



FOCAL

Canadian Foundation for the Americas
Fondation canadienne pour les Amériques
Fundación Canadiense para las Américas
Fundação Canadense para as Américas

FINAL REPORT

**Inter-American Meeting of Civil Society Organizations on
Conflict Prevention**

December 10, 2004

Ottawa, Canada

**Hosted by the Canadian Foundation for the Americas
In collaboration with
the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee and
the Coordinadora Regional de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales
as part of the
Global Partnership on the Prevention of Armed Conflict**

Funded by the International Development Research Centre

INTRODUCTION

In 2002 the European Centre for Conflict Prevention (ECCP), with the support of the United Nations, initiated a global partnership on the role of civil society organizations and NGOs in the prevention of armed conflict (GPPAC), to culminate in an international conference at the UN. The project is structured around independent regional initiatives (in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America & the Caribbean, the Middle East and North America) which have been holding sub-regional consultations, and compiling input (in the form of Action Agendas) for the global conference. As a result of shared geography and strong political/economic ties, members of the regional steering groups from Latin America & the Caribbean, North America and Mexico felt that inter-regional collaboration could help strengthen their regional agendas and activities.

On December 9th, 2004 the North American regional meeting was held in Ottawa to begin an initial negotiation of a North American (Canada, United States and Mexico) Action Agenda for the GPPAC process.

Building on the accomplishments of this meeting, members of regional steering groups and other experts from Latin America & the Caribbean, North America and Mexico met in Ottawa on December 10th in order to determine areas for inter-regional collaboration. LAC participants included members from the *Regional Coordination of Economic and Social Research (CRIES)* who are the coordinating organization for the GPPAC process in the LAC region. Other civil society organizations in attendance that form part of the LAC regional network are; from Mexico, *Servicio de Asesoría para la Paz (SERAPAZ)*, *Centro de Derechos Humanos Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, Jóvenes en Resistencia Alternativa (JRA)*; from Chile, *FLACSO*; from Ecuador, *Non-violent Peaceforce*; from El Salvador, *Central American Human Rights Commission (CODEHUCA)*; and from Honduras *ODECO-ONECA*. Members of the North American civil society network in attendance included from Canada: *The Canadian Peacebuilding Committee (CPC)*, *Nonviolent Peaceforce*, *Peace Brigades International*, *The North South Institute*, *The Canadian International Institute of Applied Negotiation (CIAN)*, *World Federalist Movement*, *FOCAL*, and *Human Rights Internet*; and from the United States, *InterAction*, *Friends Committee on National Legislation*, *International Committee of the Red Cross*, *Alliance for International Conflict Prevention and Resolution (ALLIANCE)*, and *Nonviolent Peaceforce*.

Specifically the objectives of this hemispheric meeting were to:

- share and debate new research conducted by LAC and NA CSOs;
- effectively share information for the GPPAC process and beyond the global initiative;
- strengthen GPPAC submissions by identifying common priorities, policy approaches and overlapping positions, as well as regional differences;
- strengthen ties among civil society organizations and leave in place a network for future cooperation in security and conflict prevention in the Americas;
- establish areas for collaboration in research, advocacy and networking in conflict prevention;
- explore ways to improve CSO interaction with regional (hemispheric) organizations.

RESEARCH PAPERS

Two research papers commissioned by FOCAL (and funded by IDRC) were presented in the first half on the hemispheric meeting. Discussion of the papers gave participants an opportunity to identify key areas of interest in the broad domain of conflict prevention, and to debate where efforts should be concentrated.

1) **Inter-American Institutions and Conflict Prevention in the Americas**

Author Stephen Baranyi of the North-South Institute presented the first paper entitled, *“Inter-American Institutions and Conflict Prevention in the Americas”*. This draft paper reviews the evolution of inter-American norms and institutions that deal, directly or indirectly, with conflict prevention in the Hemisphere. It looks at four pillars of CP practice: i) the peaceful settlement of inter-state disputes and the new hemispheric security agenda; ii) the protection of human rights; iii) the defense and promotion of democracy; iv) other aspects of structural prevention, especially the work of the IDB and the potential conflict impacts of the FTAA. It ends with an analytical summary of trends, highlighting five areas for dialogue and action by CSOs.

Stephen started by asking whether we are seeing a move towards a “culture of prevention” in the Hemisphere. There have been advances in the prevention of inter-state disputes, for example in the area of confidence and security building measures, based on long-standing OAS norms. Yet these mechanisms have largely ignored the US-Cuba dispute, which could escalate into armed conflict in the coming years. He suggested that the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights could be used more effectively to provide early warning and prompt early action to prevent armed conflicts, as could the emerging instruments for the defense of democracy. Yet political resistance by certain member states has undermined the potential of the IACHR in this regard. Moreover OAS Resolution 1080 and the Inter-American Democratic Charter still offer only limited instruments for conflict prevention, though the work done by the OAS Unit for the Promotion of Democracy is contributing to strengthening capacities for dialogue and conflict prevention in certain countries. Finally, he suggested that more work is needed on other aspects of structural prevention, such as monitoring the conflict impacts of Inter-American Development Bank programming and of trade liberalization processes such as the FTAA. Stephen ended by suggesting that CSO networks are well positioned to advance and link some of these agendas in the Hemisphere. He also noted that there was a need for more inter-American dialogue among CSOs on the constraints/possibilities of putting the "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) into practice in Latin America and the Caribbean.

In response many participants agreed that the record of the OAS and other inter-American institutions, on conflict prevention, has been quite mixed. There is an emerging conceptual debate on conflict prevention but it has yet to be articulated with institutional changes in a consistent manner. Moreover CSOs are still marginal to these policy debates. This has to do in part with the state of democracy in LAC. But there has also been an over emphasis on operational prevention in the LAC region, and prevention tends to be reactive rather than pre-emptive. Part of the problem is that the United States is imposing

its own concept of “Security” in “partnership” with governments such as in Colombia. Civil society is not paying enough attention to the security of democracy and participation nor to economic security. CSOs working on Hemispheric security issues also need to connect better with CSOs working on democracy, participation and rights issues at the national and at the local levels. The recommendation now emerging in civil society is that security issues should evolve from a narrow to a broad focus in which issues of human security, poverty, democracy, environmental protection, migration, as well the impact of the social exclusion of groups such as afro-descendants, indigenous peoples, and women, are taken into consideration. Other areas that need attention are interstate conflict, and corruption. Several participants noted that there is an emerging stream of reflection on R2P in Latin America and the Caribbean, particularly in the light of the recent experience in Haiti, and that it is important to foster deeper engagement by CSOs in the Hemisphere on this issue.

Civil society is increasingly promoting the importance of analyzing the sources of conflicts, to understand for example the role that hunger plays in provoking conflict. Some participants felt that CSOs also need to seriously examine the effects of globalization because up until now it has been difficult to prove with academic certainty, how international accords which promote the globalization of commerce and trade, are preventing or provoking conflict in the LAC region. Some felt that the United States Government (and the neo-liberal policies it promotes) is often vilified for its role in aggravating conflict in the LAC region, yet other potential sources of conflict exist which are exclusive of US interference. Others felt that there was a need for deeper, ongoing of US policy and its conflict impacts, particularly in the Andean region.

Some participants noted that conflict in countries such as Cuba is less likely to arise from external intervention, and more likely to arise from internal implosion. Civil society needs to help Cubans address their internal problems, while preserving the public systems that attend to the needs of the most disenfranchised. There are many reasons to be concerned about Cuba, as there is much disagreement between US policy and the mandates of organizations such as the OAS. Some skepticism exists about the effectiveness of working through multilateral channels, such as the OAS or other sub-regional organizations. While not precluding working through the Organization of American States, sub-regional activities through mechanisms existing in Mercosur or la Comunidad Andina, can be more dynamic, and may achieve results faster than working through the OAS.

One participant noted that an area not touched upon in the papers are conflicts generated by historic invasions of territories such as Puerto Rico. Another issue not mentioned in the research is the remilitarization of LAC, and the impact of this on prolonging conflict. There is an absence of discussion of the context of conflict in Mexico in the documents. Mexico is focusing its efforts on the follow-up and the enforcement of existing peace agreements.

2) Seguridad, prevención de conflictos y sociedad civil: América Latina y el Caribe

Co-author Andres Serbin of CRIES presented the research paper entitled “*Seguridad, prevención de conflictos y sociedad civil: América Latina y el Caribe*”

This research paper identifies existing formal and ad hoc mechanisms developed to help civil society participate in the prevention and resolution of conflicts. The study demonstrates that there is a lack of participation by civil society in the LAC region as a result of three interrelated phenomenon. First, conflict prevention and peacebuilding have developed primarily through state and military channels due to the emphasis on security. Second, the notion of state-controlled conflict prevention is reinforced by civil society and its networks because the vast majority believe that CP is primarily the concern of the state, and so do not make it part of their agendas. Finally, participation of civil society in forming the conflict prevention agenda is further hindered by weak civil society networks, lack of resources and the sometimes un-representative (non-participatory) decision-making practices of civil society organisations.

In the LAC region there is a prominent discourse of security instead of conflict prevention, partly because it is one of the most peaceful regions in the world. The region is characterized by diverse conflicts, not many inter-state conflicts, and different sources of conflict in different countries.

CSOs have argued that the state-sponsored concepts of conflict prevention as primarily a “security”, and therefore military concern, is too narrow and have argued instead for a broader approach to conflict prevention employing the concept of “human security” as the desired end result. While the concept of human security forms the axis for thinking about conflict prevention for many civil society organizations, it is such as general concept that is has also been employed by states to justify interventionist policies, in the name of security for humanity. Further, achieving human security (and furthering agreement to concepts such as R2P) is difficult because human security is often the first thing compromised in conflict.

Serbin pointed out that CSOs debate development and trade a lot, but do little work on security. CSO participation in forming the conflict prevention agenda has increased with the creation of the Summit of the Americas meetings, but there remains a question about how effective this participation is. CSOs have had a greater part in resolving conflicts than in preventing them and need to demand a monitoring role for the development of the conflict prevention agenda in multilateral organizations. While the OAS does offer some real opportunities for CSO involvement in the development of a conflict prevention agenda, the United Nations is too “distant” an organization to be effective in the Latin-American context. While the UN has offered some space for CSO participation, this has not translated into concrete achievements. Serbin questioned whether CSOs should focus on anticipating and tracking the conflict impacts of trade liberalization processes such as the FTAA, given that the latter is not expected to lead to an agreement in the near future.. Nor does he see that there is space for civil society participation through Mecosur, although Comunidad Andina de Naciones and the Central American Integraiton system may hold more promise for CSO involvement.

Participants responded by pointing out that there has been an increase in political violence, caused in part by a frustration with non-functioning democracies. This frustration has resulted in violence becoming part of the political expression of the LAC region. Three major challenges exist for civil society participation in conflict prevention the LAC region; the lack of social participation in political decision-making, the weakness of democratic institutions in many LAC countries, and the rise of political violence in countries such a Venezuela and Brazil.

In general civil society has relied too heavily on regional organizations to insert itself into the conflict prevention debate, and should increase attempts to participate at the governmental level. If there is no voice for civil society through government on this issue, then civil society should be stimulating the political class to create spaces for CSO participation. CSOs lack a more detailed view of successful experiences by national and local initiatives in conflict prevention, and need to study local social initiatives on how to deal with violence, and broaden national public spaces for discussion and policy formation.

The context within which conflict prevention is currently being advanced is within the growing tension between human rights and the “War on Terror”. The security agenda is eating up a lot of resources that are needed to help reach the Millennium Development Goals. In the vast LAC region with so few inter-state conflicts and a tremendous need for development, why are national militaries maintained? One dimension CSOs should give more attention to is non-military interventions such as the Peace Brigades. Is there a possibility for a regional peace force?

Further, the “Responsibility to Protect” has proven to be an ambiguous and complex concept, which has not helped clarify appropriate responses to the sources of conflict in many instances. For example, how do we deal with arms in society? Canada’s limits on arms is largely do to lobbying and input from CSOs. Many CSOs argue that the appropriate response to arms proliferation related to the drug trade is not necessarily a military one, and that in this instance working with and through regional organizations is necessary.

Finally, participants commented on some general activities that CSOs needed to undertake in the near future, including:

- Get involved in the five year summit meetings of heads of state; and special events (such as the UN GPPAC meetings in July).
- Examine how social movements are related to the conflict prevention agendas. How can we engage the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre or existing campesino networks such as CLOC and Vía Campesina?
- Improve early warning systems through existing networks.
- Develop a database of information on conflict prevention.
- Advance the discussion about economic issues as a major cause of conflict.

REGIONAL ACTION AGENDAS

On December 9th, the day before this hemispheric meeting, members of the Canadian, US, and Mexican task forces met to begin the negotiation of a North American Action Agenda, an agenda that would give CSOs in the region a unified voice on conflict prevention before the United Nations (GPPAC process) and in future dealings with regional organizations and their national governments. The resulting document “North American Action Agenda on Conflict Prevention” can be accessed at the CPCC website at: <http://www.peacebuild.ca>

The LAC Action Agenda was last updated in a meeting in June 2004, in Buenos Aires. LAC participants at this meeting felt that they would have difficulty giving firm



US and Canadian participants listening to presentations on the Regional Action Agendas for Conflict Prevention

commitments or making decisions immediately, as they will first need to share the outcomes of the meeting with their partner organizations, and seek their endorsement of new language or agreements. They hope to accomplish this before the next meeting of LAC task-force members in Caracas in February, 2005.

ROUNDTABLES

As there has been a lot of emphasis and some areas of agreement on determining action agenda priorities both in the Northern and Southern hemispheric processes, the main purpose of the hemispheric meeting was to determine areas for collaboration. Participants met to determine collaborative activities in three broad areas: advocacy, networking and research.

Advocacy

Participants identified some shared goals for advocacy in the conflict prevention agenda, from the point of view of civil society. First, civil society would like to advocate for a ‘human security’ policy framework, where this is not being applied at a national or regional level. Second, it was agreed that the policy for ‘Responsibility to Protect’ needs more visibility in the LAC region. Third, there is a need to build capacity for CSOs to engage internationally on conflict prevention issues. While the UN-GPPAC process should help promote a horizontal interaction between state and non-state actors, advocacy organizations are interested in strengthening the ability of civil society to participate beyond the UN conference in 2005. Some CSOs (notably in Mexico) have begun this process by working through the Inter-American Human Rights system.

CSO collaboration for interfacing with the OAS

Members of the Advocacy roundtable agreed that beyond the GPPAC process, interacting with the Organization of American States is a priority for CSOs in the North and the South. Presently, CSOs do not have interlocutors for either the OAS, nor and next Summit of the Americas meeting in November, and need to establish forms of horizontal communication to follow-up at the UN and at the OAS. Group participants agreed that they should coordinate efforts in preparation for the next General Assembly of the OAS in June 2005.

Regarding collaboration for improved interfacing with the OAS, the group suggested:

- **Identify horizontal networks that already exist for interfacing with OAS** (e.g.: Inter-American Network for Democracy meeting January 24 in Washington, [These do NOT interface with the OAS!] and the Inter-American Coalition of Human Rights).
- **Identify ways the United States and Canada can make a contribution to the LAC process.** (e.g.: LAC CSOs could provide North American CSOs with a short briefing on most pressing issues that North Americans could show their governments, in preparation for OAS meetings, and advocate for Canada/US ratification of the Inter-American Convention on Human Rights)
- **Use the OAS voting system to expedite the passing of desired resolutions** (of the 30 countries represented at the OAS, the main block of votes comes from the smallest countries, especially CARICOM who have 14 votes; with support from these countries there is a better chance to influence the agenda).
- **Utilize the hemispheric networks established for the GPPAC process to share a common agenda at the OAS.**
- **Research the possibility of a specific mechanism for Conflict Prevention at the OAS** (joint action might include a discussion about political mechanisms and CP, conduct research about how this mechanism would work, bring a technically solid proposal to OAS)



Latin American participants at the Advocacy Roundtable

GPPAC Process

Participants indicated that a major challenge for advocacy in the LAC region is that many people do not know about the GPPAC process, or how to insert their organizations in the process. Unlike the single issue of landmines to which many state and non-state actors rallied to make sweeping international policy changes, conflict prevention lacks a clear or simple point for shared advocacy. The challenge is to agree to issues to which many people can rally, and see the direct relevance to their work. Participants agreed to some areas of possible collaboration to overcome these particular challenges.

- **Share ideas and analysis of conflict prevention issues between Northern and Southern NGOs to a greater extent.** (First meeting suggested where this could occur was the Forum for Citizen Diplomacy in Caracas)
- **Investigate using the Quaker UN houses in Geneva and NY which were used in landmines process, for collaborative work on CP.**
- **Through regional CSO collaboration focus on improving capacity and the political will to respond to specific conflicts** (such as Sudan)
- **As part of the GPPAC process advocate for a UN Decade of Conflict Prevention**
- **Form coordinating group who will assist CSOs in maintaining contact and collaboration on these proposals, and on other themes and proposals for future joint work**

Summit of the Americas and Regional Human Rights Mechanisms

To date there are no joint CSO statements for the Summit of the Americas related to conflict prevention. In fact, the main themes at the Summit are more closely related to labour markets and employment, and no formal space has been dedicated to the discussion of conflict prevention and peacebuilding. In past meetings of the Summit, conflict prevention issues have been couched in the language of “democratic development”, and CSOs will need to consider the effectiveness of continuing to use this language at Summit meetings and with the Inter American Human Rights Coalition. The human rights network (particularly through the Inter American Human Rights Coalition) has been one of the main defenders of the conflict prevention agenda, and is a good place to continue to promote conflict prevention, especially in light of the fact that there is not always space given for CSO participation at Summit meetings. CSOs should begin to develop their own indicators of early warning and coordination around the human rights networks.

There are several upcoming meetings of CSOs focused on planning for the Summit meetings, one in March in Buenos Aires and one the week before the Summit in November.

Other Activities

- **Southern and Northern CSOs should attempt to coordinate with LAC governments to find ways to collaborate on conflict prevention issues.** (Some disagreement on this point as experience has shown that there has been a reluctance by some LA governments to involve other countries on national issues, although this could be attempted instead as a regular set of meetings and workshops on CP)
- **Provide support for training in conflict prevention, non-violence, peace education, citizen diplomacy, early warning**
- **Develop alternative strategies for conflict resolution by CSOs, such as education with children at the school level** (such as Parlamentos de la Paz in Argentina)

RESEARCH

Participants of the research roundtable exchanged information about research in progress in several countries, on issues pertaining to security and conflict prevention in the Americas. There was an overall consensus among the participants of this group that there are a number of areas pertaining specifically to LAC that are understudied and that would benefit significantly from collaboration among North American and Latin American research institutes such as NSI, FLACSO, CRIES and NGOs such as FOCAL. Each participant committed to presenting a list of research their institutions are undertaking and share it with other researchers by January 15, 2005.

Areas identified include:

Migration and Security What are the implications of current patterns of migration for national and sub-national security? What impact does outward migration from conflict areas have on conflict zones or on receiving countries? What are the links between trade and migration due to conflicts and inter-American security system?

Structural prevention There are several important projects underway or in development on aspects of structural prevention. This includes the proposal by CRIES for research on the conflict impacts of economic globalization in the Americas. It includes the initiative by the World Lutheran Federation to examine the outcomes of peacebuilding processes for the advancement of economic, social and cultural rights. It also includes work by the North-South Institute and its partners on “What Kind of Peace is Possible?” and on the conflict impacts of land policies. Several participants expressed a desire to explore possible collaborative work on structural prevention based on these strengths.

Gender and Security Though there has been important work on the gender dimensions of security/insecurity, for example by CRIES, Fundación Género y Sociedad and the Arias Foundation, there is a need for more work at the interface of gender equity and conflict prevention. For example, there is a need for more research on violence against women and children in post-conflict and other contexts. Marginalized women and children are often the main victims of conflict and social violence. In many instances, there are few support mechanisms in place to aid these groups. What measures have states undertaken to address the needs of these groups? What role can CSOs play in raising awareness and advocacy for these groups and for engaging in further research in order to build a better understanding of the issues facing these groups in conflict and post-conflict societies.

Follow-up on Conflict Situations in Haiti and Cuba It was agreed that the situations in Haiti and Cuba required more collaborative engagement of CSOs in the Hemisphere. Haiti: Many of our governments are controversially involved in Haiti. We need to monitor their actions better, and collaborate with Haitian CSOs to support genuine peacebuilding. NSI and FOCAL agreed to contact Haitian CSOs and get back to CRIES regarding the possible establishment of a sub-network on Haiti.

Cuba: CRIES includes several Cuban member institutes. FLACSO-DR has a project on Cuba after the blockade. We agreed to discretely explore how we could build on these links to raise the profile of conflict prevention in/on Cuba.

NETWORKING

The Networking roundtable participants began by establishing the need to track existing conflict prevention networks, and determine how these networks function (i.e. how networks are structured and how decisions are made). Such an analysis is needed at this time to help CSOs understand how civil society in this hemisphere will continue to relate to each other. Networking between CSOs in the Americas on conflict prevention issues can be improved by widening the criteria to include groups in the network who might not have been included before. This will help CSOs also widen the debate about conflict prevention and shared strategies for action.

Participants identified one of the major challenges of networking at a hemispheric level is the inherent diversity of civil society organizations. Some organizations have strong connections to governments, some to the grassroots and there is a wide political spectrum of organizational agendas from progressive to militarized. A future hemispheric network should map civil society organizations working on conflict prevention and gather information about the focus of their work, and their sphere of influence.

Other challenges identified by the group to work effectively through networks, was the time (and resource) consuming nature of incorporating different interests, ideas and ways of working, to obtain a positive outcome. Many people need to still be convinced of the benefits of working through larger networks and of the advantages of taking shared positions on conflict prevention issues. As networking is collaborative work, finding people with enough time and resources to maintain the networks is an ongoing challenge.

CSOs can use networking most effectively if they are strategic about how it will bolster the day-to-day work of their organization. In Mexico, peacebuilding work is approached as both a strategy and a project that requires permanent, ongoing work and periodic joint projects with other CSOs. In Canada, the experience of peace work with the International Peace Brigades (accompanying and protecting human rights activists) has been pursued under the auspices of Canada's foreign policy framework, and so has not just been isolated efforts.

In the LAC region there is still uncertainty and debate between CSO about working with concepts such as "human security", "humanitarian intervention" and the "responsibility to protect". LAC partners need more opportunities to debate and agree on these issues. The GPPAC meeting in July would provide us an opportunity to hold a workshop for such a debate. That should be followed up by another meeting post July to define research of common interest and/or other proposals from networking and advocacy and the possibility of developing a permanent mechanism for CSO participation on conflict prevention.

Actions:

- **Following GPPAC meeting in July, begin communication about establishing hemispheric and global leadership to facilitate CSO networking on conflict prevention.**
- **Undertake research on how CSO can best interact and share expertise.** (eg: who does advocacy in the political arena on specific policies and proposals, such as IFIs, trade policies; who does education campaigns within their own countries on CP; who does public relations campaigns?)
- **Exchange lessons learned**
- **Establish a regional level networking mechanism that would facilitate and coordinate grassroots responses to issues that arise, and serve as a platform for collaborative work at the hemispheric level.**
- **Widen networks not only through means of communication, but also through public education campaigns on conflict resolution** (possibly a popular education strategy)
- **Develop mechanisms for implementing recommendations of all three groups it's a framework agreement for how we're going to work together, on research, on advocacy and on networking**

CONCLUSIONS

Participants felt that the exercise of this preliminary meeting at a hemispheric level was useful for several reasons:

- It reaffirmed for participants that despite pursuing their conflict prevention work in very different social, political and economic contexts, CSOs hemisphere-wide share values, goals and conflict prevention strategies that could be enhanced by regional solidarity.
- It also helped regional partners understand that despite similar goals, specific local/national/sub-regional contexts require, and will continue to require localized strategies and responses tailored to meet the needs of the particular context. (A good example is the choice of language chosen by CSOs in the United States where the current foreign policy of the Bush Administration forces civil society to acknowledge the “security” agenda in order to make any headway with government.)
- It gave participants an opportunity to define some practical actions that would lead to hemispheric cooperation on issues of conflict prevention.

A prevailing challenge for CSOs is finding the resources to foster linkages and collaborate on work with other organizations across the hemisphere. This meeting may have opened possibilities for Northern CSOs to help Southern CSOs by sharing their contacts for funding and resources to pursue cooperation at a regional level. More immediately, organizations are satisfied with piggy-backing on the coming regional meetings they are attending (GPPAC, Summit preliminaries, OAS), as an opportunity to also hold further discussions about potential collaboration in networking, advocacy and research.

While the opportunity to meet CSOs from the hemisphere may have broadened the perspective of participating CSOs on what conflict prevention work, and policy priorities are being pursued outside their regions, it also reaffirmed the importance of maintaining a deep understanding of successful local and national experiences of conflict prevention. Processes such as GPPAC and hemispheric level collaboration will be successful when they can expand national public spaces for discussion and policy formation, and raise public awareness of key issues in conflict prevention.