

Dynamics of public participation in peace agreements

Andrea ArricaleMercy Corps Peace and Conflict division



BROADENING PARTICIPATION IN PEACE PROCESSES

Why?



Making a negotiation more effective

- The process will involve power groups who exert influence on the civil society
- The grassroots involvement will pressure official/government parties
- The popularity of the process will increase among the public
- The negotiation will contain more points of view, knowledge and competences
- It will turn into reality the citizens' right to participation



Strengthen the quality and sustainability of the agreement

- The agreement will increase its legitimacy, while enhancing the effective representation of citizens
- With more grassroots involvement, the agenda will cover a broader amount of issues
- The participation of the civil society will serve as a watchdog on public powers



Is it that easy?

- The parties usually oppose the involvement of other subjects (especially if they can't manipulate grassroots parties)
- The diverse opinions and interests of participants and community groups may be too challenging
- Problems of selecting/excluding participants
- Grassroots level parties may be more easily manipulated and co-opted
- Lack of negotiating skills
- The 3rd party mediator might oppose to increase participation or may have a hard time managing them







- Direct representation as in the case of National Dialogues (e.g. Yemen, DRC)
- Observer status/direct presence during the negotiations (e.g. Liberia, Burundi)
- Official consultative forums (e.g. Guatemala, Afghanistan)





- Consultations, without official endorsement (e.g. Kenya). They may occur in any stage of the negotiation process.
- Post-agreement mechanisms which involve the participation of grassroots level through the implementation process and institutions (e.g. Somalia, Liberia, DRC, Kenya)
- High-level civil-society initiatives (or non-official 'Track 1.5', problem-solving workshop, private facilitation initiatives e.g. Georgian-Abkhaz Schlaining Process)



- Public participation, involving the broader population via public hearings, opinion polls, town hall meetings or signature campaigns (e.g. Northern Ireland, Colombia)
- Public decision-making, referenda and other elective forms (e.g. Cyprus, Northern Ireland, Kenya)
- **Mass action**, street demonstrations, rallies, etc. (e.g. Sri Lanka, Nepal).





Main recommendation for governments

- Fix a **consensual solution** as the objective, as it often brings about a more durable peace
- Look for the **appropriate type of public participation**, depending on the specific features of the peace process and socio-economic situation
- Aim at achieving the **legitimacy** of the peace process
- Post-agreement implementation is crucial: some parties' silence may not mean acquiescence, but may be strategic
- Promote joint learning exercises between actors involved in peace processes between state and non-state actors.
- Tailor financial and policy tools as well as official development assistance to improve linkages between governmental and non-governmental actors involved in different mediation efforts
- Work actively with specialised NGOs working in the field of mediation

