such exercises are highlighted in the figure below.

Box 5.2. Performance Indicators in Programme Monitoring and Evaluation

Validity
- Are your indicators likely to record progress towards your objective?
- Are you measuring outcomes, not simply activity?
- Would different people taking the same measure get the same results?

Balance
- Do you have a balanced basket of indicators that measures progress towards a single aim?
- Is the ambiguity inherent in each single indicator reduced by the presence of the other indicators?

Sensitivity
- Are all of your indicators sensitive enough to record the kinds of changes likely to occur from one period to the next?
- Are your indicators sensitive to the changes your interventions are most likely to produce?

Equality
- Do your indicators specifically capture the experience of particular or vulnerable groups, for example, people in poverty and/or women?
- Can your indicators that capture general experience be disaggregated to isolate the experience of particular groups?

Motivation
- Can you identify the ways in which the introduction of your indicators may change the incentives guiding the behaviour of officials or citizens?
- Can you minimize any danger that your indicators will create perverse incentives that could undermine your aims?
Practicality

- Can you afford to collect the necessary data on a regular, continuing basis and are there simpler, less expensive ways to collect data available?
- Will the data collected specifically for your indicators be reliably accurate?

Ownership

- Have all those whose progress will be measured contributed to the development of the indicators?
- Do those whose performance will be judged by the indicators have confidence in them?

Clarity

- Do the measures make sense to all of your audiences, including particular or vulnerable people in poverty?
- Are your measures expressed in units that are clear?

Source: OECD DAC, 2007 p. 74 (amended)

ACTIVITY 2

1. Brainstorm on key objectives and performance indicators of M&E.
   - Why must programmes and projects be monitored and evaluated?
   - How does monitoring differ from evaluation?
   - Outline the practical steps involved in effective M&E. What should an M&E officer look out for when assessing the effectiveness of atrocity prevention programmes?

2. Note answers/responses on flipchart.

3. Comments on significant responses.
UNIT 3. OWNERSHIP, SUSTAINABILITY AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 30 MINUTES
10 minutes for brainstorming, 10 minutes for presentation, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE
Discuss resource mobilization in programme design and implementation, and explain programme ownership and implementation.

Ownership and sustainability

Peace mechanisms, especially in Africa, must have national/local ownership, much the same way as programmes that are implemented by the institutions. Without national ownership, sustainability of institutions and programmes become problematic.

National ownership is a prerequisite for programme sustainability. Equally, the sustainability of National Mechanisms and programmes includes human resource and capacity, financing, cultural awareness and institutional structures, systems and capacities.

Figure 5.3. Achieving National Ownership and Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicator examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National/</td>
<td>Political support</td>
<td>Political statement on leadership and support for existing and new National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local ownership</td>
<td>Change in government policy and practice</td>
<td>Mechanisms and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil society engagement and initiative (important</td>
<td>New government initiative to establish new and improve existing mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distinction between government ownership and national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ownership)</td>
<td>Create dialogue process on mass atrocity prevention with both state and civil society participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and</td>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
<td>National budgetary allocations determine mass atrocity prevention funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Training to strengthen management capacity to implement programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information management and monitoring capacity</td>
<td>Establishment of national data centre to track and monitor progress of mass atrocity prevention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from OECD DAC, 2007 p. 73
Resource mobilization

Budget remains an important part of programme implementation. Without funds or with a shortage of funds, programmes are poorly implemented. Most African countries depend on donor support to execute programmes. National Mechanisms for mass atrocity prevention may not receive adequate funding from government budgets or subvention, and may have to look to donors for extra support.

A key question is whether National Mechanisms will be able to operate effectively if donor support is withdrawn in the future. Requesting funds from donors requires special skills in proposal writing and stakeholder engagement. Equally important in resource mobilization efforts is auditing and accountability. However, weak institutional capacity in the public sector has made accountability a weak link in programme management and sustainability. Accountability is an important measure of trust and confidence in resource mobilization.

**ACTIVITY 3**

1. Group brainstorm on resource mobilization, programme ownership and sustainability.
   - What specific measures can National Mechanisms put in place to consolidate their programmes?
   - You have been appointed as a Resource Mobilization Manager for the newly established National Architecture for Atrocity Prevention in your country. What are the most effective ways of generating resources to support the functioning of your institution? Consider both internal and external sources of resource mobilization.
   - Is national/local ownership a sufficient requirement for the sustainability of National Mechanisms?

2. Note answers/responses on flipchart.

3. Comments on significant responses.
UNIT 4: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 30 MINUTES

10 minutes for brainstorming, 10 minutes for presentation, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVES

- Discuss how capacity development enhances the sustainability of National Mechanisms; and
- Explain the different areas of individual and organizational capacity building.

Although financing and cultural considerations are important elements of programme sustainability, capacity development and building constitutes the most important single driver of programme ownership and sustainability.

Figure 5.4. Areas of Individual and Institutional Capacity Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aptitude</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual capacity:</strong></td>
<td>relates to an employee’s education and professional training, professional experience and competence, as well as her or his physical and mental aptitude.</td>
<td><strong>Organizational capacity:</strong> refers to institutional qualities such as the number of staff, the organizational structure, resources, infrastructure and information systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrity</strong></td>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual integrity:</strong></td>
<td>refers to an employee’s adherence to international standards of human rights and professional conduct, including a person’s financial propriety.</td>
<td><strong>Organizational integrity:</strong> relates to procedures employed to establish the principles and values of an institution, including disciplinary and complaint procedures, oversight mechanisms, ethical guidelines, codes of conduct and representation (gender, ethnicity, geographic origin and religion).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from OECD DAC, 2007 p. 60

Sustainability is enhanced further if capacity development is coupled with both individual and organizational integrity.
An understanding of how mass atrocity crimes affect the lives of women and men enables practitioners to better appreciate the context in which they are operating. This in turn helps them in making sure that response efforts do not worsen the plight of the local population or exacerbate past injustices.

Additionally, it should enable practitioners to correct social inequalities, such as the underrepresentation of women in decision-making processes or limited access to justice mechanisms. Having a thorough understanding of the different needs, primacies and capacities of women and men should eventually lead to better-informed decisions and more effective implementation of mass atrocity prevention programmes.

The term “gender” refers to the social differences and social relations between women and men. It therefore refers not to women or men, but to the relationship between them, and the way this is socially constructed. The gender of a person:

- Is socially constructed and therefore learned and can be changed;
- Differs and varies within and across cultures and over time; and/or
- Results in different roles, responsibilities, opportunities, needs and constraints for women, men, girls and boys.

Mass atrocity prevention programmes should mainstream gender considerations to ensure that they respond to the diverse needs of men and women. At the meeting of the UN Economic and Social Council in 1997 gender mainstreaming was defined as “the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making the concerns and experiences of women and men an integral dimension of design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.”

16 Statement from the workshop on Gender Mainstreaming, 15-17 September 1997, Geneva, Switzerland.
Gender-sensitive programming requires National Mechanisms to be able to develop relevant approaches under a gender lens: to create space for addressing gender-based violations as well as mainstreaming gender roles in prevention initiatives. Mainstreaming refers to ideas and practices that ensure that prevention efforts equally attend to gender-related roles, needs and interests. It may include appointing gender advisors to National Mechanisms and maintaining a network of gender experts to provide skills and approaches to prevention, for example, in areas of sexual and gender-based violence or human rights violations (social, political, economic and religious) during mass atrocity situations.

To this end, some of the best practices include:

- Developing gender-specific indicators to help identify gender-related issues during mass atrocity situations, e.g. economic, social, legal and political practices against women at family, communal and national levels. Identified indicators can be factored into early warning systems in order to forecast threats and risks faced by women and young people.

- Early responses to acts of violence against young people and women, e.g. countering sexual violence against women by strengthening relevant institutions of the state, including access to resources and political opportunities by women and legal guarantees for gender-based rights.

- Adopting gender analysis and mainstreaming as a cross-cutting theme in capacity building and outreach programmes by National Mechanisms.

- Ensuring members and staff of National Mechanisms are well trained on gender sensitivity and mainstreaming, e.g. associated risk factors, rights, obligations, strategies, approaches and tools to ensure coordinated actions to respond more effectively to gender issues during mass atrocity prevention.

- Attaching a gender advisor to each National Mechanism to provide technical assistance at all stages during programming for mass atrocity prevention.

- Incorporating gender resilience training in mass atrocity prevention capacity building programmes at family, community and national levels.

- Advocating to increase overall youth and female participation in major national processes concerning health, education and security sector reforms, economic planning, etc.
What gets mainstreamed about gender?

- Recognition and respect for gender differences during prevention;
- Gender equality as an essential value during mass atrocity prevention;
- Promoting gender equality as a society wide responsibility;
- Gender-sensitive political, social and economic programming for mass atrocity prevention;
- Full participation (formally and informally) of women and young people in prevention; and
- Gender-based understanding of the context of prevention to ensure critical values of equality and inclusiveness are properly integrated in programming against mass atrocity crimes.

Further reading


MODULE 6: ENGAGING CRITICAL STAKEHOLDERS TO BUILD RESILIENCE

MODULE OVERVIEW

Prevention of atrocities occurs through a broad range of strategies used to identify and respond to threats and risks with the aim of mitigating the occurrence or recurrence of these crimes, while also building local resilience for communities to survive and bounce back after the crimes. The measures may include strengthening state institutions, legal dialogue and other reforms to build trust; promoting accountability, human rights and the rule of law; improving service delivery and democratic governance; supporting civil society, etc. Effective mass atrocity prevention programmes focus on all levels of society to include relevant stakeholders. This module is designed to help you identify, prioritize and engage with the stakeholders that are critical to the establishment and/or maintenance of National Mechanisms.

LEARNING OUTCOME

By the end of the module, participants will be able to:

- Identify the critical stakeholders of National Mechanisms relative to their specific context;
- Understand the importance of stakeholder engagement; and
- Undertake activities to inform the development of action plans for constructive engagement.
LESSON MAP

UNIT 1
Introduction

UNIT 2
State Agencies and Political Actors

UNIT 3
Indigenous Actors

UNIT 4
Civil Society Organizations

UNIT 5
Media

UNIT 6
Women’s Groups

UNIT 7
Youth Groups

UNIT 8
Private Sector Actors

UNIT 9
Epistemic Communities

UNIT 10
Activities: Stakeholder Analysis and Actor Action Plan/Power Analysis

ESTIMATED TIMING

This module should take approximately 6 hours and 30 minutes to complete.

NOTE: UNLIKE OTHER MODULES, THE NINE UNITS BELOW DO NOT HAVE AN ACTIVITY EACH, BUT RATHER TWO JOINT ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED IN UNIT 10 AT THE END OF THE MODULE. THE TRAINING TIMES DO NOT INCLUDE THE ACTIVITIES (4.5 HOURS).
UNIT 1: INTRODUCTION

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 45 MINUTES

20 minutes for brainstorming, 15 minutes for presentation, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Understand the different stakeholders and how to engage with them.

What is stakeholder engagement?

Stakeholder engagement is the process of involving people who may be affected by or can influence the prevention of mass atrocities. Stakeholder engagement is a critical aspect of the operationalization of National Mechanisms. Without it, ownership of decisions and actions relating to mass atrocity prevention and the sustainability of preventive programmes will be ineffective. Through engagement, National Mechanisms actors are able to translate the needs of relevant stakeholders into preventive strategy. The following clip demonstrates what stakeholder engagement entails.

How to engage?

Figure 6.1. Stakeholder engagement – How?

Profile stakeholders using the tools

Plan capacity increases where necessary

Decide engagement priorities

Map engagement expectations and capacities
Why is stakeholder engagement important?

■ It helps to improve the performance of the National Mechanism by bringing together various skills and capacities to inform prevention;
■ It encourages programme(s) sustainability by ensuring greater buy-in/trust/confidence in/legitimacy of the National Mechanism, producing better institutionalization and improved performance;
■ It creates favourable attitudes towards the National Mechanism; helps to create and reinforce local ownership;
■ It helps to institutionalize mass atrocity prevention;
■ It helps to open communication channels and build partnerships between pre-existing or potential adversaries that can be used in times of need to prevent mass atrocities;
■ It increases the knowledge, understanding and capacities of stakeholders to respond to risks and threats within their communities and enables them to improve their mass atrocity prevention initiatives;
■ It ensures deeper prevention goals are achievable, i.e. a better ability to address underlying and manifest issues at structural and relational levels;
■ It builds pathways for peaceful regeneration and enables communities to be more resilient to, and bounce back quicker from, conflict and mass atrocities;
■ It can promote positive and inclusive models of behaviour, reinforce global norms and undermine the acceptability of atrocity behaviours, i.e. incitement, hate speech, violence etc.; and
■ It is necessary for building resilience. Resilience is the strength and capacity of a community to withstand and resist incitement, prevent mass atrocity crimes and to recover quickly from the impact of mass atrocities.
The three ‘Ws’ of stakeholder engagement

To ensure a successful stakeholder engagement, it is important to answer questions on ‘why’ (purpose), ‘what’ (scope and issues) and ‘who’ (which stakeholders).

Table 6.1. Rudiments of Stakeholder Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish the purpose – why are you engaging?</td>
<td>Establish the scope – material issues relevant to the purpose</td>
<td>Determine/establish the mandate and ownership to determine the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What needs to be achieved should be dependent on improving and developing a strategy; identifying and addressing operational issues; as well as understanding stakeholders’ views and perspectives.

A material issue influences decisions, actions or behaviours of one or more stakeholder. These include:

- Where to engage: by geographical area (region, country, sub-region, etc.) and by organizational area (government or ministry, civil society or women’s groups, etc.).
- Time frame of engagement: this could be short-term, focusing on current concerns and issues, or long-term dealing with strategic interventions.
- Activities/products/services: the main subjects or issues to engage upon must be defined.
- Level of engagement: what level of engagement is required and how (see Figure 6.1.).

The stakeholders identified should be:

- relevant to the purpose and scope; and/or
- able to affect/influence or are affected by the action/activities; and/or
- directly or indirectly needed to achieve purpose; and/or
- those with an ethical/moral authority/responsibility; and/or
- those with a diverse/different views; and/or
- those with a legitimate claim to represent the interests of a stakeholder.
Figure 6.2. Levels of Engagement

- **COLLABORATE**: Two-way engagement with joint learning, decision-making & actions, partner in process

- **INVOLVE**: Two-way engagement with limits to their responsibility, they are part of the process

- **CONSULT**: More limited part of process - involved, but role is limited - stakeholders are asked questions & they respond

- **INFORM**: Using pull or push communication
  - Pull: Information is made available and the onus is on stakeholders to find it
  - Push: Information is actively broadcast to stakeholders

Source: Centre for Effective Services (2021), *An Introductory Guide to Implementation*.

**Further reading**

- Watch the video “Stakeholder Engagement: Five-step Process”: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5VrHeEfRceo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5VrHeEfRceo)
UNIT 2: STATE AGENCIES AND POLITICAL ACTORS

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 1 HOUR 10 MINUTES

30 minutes for presentation, 30 minutes for plenary discussion, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVES

- Define what State agencies and political actors are; and
- Explain why it’s important to engage with them, how to do so and what the risks and challenges may be.

State agencies are any department, commission, council, board, committee, institution, legislative body, agency, government corporation, educational institution or official of the executive, legislative or judicial branch of the government. Examples include: government ministries; national human rights institutions; national police; national defence forces; office of the president/prime minister; advisory committees; and inspectorates and regulators.

Political actors include parliamentarians, ministers and other affiliate government officials. They are supported by civil/public servants and security actors in the discharge of their duties.

Why engage?

States should take the foremost responsibility of protecting their citizens and their property. As such, state agencies should be engaged to ensure greater political trust and legitimacy; ensure that National Mechanisms are created and accepted as a legal entity; increase support for the functioning of the National Mechanisms; minimize resistance to the domestication of the work; reinforce National Mechanisms’ autonomy and moral authority to influence policies and decision-making; and utilize existing expertise.

Moreover, it will support efforts to secure stable and reliable funding (from the state); encourage the domestication of international instruments that give risk to regional and National Mechanisms; establish channels of influence to impact state policies and programmes relevant to mass atrocity prevention; and improve ability to support the institutionalization, especially through actors with mandates and capacity to be influential and ensure open and effective communication channels should engagement be necessary to de-escalate hostilities.

Political actors are responsible for the development of legislation and initiatives at the national level; advocating for action at the national and international level; advocating for or allocating sufficient resources and legislate to ensure the sustainability of the National Mechanism and ensuring the creation, codification/institutionalization and sustenance of the National Mechanism.

Both actors also have the potential to delegitimize/undermine the National Mechanism as well as having constituency that can influence negatively in other ways.
How to engage?

Multiple ways of engagement exist, including through dialogue/communication; through influencers (e.g. think tanks, civil society, lobby and interest groups, constituents, political parties, the private sector, etc.); establishing internal relationships; recognizing and filling knowledge gaps and by capacity building opportunities. It is important to involve as broad a spectrum of political actors (officials/legislators) as possible in the drafting of bills, etc. legislating for National Mechanisms. They can be accessed directly or through their constituencies.

What are the risks and challenges?

The risks and challenges include the co-option of the National Mechanism and its mandate; a lack of political will to support the creation and/or maintenance of the National Mechanism; the motivations of those engaged with the National Mechanism; external perceptions of or actual bias towards one or other political actor; and being used as a political tool and/or for political gain.
Why engage?

Engaging indigenous actors is crucial in managing National Mechanisms. It will ensure the integration of cultural practices and languages; improve efficacy of programmes and activities by building local ownership; ensure their in-depth and unique knowledge and experiences are integrated into the analysis and solutions and take advantage of pre-existing trust dynamics within these communities to improve mass atrocity prevention and early warning actions and responses. It also offers opportunities to strengthen and improve a community’s ability to withstand and resist incitement and strengthen and improve a community’s ability to prevent or recover from mass atrocities.

How to engage?

Each situation is individual and context specific, however it’s important to make sure to understand and utilize pre-existing practices and structures.

What are the risks and challenges?

These are minimal but a lack of understanding and/or knowledge of the practices/languages/structures of indigenous actors can result in increased fragmentation rather than cohesion. In addition, it is vital to ensure you do not unknowingly reinforce or entrench pre-existing inequalities and prejudices.
UNIT 4: CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 1 HOUR 10 MINUTES

30 minutes for presentation, 30 minutes for plenary discussion, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Define what civil society organizations are, explain why it’s important to engage with them, how to do so and what the risks and challenges may be.

What are they?

Civil society organizations (CSOs) are broadly described as:

- **Non-governmental organizations** (NGOs), non-profit formally structured organizations that operate independently of any government and are often privately funded or an adjunct to an existing organization (e.g. a church), that address issues in support of the public good. Also known as not-for-profit, charity or voluntary organizations. Within this category there are:
  - International non-governmental organizations (INGOs), which have multiple offices in multiple countries. They can be registered as national NGOs within the country but often have a headquarters/main office based elsewhere;
  - National non-governmental organizations (NNGOs), whose registration/focus/scope is within a country;
  - Local non-governmental organizations (LNGOs), whose location/focus/scope is localized within a single country.
- **Community-based organizations** (CBOs), non-profits working at a community level, often run/managed by community members; and
- **Grassroots support organizations** (GSOs).

Why engage?

CSOs can creatively engage actors at a local, national and international level as they often have pre-existing trusted relationships with individual lawmakers/parliamentary groups and are likely to have pre-existing trust-based interactions with communities and affected communities, to know of or be able to identify and support local sources of resilience. In addition, they can create and expand networks connecting to the international community as well as grassroots. They can share information, advocate, build prevention capacities, monitor and share information. They can promote peaceful democratic transitions through structures, institutions and practices for good governance at various levels. They can provide a greater knowledge and understanding of cultures/practices. They can also, through programming and activities, reduce inequalities, tackle discrimination (that give rise to mass atrocity crimes) and prevent escalation of problems between groups.
What are the benefits?

Their engagement often improves trust and confidence building of National Mechanisms if endorsed/supported by trusted CSOs; they often have expertise and a more diverse spectrum of views and can facilitate meetings between a broad range of actors.

What are the risks and challenges?

A lack of understanding and/or knowledge of the structures and dynamics within and between CSOs can result in increased fragmentation rather than cohesion and they may unknowingly be reinforcing and entrenching pre-existing inequalities and prejudice.

Further reading

UNIT 5: MEDIA

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 1 HOUR 10 MINUTES

30 minutes for presentation, 30 minutes for plenary discussion, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Define what media are, explain why it’s important to engage with them, how to do so and what the risks and challenges may be.

What are they?

This term includes newspapers, radio, TV, bloggers and influencers.

Why engage?

The media can play critical roles in contributing to the prevention of mass atrocities. They have the power to increase positivity and disseminate preventive information. They have unique knowledge, understanding and access to local dynamics and a good knowledge of the local context and influence at a local level.

How to engage?

The first step to engaging with the media is to identify and engage with them through a well-researched and designed communications strategy. Engagement includes working with the media on their own outputs or contributing your own such as writing editorial/blogs and creating radio shows/advertisements. It’s also important to ensure you are utilizing a local as well as national engagement strategy.

What are the benefits?

The media can document, monitor and help prevent mass atrocities. They can also generate positive discussions, and counter incitement or negative reporting. In addition, they can disseminate preventive information/messaging in local languages widely, quickly and effectively and transmit early warning information to decision makers and the wider public.

What are the risks and challenges?

Unfortunately, the media are also able to fuel tensions, spread hatred, generate negative discussions, disseminate negative information/messaging and they can create or hasten/inflame evolving crises. In addition, many media require you to pay for content which can be prohibitive. They can also have in-built political and other bias.

Further reading

UNIT 6: WOMEN’S GROUPS

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 1 HOUR 10 MINUTES

30 minutes for presentation, 30 minutes for plenary discussion, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Define what women’s groups are, explain why it’s important to engage with them, how to do so and what the risks and challenges may be.

What are they?

Women’s groups refer to a collective of like-minded individuals and institutions that advocate for policies and actions that empower and support women’s rights.

Why engage?

It is widely acknowledged that violent conflicts and mass atrocity crimes disproportionately affect women and girls. Thus, one of the priority objectives of the international community is the full and equal participation of women in social, political, economic, cultural and civil life at the national and international levels and the elimination of all forms of discrimination on the basis of sex. Including women helps to integrate their unique needs and interests in decision-making processes. Engaging women is therefore critical to formulating and implementing policies that support the effective prevention of gender-related risks. Further, engaging women in the operationalization of National Mechanisms helps to integrate gender-related warning signs that usually precede the commission of mass atrocity crimes such as sexual and gender-based violence into preventive measures. A gender-based understanding of the context of prevention helps to ensure that critical values of equality and inclusiveness are properly integrated in programming against mass atrocity crimes.

How to engage?

Mainstream gender into policies and programmes. Incorporating data collection disaggregated by sex and other gender factors ensures a deeper engagement of gender issues. Consult with gender experts such as women’s organizations on programme planning and design, and integrate gender dimensions into activities, training and reporting. It is also a good idea to consider appointing specific advisory roles within the National Mechanisms.

What are the benefits?

Recognition of and appropriate responses to violence perpetrated against women before it escalate into mass atrocities can help make institutions more resilient. Engagement with, and understanding of, women can help strengthen institutional responses. Increased recognition and positive and proactive participation by, and engagement with, women in national processes can break down prejudices resulting in an increase in recognition of, respect for, and sensitivity to gender, age and other differences.

What are the risks and challenges?

It is important to make sure not to further entrench any pre-existing and in-built prejudices and negative stereotypes. If engagement is not genuine or is mismanaged it can result in the further exclusion of women.
UNIT 7: YOUTH GROUPS

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 1 HOUR 10 MINUTES

30 minutes for presentation, 30 minutes for plenary discussion, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Define what youth groups are, explain why it’s important to engage with them, how to do so and what the risks and challenges may be.

What are they?

Youth groups constitute important stakeholders because they are resourceful and often have a good knowledge of the local context that can be exploited to either perpetrate or prevent mass atrocities. The youth are often socially, economically and politically excluded, which compounded by a lack of opportunities makes them vulnerable to recruitment as perpetrators of mass atrocities, but they are also often the most vulnerable and common victims. Nearly all the mass atrocity crimes that have occurred on the African continent have exploited the vulnerabilities of the youth through recruitment (voluntary or forced) or targeted attacks. In addition, the victimization of youth and the failure of accountability for crimes can be a precursor to wider violence, so are important in terms of early warning. It is important to enhance understanding, sensitivity and response to violations targeting the youth.

Countries with high youth populations are at a higher statistical risk of armed conflict (though this is not necessarily causal). The youth are potentially more vulnerable to recruitment due to their biological, psychological and social development stage. Their sense of identity and belonging is important to them and can be channelled to the positive or negative.

How to engage?

Develop a clear objective and implementation plan that takes the interests and needs of youth into account. Provide meaningful roles to young people, as a direct outcome of empowerment, training and mentorship. Effective youth engagement is underpinned by informing, educating and resourcing them to be able to play tangible roles.

What are the benefits?

Recognition of, and appropriate responses to, violence perpetrated against youth before they escalate into mass atrocities can help make institutions more resilient. Engagement with, and understanding of youth groups can help strengthen institutional responses.

What are the risks and challenges?

Without proper screening and sensitization, politically exposed youth who are included in sensitive preventive actions can jeopardize the objectives of National Mechanisms. To ensure sustainability of youth engagement, programmes must be deliberately designed to cater to their interests. Ad hoc arrangements can risk alienating youth groups and exposing their vulnerabilities.
What are they?
These are non-state-controlled economic actors, whose financial wherewithal can either influence or prevent the perpetration of mass atrocity crimes.

Why engage?
They can generate more finances/power/influence than the state at a local and national level and they often have good knowledge of the local context and the ability to influence at a local level. In some circumstances, they may have the ability to influence/refuse to cooperate with those pushing towards mass atrocities. The private sector is politically active, especially with regards to their commercial interests and therefore can act as a check on state actors. However, they also have the ability to commit, contribute or be complicit in mass atrocities and/or to support mass atrocity perpetrators to maintain the status quo and/or gain commercial favour, etc.

How to engage?
Access pre-existing, or create new platforms for engagement through influencers e.g. think tanks, CSOs, lobby and interest groups, constituents and/or political parties. Establish internal contacts and relationships and recognize and fill knowledge gaps by offering capacity building opportunities. As with state and political actors, the 3Ps apply — be proactive, persistent and patient.

What are the benefits?
The private sector can have already established and trusted communication channels with government and have the economic power to influence. They have the ability to be a force for change by strengthening local economies and/or encouraging economic activity which can result in improvements negating inequality and discrimination and often have resources for and/or experience in engaging with the media.

What are the risks and challenges?
Due to their commercial and financial capacity, the private sector has the ability to commit, contribute or be complicit in mass atrocities. Their motivations are different from the other stakeholders, i.e. commercial/financial and if it is of benefit to them, they can be a destabilizing force. In addition, they can be direct perpetrators and/or accomplices/enablers to mass atrocities through the provision of resources, goods, services, etc.
UNIT 9: EPISTEMIC COMMUNITIES

TOTAL TRAINING TIME: 1 HOUR 10 MINUTES

30 minutes for presentation, 30 minutes for plenary discussion, 10 minutes for summary.

SESSION OBJECTIVE

Define epistemic communities, explain why it’s important to engage with them, how to do so and what the risks and challenges may be.

What are they?

They are largely independent institutions (think tanks, research and academic institutions), which can play watchdog and advocacy roles through public dialogues, seminars, workshops and publications. Engaging them is important in designing and shaping policies and providing critical inputs into revising old and outdated policies and legal frameworks.

Why engage?

Since they influence policy through their specific knowledge on important issue areas, engaging epistemic communities helps to create positive outcomes in policymaking and implementation. They also help to frame preventive programming and break down technical issues, thereby finding solutions to otherwise difficult problems.

How to engage?

Before atrocity prevention programming, ensure to include think tanks and research institutions in the conceptualization. Often, they can detect unforeseen challenges by playing the role of independent observers and expert contributors. To effectively engage the epistemic communities, firstly define the expertise required, as well as context-specific requirements. Debates, workshops, seminars and research projects offer a more conducive environment for the engagement of epistemic communities.

What are the benefits?

When they are engaged under the right conditions, they can help to identify issues, understand what works and what doesn’t, as well as highlight challenges, controversies, and emerging trends in the prevention of atrocity crimes. Through their advocacy roles, the epistemic community can help to catalyse needed external attention to the work of National Mechanisms. But most important is their role in knowledge generation and context-specific agenda setting which provide the framework for National Mechanisms to implement atrocity prevention programmes.

What are the risks and challenges?

As a result of the indefinite nature of knowledge production, it can sometimes be difficult to know what is the right prescription for a problem. Epistemic communities can often send atrocity prevention practitioners on an unending expedition if the parameters of the problem are not well defined. Further, not knowing the inherent interests behind a particular prescription can compromise the work of National Mechanisms by exposing them to the political machinations of self-seeking stakeholders.
ACTIVITY 1

TOTAL TIME: 1 HOUR 30 MINUTES

10 minutes presentation, 30 minutes group discussions, 40 minutes group presentations, 10 minutes summary.

1. Explain how the exercise will be undertaken and its purpose.
2. Break the class into eight groups and give each group one of the stakeholder groups.
3. Using the identified stakeholders from Activity 4 in Module 1, ask each group to plot where the identified stakeholders are situated.
4. Ask them to first think about their current situation and decide which quarter to put the stakeholder into, then use the 1-10 markings to grade them within that. Give them 10 minutes to do this.
   - A 10/10 ally is the best.
   - A 10/10 opponent is the worst and will need significant work/engagement to move to the desired grid.
   - A 1/1 ally is at risk of moving down to neutral or across to opponent so needs nurturing.
5. Ask them to then think about which quadrant and where within it, they would like to see each stakeholder. Give them 10 minutes to do this.
6. Ask each group to present their two matrixes.
7. Open the floor for discussion and amend the matrix to include the feedback before finalizing. Allow 10 minutes per group for feedback and amendments.
### Figure 6.3. Stakeholder Analysis (Current and Desired)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALLIES</th>
<th></th>
<th>OPPONENTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **ALLIES:** Stakeholders supporting the project.
- **OPPONENTS:** Stakeholders opposing the project.
- **NEUTRAL:** Stakeholders with no clear stance.
- **UNKNOWN:** Stakeholders whose stance is unknown.
ACTIVITY 2

TOTAL TIME: 1 HOUR 30 MINUTES
10 minutes presentation, 30 minutes group discussions, 40 minutes group presentations, 10 minutes summary.

1. Explain how the exercise will be undertaken and its purpose.
2. Break the class into the same eight groups as above.
3. Ask the groups to put all their identified stakeholders into the table and proceed to populate the table accordingly. Give them 10 minutes to do this.
4. Ask each group to present their tables.
5. Open the floor for discussion and ask each group to amend the table to include the feedback. Allow 10 minutes per table for presentation and discussion.

---

**Figure 6.4. Power/Interest Grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Inform/Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Role/Position</th>
<th>Interest in the issue</th>
<th>Power Holder/Influencer or Affected (PH/I/A) and scale 1-10</th>
<th>CURRENT Ally, opponent or undecided or not known (A/O/U/?) and scale 1-20</th>
<th>DESIRED Ally, opponent or undecided or not known (A/O/U/?) and scale 1-20</th>
<th>Type (civil society, government community, etc.)</th>
<th>Strategy/plan to move from current to desired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
ACTIVITY 3

TOTAL TIME: 1 HOUR 30 MINUTES

10 minutes presentation, 30 minutes group discussions, 40 minutes group presentations, 10 minutes summary.

1. Explain how the exercise will be undertaken and its purpose.
2. Break the class into the same eight groups as above.
3. Ask the groups to put all their identified stakeholders into the table and proceed to populate the table accordingly. Give them 10 minutes to do this.
4. Ask each group to present their tables.
5. Open the floor for discussion and ask each group to amend the table to include the feedback. Allow 10 minutes per table for presentation and discussion.

Figure 6.6. Engagement Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Willingness to engage 1-10</th>
<th>Capacity to engage 1-10</th>
<th>Power to influence/affect change 1-10</th>
<th>Level of engagement Willingness x capacity x power</th>
<th>Engagement activity (do nothing, monitor, advocate, inform, consult, involve, collaborate, empower, build capacity)</th>
<th>Engagement expectations</th>
<th>Capacity gap remedies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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West Africa Network for Peacebuilding website. Available at https://www.wanep.org/wanep/

SECTION 4
PUTTING THEORY INTO PRACTICE
MODULE OVERVIEW

The key to making a National Mechanism an effective instrument of prevention is its implementation in practice. Identifying and countering risks of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and ethnic cleansing before they develop into unmanageable situations, employing an inclusive process of engaging critical stakeholders and developing deliberate programmes to respond to mass atrocity risk are all vital to peace and stability in regions all over the world.

National Mechanisms are equipped with resources that can be used by different actors at various levels of society in order to prevent mass atrocity crimes or their escalation. But for this to happen the actors involved must be aware of the possibilities that already exist in society and of the mechanisms that need to be put in place for mass atrocity prevention to work effectively in real life.

The task is for participants to identify which societal issues are specifically relevant to mass atrocity prevention and to set up a whole-of-system approach that can respond to these. This will include relevant state actors, other relevant intergovernmental agencies as well as non-state actors.

Once the issues have been delegated, the participants take up their appropriate roles as actors, and conduct a multi-actor national conference in which they decide what measures should be taken, by whom and how.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

This exercise facilitates practical application of the knowledge and skills acquired through the preceding modules. The simulation is designed to have the course participants think about National Mechanisms and responsibilities, and to engage with tools for early warning programming and prevention.
By the end of this simulation exercise, participants will:

- Be able to appreciate the importance of National Mechanisms and approaches to establishing them;
- Understand the importance of identifying and acting on early warning indicators;
- Appreciate the importance of a whole-of-system approach in establishing and managing National Mechanisms;
- Be able to suggest action-oriented programmes and targeted solutions through relevant actors for operationalizing National Mechanisms;
- Learn how to incorporate mass atrocity prevention principles into operational planning and strategy.

LESSON MAP

The simulation is detailed in annexes 2 to 5.

ESTIMATED TIMING

This module should take approximately 6 hours to complete:

- 30 minutes of introduction;
- 1 hour and 30 minutes to 2 hours (90-120 minutes) of actor group discussions;
- 3 hours (180 minutes) of plenary discussions; and
- 1 hour (60 minutes) of debriefing.
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CARANA is a fictitious country, located on a fictitious island, KISIWA, off the eastern coast of Africa. It shares borders with SUMORA to the north, KATASI to the west, RIMOSA to the south and the Indian Ocean to the east.

It has three main ethnic groups:

- The FALIN (49 percent) are the ethnic majority in the country and mainly live in the east and centre of CARANA, although some are also present in the west and south.
- The KORI (38 percent) mainly in the west, are the dominant ethnic group in the provinces of TERENI and KOLONI.
- The TATSI (13 percent) mainly live in the south.

All three groups are intermingled in several areas and this has sometimes led to violent interethnic clashes.

Some KORI are nomads and their annual migration, with their herds, is an increasing source of tension with the FALIN in the provinces of MAHBEK and BARIN.

ADMINISTRATION

The state of CARANA is divided into eight provinces – TERENI, KOLONI, MAHBEK, HANNO, BARIN, FELLARI, GUTHAR and LEPPKO and a special capital zone of GALASI.

The capital is GALASI. The provincial capitals are GALASI, MARONI, SUREEN, ALUR, FARON, FOLSA, AMSAN and CORMA.
POLITICAL SITUATION

CARANA gained its independence in 1962. JOSEPH UROMA (the leader of the largest of the liberation movements and with a power base backed by the FALIN majority in the east of the country) came to power after independence.

He was overthrown in a military coup in 1971 led by GENERAL KEPLO. Rather than return the country to civilian rule, however, the military continued to rule CARANA until 1999. Under GENERAL KEPLO’s military regime, the country’s economic, political and social development was stifled – civil and political rights in particular were not observed and resources were directed towards the military sector. The death of GENERAL KEPLO in 1999 created an opportunity for the country’s first democratic elections in many years in which JACKSON OGAVO, a FALIN from the Parti Démocratique de CARANA (PDC) was elected President.

Initially the government was reasonably representative of the ethnic balance of the country, although still dominated by the FALIN, and it followed democratic principles that were later enshrined in the 1991 constitution. Since about 1996, CARANA has effectively been a one-party state.

During the first years of the OGAVO regime CARANA achieved some liberal development and economic prosperity but over time OGAVO’s focus changed and he became preoccupied with suppressing opposition groups and enhancing his own power base. Since 2004, he has expanded the influence of the central government on all economic and social activities by laws and administrative rules. The packing of key positions in government with members of his own tribe led to administrative and economic incompetence, inefficiency and massive corruption.
Opposition to OGA VO’s dictatorial regime began to grow with small uprisings between 2008 and 2010. In 2010, some small rebel groups in the TERENI province came together to form a larger and better organized rebel group known as the Movement Patriotique de Carana (MPC). This group became a well-structured and efficient opposition to the OGA VO regime and a real match for the government forces, the Forces de Defense du CARANA (FDC).

The MPC achieved some local success in the west over the CARANA Defence Force (CDF) and, by 2012, it effectively controlled the western highlands. Though the MPC’s military engagements were well coordinated and successfully executed, the rebels failed to formulate a comprehensive political programme. Their only stated aim was to remove OGA VO from power. By 2014, however, the MPC gained control of the three provinces in the west – KOLONI, TERRENI and MAHBEK.

With the bulk of the CDF tied down in the west, TATSI s in the southern province of LEPPKO began to agitate and attack government institutions. This quickly escalated into general looting and attacks on FALIN civilians. A number of these small rebel groups united and called themselves the Independent Combattants du Sud CARANA (ICSC).

The government responded by covertly arming “self-defence militias” amongst the FALIN community who have retaliated with attacks on TATSI s.

With no quarter asked and no quarter given, all parties suffered many casualties with the civilian population the most seriously affected. An estimated 150,000 civilians were killed through violence, famine or disease. The ICSC took advantage of the conflict to exploit natural resources in the south to fuel their war efforts, while the MPC exploited diamonds and received external support from the neighbouring country of KATASI.

A combination of war weariness and strategic manoeuvring by the international community led the leaders of both MPC and ICSC, as well as President OGA VO, to start negotiating a ceasefire and peace treaty in the beginning of 2019. A ceasefire agreement, the KALARI Peace Treaty was signed on 19 May 2019, after years of violent conflict in CARANA between the country’s government and rebel forces.


All the parties agreed to disarm have a consensus national government in which all stakeholders, ethnic, political and rebel groups will be adequately represented. The first task of this Government of National Unity was to organize a conference to see how best to end the communal violence and protect civilians from mass atrocities.

Historically, CARANA has relied on indigenous approaches to resolving disputes between communities and ethnic groups. The NTAM traditional system of dispute resolution is widely practiced by the FALIN and TATSI ethnic populations, as well as some neighbouring countries. It has over time become one of the main means of addressing conflicts in CARANA. A similar dispute resolution system called GOBE is practiced by the KORI group. These indigenous approaches are mainly composed of elderly men who make the rules and decisions, and women’s roles are limited to providing supporting roles. There is however no nationally recognized institutional mechanism for the prevention of conflict and mass atrocity crimes in CARANA. The court system is perceived to be slow, cumbersome, costly and contentious, and as such utilized mainly as a last resort. Nonetheless, criminal cases have always been addressed through the courts.
1. Agro-pastoralist tensions

Annual migration of nomadic KORI herdsman from south-west to east, through the ethnically mixed provinces of MAHBEK and BARIN, during the dry season, takes place in search of pastureland for their herds. This has been a growing source of tension with the settled farmers in MAHBEK and BARIN who are mainly FALIN. Tensions have increased in recent years as the effect of climate change is leading to a shortage of land, either for arable purposes or for pasture. The KORI nomads complain that land to which they traditionally had access for pasture has been gradually fenced off by settled farmers in MAHBEK and BARIN. As the authority of CARANA’s central government has weakened, these nomadic KORI have become increasingly assertive in their demands for access to water and pastureland for their herds at the expense of the traditional rights of the FALIN farmers. This has led to several shooting incidents in recent years and some FALIN claim that their farms have been over-run and their fences and crops destroyed. Many FALIN believe that they are facing a concerted campaign to drive them from their traditional lands, destroy their country’s territorial integrity and to “wipe the FALIN people from the face of the map”. Demonstrations have been organized demanding “rights for FALINs” and pledging to resist further encroachment by the KORI nomads. The worsening humanitarian crisis in the south of TERENI and MAHBEK is meanwhile placing increasing pressure on the KORI nomads to find fresh grazing land.
2. Sexual violence

Although CARANA has ratified the main international human rights and humanitarian treaties, which guarantee women’s right to equality, in practice women still suffer considerable discrimination, particularly in the west of the country, where the KORI believe that women are essentially second class citizens. Female genital mutilation (FGM) of girls in their early teens, though illegal, is practised very extensively in the west. Some national and international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) have been running educational campaigns to try and end the practice. Many reports of sexual violence in CARANA’s internally displaced person (IDP) camps have been received through some humanitarian agencies. The general breakdown of the rule of law has also led to increased incidences of child prostitution involving both girls and boys. There are also reports of children being trafficked to neighbouring countries for further transport to the sex markets in richer countries. Rape rates of young girls in the cities are also high. Many girls have been forced to quit school due to fear of sexual violence worsened by the social stigma attached to this form of violence. Organizations working with women affected by sexual violence during the conflict report that levels of domestic violence, including sexual abuse, and the use of hand weapons have increased dramatically.

3. Increasing build-up of tension, violence and use of civilians as human shields

The situation in CARANA is now approaching crisis point. There have been numerous violations of the KALARI Peace Agreement (KPA) by both the CARANA Defence Force (CDF) and the Movement Patriotique de CARANA (MPC) in the west of the country. The UNAMIC-led Joint Liaison Teams (JLT), established by the KPA and composed of representatives of all signatories to it, have all but collapsed. Following clashes in the town of FARON, both sides began to mobilize their forces in western HANNO, near to the town of KARO, which is under MPC control. The MPC, which had demobilized half of its combatants, has issued a general command for all soldiers to rejoin their units. The CDF has accused the MPC of preparing to use KARO as a base for an eastern offensive. It has three regiments garrisoned in western HANNO and has put them all on high alert. It has declared that unless the MPC verifiably withdraws all of its forces from the town, it will have “no option” but to attack. As the CDF moves into MPC controlled territory there are reports of clashes between rival groups of fighters. The CDF is using tanks and heavy artillery, in contravention of the KPA (Article 2.10). The MPC is using civilians as “human shields” and taking up positions near to hospitals, churches and other “protected” areas, in contravention of international humanitarian law. Some civilians are reported to have been killed in the clashes.
2. ACTORS’ PROFILE FOR MODULE 7 SIMULATION

ASSIGNED ACTOR: MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AND INTERIOR

Your objective for the national conference

A national plan to halt violence and suppress the insurgency preferably through dialogue and professional and transparent judiciary mechanisms. While participating in the national conference, you want to focus on a mechanism that identifies imminent risks that require immediate response. You must also aim to come up with long-term strategies (programming, capacity building, engagement, etc.) to prevent mass atrocity crimes.

Your identity

This actor includes the government’s Ministry of Justice and Interior and represents the security and law enforcement agencies, as well as the accountability and judicial infrastructure of CARANA.

Your interests

- Play the lead role among all state agencies and departments in ensuring adequate government representation in any ensuing national mechanism;
- You have an obligation to activate structures to commence accountability proceedings immediately through the national justice system to hold perpetrators accountable for their crimes;
- An enforced sense of legitimacy within parliament, validating efficient justice policies that mandate the establishment and or effective functioning of national mechanisms for atrocity prevention;
- Maintaining the government’s interest in the establishment and functioning of a national mechanism;
- Promoting programmes for dialogue among various ethnic communities;
- Building effective courts; and
- A system to end impunity for atrocity crimes.

Your concerns/challenges

- Ethnic and civil conflict involving cattle raiding might emerge between civilians disregarding the policies put in place by the government;
- While you have the common goal of preventing and protecting the population from atrocities, some members of the ministry do not want to negotiate with other parties. Other members of the body will disagree however, and believe that negotiations are necessary to ensure justice and stability within the region;
- Weak court system without the capacity to try serious crimes;
- Dearth of information on perpetrators; and
- Lack of sufficient witness protection.
ASSIGNED ACTOR: CARANA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION/OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN

Your objective for the national conference

A national plan to ensure that human rights are provided to civil society as well as the prevention of widespread and systematic mass atrocity crimes. Establish your own critical role in the national plan. Meet the needs of the ethnic populations that you represent, and work in association with members of parliament and bodies who represent various sectors of the government to ensure sustainable solutions to peace. Address long-term conflict between communities and ensure accountability for past crimes.

Your identity

This group is to be represented by spokespersons advocating the rights of the diverse CARANA population.

Your interests

- Ensure independence in the functioning of any established mechanism for atrocity prevention;
- Supporting the government to hold perpetrators accountable for crimes committed and ensuring that culprits are tried fairly;
- An end to conflict without an escalation to mass atrocity crimes;
- Stability through addressing disputes between ethnic groups. This could be completed through local integration or reintegration programmes, including income-generation projects, restoration of education and other assistance;
- Durable policies that will allow the CARANA population to rebuild stable lives;
- Promoting programmes for dialogue amongst various communities;
- Addressing root causes of atrocity crimes; and
- Sensitizing the public to ensure respect for human rights.

Your concerns/challenges

- There are numerous actors pursuing a diverse set of priorities including promoting justice, equality and defence, while others have a broader ethnic conflict prevention agenda. You are concerned that these diverse priorities may overshadow the desire to prevent widespread human rights abuses;
- Inter-communal and civil conflict involving cattle raiding might emerge between civilians disregarding the policies put in place by the governing body and the CARANA Human Rights Commission;
- Resource limitations as you disperse relief amongst the population in high-risk areas; and
- While you’re an independent agency, you are also a state institution and rely heavily on the government’s budgetary allocations to function.
ASSIGNED ACTOR: MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Your objective for the national conference

A national plan for the prevention of atrocity crimes that is consistent with international human rights and humanitarian laws that CARANA is signatory to. Your focus for the conference is to ensure that any ensuing national mechanism makes reference to international legal frameworks such as the Genocide Convention, Geneva Conventions, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, and other continental and regional frameworks, as well as make provisions for other bilateral and multilateral arrangements.

You must also come up with a strategy to engage CARANA’s citizens in the diaspora, and the international community to provide needed assistance for the implementation of the national mechanism.

Your identity

This actor includes the government’s department responsible for diplomacy, bilateral and multilateral relations as well as for providing support for CARANA’s citizens abroad.

Your interests

- You have an obligation to project a positive image of the government to the international community;
- Promoting legislation to domesticate international legal and political obligations on genocide and mass atrocity prevention; and
- Bilateral and multilateral cooperation to facilitate the establishment and effective functioning of a national mechanism for atrocity prevention.

Your concerns/challenges

- The international community has accused the government of being complicit in the commission of atrocity crimes;
- You operate in a region with strong opposition to how the international community has implemented the principles of the Responsibility to Protect in the past;
- CARANA has not ratified all the international legal frameworks on genocide and mass atrocity prevention, child protection, and guarantee of human rights; and
- Not all government agencies are in favour of the establishment of a national mechanism or structure.
ASSIGNED ACTOR: MINISTRY OF GENDER

Your objective for the national conference

An institutional mechanism for the prevention of atrocity crimes that incorporates the rights and interests of women and men. Your objective for the conference is to ensure that women are adequately represented in decision making relating to any legislation, mechanism, strategy or plans developed for the prevention of atrocity crimes. You must also propose measures to bring perpetrators of atrocity crimes to justice and to seek appropriate rehabilitation for victims of atrocity crimes. Critique decisions made at the conference to ensure they meet applicable gender standards.

Your identity

This actor represents the government ministry responsible for the formulation of policies and programmes that promote the institutionalization and development of gender-related issues.

Your interests

- You have an obligation to project a positive image of the government to the international community relating to norms and principles that promote the rights of women;
- Promoting legislation to domesticate international legal obligations on genocide and mass atrocity prevention particularly on sexual and gender-based violence;
- Ensuring justice for victims of atrocity crimes and demanding protection from the state; and
- An obligation to protect women from sexual exploitation and abuse through legislation, policies and programmes.

Your concerns/challenges

- The international community has accused the government of being complicit in the commission of atrocity crimes;
- You operate in a region with strong opposition to how the international community has implemented the principles of the Responsibility to Protect in the past;
- Patriarchy, which is about the dominance of men over women in social, political and economic lives, is still a challenge —where the KORI believe that women are essentially second class citizens; and
- CARANA has not ratified all the international legal frameworks on genocide and mass atrocity prevention, child protection, and guarantee of human rights.
ASSIGNED ACTOR: COUNCIL OF TRADITIONAL AUTHORITIES

Your objective for the national conference

A national plan to prevent ethnic clashes and widespread mass atrocity crimes. Establish your own critical role in ensuring respect for cultural practices and customs in the national plan. Meet the needs of the ethnic populations that you represent, and work in association with members of parliament and bodies who represent various sectors of the government to ensure stability within the region. It is your duty to support your government to ensure perpetrators are held accountable for violations of law under your authority.

Your identity

This group is composed of representatives of ethnic groups and local communities, and are entrusted with the responsibility of preserving and harmonizing customs and traditions.

Your interests

- An end to conflict without an escalation to mass atrocity crimes;
- The even distribution of basic resources including food, land and water;
- Recognition of indigenous approaches to conflict resolution and atrocity prevention;
- Resumption of normality in order to establish a stable and functioning society;
- Harmony and stability through eradicating personal and individual grudges between ethnic groups; and
- A system for channelling early warning signs into a national mechanism for response.

Your concerns/challenges

- Need for resources – whether through government assistance or development assistance from outside donors;
- Some of the international obligations ratified by the government are inconsistent with the customs and traditions of the people;
- Difficulty in generating political will to prioritize indigenous dispute resolution mechanisms; and
- Inter-communal and civil conflict between the KORI and the FALIN communities involving cattle raiding might emerge disregarding the policies put in place by the government. While you have the common goal of preventing and protecting the population from atrocities; members of the Council do not want to compromise on age-old cultural practices, some of which relegate women to the periphery of decision making.
ASSIGNED ACTOR: INTER-RELIGIOUS COUNCIL

Your objective for the national conference

A national plan to prevent the escalation of mass atrocity crimes and promoting peaceful co-existence between and among religious groups, between various ethnic groups and also avenues to engage in mediation towards preventing potential atrocity crimes in CARANA. Establish your own critical role in the national plan. Meet the needs of the population that you represent and advocate on their behalf.

Your identity

This actor is composed of representatives of various religious groups, broadly involving Christians, Muslims, Animists and others. You facilitate inter-religious harmony and cooperation, promote peaceful co-existence to reduce inter-ethnic tensions and contribute to the promotion of national peace in CARANA.

Your interests

- You have a moral responsibility to promote harmony and peaceful co-existence between ethnic groups;
- Promote the use of religious sermons and related activities to ensure national cohesion, peaceful co-existence and prevention of atrocity crimes;
- An obligation to speak truth to political power with the view to ensuring fair and balanced treatment of all manner of people irrespective of their social, economic, political and ethnic backgrounds; and
- Inclusive solution.

Your concerns/challenges

- Multiplicity of religious groups and the challenge of ideological differences may serve as disincentive to smooth mediation efforts;
- Religious approaches which are largely based on morality might not be able to deal with practical legal matters;
- Some of the international obligations ratified by the government are inconsistent with the religious principles of conflict resolution; and
- Existing tension between the state and council of religious groups on matters of morality, politics and governance.
ASSIGNED ACTOR: WOMEN’S RIGHTS ASSOCIATION

Your objective for the national conference

A national plan that guarantees the rights of women are protected by state and non-state actors. Impress on the government to respect all international and domestic conventions that seek the welfare and protection of women from human rights abuse. Establish your own critical role in the process and ensure that women take active part in decision making on the establishment and management of any national mechanisms for mass atrocity prevention. You have an obligation to ensure that international human rights and humanitarian treaties, which guarantee women’s right to equality, are reflected in domestic laws and in practice. Appeal to the international community for assistance to propagate your message and amplify the voice of women.

Your identity

This group is composed of women’s groups in CARANA who have mobilized to champion the rights of women. The group has a mandate to advocate for the rights of women in particular, but also other vulnerable populations in CARANA.

Your interests

■ Ensure the functioning of institutions/mechanism for the promotion of women’s rights;
■ Focusing national attention on key women’s issues to ensure respect for the rights of women, recognizing both international and domestic laws;
■ Prohibiting discrimination and ensuring equal access to justice;
■ Promoting programmes for dialogue among various communities;
■ Sensitization of the public to issues of human rights and differences among communities;
■ Advocacy against sexual exploitation and abuse;
■ Demanding that human rights of KORI women, who are deemed as second class citizens, are respected;
■ Ensuring that those who exploit women and children are held accountable within the justice system; and
■ Inclusive solutions.

Your concerns/challenges

■ The focus on women might mean neglecting other vulnerable groups such as children, which can hinder the prevention agenda;
■ Limited availability of resources for sustained advocacy for women’s rights might undermine the efforts of prevention;
■ As a patriarchal society, the advocacy may not receive full support of the male dominant groups particularly the traditional authorities; and
■ You face difficulties in securing a seat at important national deliberations that affect women. Nonetheless, you’re determined to mobilize all the necessary resources that will enable women to take an active part in the national conference.
**ASSIGNED ACTOR: CARANA CIVIL SOCIETY NETWORK**

**Your objective for the national conference**

A national plan to prevent an ethnic conflict with widespread mass atrocity crimes. Establish your own critical role in the national plan. Encourage the government to better protect civilians from inter-ethnic conflict. You also have an obligation to ensure that there is a recognized institutional mechanism for dispute resolution and atrocity prevention.

**Your identity**

The group represents the general population of CARANA. This group includes local civil society groups.

**Your interests**

- An end to the violence without an escalation to mass atrocities;
- Establishing a system for early detection and response to the risk of violence and atrocity crimes;
- Promoting programmes for dialogue among various ethnic groups and communities;
- Sensitization of the public to issues of human rights and differences among communities;
- Resumption of normality in order to establish a stable and functioning society fuelling economic growth; and
- Inclusive solutions.

**Your concerns/challenges**

- Need for resources – whether through government assistance or development assistance from outside donors;
- Difficulty in generating political will to respond to your requests and/or gain access to relevant decision makers;
- Some members of the group will agree with and participate in protests against the government and may support the actions of the self-defence groups if their demands are not met;
- Raising the society’s security and arms proliferation issues to the government for appropriate policy implementation; and
- While you have the common goal of preventing and protecting the population from atrocities, other actors have a very diverse set of priorities they are individually pursuing. Some may be promoting gender issues, lack of education and development, while others have a broader ethnic conflict prevention agenda, etc.
ASSIGNED ACTOR: GLOBAL/CONTINENTAL UNION

Your objective for the national conference

A national plan to ensure that basic human rights are provided to civil society as well as the prevention of violent outbursts. Work in association with the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Justice and Interior, and bodies who represent various sectors of the government to consolidate peace and security and to help establish conditions for stability and development.

Your identity

This group represents the international community including the regional and continental body of states and the United Nations.

Your interests

- Engaging in an open and fully inclusive national dialogue seeking to establish lasting peace, reconciliation and good governance, including through the full and effective participation of youth, women, diverse communities, faith groups, and civil society;
- Supporting the government and the Ministry of Justice to hold perpetrators accountable for crimes committed;
- Consolidating peace and security and to help establish conditions for development;
- Promoting programmes for dialogue among various ethnic groups and communities;
- Protecting civilians and upholding human rights through physical and diplomatic means;
- Supporting durable policies that will allow the CARANA population to rebuild stable lives; and
- Promoting national ownership of the plan.

Your concerns/challenges

- Maintaining a constructive relationship with the government in order to fulfil mandate obligations, particularly on those treaties and conventions that CARANA is party to;
- Ensuring that child protection provisions are integrated into all peace negotiations and national plans;
- Ethnic conflict involving cattle raiding might emerge between civilians disregarding the policies put in place by the government and the CARANA Human Rights Commission; and
- Gaps in priorities for those on the ground and decision makers at the Secretariat.
Introduction

The key to making National Mechanisms an effective instrument of prevention is its implementation in practice. Identifying and countering risks of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and ethnic cleansing before they develop into unmanageable situations, employing an inclusive process of engaging critical stakeholders, and developing deliberate programmes to respond to atrocity risk are all vital to peace and stability in regions all over the world. National Mechanisms are equipped with a toolbox that can be used by different actors at various levels of society in order to prevent atrocity crimes or their escalation. But for this to happen the actors involved must be aware of the possibilities that already exist in society and of the mechanisms that need to be put in place for atrocity prevention to work effectively in real life.

The task is for participants to identify which societal issues are specifically relevant to mass atrocity prevention, and to set up a whole-of-system approach that can respond to these. This will include relevant state actors, other relevant inter-governmental agencies as well as non-state actors. Once the issues have been delegated, the participants take up their appropriate roles as actors, and conduct a multi-actor national conference in which they decide what measures should be taken, by whom and how.

This simulation is designed to have the course participants think about national mechanisms and responsibilities and to engage with tools for early warning and prevention.

Objectives

At the end of this simulation the participants will:

- be able to appreciate the importance of national mechanisms and approaches to establishing them;
- understand the importance of identifying and acting on early warning indicators;
- appreciate the importance of a whole of system approach in establishing and managing national mechanisms;
- be able to suggest action-oriented programmes and targeted solutions through relevant actors for operationalizing national mechanisms; and
- learn how to incorporate atrocity prevention principles into operational planning and strategy.
Methodology/structure of simulation

The participants will be divided up into groups for the entire simulation. The simulation will start with a short introductory session where the structure of the simulation and the historical scenario will be explained, including a short historical background to the case, country profile and the current situation. The participants will be able to ask questions relating to the case. The participants will also receive a written summary of the case and be acquainted with the different roles they will take up during the scenario.

After the introduction, groups will be divided based upon randomly assigned roles. Each member of the group will receive a one-page information sheet describing their actor’s general aims during the conference. Once in groups, the simulation will formally commence.

The simulation will take place in five segments which will alternate between the small group and full-class formats (if the first two segments run long, segments three and four can be skipped and the “news update” that would have been introduced can be mentioned as a challenge going forward in the debriefing section:

1. (Actor groups) Identifying challenges and responses relevant to your actor. Participants will work together in their small groups to develop a set of policy options/recommendations/tasks in order to respond to the risk of mass atrocities. These mechanisms should be relevant to the assigned actor in terms of capacity to implement/relevance to request implementation from other actors. Groups should prepare to propose those mechanisms in the large group session.

   During these group sessions the facilitator should visit with every group briefly and discuss some of their policy options – the facilitator may encourage participants to think about the proximate and long-term actions they can pursue to address immediate concerns as well as structural priorities for prevention going forward. Note that not all groups have the desire or training to know that mass atrocity prevention should be a priority – thus some actors can/should propose actions that the “President” may need to mold into an atrocity-risk priority during the group session.

2. (Full class) Multi-actor national conference to agree upon the state’s approach to prevention. The Simulation Facilitator may act as President of CARANA or select one of the participants to act as such. The President will convene a multi-actor conference bringing together all of the actor groups in the room. Each group will have time to present their proposed mechanisms before engaging in a more open dialogue. The aim of the dialogue is for the group to prioritize different mechanisms and develop a plan of action for addressing the prevention of atrocity crimes.

   The Facilitator should encourage the groups to address potential logistical or capacity challenges in implementation with the aim of developing a realistic plan of action. The Facilitator should also steer the discussion to stay on the topic of addressing the threat of mass atrocities, and ask groups questions regarding their decisions and why they believe these can counter the threat of mass atrocities.

   The Facilitator will make the final decision regarding which options are selected – providing some justification for why others were not prioritized (the chosen options do not necessarily have to be the “best” ones, but should be the most realistic given the series of events that followed shortly after in CARANA).
After the plan is established (time permitting) the session will end with the Facilitator introducing a news update that may include evidence of emerging mass atrocities, new government policies, new international responses, etc. that the group must now address while also adjusting expectations/plans developed in the group session. The idea is that the update will dramatically change the situation such that the conversation about moving forward would be fundamentally different.

3. (Small groups) Assess the new information and its relevance to your actor. Discuss how the actor should respond to this information (if at all) and how it may adjust the policy actions proposed during the first group session. If the situation has worsened to the point where the government lacks the capacity to respond on its own, the Facilitator should encourage groups to also think about what assistance international actors could provide.

4. (Full class) Multi-actor national conference to address new challenges. The conference will be conducted similar to the first but will address how priorities have changed for the government – and the various actors around the table – following evidence of ongoing crimes. The Facilitator may also ask the group to discuss the different international actors which could be called upon to uphold their responsibility to assist the state in the prevention of mass atrocities.

5. (Full class) Debriefing. In this concluding segment the participants, guided by the Facilitator, will reflect on the simulation and discuss a number of questions, including the following:

- Were the mechanisms created effective in responding to the risk of atrocity crimes in the simulation? What was surprising? What worked well and what issues did we encounter? What coordination challenges did you observe among groups in this setting and how do you think they affect real-world decisions by relevant actors?
- What does an atrocity lens add to how I normally would have responded to the situation at hand?

**Case**

Scenario: CARANA following inter-communal violence between FALINs and TATSIs (pre-conflict analysis identifying early warning signs of potential recurrence of violence and recommending government initiatives to mitigate risk and make the state more resilient to crimes); Facilitator interjects midway to introduce facts regarding the start of the civil war and evidence of potential atrocities that have occurred and participants must return to their groups and develop new policy options for preventing atrocities.

The conflict in CARANA is a contemporary case that shifted from seasonal inter-communal violence to a protracted conflict/civil war. The scenario lends itself towards questioning how policies adopted within a country can either address growing tensions and minimize risks or facilitate further conflict. Participants will break into groups to discuss policy options at different moments (following inter-communal violence between the FALINs and TATSIs) through to the present day, identifying the warning signs that existed from independence to the period prior to the start of the ongoing civil war. Participants will develop domestic mechanisms that could be implemented to address growing tensions. The Facilitator will introduce documents, including excerpts from the UN Secretary-General’s reports on the conditions in the country and the UN Peacekeeping Force in CARANA (UNAMIC) mandate. Policy measures would be geared at establishing an institutional framework for atrocity prevention and response.
that include actions such as: legal mandate, structure and composition, measures to engage critical stakeholders, programmes to address early signs of mass violence and impunity, requests to the international community for specific types of assistance, etc.

Actors include: Civil society – represented by respected religious and community leaders, women’s groups, traditional authorities, and other local NGOs, government Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Justice and Interior, CARANA Human Rights Commission, the international community.

Facilitator materials

In addition to this instruction sheet the Facilitator will have for distribution:

- A situation background (make one copy per participant).
- Actor profiles (nine actors – make as many copies of each as necessary for groups to be evenly distributed among the participants).
4. ACTIVITY ACTION PLAN

ESTABLISHMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL MECHANISMS FOR GENOCIDE AND MASS ATROCITY PREVENTION

POST-COURSE ACTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Based on the skills and knowledge you have acquired from this course, what specific objectives do you have for application?**

**What indicators will demonstrate that you have achieved these objectives?**

**What obstacles and enablers do you expect to face in implementation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Enablers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**How can the GAAMAC/AWG help you accomplish these objectives and/or mitigate barriers?**
List specific activities you undertake in which you could implement knowledge of National Mechanisms:

Activity 1: __________________________________________

Activity 2: __________________________________________

Activity 3: __________________________________________

What specific ideas or skills do you plan to implement?

What additional tools, resources, or planning would you require for implementation?

Next steps for implementation:

In the next month I will:  

In the next 3 months I will:  

In the next 6 months I will:  

Other comments:
1. What is your nationality?

2. Gender
   - a. Male
   - b. Female

3. What is your line of work or profession?
   - a. Military
   - b. Police
   - c. Academia
   - d. NGO
   - e. Women’s leader
   - f. Civil servant
   - g. Traditional authority
   - h. Religious leader
   - i. Local government
   - j. Other: specify

4. What is your level of professional experience?
   - a. 1-5 years
   - b. 6-10 years
   - c. 11-15 years
   - d. 16-20 years
   - e. 21-25 years
   - f. Above 25 years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>How would you assess the quality of the course content?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>How would you rate the standard of the pre-course material?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How relevant is the training programme to your current job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>How would you assess the appropriateness of the method of instruction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>How would you assess the effectiveness and competence of the Facilitators?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>How would you assess the level of class interactions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>How would you assess the use of time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How would you assess the practical nature of scenarios, case studies and simulations given?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>How would you assess the impact of knowledge and skills?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>To what degree were the course objectives attained?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. How do you intend to apply the knowledge and skills acquired from the training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. How would you assess the course registration process?

17. How would you assess the training facilities and infrastructure?

18. Please comment on specific challenges encountered during the training programme.

19. Please comment on ways the entire course might be improved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1. To what extent does Module 1 achieve the stated objectives?</strong></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Marginally</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1: Historical Background of National Mechanisms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2: Conceptualizing National Mechanisms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3: Mandates, Types and Functions of National Mechanisms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4: Mapping National Mechanisms Actors and their Mandates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2. What is your impression about the Facilitator's capacity?</strong></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Any suggestions to help improve the contents of the module?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Any suggestions to help improve the presentation of the module?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MODULE 2 EVALUATION SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Marginally</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent does Module 2 achieve the stated objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1: Values and Principles in establishing National Mechanisms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2: Organs of National Mechanisms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3: Programmes and Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4: Regional and International Norms and Regulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5: Domestic Laws and Regulations Establishing National Mechanisms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is your impression about the Facilitator’s capacity?</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Any suggestions to help improve the contents of the module?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Any suggestions to help improve the presentation of the module?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MODULE 3 EVALUATION SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. To what extent does Module 3 achieve the stated objectives?</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Marginally</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit 1: Taking Context and Sensitivity into Consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Marginally</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit 2: Steps to Take Before Establishing National Mechanisms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Marginally</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit 3: Approaches to Establishing National Mechanisms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Marginally</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit 4: Managing Critical Stakeholders when Establishing National Mechanisms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Marginally</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. What is your impression about the Facilitator’s capacity?</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. Any suggestions to help improve the contents of the module? | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------||
|                                                              | |

<p>| 4. Any suggestions to help improve the presentation of the module? | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------||
|                                                                  | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 4 Evaluation Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. To what extent does Module 4 achieve the stated objectives?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1: Conceptualizing Early Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2: Early Warning Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3: Risk Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4: Early Response Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5: Women in Mediation and Mass Atrocity Crime Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. What is your impression about the Facilitator’s capacity?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Any suggestions to help improve the contents of the module?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Any suggestions to help improve the presentation of the module?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MODULE 5 EVALUATION SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To what extent does Module 5 achieve the stated objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Marginally</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is your impression about the Facilitator’s capacity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Any suggestions to help improve the contents of the module?

4. Any suggestions to help improve the presentation of the module?
## MODULE 6 EVALUATION SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1. To what extent does Module 6 achieve the stated objectives?</strong></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Marginally</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 1: Introduction</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 2: State Agencies and Political Actors</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 3: Indigenous Actors</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 4: Civil Society Organizations</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 5: Media</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 6: Women’s Groups</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 7: Youth Groups</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 8: Private Sector Actors</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 9: Epistemic Communities</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 10: Activities. Stakeholder Analysis and Actor Action Plan/Power Analysis</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2. What is your impression about the Facilitator’s capacity?</strong></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3. Any suggestions to help improve the contents of the module?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4. Any suggestions to help improve the presentation of the module?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## MODULE 7 EVALUATION SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Marginally</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent does Module 7 achieve the stated objectives?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the simulation exercise useful?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is your impression about the Facilitator’s capacity?</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Any suggestions to help improve the contents of the module?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Any suggestions to help improve the presentation of the module?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>