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INTRODUCTION

This paper is based on a conference titled ‘Regional Organisations as Vectors of Peace: Building ASEAN’s Capacities in Preventive Diplomacy and International Peace Mediation’, organised by the Crisis Management initiative (CMI) in cooperation with the ASEAN Indonesian Chairmanship and the Delegation of the European Union to Indonesia, Brunei Darussalam and ASEAN during the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting in Bali, Indonesia, on 11 October, 2011. ASEAN SOM leaders, the Committee of Permanent Representatives to ASEAN as well as representatives from relevant national lead agencies of ASEAN Member States dealing with mediation and crisis management participated. Speakers included representatives of international and regional organisations, as well as civil society organisations.

ASEAN today continues to develop its regional and institutional capacity for promoting peace and stability among its members and beyond. While ASEAN develops this capacity further to deal with peace building and develop its internal mediation architecture, ASEAN also has the opportunity to share the story of its journey to date. The story goes beyond the organisation’s role among its members, to also encompass its role as an association in contributing to building peace regionally and internationally.

As ASEAN works to strengthen its mediation capacities, there is an opportunity and a need to review approaches to preventive diplomacy and peace mediation from the ASEAN perspective. The paper examines the evolution of ASEAN’s institutions of preventive diplomacy and the ASEAN approach in peace mediation in the region. It also looks at international trends beyond Southeast Asia and draws on lessons learned from other cases. The paper also analyses opportunities to develop capacities and tools that ASEAN can use to enhance its peace mediation efforts. Finally, it draws together the ideas for further development of mediation and preventive diplomacy for ASEAN, based on the discussion between ASEAN policy makers and experts who attended the workshop.
Background

ASEAN’s engagement with peace building can be traced right back to its establishment and the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation of 1976. The decision on the ASEAN Political Security Community blueprint in 2009 became a significant milestone in this process. While the key objective of the blueprint is to encourage political and security cooperation and ensure that ASEAN Member States maintain peaceful relations, the document also outlines ASEAN’s commitment to conflict prevention, preventive diplomacy and post-conflict development. It also provides an action plan to achieve targets in these areas through cooperation with other regional organisations, research, and through the development of an institutional framework for addressing regional conflict and security issues.

At the 18th ASEAN summit, the Indonesian President and Chair of ASEAN in 2011, again emphasized the fact that “as one of the pioneers of regional integration in the world, ASEAN was established based on the strong desire to establish peace, building Consensus, promoting stability, through regional cooperation and integration” and therefore in full accordance with the APSC commitments “is responsible to responding to dynamic conflict that may influence the image of ASEAN and sustainable peace in the region”.

Specifically, the ASEAN APSC blueprint seeks to strengthen mutually-beneficial relations between ASEAN and its dialogue partners and friends. In fact, acknowledging the experience of other regional actors in peace making, the document calls for concrete action points for ASEAN like the “organisation of workshops on peace, conflict management and conflict resolution with relevant regional and international organisations” and the development of “technical cooperation with relevant regional organisations to exchange expertise and experiences in maintaining peace and stability”.

Regional and International Policies for Peace Mediation

As shown in the practice of other regional and international organisations such as the EU, the AU, the OSCE and UN, wider regional diplomacy through mature institutions has an essential role in instilling confidence in state-level peace processes and in bringing practical assistance in delivering peace dividends to all parties.

Consequently, ASEAN has a vocation to find compatible policies and a response architecture to address conflict dynamics that transcend the boundaries of its Member States and build sustainable peace within the region.

1. Council of the EU. “Concept on Strengthening EU Mediation and Dialogue Capacities”, 15779/09, Brussels 2009, Section III “Measures to Strengthen EU Mediation Capacities”
3. OSCE. “OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century”, Section I, 11th Meeting of the Ministerial Council, Maastricht, December 2003, MC.DOC/1/03
5. Speech by H.E Dr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono President of the Republic of Indonesia at the Opening of the 18th ASEAN Summit Jakarta, 7 May 2011

2. Speech by H.E Dr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono President of the Republic of Indonesia at the Opening of the 18th ASEAN Summit Jakarta, 7 May 2011
The key is to mobilize support, mainly through internal mechanisms for strengthening ASEAN capacities in this regard, including the building of institutions and infrastructure which support peace (such as developing and implementing the idea of an Institute for Peace and Reconciliation), collaboration with civil society, developing a conflict mediation programme, strengthening the ASEAN body on Human Rights, and shifting towards a more people-oriented paradigm.
Since the establishment of ASEAN and its Regional Forum, ASEAN has explored initiatives for strengthening its capacity to play a role as a peace mediator. The development of this role has been deliberate, but indicates a clear trend. With the establishment of the ASEAN Regional Forum and the agreement on the APSC blueprint, ASEAN has evolved and become more open to further cooperation among members and with external institutions including with the European Union. Various discussion forums have been established and workshops have taken place to explore ideas on strengthening ASEAN’s role in preventive diplomacy initiated by Member States and various research institutions.

Preventive diplomacy was adopted by ASEAN leaders and policy makers as the means to pursue an ‘ASEAN way’ of dealing with peace building issues. An acceptable concept of preventive diplomacy by Member States is important, because as an organisation ASEAN depends on consensus. This is the key characteristic of the ASEAN approach of dealing with any issue. ASEAN prefers an approach of preventive diplomacy as it is seen to be in line with the ASEAN charter of respecting the principles of sovereignty, political independence of states, territorial integrity and non-interference.

As a result, the concept of preventive diplomacy has been successful to some degree in encouraging broader discussion among policy makers on a more meaningful ASEAN role. Preventive diplomacy discussion has created momentum for developing and strengthening the peace building concept by ASEAN state and non-state actors. When the preventive diplomacy discourse began, it was introduced as part of a Track Two (informal) process, but since then, through various meetings of the ASEAN Regional Forum and other engagement, it has transformed the preventive diplomacy concept from a research initiative into a policy initiative.

The key momentum for the acceptance of Preventive Diplomacy is when the approach was adopted at the 7th and the 8th meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum. ASEAN formally came up with the definition of the concept and the principle behind preventive diplomacy at these meetings. It was stated that ASEAN Preventive Diplomacy objectives are: “to help prevent disputes and conflicts from arising between States that could potentially pose a threat to regional peace and stability; to help prevent such disputes and conflicts from escalating into armed confrontation; [and] to help minimize the impact of such disputes and conflicts on the region”.

While for the external observer, ASEAN preventive diplomacy policy implementation may seem slow, it must be remembered that ASEAN had a different start on the issue than other regional institutions. The regional body in Southeast Asia is more cautious than some others for a variety of reasons. However, ASEAN tries to fill these gaps of its less assertive approach with various informal and formal meetings. ASEAN is probably among the regional bodies that organize the most meetings at various levels, thus creating multiple opportunities for dialogue and consensus building among Member States.

---

Although formal meetings are often cautious on addressing conflict issues, many of these encounters, by virtue of the informal discussions they encourage and stimulate, result in the development of mutual trust and peaceful consensus, which is helpful in addressing problems faced within ASEAN. This trust and consensus is another ‘quiet’ diplomacy, without headlines, without front page stories. As an ASEAN diplomat said, ‘there are more meetings among ASEAN stakeholders and its members than the number of days in a year. After we meet 700 times a year, how could we not have dialogue?’

This is how various disputes and issues are addressed, especially with regard to intra-state problems. The informal channels, through the side meetings, is one that brought an ASEAN contribution to addressing the problem between Thailand and Cambodia regarding border issues, as well the participation of ASEAN in dealing with peace monitoring in the Aceh province of Indonesia.

The participation of ASEAN in Aceh’s peace process in Indonesia can be seen as an example of a start to its deeper engagement with peacebuilding issues. The cooperation with the EU in the monitoring mission was unprecedented for ASEAN. This was also the first time that ASEAN engaged in peace monitoring activities.

This achievement provides further encouragement in the regional institutions taking more active role. Bilaterally, some ASEAN countries

---

5. Interview with an ASEAN diplomat, October 2011.

---

THE ASEAN INSTITUTE FOR PEACE AND RECONCILIATION (AIPR)

Recent developments are encouraging, with ASEAN having developed in the last three years a greater appetite for discussions on the role of peace and reconciliation centres. This interest has been initially expressed in the APSC, as well as in the ASEAN Leaders’ ‘Joint Statement on the Establishment of an ASEAN Institute for Peace and Reconciliation’ of May 8, 2011.

The Chair’s Statement of the 19th ASEAN Summit released in November 2011 tasks ASEAN’s foreign ministers to (1) implement the set of recommendations on the establishment of an AIPR, including the finalization of its Terms of Reference and (2) explore ways of linking the AIPR in a network with other institutes and entities in the region as well as other regions and at the international level, which have similar objectives aimed at promoting a culture of peace.

Most ASEAN policy makers would like to see such an institute play a role in conducting research on peacebuilding activities. While this is a start, ASEAN civil society and key actors could organize the institute to deepen its activities beyond research. This is a first step in allowing for broader formal participation of non-governmental representatives in ASEAN’s conflict resolution mechanisms. Yet, if not well resourced and structured the new institution runs the risk of fostering unrealistic expectations in terms of meaningfully contributing to conflict prevention in the region and in acting as a centre for improved national and regional capacities to address conflicts.

1. Section B.2 in “ASEAN Political-Security Blueprint”. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat, June 2009
3. “Chair’s Statement of the 19th ASEAN Summit”. November 2011
have been more assertive than others. The challenge is to move from a bilateral initiative to an institutional one. Another source of momentum for further development of an active ASEAN role in mediation is the work going on within the framework of the acceleration of the ASEAN community by 2015. ASEAN leaders have agreed to quicken the establishment of the community concept in which the establishment of a political security community that promotes peace is the first pillar. The APSC blueprint also places emphasis upon the establishment of a community of caring societies in South East Asia. Stakeholders could work with ASEAN on setting up a mechanism to prioritise and strengthen various humanitarian actions which have currently been agreed to.

Despite ASEAN’s progress and potential in promoting peace and stability, it needs to face numerous challenges, including strengthening its internal tools, clarifying its added value and improving its cooperation with partners.
INTERNATIONAL TRENDS IN PEACE MEDIATION

Performing effectively in addressing violent conflict and bringing about peace to war-torn societies has revealed to be a challenging endeavour for the international community emerging after the Second World War. As the politics of the 21st century became more and more globalised, the international arena was confronted with new dilemmas: how to deal with a political space that was not responsive anymore to geographical or nation-state delimitations; how to address complex intra-state, cross-border, resource-based or ethnic conflicts, most often directed at or caused by civilians; how to tackle and understand complex social systems that produce violence.

MEDIATION AS A RESPONSE TO COMPLEXITY

It has been acknowledged in various forums that by their nature, modern conflicts are messy and cannot be localized and isolated by definite territorial, ideological or political boundaries. Conflicts are not nation, culture or age sensitive – they do not comply with border regulations, producing major spillovers for neighbouring regions such as illegal immigration, illicit trade, environmental degradation and terrorism. To date, there is no formula that can resolve all these equations. The responses to these new scenarios have met with little results as they have relied predominantly on the traditional diplomatic instruments and have generated standardized approached of peace promotion leading to rather fragile outcomes and 'no war no peace' situations.

In the last 10 years, there has been an increased recognition by policy makers, practitioners and researchers that the effective practice of peace mediation in complex peace processes leads to a five times greater probability to reaching an agreement compared to a non-mediated process, and a 2.5 times greater probability of long-term reduction of tension. Peace mediation is a cost-effective instrument in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and its added value has been fully recognized in improving the quality and sustainability of local and regional peacemaking. 8

Comparable with the reality they address, mediation processes are complex, thorny and often require not only other tools and policies to complement their efforts (e.g. trade policies, development programs, humanitarian assistance, etc.) but also the engagement and participation of different kind of actors to engage in escalating periods of conflict, during full blown conflict, or shortly after a peace agreement has been reached.

Once the exclusive prerogative of states and large multilateral organisations like the UN, in the last 10 years, the conflict resolution playing field has witnessed the emergence of new actors such as regional, sub-regional and private diplomacy actors that were more suited to initiate, lead or implement various components of the peace processes. These actors had a series of comparative advantages and skills, for example their access or proximity to the parties in a conflict or their capacity to use innovative approaches to address violence.

Regional Organisations

Since the 1990s, an increasing number of regional organisations have been undertaking preventive diplomacy, mediation, peacekeeping and peacebuilding initiatives, their contribution to effective conflict prevention and resolution varying broadly from one case to another, and from one region to another. Regardless of the different approaches and ability to deliver of each of these organisations, their common denominator is the fact that they are forums of states. Consequently, their modus operandi and their capacity to perform in peace processes are contingent on all the elements that derive from their Member States assignments: their rules of engagement, and their mandate; their organisational culture, resources and set of values (e.g. territorial integrity, principle of non-interference); their institutional set up, decision making or deployment mechanisms.

Likewise, the pressure to deliver quick results in dealing with ever changing conflict landscapes, porous borderlands and disputes that involve a multitude of state and non-state actors and the lack of resources to ensure oversight in the implementation of peace agreements, are only some of the external factors that test on a regular basis regional organisations’ effectiveness as peace makers. However, it has been argued in several occasions by international analysts and researchers that regional bodies are best placed not only to act as mediators, but also as catalysts with the potential to create conditions conducive to peace making.

The United Nations and Mediation

As the most assiduous peace mediators in the world, the United Nations was involved in more than half of all armed conflicts and accounts for one sixth of the total amount of mediation done. In fact, as far as a decade ago, the UN Secretary General’s High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, recognised the positive contribution of mediation. The concept was emphasised in the 2009 Report of the Secretary General on Enhancing Mediation and Its Support Activities and in 2011 when the idea of ‘preventive diplomacy’ was again presented as essential in the UN conflict management toolbox.

A Mediation Support Unit (MSU) was established in 2006 in order to support peace processes led by the UN. The MSU can act as a ‘service provider’ and respond to regional organisations’ request for specialised mediation expertise and can also cooperate with non-state private diplomacy actors especially in training exercises and exchange of best practices and lessons-learned. The unit can provide strategy development, analysis of conflict, process design, advice on thematic issues, and one to one coaching on mediation. It has its own in house capacity – and although heavily under-resourced, a standby team, and a roster of mediation experts deployable on request.


9. In Africa: African Union (AU) mediated civil violence in Kenya 2008; the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) mediated civil war in Sudan and attempted a resolution of the dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea; the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) has been a useful body for setting up trade corridors in the Horn of Africa; the Economic Community Of West African States (ECOWAS) was engaged in conflict prevention and resolution in Liberia and Sierra Leon. In Europe and Central Asia the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) is mediating since the 1990s the conflict around Nagorno-Karabakh which has as main protagonists of the peace talks Armenia and Azerbaijan and is also leading on the Moldova/Transnistria peace process. Other organisations actively involved in peacemaking are the European Union (EU), the Organization of American States (OAS), the Arab League, the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), the Southern African Development Community (SADC).
One of the areas where the MSU has not previously invested extensive efforts since its establishment has been focusing on policy, guidance and normative development of mediation inside the UN. This has changed since the adoption of the Finnish-Turkish sponsored General Assembly resolution “Strengthening the role of mediation in peaceful settlement of disputes, conflict prevention and resolution”\(^5\) that tasks the Secretary-General to develop guidance for more effective mediation, taking into account lessons learned from past and ongoing mediation processes.

This request generated several consultation processes led by the MSU inside the UN but also in cooperation with other regional organisations, Member States and non-governmental actors. The process, stretched over several months, will lead to the drafting of a series of fundamentals of mediation to guide and inform the practice of the international community in peacemaking.

The resolution also adopted on June 22nd, 2011, including by ASEAN Member States, invites all Member States of the UN to “consider providing timely and adequate resources for mediation, in order to assure its success, as well as for mediation capacity-building activities of the United Nations and of regional and subregional organizations”\(^6\).

---

6. Ibid. (emphasis added)

---

10. Among the recognized non-governmental actors involved in mediation or mediation support in Asia: CMI, HD Centre, Muhammadyiah, Asia Foundation, Conciliation Resources
12. CMI has engaged in a mapping exercise of the various private diplomacy actors active and based throughout the world. This mapping will be published in an interactive format by CMI in October 2012: http://www.privatediplomacy.info

Complementing diplomatic efforts or regional initiatives, the private non-governmental organisations\(^10\) are recognized today as essential peacemaking actors\(^11\). They have the ability do things that governments cannot, such as facilitate the development of new and creative ideas in peace processes, provide a trusted but informal channel of communication for all conflict parties or affected groups, tap into local civil society capabilities and resources and expand networks of contacts, especially to groups or individuals that governments may be precluded from meeting with because of political sensitivities or legal concerns. These organisations are not part of national or international state-based organisations or institutions, but have the capacity to contribute to facilitating, mediating and encouraging parties to find peaceful solutions\(^12\). A number of ASEAN Member States have experience with the role of civil society in peace processes, such as in Aceh, Mindanao, and in southern Thailand.
Experiences from the Mediation Support Activities of Other Regional Actors

In an effort to accomplish its mandate to “save succeeding generations from the scourge of war”¹³ and the UN has undertaken significant efforts to increase its organisational preparedness to address the multiple challenges posed by the conflicts and crisis arisen after the 1980s. This included investing in peacemaking tools, be they peacekeeping, mediation support through the Mediation Support Unit and the creation of the Policy and Mediation Division, the provision of good offices or the fielding of Special Representatives.¹⁴ These efforts have been seconded by the advent of regional and sub-regional organisations with an increased interest in developing peace-making mandates and ‘portfolios’.¹⁵ The proliferation of mediation attempts by regional actors has generated a major “self-awareness” and an engagement thereof in developing tools and an institutional architecture that could support the organisations performance as effective peace-brokers.

The African continent is probably the most advanced at the moment with regard to the toolbox and the organisations committed to ‘African Solutions to African problems’ slogan (the African Union and the sub-regional organisations: in the east the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD); in the west the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and in southern Africa, the Southern African Development Community (SADC). In Europe, the OSCE followed by the EU are the most active actors in peace-making and peacebuilding.

The experience of each of these actors can be of value for other organisations which are seeking to develop similar structures and capacities in the field. ASEAN could draw comparative positive lessons from these parallel experiences. During the CMI conference, special focus was given to the EU, the OSCE, and SADC experiences in this regard.

The European Union

The European Union (EU) has had a long process of political and economic integration aiming to ensure that the regional and world wars which plagued its history would not reoccur. Similarly to ASEAN, regional integration is seen as a method to achieve stability and peace in the region. Mediation has become an increasingly important tool in the external relations of the EU, which has taken a broad understanding of mediation and dialogue facilitation¹⁶. The EU has sought to avoid the risks of focusing solely on Track 1 negotiations by deliberately engaging in and supporting different types and levels of

---

¹⁵. “Before 1975, regional organisations conducted only two mediations per year on average. Between 1989 and 1995, regional organisations undertook 116 attempts at mediation, which represents almost 20 attempts per year. According to this calculation, the peace mediation activities of regional organisations had risen tenfold.” Quoted from T. Piiparinen and V. Brummer. “Globalised peace mediation”. Global networks of mediation Prospects and avenues for Finland as a peacemaker. T. Piiparinen and V. Brummer (eds.) The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, Tampere: 2012
¹⁶. Council of the EU. “Concept on strengthening EU mediation and dialogue capacities”, 15779/09, Brussels:2009 p.3
intervention. One aspect of this is the recognition of the importance of non-state actors, as well as ensuring that mediation occurs at all levels with all actors, and in particular emphasizing the role of women in the mediation process. The EU therefore engages in ensuring communication channels between parties, backstopping mediation processes, providing direct mediation and mediation support services, as well as providing financial support for initiatives by private actors, and economic support in the implementation phase of peace processes.

As regards mediation support, the EU is engaged in three work streams. It offers training and coaching in mediation for its staff, with the goal of ensuring that they are equipped with appropriate mediation skills. A second work stream consists of setting up a mechanism which allows the EU to have the best internal and external expertise delivered at the right time and the right place. The third component of the EU’s activities is to develop a knowledge management structure which ensures that lessons learned are not forgotten, and that it is possible to find out what has been done, how it was done, and how well it worked. The EU engages with other Regional Organisations, such as supporting the African Union, at its request, in the development of its mediation capacities, in coordination with non-state actors, such as CMI and the HD Centre.

---

**THE EUROPEAN UNION AND MEDIATION**

The European Union’s task since its inception has been to contribute to the creation of conditions for a renaissance of peace and prosperity. The EU began as a conflict prevention and peace-building project. Its primary objective was to overcome the legacies of wars and reconcile France and Germany, and, later, Eastern and Western Europe. Peacebuilding is, therefore, an intrinsic part of the EU’s raison d’être and identity. As Europe has developed its political and economic capabilities, it has also asserted itself as a security player with a global strategic responsibility.

Mediation is an integral part of the EU’s external action, but is in the past been used in a rather ad-hoc fashion. The ‘Concept on Strengthening EU Mediation and Dialogue Capacities’ adopted in 2009 states: "that its aim is to develop a more systematic approach to mediation and to strengthen its mediation support capacity which will allow it to contribute in a more efficient and effective way to preventing and resolving conflicts [...] The EU will strive to establish and promote the use of mediation as a tool of first response to emerging or ongoing crisis situations".

---

2. Council of the EU. “Concept on Strengthening EU Mediation and Dialogue Capacities”, 15779/09, Brussels:2009

---

In developing its own structures and institutions, the OSCE has drawn on the experience of other organisations, in particular the UN and the EU. With its fifty-six participating States drawing out on an area that goes from Vancouver to Vladivostock, the OSCE is currently the largest regional security organisation in the world. It deals with conflict prevention, crisis management, post conflict reconstruction and early warning in a geographical area where different regional and global actors (EU, UN, NATO) operate with their different agendas, overlapping memberships and mandates. The OSCE has a relatively rigid and conventional organisational structure bound to its participating States’ political will and agendas, and subject to a strong respect for territorial integrity and non-interference. Nevertheless, the OSCE has sought to improve its institutional and operational capacities in response to demands for becoming more effective in bringing about peace, particularly on the protracted conflicts that have resulted from the breakdown of the Soviet Union. These include Nagorno-Karabakh, Moldova/Transdnistria and the Georgian conflicts.

This was translated in institutional terms by the establishment of two structures tasked with supporting the OSCE mediation and conflict prevention efforts: the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) and the autonomous High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM).

---

**The OSCE and the Conflict around Nagorno-Karabakh**

Nagorno-Karabakh (NK) declared independence from Azerbaijan in 1991, and the subsequent war between Armenia and Azerbaijan resulted in 25,000 deaths and 1 million refugees and IDPs in Azerbaijan and 350,000 in Armenia by the time of the 1994 ceasefire.

The OSCE began mediation and dialogue facilitation efforts in the mid-1990s. OSCE mediation, known as the ‘Minsk process’ is led by the Co-chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group, representing Russia, France and the U.S., and are supported by the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office. The Co-chairs have elaborated ‘basic principles for the peaceful settlement of the conflict’. A comprehensive settlement would follow agreement on the basic principles. There are currently a few outstanding issues which will need to be resolved before a peace agreement is reached.

The OSCE is host to the High-Level Planning Group, responsible for the planning and preparation of an OSCE-led peacekeeping operation to be deployed after an agreement is reach. The situation on the Line of Contact and on the Armenia-Azerbaijan border remains relatively calm and stable despite regular cease-fire violations and 25-30 military and civilian fatalities per year.

The Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on the conflict dealt with by the OSCE Minsk Conference leads a team of international officials based in Tbilisi, Baku, Yerevan and Stepanakert/Khankendi who conduct cease-fire monitoring exercises, constituting the only confidence-building measure between the parties in the military sphere.

---

The CPC is a ‘mediation-support’ type of structure located in the OSCE Secretariat that represents a unique model of interaction between thematic and geographical units and was set in place to support the Chairman-in-Office and other OSCE bodies in the fields of early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. While these institutions play a great role in shaping the organisation’s peacemaking practice, the primary mediation assignments in the OSCE are undertaken by the Chairman-in-Office through appointed Personal or Special Representatives and Envoys.

Considering the fact that the OSCE has limited resources, the organisation had little room to invest in building new structures and institutions and it has decided to focus on building internal capacity. Therefore, efforts were made to pool resources and expertise within existing structures and financial considerations.

Dialogue, facilitation and mediation are seen as important tools in all phases of conflict cycle, including for trust building between conflict parties. Furthermore, in operationalising dialogue facilitation and mediation activities, ownership by participating states is a key OSCE priority. A comprehensive decision on enhancing the OSCE’s capabilities in Early Warning, Early Action, Dialogue Facilitation and Mediation Support, and Post-Conflict Rehabilitation was reached in December 2011, and outlines the organisation's strategy for addressing conflicts.

**The Southern African Development Community**

SADC has its origins in the political-liberation context of the region in opposition to colonialism and economic cooperation as a counter to South African apartheid. With the SADC treaty of 1992, it transitioned to a process of co-operation and integration. It also faces the fundamental guideline of sovereign equality of Member States, while working to establish a climate of security, peace, stability and solidarity among its members and promoting Human Rights, democracy and rule of law, as well as the peaceful settlement of disputes.

SADC's directorate, The Organ is placed under the authority of the Summit, which is headed by an annually rotating leadership (the Troika) consisting of the outgoing, current and incoming Chairpersons.

SADC’s policies towards mediations have been elaborated in the ‘Protocol on Politics, Defence and Security Co-operation’ of 2001, which binds members to promote peaceful settlement of disputes by preventive diplomacy, negotiation, conciliation, mediation, good offices, arbitration and adjudication by international tribunals.

In order to do so, SADC has three primary components to its mediation mechanism. The Panel of Elders consists of 10-15 high-profile personalities who can act as respected mediators and engage in preventive diplomacy. The Mediation Reference Group consists of persons coming from diverse professional backgrounds, and acts as a resource to the Panel of Elders, as well as provide capacity building and reflective lessons-learned. The

---


See: [http://www.sadc.int/index/browse/page/157](http://www.sadc.int/index/browse/page/157)
Mediation Support Unit is tasked with (inter alia) record keeping, profiling conflicts or potential conflicts, and evaluating progress of activities. Furthermore, mediation experts are tasked with designing and guiding the mediation process.

**SADC Engagement in Madagascar**

Madagascar has experienced a series of coups and political crises most recently in 2009. The political situation has resulted in an increase in economic hardship, with a 76% poverty rate and a half million unemployed linked to the 2009 political crisis. The crisis resulted in Madagascar’s suspension by most international organisations, such as the AU, SADC and the EU (which suspended aid).

A roadmap was signed on September 16th, 2011, with leadership from the SADC Organ Troika, consisting of South Africa, Zambia and Mozambique.

Efforts to resolve the current situation have faced a number of challenges. Technical challenges are related to how the roadmap is interpreted and implemented. Political challenges require making a broad concerted effort to implement roadmap. The Engagement by civil society organisations also faces challenges of capacity and financial constraints.

There has been nevertheless a strong participation by CSOs in mediation efforts, and this has delivered ownership of the process by the Civil Society for the first time. CSOs have been recognized as a crucial actor in the roadmap, and have been tasked with significant responsibilities in the process.

Lessons learned for SADC included the need to have a strong leadership in the mediation efforts, especially from the Troika. There was also the realization that a permanent office was necessary to monitor the roadmap implementation and support the actors on the ground.
Working with Civil Society in ASEAN Member States

A further commonality among most regional organisations is the recognition that effective mediation requires engagement with a wide variety of actors, beyond official state and inter-state institutions and governments. Civil society groups and private diplomacy actors are playing a crucial role in numerous conflicts, and harnessing this capacity and knowledge is mutually beneficial for the regional organisations as well as those private groups.

Also recognised is the need for inclusivity – in particular the inclusion of women in peace processes and mediation initiatives on every level. With a broader inclusivity, there is a stronger and more final outcome. All the main actors in a conflict need to be part of the process, and this includes not only the armed groups and governments, but all those in the society who have been affected by the conflict. The engagement of Civil Society groups can ensure that a peace agreement is rooted in a society ready for peace and accepting the legitimacy of the agreement.

Many civil society groups in Southeast Asia have developed networks in order to address a variety of issues, including conflict mediation. The networks are mostly initiated by civil society groups, including academics, journalists, religious leaders, among others, in order to contribute to peacebuilding activities, share information, and strengthen local and cultural resources for peace capacity. Track II meetings, bringing together a mix of academic experts, research analysts, and government officials acting privately (many of which are organized on the margins of the ARF), have increasingly addressed conflict-related issues.

The experience in the Aceh peace process showed the significant role of civil society across many sectors. There are various groups addressing topics ranging from

Insider Mediators

There is also a broad-based understanding that ‘peace mediation’ automatically means a third party support being provided by persons and institutions outside of the affected country. A closer look at the reality of most peace processes reveals that there crucial roles with respect to conflict transformation are also played by ‘insiders’, i.e. persons who are perceived as belonging ethnically, religiously or in other respect to one of the conflict parties, but who try to de-escalate the conflict, build bridges, engage in peace advocacy. Sometimes they are also called ‘(semi-)partial insiders’.

Many of them belong to the important group of insider peacebuilders being active on the ‘Track 3’ and ‘Track 2’ levels. But some of them also operate on higher levels of engagement, i.e. ‘Track 1.5’ and ‘Track 1’ and they often build alliances with different allegiances to the parties to support conflict transformation in a discreet manner.

A closer look at mediation in the ASEAN region reveals that in most conflict cases there are persons with experience, commitment and a good rapport with the conflicting parties who play these roles. Because international intervention is a very sensitive issue for some ASEAN Member States, it is highly advisable to explore their contributions and potential more in detail and also to explore, how their support can be made more effective. In several cases it also advisable to look for creative ways to combine mediation efforts from outside of the country with those from inside.
peace-related activities, short term recovery, democracy and justice, economic development, as well as education and the empowerment of women. Among those groups who engage in peacebuilding activities, are the Aceh Civil Society Task Force, the Institute for Peace and Human Security Studies, Program Pendidikan Damai Aceh (Aceh Peace Education Program, and the Aceh Working Group (itself an umbrella organisation for NGOs focused on peace for Aceh).

Mindanao also has a vibrant set of peace movements and networks, such as the Mindanao Peaceweavers, Consortium of Bagsamoro Civil Society (CBSCS) and the Mindanao People's Caucus (MPC). These and other CSOs have engaged in a wide range of peacebuilding activities in Mindanao, from ceasefire monitoring, to dialogue and consultation, to inter-faith dialogue and peace journalism. For example, the MPC developed the ‘Bantay Ceasefire’ program, which now with 900 volunteers over seven provinces in Mindanao, supports the ceasefire by reporting violations of the ceasefire agreement and in general reducing threats to the safety and security of civilian populations in conflict affected areas in Mindanao.

Bringing civil society groups on board and working closely with various groups is crucial to assist the development of the peaceful ASEAN community. ASEAN’s effectiveness in peace mediation would be enhanced by harnessing the resources, capacities and access of civil society groups. This would require ASEAN to more directly engage with civil society, in order to gain from the access to local communities, as well as the expertise and experience of civil society actors. This again points to a more multi-track and cumulative approach needed for effective mediation.
IDEAS EXPLORED IN THE CONFERENCE DISCUSSIONS

The EU – ASEAN Conference on Preventive Diplomacy and International Peace Mediation was an opportunity for leading representatives of ASEAN Member States and the ASEAN Secretariat to meet with representatives of fellow regional and international organisations such as the European Union, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the Southern African Development Community, and the United Nations, in order to exchange experiences in the development of capacities and mechanisms for preventive diplomacy and peace mediation. Each of these organisations, including ASEAN, is seeking ways in which to enhance their capacity to respond to dynamic situations of latent and manifest conflict and engage in timely preventive diplomacy and peace mediation. Also participating were experienced practitioners from the field, who have engaged with regional organisations on issues of peace mediation in settings of conflict, providing insights into links between regional organisations and on the ground activities in support of peace mediation initiatives.

The conference resulted in a constructive and mutually beneficial discussion between ASEAN senior leaders and representatives and the invited participants from other regions. Drawing upon these discussions, the following ideas relevant for ASEAN are proposed for further discussion and exploration. These ideas remain at a draft stage and will be developed according to feedback from ASEAN conference participants. At this stage, these ideas are suggestions for further discussion.

- Develop conflict prevention and resolution capacities rooted in, and based on, the achievements of ASEAN to date.
- Facilitate timely cooperation in supporting the implementation of the APSC blueprint in the area of promoting a coherent, peaceful and resilient region with shared responsibilities.
- The participants look forward to the future elaboration of ASEAN Institute for Peace and Reconciliation, drawing on regional and international expertise.
- Support ASEAN to enhance conflict prevention, preparedness, and peacebuilding capacities.
- Promote synergies and cross-linkages with multilateral and regional actors in international mediation.
- Explore a regular policy dialogue with relevant international and regional organisations.
- Enhance the ability of ASEAN to respond to issues of global relevance.
- Shape and share norms, rules, values and processes based on the regional experience and needs.
- Explore possibilities for developing trainings for ASEAN national diplomatic training institutions.
- Engage younger officers of Member States in peer to peer exchanges.
- Create a platform to continue and deepen the information exchange, in particular on thematic issues.
• Explore the use and enhance the capacity of insider mediators.
• Enhance existing cooperation among ASEAN member state think-tanks to study peace, conflict management, and conflict resolution.
• Reciprocity should be a founding principle in exchanges between regional organisations, with each able to contribute valuable experiences to the others.
• Conduct joint trainings with other regional organisations.
• Enhance exchange on common thematic issues relevant to regional organisations, such as: preventive diplomacy, peace mediation, dialogue facilitation.
• Continue and develop this exercise further.
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Agenda

9:00 – 9:30
Welcoming Remarks and Setting the Scene

- Mr. Jan-Willem Blankert, Special Advisor ASEAN, Delegation of the European Union to Indonesia, Brunei Darussalam and ASEAN.
- H.E. Ambassador Nadjib Riphat Kesoema, Deputy Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal and Security Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia
- H.E. Ambassador Djauhari Oratmangun, ASEAN SOM Chair
- Mr. Guy Banim, Programme manager, EU External Action Service (EEAS), Conflict prevention, peacebuilding and mediation unit
- H.E. Ambassador Kai Sauer, Ambassador of Finland to Indonesia
- Mrs. Tuija Talvitie, Executive Director, Crisis Management Initiative (CMI)

9:30 – 11.00
Panel: Trends in International Peace Mediation and the Role of Regional Organisations

- Mr. Andrew Marshall, Senior Mediation Adviser, CMI (to provide an overview of the international peace mediation landscape with an emphasis on the different roles played by the various actors active in this field)
- Mr. Levent Bilman, UN Director of the Policy and Mediation Division in the Department of Political Affairs (to provide an overview on the UN Mediation Support Unit experience, mandate, services, capacity and its relationships with different regional organisations. The presentation will also touch upon the recently adopted UN General Assembly resolution on mediation.)
• Dr. Alice Ackermann, Senior Operational Advisor; Conflict Prevention Centre, OSCE Secretariat (to provide an overview on the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre and its experience in setting up its mediation support capacities. The presentation will also touch upon the OSCE’s approach in addressing the conflict through international peace mediation.)

• Mr. Guy Banim, EU External Action Service (EEAS), Conflict prevention, peacebuilding and mediation unit (To provide an overview on the EU experience to setting up its mediation support capacities.)

• Mr. Masimba Ignatious Kamba, Senior Officer, Southern African Development Community (SADC) (To provide an overview on the SADC experience in attempts to setting up its mediation support capacities.)

1:00-11:30
Tea and Coffee Break

1:30 – 12:30
Panel: Trends in International Peace Mediation and the Role of Regional Organisations
Facilitated Discussion – Questions and answers session

• Mr. Basil Vasilica Constantinescu – Discussant, Counsellor, EU – ASEAN Regional Cooperation Advisor, Delegation of the European Union to Indonesia, Brunei Darussalam and ASEAN

• Mr. Agus Wandi – Discussant, UNDP Afghanistan

Guiding questions: What is the added value of regional diplomacy in conducting meaningful peace processes? What is the added value of institutionalizing mediation support capacity? Cooperation versus competition among various actors. What role for ASEAN in this international theatre?

2:30 – 14:00
Lunch

4:00 – 15:30
Panel: Regional experience in International Peace Mediation- Case Studies

• Mr. Peter Keay, Formerly adviser to Amb. Kasprzyk - Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. (To provide an overview of the practical experience of the OSCE in conducting the peace process for the settlement of the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh. Also the presentation will touch upon the role and experience of EU in the Kosovo case.)
• Dr. Norbert Ropers, Berghof Peace Support BPS (to provide a presentation on “insider mediators”, in Asia and their cooperation with regional organisations)
• Mr. Francois Butedi, Governance, Peace and Security Programme of SADC –CNGO (to provide a presentation on the role of the civil society in supporting SADC in bringing about peace in violent conflict situations. The presentation will touch on the Madagascar case study.)
• H.E. Ambassador I Ged Ngurah Swajaya – Comments, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to ASEAN
• H.E. Ambassador Manasvi Srisodapol – Comments, Permanent Representative of Thailand to ASEAN
• H.E. Ambassador Kai Sauer – Discussant, Ambassador of Finland to Indonesia
• Ms. Roxana Cristescu (CMI) – Discussant, Advisor, CMI

15:30 – 16:00
Tea and Coffee Break

16:00 – 17:15
Open Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

• H.E. Ambassador Kai Sauer – Discussant, Ambassador of Finland to Indonesia
• H.E. Ambassador I Gede Ngurah Swajaya – Discussant, ASEAN Chair
• Mr. Jan-Willem Blankert- Discussant, Special Advisor ASEAN, Delegation of the European Union to Indonesia, Brunei Darussalam and ASEAN

Questions being addressed: What are the different good practices and lessons learned from different contexts (including South East-Asia) that ASEAN could tap in for further developing its own capacity as a regional peace maker? What are the next steps that ASEAN could undertake in order to improve its capacity as a peace maker? How should these next steps be sequenced and prioritized? Are there concrete cooperation possibilities with the EU, other regional organisations and peacebuilding expert community on specific areas of interest for ASEAN?

17:15 – 17:30
Closing Remarks
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