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This briefing note for partners relates to the forthcoming UNEP report ‘Relationships and Resources’ prepared in collaboration with Relationship Foundation and Relationships Global. A longer report with additional analysis of how this work has been used in practice will be published in early 2013. ‘Relationships and Resources’ is one of three reports prepared under the Sudan Integrated Environment Project in a series on environmental governance in Sudan. The other two are:

- ‘Environmental Governance in Sudan – an expert review’ – for publication in November 2012
- ‘Governance for Peace over Natural Resources – a review of transitions in environmental governance across Africa as a resource for peace-building and environmental management in Sudan’ – for publication in December 2012

Background on the importance of governance in environmental programming in Sudan is provided in UNEP’s Sudan Integrated Environment Project (SiEP) 2012 Programme Consultation which includes a shared problem analysis with project stakeholders. See www.unep.org for details of these documents.
Part 1 Introduction
Why measure relationships?

- Conflict is often measured in terms of numbers of fatalities. This indicator however, fails to provide information on the dynamics between groups before fatalities occur or indicate why the tension exists. A more nuanced indicator, or set of indicators, is therefore needed.
- Conflict over natural resources can be analysed in terms of the effectiveness of interaction between organisations – for example between communities in efforts to 'co-manage' a resource or between the communities and organisations with a mandate for environmental governance.
- Organisations promoting sustainable and equitable use of natural resources in areas of conflict will require an approach that draws on both peace-building and capacity-building. Both are needed in order to map to out an end-game that comprises peace and an ongoing context for peace based on an effective and inclusive management under the jurisdiction of the appropriate environmental line ministry. (This assumes other actors involved – customary leadership, judiciary, civil society, other line ministries etc).
- New indicators, therefore, need to straddle issues of governance and conflict / peace-building. This presentation sets out an analysis of relationships as the basis of indicators to achieve this objective.
- There are three potential advantages if suitable analysis of relationships can be achieved:
  1. Analysis of conflict and governance can be improved
  2. Impact of interventions can be measured
  3. Design of interventions can be improved

Measuring relationships in support of programme design, monitoring and evaluation

UNEP's work in Sudan has been designed on the premise that improving both the performance of organisations with an environmental mandate and improving their interaction and complementarity are required to promote sustainable and equitable environmental governance.

This rationale, however, has needed to be translated into indicators that denote progress and impact of the programme. In collaborating with the Relationship Foundation (RF) and Relationships Global, UNEP has been able to draw on their expertise in measuring relationships and their experience of applying this expertise to improving the performance of single or multiple organisations. RF’s work in this field has predominantly been in the UK in working with government agencies in the health service and criminal justice service and with the private sector. Challenges here have been to promote the means by which organisational relationships have improved in order to increase the efficiency of service delivery.

In the design of the UNEP Sudan programme, the relationships lens has led to prioritising interventions such as enabling joint action between organisations with interests in, for example, energy supply and forestry, pastoralism and climate change, water resources and climate change etc. Where this can be achieved, it often stands in contrast to a context in which environmental policy, mandates and implementation are fragmented and piecemeal.
The development of indicators relating to relationships has enabled progress to be identified and measured on an objective scale. This is significant in demonstrating the impact of the programme, particularly in the less tangible but, nonetheless, vital elements of improving environmental governance – enabling environmental line ministries to deliver on their mandates effectively.

Two examples highlight this. Firstly, within the WASH sector in the Darfur humanitarian response, international funding has been channelled through organisations with demand-side mandates, but funding for resource management has lagged. The banking arrangements for demand-side mechanisms are much more conducive to receiving international funding than for resource interventions. This is, ultimately, a result of the context of sanctions in Sudan and the enabling mechanisms for activities clearly identifiable as ‘emergency responses’ in terms of providing water for vulnerable groups. However, the imbalance of factors here have meant that organisations that abstract water from aquifers, with mandates for provision, have much better cash flow arrangements than organisations with resource management mandates – creating an unbalanced relationship between institutions in the sector. During the Darfur crisis, groundwater in Darfur’s major cities has dropped by up to 10m. For the early years of the conflict there was little or no engagement of the resource management organisations in the humanitarian response. Had there been a relationship of greater complementarity between resource management and demand-side stakeholders, some of the resource depletion might have been mitigated.

The progress that has been made in this relationship is that the organisation for resource management (the Groundwater and Wadis Department) now participates in the WASH sector coordination and disseminates information on the status of the resource. In addition, water resources management has greater recognition as part of the sector as a result of major initiatives such as the Darfur International Water Conference. However, resource management remains constrained by more complex funding arrangements, than the water supply groups.

Categorisation of the components of a relationship is the basis of measuring progression in the quality of a relationship. This is an important step in assessing intended and unintended impacts of interventions on their wider institutional context. This is an area that demands greater attention in fragile states – how does delivery of large emergency programmes impact perhaps more poorly funded government programmes working in the same or adjacent areas?

The second example relates to forestry and energy. A significant effort has been put into improving security for women in camps and reducing deforestation by providing fuel efficient stoves and other energy-related initiatives in Darfur. However, it became apparent that one of the most important processes in changing the energy sector in favour of these objectives, is the uptake of LPG in Darfur’s major urban centres. LPG is subsidised in Sudan but the price for a 12.5kg bottle was 14 SDG in Khartoum and 44 SDG in West Darfur. The subsidy is therefore in need of revision so as to bring about the intended benefits.

UNEP convened an initiative in which the Ministry of Environment, Forestry National Corporation, Ministry of Petroleum, UNDP and DFID all produced papers on the benefits of promoting the uptake of LPG. These identified benefits in the fields of poverty alleviation, women’s health, climate change mitigation, in addition to the original objectives of women’s security and reducing deforestation. The workshop produced a joint vision statement and action on the subsidy with the price in Nyala dropping from 40 SDG to 22 SDG within weeks of the workshop.

UNEP contends that the benefits of this approach, which tackles the root cause of the problem - in this case is misaligned policy - institutional mandates, or strategies, are more cost effective, and more sustainable than, for example, extending fuel efficient stove programming to gain the same results. By demonstrating and measuring the relational process that achieves this result the impact of UNEP’s work becomes more tangible. Demonstrating impact has enabled UNEP to better demonstrate value for money.
An example of promoting a relational analysis of programming at the level of peace-building can be seen in the example of the work undertaken by CARE in the Kass area in 2005-7. UNEP reviewed this project in 2007 and the report was widely circulated during the design of the Darfur Community Peace and Stability Fund. The CARE project was subsequently taken up as one of the first two pilot projects for the fund.

The project comprised the formation of Village Development Committees (VDCs) with representation spanning communities between whom significant tension existed. Community projects were to be delivered through these committees (thereby incentivising the collaboration). In reality, it took up to 14 months of negotiation to form the committees and for them to agree the conditions under which the aid could first be delivered. This preparatory period of substantial 'peace-building' but the project results could not be expressed in indicators that described the concrete community programme results.

However, once these programmes had reached a period in which projects were being delivered together, the representatives of the communities on the VDCs began to meet to extend their collaboration to other issues beyond the project. Most significantly, a number of pre-existing but now abandoned peace committees were re-established. The peace committees were effective in negotiating security for pastoralists migrating through the area, resolving disputes over cattle theft and other functions.

The relationships improved as a result of CARE’s project brought benefits beyond the scope of the programme. For more information on UNEP’s review of the CARE programme see ‘Environmental Impacts of Conflict: The Loss of Governance and Routes to Recovery’ (p309-319) in ‘Environment and Conflict in Africa: Reflections on Darfur’ UPEACE 2009

The indicators developed by UNEP and RF are intended to support both the analysis and the evaluation of programmes such as the CARE project in Kass, in addition to work on higher level governance. Critically, however, the work is intended to narrow the gap between these types of intervention and support government in the work of managing resources in a participatory manner that achieves peace-building objectives as one aspect of resource management.
Understanding relationships

At the beginning of this review of relationships the following points are noted:

- Relationships are complex – disaggregating the components of a relationship will facilitate their measurement. This disaggregation will allow an analysis of where problems may exist and how to intervene.
- The organisation of indicators of relationships needs to be simple enough for practical use, and yet there is still a need to acknowledge that the complexity of relationships goes beyond the indicator.
- Relational indicators may be used as either process or output indicators. In peace-building it may be an output as that is the declared objective of an intervention. UNEP have experience of using them at the purpose level of a project logframe – acknowledging that they contribute to the higher level goal of the project.
- Addressing relationship issues is likely to increase the sustainability of other outputs.

Methodology - Step 1

- Mapping and categorising relationships among the web of stakeholders involved in conflict and governance of natural resources
  
  1. Identification of third party stakeholders within two communities that co-manage a natural resource
  2. Identification of relationships between the third parties and other actors that are important to their interaction
  3. Analysis expands to include government, civil society, private sector, traditional leadership etc
  4. Definition of scope of mapping needs – eg whether armed groups etc are included as required by the focus of the work
- The relationships within the map are then categorised
- This is described in Part 3 - Slide 13
Methodology Step 2

- Each category of the relationship is analysed to identify markers of quality or change in quality of the relationship. This work relies on the relational proximity model developed by the Relationship Foundation.
- The markers of quality of relationships are reviewed in order to identify a provisional series showing better or worse relationships and whether a progression in improving relationships exists.
  - Activities that indicate action within a relationship are listed (trade, meetings, agreements etc)
  - These are then reviewed against examples of relationships that have been observed as improving within the experience of the UNEP Sudan programme, and provisional progressions of relationships are established.
  - These progressions have then been analysed with the five parameters of a relationship defined in the relational proximity model. This has clarified the steps in the progression of relationships, defining them in terms associated with the model.
  - This produces a progression in proximity of relationships. More detailed work is then done with a larger number of case studies to refine the analysis and definition of the steps in the progression. This more detailed analysis is currently in progress against case studies developed from interviews in Sudan.
- This is described in part 4 - Slide 21

Part 2 – Rationale and Context

- A significant amount of analysis of local conflict in Darfur has been undertaken with a livelihoods framework (ref Livelihoods Under Siege, Livelihoods Power and Choice, Darfur Livelihoods Workshops).
- This has categorised livelihood groups in Darfur and considered:
  - Their interaction
  - Processes of change they are facing
  - Support being provided
- This section discusses links between livelihoods and governance, showing that both are changing, and that understanding the changing context of relationships is important in relating to peace-building and governance. It also acknowledges the significance of conflict as a process relevant to livelihoods.
- It looks at the interaction of these processes occurring at different levels. This provides a background for looking at different levels of institution and the relationships between them.
- The key theme is that the context of livelihoods is changing and consequently structures of governance are changing and analysis of relationships illuminates these dynamics.
The livelihood lens enables analysis of the goals and strategies in the use of a resource that parties within a conflict or co-management arrangement may have. It also draws attention to the impact of policies and institutions – the context of governance. The relational lens adds analysis of the interactions of the stakeholders involved to the analysis of livelihoods. With respect to natural resources and conflict UNEP’s programme works with three entry points to the livelihoods framework:
- Natural assets – improving the availability and access to natural resources
- Social assets – improving collaboration on management of resources
- PIPS – improving the institutional and policy contexts in which livelihoods are worked out.

The context here is that livelihoods are changing – so these three components are undertaken with the understanding that the purpose is to enable livelihoods to adapt in response to the various drivers of change, in addition to enabling them to be implemented sustainably and equitably (see Buchanan-Smith & Bromwich ‘Preparing for Peace’).

This section now looks at some of the processes occurring in the livelihoods context in Darfur – this context applies to the changing dynamics of relationships in addition to changing livelihoods. Both livelihoods and systems of governance are faced with challenges of adaptation in the context of these processes of change.
Concurrent processes of change

The El Fasher Climate Conference was a consultation held by the UN RCO as a basis for planning an early recovery programme for Darfur. It identified the following concurrent processes of change that impact livelihoods:

- climate change
- population growth
- migration
- urbanisation
- environmental degradation
- technological and economic changes
- the impacts of conflict

The conference identified that livelihoods need to adapt to all of these processes. The extent of these changes has significant implications for how to manage relations between livelihood groups as they all adapt. These dynamics are key sources of stress in the interaction between communities, and between communities and government. They therefore also impact how different parts of government interact.

The resolution of legal and institutional issues was identified by the workshop participants as one of the areas that needs to be addressed in response to these processes. See [http://climatechange.sudanct.net/](http://climatechange.sudanct.net/)

Deforestation and the urban footprint

- This map identifies a major woodfuel deficit for central states in Sudan.
- The drivers for deforestation across Sudan are therefore part of a national rather than simply a local dynamic.
- Woodfuel is brought into Khartoum for several hundred kilometres
- Control of the charcoal trade and control of the bush are conflict dynamics in South Kordofan and Darfur
- This links adaptation of local livelihoods, with both local and national government processes

Source: WISDOM Sudan - Preliminary results. Presentation made by R. Drigo at the joint SIFSIA/FNC Workshop, MoAI, Khartoum, on 1st March 2012.
What is the role of environment in the Darfur conflict?

- The conflict in Darfur can be analysed as having different levels
- Environmental issues occur at the most local level, but not at national and regional levels
- However, all three levels of conflict affect the context of governance, security and economy in which communities are making decisions over livelihoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of conflict</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Examples of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional conflict</td>
<td>Regional political issues</td>
<td>• Violence reaching N'Djamena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National conflict</td>
<td>National political issues</td>
<td>• Violence reaching Omdurman • Categories in the DPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local conflict</td>
<td>Land and access to natural resources Political issues</td>
<td>• Environmental asset stripping • Local violence often taking place between different livelihood groups, over access to natural resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Tufts’ report ‘Livelihoods Power and Choice’ gives examples of changes in livelihoods among pastoralist groups before and during the conflict in North Darfur. One example highlights the shift to firewood collection, the other to more direct conflict related livelihoods.

ODI’s report ‘Out to pasture’ identified a similar situation with pastoralists in South Kordofan adopting charcoal-making as a livelihood strategy.
Changes in governance, livelihoods and relationships

- Consider a pastoralist sheikh taking his herd from South to North in the two scenarios.
- To avoid farmland he has a much wider network of interlocutors as he negotiates his route in 2000, than he had in 1973.
- This is an example of the need for adaptation in the systems of environmental governance to avoid conflict over resources. The changes in his livelihood are apparent in the PIPs – particularly institutions of governance in this case. This is seen in the changing dynamic of relationships he must manage to pursue his livelihood.

Conclusions

- The review of the impacts on livelihoods of deforestation and conflict above indicate how local governance and conflict issues are linked with higher order processes. This stresses that in order to resolve local conflict there is a need to look at higher levels of governance in addition to local government.
- In post conflict scenarios ultimately environmental line ministries will have to lead on allocation of resources with appropriate consultation – both conflict mitigation and resource management.
- This report argues that links between peace-building and capacity-building need to be made early in humanitarian and recovery programming so that suitable new practices within government are established to manage resources sustainably and equitably in the post conflict context.
Part 3 – Establishing a relational lens: mapping and categorising relationships

- Community peace-building
- Addressing governance as well as peace-building

There are established programmes working on community peace-building, often relating to management of natural resources, but in many cases links to line ministries are omitted, so benefits in building governance are not made.

In some cases, opportunities to support state level ministries and their interaction with communities may be missed because capacity building may be focused on federal organisations.

Relationships for effective governance

- There may be issues relating to misaligned mandates or programmes between state ministries that undermine their roles – for example the lack of engagement of the water resource organisations in the WASH activities in the early years of the Darfur humanitarian response.
- Resolving difficulties in relationships between line ministries contributes to each one fulfilling their mandate, enabling them to make a greater contribution to support relationships between communities.
The role of traditional leadership is in transition – across the world – in Canada and Latin America this has led to constitutional changes. Afrobarometer’s work in Africa indicates an increasing interest in traditional leadership in many parts of the continent. REFERENCE

Traditional leadership often has particular significance in land, natural resources and conflict resolution.

Peace-building, service provision, and governance

Service provision or peace-building work by NGOs or the UN may substitute the role of line ministries in the humanitarian context, but part of the early recovery programme will be to transfer responsibilities to the line ministries.

Developing appropriate relationships between humanitarian actors during the humanitarian or early recovery phase will facilitate this transition during the recovery phase.
UNEP’s work in the context of peace-building and environmental governance

- This map begins to look at stakeholders and relationships relating to UNEP’s efforts to promote good governance and peace relating to natural resources.
- In addition to state ministries, the map shows federal ministries. Resolving misalignment of these higher level relationships has potential both to empower state level ministries and also to improve the context for adaptation of livelihoods (PIPs) at the national level, the need for which was highlighted in Part 2 – Rationale and Context.
- UNEP does not work directly with communities. The map indicates how UNEP’s interventions are designed to promote local peace through improving the context for this in the government context.

Environmental governance stakeholder map with a focus on UNEP’s relationships

- This mapping is limited in scope, for example, it doesn’t include armed groups, traditional leadership, judiciary, higher councils, other government actors, universities or the private sector.
Categorisation of relationships, and the use of the relational map

- The relationships on the mapping can be categorised into three broad categories:
  - A Institution – Institution
  - B Institution – Community
  - C Community – Community

- Beyond this, the suffix indicates types of relationship with these categories – A1 relationships are between state ministries, A3 between federal ministries, A13 between NGOs and state ministries for example. Category C relationships have not been broken down at this stage. This could be done for example by classifying livelihood groups and looking at relationships between communities of the same livelihood group and of different livelihood groups.

- The mapping does show relationships of direct and indirect influence – for example priorities for UNEP would be support to relationships of type A1, A2, A3 working through relationships of type A5 and A6, from which benefit is also expected at B1 and C. UNEP’s work with joint study tours or co-hosted workshops which have resulted in the production of shared vision statements have been particularly significant in the A1 and A3 relationships.

- UNEP work on relationships at community level through support to an NGO for a project on community natural resource management (using the CEAP methodology – community environmental action plan). See relationships A9 to support B3 and then C.

- The brokering role between communities – B3 to C is a role that should be transferred from NGO to government for them to undertake. This requires partnering with government during the project – stressing the often neglected relationship A13. A2 is important. Civil society may be part of a wider network supporting government and promoting best practice. These projects ultimately serve to promote models that demonstrate how B may be achieved to promote C.

Part 4 – Towards Relational indicators

- The development of these indicators is still a work in progress.
- A list of relational markers is provided on the following slide for the three categories of relationship.
- These are then organised into three frameworks of relationships on the following three slides. They describe 7 steps in a relationship in which the first one represents little or no contact, 2-4 represent the formation of a relationship, 5 is a critical point in which there is a major piece of joint activity for the first time and 6 and 7 are improvements on this in which 7 is a stable state in which significant mutuality exists in the way in which each partner organises their arrangements.
- UNEP has most direct experience of type A relationships, and has researched contexts in which type B and C are implicit, such as local agreements between livelihood groups in Darfur. In addition these relationships draw heavily on the work done by UNEP and particularly Tufts university on trade and livelihoods in Darfur.
- After setting out these steps, the relational proximity model is introduced and the relational metrics described.
- Type A relationship is then reviewed with the use of these metrics and a theoretical framework established.
- More work is currently being undertaken in reviewing these frameworks against case studies of relationships in Sudan.
### Markers of relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>A Institutional relationships</th>
<th>B Institutions with communities</th>
<th>C Inter-community relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential indicators</td>
<td>Meetings - frequency, representation</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment of focal points</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Ad-hoc agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint research</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Natural resource management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Project implementation</td>
<td>Blood money and restitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint vision statement / document</td>
<td>Project management and</td>
<td>Agreement frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint visits / study tours</td>
<td>maintenance</td>
<td>Traditional agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal agreements</td>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>Role of mediators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint implementation – budget, staffing</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Marriages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash transfer</td>
<td>Campaigns</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relational impact on policy and institutional reform</td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relational phases

**Type A – Institution to institution**

1. **Limited contact**
   - Few or no meetings of staff
   - No alignment of policy, mandates, strategy

2. **Approach**
   - Meetings commence - frequency, representation
   - Appointment of focal points

3. **Engaging**
   - Joint action includes evaluation, workshops, study tours. Working towards a shared vision.

4. **Developing**
   - Preparing for the establishment of a joint project or programme, formal project agreements, cash transfer, joint account. Working to a joint vision statement / document.

5. **Activated/Effective**
   - Successful one-off joint action for shared objective. MOU established.

6. **Functional/Established/Improving**
   - Repeated joint action for shared objective or diversification of action to second shared objective. Numerous transactions through joint funding mechanism, Effective co-location (if required)

7. **Mature/Enhanced**
   - Complementarity in alignment policy, mandate, strategy, activities, Evidence of difficulties encountered and resolved
### Relational phases
#### Type B – Institution to Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Limited contact</td>
<td>Conflict, tension, little or no contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approach</td>
<td>Meetings established – a dialogue developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engaging</td>
<td>Evaluations, studies, needs assessments being prepared and undertaken. Increasingly senior representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing</td>
<td>Positive responses to evaluations under negotiation. <strong>Effort on the design of how needs will be met.</strong> Increasing representation. Formalisation of dialogue processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Functional/ Established/ Improving</td>
<td>Repetition of joint implementation, diversification of joint implementation. Evidence of difficulties encountered and resolved, increased range of issues addressed. <strong>Changes being made to improve the relationship.</strong> Feedback from monitoring and evaluation informing new cycles of joint project formulation. Evidence of enduring impact of the joint action – e.g. ongoing collaboration on operation and maintenance demarcation of livestock migration routes, community forests established etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mature/ Enhanced</td>
<td>Effective ongoing consultation and representation and implementation mechanism with more than one succession of incumbent representatives. M&amp;E has made a substantial impact on a number of project cycles and on the mechanisms of consultation to the extent that both parties are satisfied that a stable framework of mutual interaction is in place. Impact on government policy and strategy – byelaws etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relational phases
#### Type C – Community to Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Limited contact</td>
<td>Conflict – possibly frozen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approach</td>
<td>Meetings – limited frequency and representation, pioneering infrequent trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engaging</td>
<td>Dialogue, pioneering trade, contact between a few individuals, need for a more substantial agreement identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing</td>
<td>Mechanism of dialogue formalised, trade broadening, more substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Activated/ Effective</td>
<td>Major joint implementation on the basis of formal agreement between groups e.g. shared access to pasture, open a route and provide security for transhumance. Effective mechanisms and effective collaboration. Evidence of impact of relationship – demarcation of migration routes, community forests established etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Functional/ Established/ Improving</td>
<td>Successful repeated implementation/trade, joint activities are sustained. Evidence of difficulties encountered and resolved, diversification of trade, joint cultural activities. Regular trade with clear rules, tariffs etc. Relationship in growth phase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

- The key features of the stages in each framework are highlighted in bold. The turning point in the cycle may be seen at the 'Activated/effective' step 5 in which a significant piece of joint activity is undertaken.
- Thereafter, if the relationship grows from here either by diversifying or by developing through repetition then it moves to step 6 'Functional/ Established/Improving'.
- Type C is more complex, in part, because the issue of scale is less well defined. How big is a community? Interaction may occur at the individual level to the extent that one family may pioneer relationships and trade and move through the framework, followed by one or two more families and then this process begins to coalesce before the process moves to being taken up in a manner that represents interaction of the communities.
- This dynamic of parts of organisations moving forward occurs in the context of A and B relationships too. In this case the analysis needs to describe the scale at which the analysis is being applied.

- In a formal, legal sense the institutions may have long standing relationship - different expressions of the relationship between the institutions (departments, localities, individuals) may be at different stages. Thus, although this is defined as an institution to institution to relationship, in some cases it is necessary to clarify whether the issue analysed is a description of legal or institutional position or the current character of the relationship.
- The progression here assumes that these relationships have a forward dynamic. This raises the question of the basis on which a weakness in a relationship is seen as an indication of an early stage, or the poor expression of a later stage. The context of peace-building and capacity building assume progress, but further work is required to investigate contexts of deterioration of a relationship.
- In addition, it may be significant to distinguish the proactive development of a relationship from the mere interactions that are a consequence of geographic proximity. Frequent cattle raiding could be characterised as 'limited contact' in the sense of limited contact for the purposes of developing shared goals or interests.
An approach to assessing and developing relationships within and between organisations and professions has been developed by the Relationships Foundation in the UK. It was used first to assess relationships within prisons, then to facilitate the development of new primary care organisations that were part of the NHS reforms of the late 1990s. This included looking at how the functions of public health and primary care were relating, as evidence in the relationships between directors of public health and lead GPs. The approach was also used to assess organisational development needs, mapping the gaps between the relationship requirements of new policy directions, organisational strategy within the NHS, and the reality of relationships within local health care systems.

A formal set of relational audit tools and facilitative processes has been developed and these have subsequently been widely used in to assess and develop relationships within private, public and third sector organisations. The approach has been the subject of a UK Cabinet Office strategy unit seminar, and is currently the focus of a project to develop new ways of reporting on stakeholder relationships in South Africa in the content of their new corporate governance code. The international application of these materials is being led by Relationships Global.

The core of the tools is a set of 5 metrics of a relationship: Directness, Commonality, Parity, Multiplexity and Continuity that apply to different domains of a relationship – communication, purpose, power, information/knowledge and time. These are shown on the following slide and described below.

**Relational Proximity Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains of Relationship</th>
<th>Relational Proximity</th>
<th>Relational Goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Directness: increasing presence by reducing mediation or filtering</td>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>Clarity and completeness of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Continuity: managing the gaps between interactions</td>
<td>Rootedness and belonging</td>
<td>Momentum and growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information / knowledge</td>
<td>Multiplexity: improving the breadth and quality of information</td>
<td>Being known &amp; mutual understanding</td>
<td>Reading situations and responding to needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Parity: the fair use of power</td>
<td>Mutual respect</td>
<td>Participation and investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Commonality: building shared purpose</td>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>Motivation and synergy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication / Directness

- In any interaction there may be physical, emotional or intellectual presence which is filtered and mediated by the medium of communication.
- This has implications for the clarity and effectiveness of communication: messages are misunderstood, or simply do not get through. Motives or aims are misinterpreted. Rumours and the grapevine undermine relationships. Vital information is lost because people are not there when decisions are made. There is less compliance with decisions that are not made face to face.
- It is not just the functional consequences that matter. The degree of directness in communication affects the sense of connection – the emotional or intellectual spark. This changes the pattern of energy and engagement in the relationship.
- But directness can be inappropriate – an intrusive overbearing presence. It can also exacerbate tensions if other aspects of the relationship are weak. Difficult decisions may require more space and detachment.

Time / Continuity 1

- Relationships are repeated interactions over time. Continuity of these interactions includes overall duration and the way gaps between interactions are managed.
- The overall duration is important for building trust, understanding and commitment. Relationships that require significant investment of any form of capital are therefore likely to need continuity.
- Discontinuity can be a product of change of staff, failure to manage the gaps between interactions effectively, or shifts in strategy and direction that change the basis of the relationship.
- Without this continuity time is wasted and momentum lost. Poorly-managed change inhibits investment in the relationship and can reduce accountability.
- Continuity also builds up a narrative of the relationships which underpins the sense of rootedness, belonging and commitment.
- Inescapable continuity can be an incentive for resolving issues – there is no option to walk away, the costs of failure and the benefits of success are persistent. Continuity is also an incentive for collaboration: sanctions against free-riders can be applied and the dividends of reciprocity reaped.
Time / Continuity 2

- In relationships between groups and organisations it is important that the story of the relationship is maintained, even if there are different actors. This may be through formal documentation, having some people who are the guardians of the relationships, or through effective handovers.

- Continuity does not preclude change and growth. Some change is good, avoiding the ossification of a relationship. New brooms can sweep clean. Complacent collusion can be disrupted. What matters is the underlying sustainability of the relationship through change.

- Things to look out for:
  - Evidence of high churn rates of participants
  - Processes for recording decisions to enable progress at future meetings, without having to go over the same ground again
  - Time frames of agreements and processes – what assumptions about continuity are made
  - Gaps between interactions – are they too long to maintain momentum

Information / Multiplexity

- What we know about other parties in a relationship aids the management and conduct of the relationship
- Knowledge that is too limited in breadth or depth, or inaccurate, can create misunderstandings and reduce the optimum use of resources. Skills may not be known or utilised. Pressures may be unknown - similarly interests and values. Greater personal knowledge can aid reading responses accurately, as well as modifying responses to meet others’ needs.
- Better understanding of clients/service users helps needs to be met and informs better design of services. Unintended consequences are more easily avoided.
- The sense of being known and understood breeds confidence and security. Conversely a persistent sense of being unknown or misunderstood is devaluing.
- Knowledge can be gained through encounters in varied contexts so that parties are exposed to a wide range of behaviours and pressures. They are enhanced by effective use of conversations and via other people, through references and recommendations.

- Issues to explore:
  - Evidence of mistaken assumptions about the needs, capacities or interests of other participants
  - Discovery of missed opportunities because information was lacking
  - Reported difficulties in interpreting the responses of others
Power / Parity

- There are many different forms of power in a relationship: money, knowledge, formal authority, capacity to use force, legal agreements.
- The way in which power is used influences the perceptions of fairness and respect and thus engagement and participation in the relationship.
- Assessment of fairness is complicated by the different ‘currencies’ of investment in a relationship: time, money, reputation, contacts, knowledge.
- Unfairness can generate less rational responses with lingering grievances corroding the relationship in the future.
- The misuse of power and unfair treatment can undermine respect. Status and identity matter, and threats to this can impede constructive participation in a relationship.
- Things to look out for:
  - Presumptions of authority or precedence that irritate others (e.g., who travels to whom whose convenience matters most, who assumes leadership of meetings)
  - Behaviour that does not display respect for the dignity of others
  - Cultural issues of power (e.g., gender, ethnicity, age, religion) affecting the conduct of the relationship. Also, management style, organisation size and structure impact on how power operates in a relationship
  - Mismatch between formal and informal power sources: are decisions being made by those who have actual authority
  - Inability to take initiative as no authority delegated
  - Undue deference or fear that leads to missing contributions (e.g., not speaking up at a meeting)
  - Withholding contributions to a relationship due to perceived lack of a return

Purpose / Commonality

- The extent to which purpose is shared – in terms of the depth of shared roots, the breadth of its scope and the degree of alignment – influences both the rationale for being in the relationship and the conduct of that relationship. Synergy and a sense of common identity are key aspects of the experience of shared purpose.
- Alignment can range from substantial common ground and shared purpose, through compatibility of purpose, to incompatibility and actively conflicting purposes.
- Shared purpose motivates, unlocking energy and strengthening and directing contribution. A wider range of resources is brought to bear and applied more effectively. A lack of shared purpose hinders objectives that require others’ contribution.
- Shared purpose is an important basis for collective identity.
- Alignment impeded by fuzzy, evolving or multiple purposes as well as different time horizons.
- Issues to look for:
  - Evidence of shared activity that accommodates diverse needs
  - Evidence of conflict or disagreement over goals
  - Analysis of the forces/issues that pull people apart or push them together
  - Use of ‘we’ language or ‘them and us’ mentality
  - Evidence of ability to articulate win-win scenarios
  - Analysis of purpose statements in business plans, organisational aims, targets, etc.: can shared goals be identified
Some examples of the dimensions of relationships applied to peace processes - examples of metrics used to describe features of relationships

- The Nile Basin Initiative comprises a six-year process of negotiation during which time programmes are run in all the riparian states (on themes such as environment, poverty reduction etc) with each office headed by someone from one of the other states. This has allowed a group of technocrats extensive contact (directness) and an understanding of the Nile issues from the perspectives of their host country (multiplexity) and over time to build a shared story (continuity).

- Sudan’s Comprehensive Peace Agreement was incentivised by a clear common objective relating to the abstraction of oil (commonality). The intention that during the interim period all parties should ‘make unity attractive’ was the intention to establish commonality, for the longer term.

- The local peace-building programme in Kass described in the introduction was designed with a community development programme to provide the commonality. This levered engagement of the groups, establishing directness and, during the course of the negotiations, the village development committees were established in a manner acceptable to both parties. The fact that these could then deliver aid to communities and then led to restoring other joint programmes through peace committees indicates that the power arrangements were acceptable (parity). The broadening of this programme over time indicated growth in commonality, multiplexity and continuity.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directness</strong></td>
<td>Meetings, communications, co-location, study tours</td>
<td>Democratic election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuity</strong></td>
<td>Issues resolved, projects completed, shared evaluation</td>
<td>Effective project delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiplexity</strong></td>
<td>Breadth of interaction, shared evaluation</td>
<td>Communications – media, assessments, evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parity</strong></td>
<td>MOUs, effective and fair funding stream, project board, joint account</td>
<td>Form of representation, impact on project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commonality</strong></td>
<td>Vision statements, aligned mandates, policy</td>
<td>Local Investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relational phases

**Type A – Institution to institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Relational Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Limited contact</td>
<td>Few or no meetings of staff. No alignment of policy, mandates, strategy.</td>
<td>advanced – features that define that step in bold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approach</td>
<td>Meetings commence – frequency, representation. Appointment of focal points.</td>
<td>D starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cm Assessed – Is there a shared objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engaging</td>
<td>Joint action includes evaluation, workshops, study tours. Working towards a shared vision.</td>
<td>D grows, Cm defined in greater detail, P Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preconditions (P, Cm particularly) identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing</td>
<td>Preparing for the establishment of a joint project or programme, formal project agreements, cash transfer, joint account. Working to a joint vision statement / document.</td>
<td>Preconditions in process of being established – P, Cm focus, growth of D, M, Cn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Activated/Effective</td>
<td>Successful one-off joint action for shared objective. MOU established.</td>
<td>Cn – a shared story of success now exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Functional/Established/Improving</td>
<td>Repeated joint action for shared objective or diversification of action to second shared objective</td>
<td>Preconditions confirmed through implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mature/Enhanced</td>
<td>Complementarity in alignment policy, mandate, strategy, activities. Evidence of difficulties encountered and resolved.</td>
<td>All refined particularly M through enhanced reciprocity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relational phases

**Type B – Institution to community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Relational Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Limited contact</td>
<td>Conflict, tension, little or no contact.</td>
<td>advanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approach</td>
<td>Meetings established – a dialogue developing.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cm - incentive, P assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engaging</td>
<td>Evaluations, studies, needs assessments being prepared and undertaken.</td>
<td>D, Cm, P, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing</td>
<td>Positive responses to evaluations under negotiation. Effort on the design of how needs will be met. Increasing representation. Formalisation of dialogue processes.</td>
<td>P, M, Cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Activated/Effective</td>
<td>Effective single significant response. Joint ownership of implementation.</td>
<td>P, M, Cn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Functional/Established/Improving</td>
<td>Repetition of joint implementation, diversification of joint implementation. Evidence of difficulties encountered and resolved, increased range of issues addressed. Changes being made to improve the relationship.</td>
<td>M, Cn,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mature/Enhanced</td>
<td>Effective ongoing consultation and representation and implementation mechanism with more than one succession of incumbent representatives. Impacting on government policy and strategy – bylaws etc.</td>
<td>P, Cn, M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relational phases
Type C – community to community

1. Limited contact
   Conflict – possibly frozen

2. Approach
   Meetings – limited frequency and representation, pioneering infrequent trade

3. Engaging
   Dialogue, pioneering trade, contact between a few individuals, need for a more substantial agreement identified.

4. Developing
   Mechanism of dialogue formalised, trade broadening, more substantial

5. Activated/Effective
   Major joint implementation on the basis of formal agreement between groups e.g. shared access to pasture, open a route and provide security for transhumance
   Effective mechanisms and effective collaboration
   Evidence of impact of relationship – demarcation of migration routes, community forests established etc.

6. Functional/Established/Improving
   Successful repeated implementation/trade, joint activities are sustained.
   Evidence of difficulties encountered and resolved, diversification of trade, joint cultural activities.
   Regular trade with clear rules, tariffs etc.
   Relationship in growth phase.

7. Mature/Enhanced
   Increased range of issues addressed.
   Widespread trade, significant livelihood synergies.
   Regular intermarriage.
   All refined

D Directness, M Multiplexity, P Parity, Cm Commonality, Cn Continuity

Part 5
Conclusions 1 - What has been achieved?

- Linking peace-building and capacity-building through a relational map
  - The case for an integrated approach to community peace-building and capacity-building is made on the basis of the need for an institution to manage conflict over a given resource over the long term.
  - The case is made for this approach to address higher levels of governance – noting that processes of environmental governance and processes of conflict operate at different scales and different levels – so a vertically integrated approach is needed to peace-building and to supporting governance.
  - The claim that addressing governance issues is a contribution to local peace-building in any given project can now be analysed through the rationale of the network of relationships. This contributes to discussion of attributability and impact of governance and peace-building work.

- Developing a framework for measuring the three categories of relationship
  - Most significantly the five relational metrics – Commonality, Directness, Parity, Multiplexity, Continuity, are brought alongside the livelihoods framework as a further tool to analyse governance, conflict, livelihoods and peace-building.
  - The synthesis of the metrics with the 7 steps into a valid framework to analyse the progression of relationships between institutions (Type A). The framework in terms of the relational metrics is shown below.
Synthesis – defining the phases by the relational metrics assessed or advanced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Limited contact</th>
<th>Prerequisite</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Approach</td>
<td>Directness starts in the context of the new initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commonality is being assessed – Is there a shared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>objective that constitutes a reason to move forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with this relationship?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A shared objective is identified - commonality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engaging</td>
<td>A sufficient degree of commonality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directness grows, Commonality defined in greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detail, parity is being assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preconditions in terms of the arrangements of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ensuring parity and the degree to which shared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>objectives will be achieved are defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preconditions for joint action are identified –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>particularly in terms of commonality and parity (the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>benefits, the benefit-sharing arrangement and costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing</td>
<td>Preconditions for step 5 largely defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preconditions are in the process of being established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– possibly through the preparation of a formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preconditions for joint action (step 5) have now been</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Activated/</td>
<td>Preconditions for joint action now met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Joint action is now taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuity – a shared story of success is established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preconditions confirmed through implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas for growth – refining parity, directness and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other areas of potential commonality are identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A joint history of implementation has been established,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contributing to a tangible foundation in terms of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trust – ‘it has been done before’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Functional/</td>
<td>Joint action has been achieved before – its not new.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established/</td>
<td>Continuity developed through repetition, and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>multiplexity is increased as new shared objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and new cycles of growth– steps 3-5 are in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The relationship is growing in terms of continuity,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and multiplexity – other parameters are refined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mature/</td>
<td>A period of growth in joint action has occurred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>As a result of the increased knowledge – multiplexity,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>each organisation organises itself in reciprocal ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– enhancing directness, parity, and commonality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A stable state in the relationship has now been attains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions 2 – How can this work be used?

The three areas of potential use of this analysis, as identified in the introduction, are reviewed below:

1. Analysis of conflict and governance can be improved by:
   - Applying the relational metrics
   - Mapping relationships: this is not new to conflict analysis - sometimes by drawing different lines (zagged, double, dashed) between stakeholders to denote quality of relationship, but the relational metrics and the progression in quality provide options for improving on this analysis
   - Giving greater attention to the links between the institutions, processes and policies of environmental governance and conflict management, as this document appeals for, would improve analysis of conflict over natural resources

2. Impact of interventions can be measured:
   - An indicator can be used to measure a brokering role by counting the progress made in terms of a particular relationship, either descriptively through the metrics, or concretely through the progression. The progression, however, needs qualification in terms of how much of the institution is engaging – one department or corporation. In addition, some allowance for variations on this progression needs to be acknowledged. More ground-truthing is needed on this as indicator.
- The progression may be used for broader influence towards resolving institutional or community dynamics, by counting the number of relationships that are resolved to a particular level – e.g., the number of government departments or ministries that develop relationships through the project to level 5 – ‘activated/effective’ or above. This is the way in which UNEP uses the progression. It denotes the quality of the programme in bringing about higher level change in government. The programme comprises work on water, waste, forestry, climate change, energy, pastoralist livelihoods, and other environmental themes, but this indicator measures progress on integrating these themes in partnership across government. The analysis here also facilitates the review of pathways and consequentially attribution of UNEP’s role in these relationships, e.g., supporting a workshop that leads to the production of a document describing a shared vision.

- Reference to ‘theory of change’ improving a relationship may be an outcome or impact of a project, given that it is, by definition, beyond the sole control of the project implementer. However, improving a relationship may be part of a process within a project – building the relationships with project stakeholders so that work may be done together.

3. Design of interventions can be improved.
- Improving governance and peace-building programming can be achieved by designing interventions with greater focus on problems that have poor relationships at their root. As with the UNEP example, an explicit focus on resolving policy fragmentation can be designed, notwithstanding the organic and complex nature of institutional relationships. The same benefits of enhanced contextual analysis and design would apply where the focus is on peace-building.

- In addition to improving projects designed for capacity-building and governance, the methodology here can be applied to an analysis of secondary or unintended impacts of interventions – both in terms of social and institutional impact. Social impact analysis could use aspects of the approaches here; for example, the procurement of beef for peacekeeping forces in Darfur takes place in the context in which certain groups derive their livelihoods from cattle, whereas other groups do not. Some useful analysis could be undertaken to extend the work done by reports such as ‘Adaptation and Devastation: The Impact of the Conflict on Trade and Markets in Darfur’ (Tufts 2008) to identify best practice in procurement in the context of conflict. Assessments of these secondary impacts have room for improvement in the planning of interventions.
Theory of change

- The following categories can be defined on the basis of the degree of control of the project implementer:
  - Output – something a programme does itself
  - Outcome – the consequence – achieved in partnership with others
  - Impact – the result – beyond the limits of the actions of the programme implementer

- Relationships naturally come at Outcome or Impact level as, by definition, they require the participations of others. A project output might include activities that enable relationships – holding joint research initiatives, workshops etc. The outcome would be improved relationships between the organisations involved in those events. Relationships beyond this with third parties could be at impact level.

- In the case of the UNEP programme, the project rationale includes the assumption that improving relationships between government environmental stakeholders (type A relationships – an outcome of the project) enables relationships to be improved with communities (Type B) and ultimately, among communities (Type C). The forthcoming UNEP project design guide acknowledges that outputs can be targeted at multiple steps along a process – driving change from output to outcome and also from outcome to impact, possibly through a number of intermediate states. This is helpful and an improvement on simpler one-dimensional models as it reflects the complex reality of programming in the context of governance and peace building.

Direction of impact of change

Combining direct action of project implementer – influence increasingly indirect – through consequences of main outputs (effective government institutions) enhanced by demonstration in B and C areas.
Theory of change

- The diagram above shows that the major outputs of the project are on the with respect to the institutions in two ways:
  - Implementing actions that enable relationships between organisations - such as holding workshops, coordinating research projects etc, the outcome of these being improved relationships of type A
  - Working with individual organisations to improve their own capacity or effectiveness - such as training staff
  - These two actions are mutually reinforcing
- To improve relationships at B and C level UNEP is unable to operate at a large scale but can assist in two ways – firstly by implementing demonstration projects which are another programme output, and secondly through the individual capacity building projects described above as one of the two main outputs. The work with institutions on policy and capacity enable scale up of the demonstrated practices.
- Overall the pathway of change is that the two main outputs (on the left) improve the capacity of institutions and their collaboration. This improves their interaction with communities (relationship B) which, in turn, improves the interaction between communities (relationship C). This relationship is essentially peace, but is accompanied by improved livelihoods and improved management of the natural resource base. Assessing the interrelation of these three impacts (or intermediate states?) would require additional analysis, but each component is, clearly, mutually beneficial to the others so they may be considered together as a combined impact of the project. Subjective preferences or funding policy may elevate attention of one component over another.

Relationships and livelihoods

- Linking the results back to support to livelihoods, the three entry points are confirmed, but greater clarity on the respective emphasis can now be seen. The three entry points identified were social and natural capitals and PIPs (policies institutions and processes)
- C relationships would relate to social assets – capacity to collaborate between livelihood groups comes as an overall impact of the project
- B and A relationships relate to the policy and institutional context of livelihoods - government institutions that collaborate, for example line ministries can create integrated development plans; and collaborate with communities – effective consultations on those plans. A relationships are project outcomes and, so, the most direct effect of the project is in the are of the PIPs. This is reinforced by outputs relating to the building of capacity of institutions themselves – also PIPs
- Improving B and C relationships are respectively intermediate states or impact
- Improving natural assets comes an overall impact of the project
Conclusions 3 - What has not been achieved?

- Where are the gaps?
  - Gaps in the current scope of work
    - Type A – ready for wider analysis and trialling
    - Type B – needs more analysis to assess whether the approach here is applicable
    - Type C – needs more analysis to assess whether the approach here is applicable
  - Relationships of other types beyond the framework here
    - Militia
    - Higher levels of conflict – eg international from one government to another
    - Check the diversification of context – here the focus is on environment and livelihoods – does it apply in other contexts?

Next steps

- Current work focussing on governance
  - Complete the review of the case studies
  - Refine work on the progressions for the three types of relationships and harmonising the terminology and indicators of each step.
  - Complete the review of the report ‘Relationships and Resources’
  - Review and refine the use of this work in the UNEP programme
- Assess applicability to B and C relationships
  - Review the work of UNEP’s programming partners in more detail with particular reference to community environmental management and stakeholder participation in, for example the water programming.
  - Develop partnerships with organisations working on community peace-building and local environmental governance to enhance the analysis of these dynamics and develop opportunities for piloting and ground-truthing use of relationship based indicators
  - Identify and support opportunities for use of relationships analysis to enhance analysis of peace-building, livelihoods, conflict and governance.
- Work with a small number of selected partners interested in exploring the potential of relationship-based indicators in other contexts. These actors could be through networks associated with this programme. Wider dissemination could be undertaken when further ground-truthing has been achieved.
  - Are there programmes in fragile states that are searching for improved analysis of context and impact that could inform, or be informed by, this work?
- On-going monitoring and evaluation of the use of relationship-based indicators to provide a platform for more widespread application if appropriate.