

Annex 1

Certification for / Accreditation of Peace Professionals and Volunteers

Annex 1

Certification for / Accreditation of Peace Professionals and Volunteers

There are calls for professionals from all sectors for work in conflict management. However, even the most experienced and/or qualified professional would need to supplement their knowledge and experience with key peace competencies (communication, conciliation, conflict Analysis, facilitation, mediation, negotiation, operational planning, peace building, personal security, strategic thinking, teamwork¹) and core values if they are to be effective in situations of conflict. Indeed, seasoned peace professionals go further. They say: while key competencies can be learned, core values need to be in place from the start. Consequently, if core values are not identified during rigorous initial screening, to assess their readiness or suitability, professionals can (and have) do more harm than good in situations of conflict, despite their technical competence.

This is where the need for Peace Professional Accreditation (and CPSC's unique contribution to the field) comes in - their readiness or suitability. The Canadian CPS aims to offer the first ever opportunity, not only for professionals in other fields to supplement their expertise with specific training in key peace competencies to become accredited Specialized Peace Professionals and General Peace Professionals.² Volunteers wishing to be recognized for their invaluable contributions to peace management, while retaining their status as volunteers, could also be assessed against key competencies and core values, for certification as Accredited Peace Volunteers. CPSC is taking on board the certification challenges faced and lessons learned by TRANSCEND Peace University³, founded by Dr. Johan Galtung. "I think certification is very important, but also listen to the voices of intuitive recognition. We need both." Hence, TRANSCEND⁴ training spans not only academic training (soon up to the Master's level), but also work with 7-year olds to resolve conflicts at school (through the ZABONA program)⁵. "Certification is tricky" says Dr. Johan Galtung, a pioneer in not only of peace research, but also of educating peace professionals. TRANSCEND⁶, the organization he founded, has held about 1000 workshops around the world, with an average of 10 to 20 participants. Dr. Galtung's on-line

We are also training 7 year-old kids in how to find transcending solutions through the ZABONA program: ZABONA – is Zulu. It means: "I see you". It means more than communication; more than empathy. It means: "I take in your reality".

Example: Boy A invites boy B to stay the night. For some reason it has to be Friday night. B looks forward to it. A then says it doesn't work, because his mother works all week and on Saturday morning she does not want to appear in a not made up face in front of visitors. The case is brought to the class. They have been taught that there are five options: **Cancel** (leads to dissatisfaction); **Carry on any way** (leads to dissatisfaction); **Compromise:** Do it next year. Have a short visit for only the Friday evening. Etc. (leads to dissatisfaction); **Make a deal:** Mother says, "I can show my face anyhow on Saturday". Or the Boy gives up staying the night. This is known as making a deal. (Everyone is equally dissatisfied.); **Breakthrough:** Boy B, visitor, comes one hour earlier on Friday evening, and leaves one hour earlier on Saturday morning, i.e. before the mother gets up (everyone satisfied). To achieve the breakthrough, you first need to careful observation of the context. This example was given to many adults. They could not work it out. The children did. Dr. Johan Galtung, CPSC Conference, April 2007, <http://verbena19.wordpress.com/2007/02/06/ottawa-peace-as->

university, now in its 5th year offer 19 courses to about 100 participants a year. These include Peace Conflict Transformation – English Russian, Japanese, Rumanian, etc. Peace Zones, Peace Journalism, Peace and Gender, Gender and Militaries. A recent addition will be the field of mathematics in support of peace. This year's course has mainly politicians who participate in chat rooms on line, write essays and produce individual assignments, focusing on the conflict that affects them most. Some are micro, some mega, some geopolitical.⁷

“I am not satisfied with regular university approaches. I like certification to be very close to the field. We experimented with the following: We expected people to be able to define and do research in 2 conflicts; to have mediated in 2 conflicts, be teaching about 2 conflicts, disseminated effectively to media about 2 conflicts... the action, teaching, dissemination and research of conflict. This is now raised to 3 conflicts. We certify when the person feels in command of those three cases. At first people were not able to analyse... it came out as a narrative.... We trained them to identify the parties, goals, etc. etc. A good doctor sees both the human being and the case at the same time. Don't confuse the two. In 2-4 years we may have some kind of answer to the question.”⁸

Particularly sensitive and vitally important in the debate about the merits of certification (leading to professionalization of peace workers), is the concern about protecting the immeasurable contribution of peace volunteers. As demonstrated in Table xxxx below, CPSC is taking this challenge very seriously.

Should ‘Peace Building’ be Categorized as a Profession?

A presentation by Marsha Lake⁹ to the Second CPSC conference on a Canadian Civilian Peace Service¹⁰ was instrumental in influencing the CPSC to pursue the need for certification of peace professionals, despite the complexities and issues involved. In answer to the question “whether the activities referred to as ‘peace building’ can or should be categorized as a profession, and to identify the implications of such a categorization for the practice of the activity”, she concludes: “The practice of peacebuilding can be greatly improved by confrontation with the question of its professional status and that peacebuilding, rather than as just a separate profession, should be viewed as an integrating framework.” She offers two major recommendations. First, an association of peacebuilders should be formed that consolidates knowledge and common identity around peacebuilding” and that Canada should lead the articulation of this vision of professional peacebuilding.”¹¹

She uses “Peacebuilding” in its broadest interpretation, as “a full range of approaches, processes, and stages needed for transformation toward more sustainable, peaceful relationships and governance modes and structures. Peacebuilding includes building legal and human rights institutions as well as fair and effective governance and dispute resolution processes and systems.” It also includes “state building” and “nation building” when the “intent of those activities is the creation of a peaceful, democratic, and just order.” She sees this approach in “the spirit of the term ‘peace, order and good government’” in Article 91 of the Constitution Act, “a remarkably clear and original expression of the linkage between peacebuilding and state building.”¹²

The report is organized in six chapters, dealing respectively with: (1) a literature review; (2) an analysis of “peacebuilding as a social activity (which “shows how views of the activity are shaped by the intersection of three historical currents: peacebuilding as a political activity, peace studies as an academic undertaking, and peacebuilding as an evolving set of ad hoc efforts in international politics”); (3) a review of literature on the sociology of professions; research methods used in her major project; (4) “several illustrative cases based on (her) experience in Kosovo while serving with both the United Nations Interim Administrative Mission in Kosovo and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ... to... identify implications for the status of peacebuilding as a profession”; (5) three additional research efforts that showed how “interpersonal relations and communication skills are recognized as important by nearly all interview and questionnaire respondents, and very clearly in job skills specifications, but are given relatively little place in the structure of education programs”; and (6) an assessment of “the state of peacebuilding as a

profession in order to facilitate the improvement of peacebuilding practice.” Her research suggests that “viewing peacebuilding as a profession generates important insights into the factors that might affect the quality of practice of peacebuilding; that a greater awareness of the professional status of peacebuilding may influence the ability of “peace builders” to build peace; (and that) the existence of a defined body of knowledge, professional standards, ethical codes of conduct, and a self-conscious group of practitioners may increase the quality and impact of peacebuilding efforts.”¹³

TABLE - The Civilian Peace Professional and the Civilian Peace Volunteer

Issue	Civilian Peace Professional ¹⁴	Civilian Peace Volunteer
CPSC Mandate	To build a sustainable peace, at home and abroad, in partnership with local communities by establishing the first Canadian vehicle for professional training and accreditation of qualified civilians to promote and facilitate the non-violent resolution of conflict? ¹⁵	To provide the first Canadian vehicle for accredited recognition of civilian volunteers active in promoting and facilitating the non-violent resolution of conflict
What’s Unique?	<p>CPSC will graduate Canadian Peace Professionals with formal accreditation based upon a values-based¹⁶ assessment prior to competency-based training.¹⁷</p> <p>Competency-based approach to building a roster of qualified Peace Professionals and Specialized Peace Professionals¹⁸</p> <p>A focus on conflict prevention, as well as conflict resolution</p> <p>A focus on core values and competencies to sustain peace over time</p> <p>CPSC competency-based Graduate Programs in Coexistence / Conflict Work (delivered in cooperation with existing training institutions and NGOs)</p> <p>CPSC template for use by managers and practitioners who wish to describe the work of particular jobs in terms of Key Competencies and mission-specific competencies.</p> <p>Setting standards for peace professionals</p> <p>Peace Professional Accreditation</p> <p>Supplementary pre-assignment peace training</p> <p>A focus on civilians (including former military).</p>	<p>Volunteers who do not wish to register as CPSC Peace Professionals or as CPS “Recognized Volunteer”, would continue as before.</p> <p>Formal Recognition of peace volunteers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to move from peace volunteer to CPSC Recognized Volunteer for registration on competency-based CPSC would require CPSC “Peace Equivalency Assessment and Recognition (PEAR)”, with or without additional training, pending PEAR assessment results.²⁰) • Registered peace professionals who chose to volunteer. • to move from Peace Volunteer or CPSC Recognized Volunteer to Peace Professional (or Specialized Peace Professional) would require CPSC “Peace Equivalency Assessment and Certification(PEAC)”, with or without additional training, pending PEAC assessment results.

Issue	Civilian Peace Professional ¹⁴	Civilian Peace Volunteer
	Arms-length funding relationship to Government, perhaps through proposed Federal Department of Peace ¹⁹	
Assumptions:		
Pre-registration Personal suitability Assessment for work in areas of conflict	Seasoned Peace Professionals agree that while Key Competencies can be learned, Core Values need to be in place from the start. Consequently, if Core Values are not identified during rigorous initial screening, candidates are not invited to continue the qualification process.	Similarly, each volunteer however experienced and/or qualified in their professional field should be assessed (to determine their core value suitability for work in areas of conflict)
Pre-registration Professional suitability assessment for work in areas of conflict	Candidates with the requisite Core Values are then measured against the Key Competencies (communication, conciliation, conflict Analysis, facilitation, mediation, negotiation, operational planning, peace building, personal security, strategic thinking, teamwork) and invited to participate in training as appropriate to qualify as a Peace Professional for accreditation as a “Peace Professional”.	Similarly, each volunteer being considered for work in conflict areas, however experienced and/or qualified in their professional field will be assessed (to determine their peace volunteer suitability for the assignment)
Peace training	<p>A CPSC accredited Peace Professional would be ready for assignment into areas of conflict.</p> <p>Other professionals being considered for work in conflict areas, however experienced and/or qualified in their professional field, would be assessed against Core Values/ Key competencies).</p> <p>Organizations deploying individuals to conflict areas can determine readiness or suitability depending on candidates completion of the CPSC program.</p>	<p>A CPSC accredited Peace Volunteer would be ready for assignment into areas of conflict.</p> <p>Other volunteers being considered for work in conflict areas, however experienced and/or qualified in their professional field should be assessed against Core Values/Key competencies).</p>
Deployment	In its initial stages, CPSC will assess and prepare peace professionals for deployment through, and employment with, a wide variety of other organizations (e.g., CANADEM, UN, World Bank, NGOs, Canadian Government Departments, etc. In the long-term, should it become necessary, CPSC may establish a deployment “arm”.	
Current Status	Advocacy within Canada; established base for development of curriculum and training program; held several conferences to raise awareness and develop CPSC programs and concepts; made preliminary contacts with government officials, other NGOs and parliamentarians; gained support of expanding set of volunteers; produced preliminary communications materials.	<p>Are taking very seriously the key and continuing role of peace volunteers.</p> <p>Aim to reinforce the value of volunteers through their recognition.</p>

Issue	Civilian Peace Professional ¹⁴	Civilian Peace Volunteer
	(summarize achievements to-date)	

Professional Association for Training as a Vehicle?

Lake promotes the setting up of a Professional Association for Training, which she describes as “an identified place we arrive at, where we have said to each other: ‘We want to come together to create a trans-disciplinary framework, a community. We want to come together and work to define its parameters and, within its structure, a commitment to learning about the micro and the macro... We want to include people who may never work in a large conflict area... It would not necessarily be a professional association. It might be an association in its broadest sense of a wide range of capacities and desires.”²¹

Dr. Johan Galtung on Marshal Rosenberg and non violent communication, specifically relating to schools. ... “He is dead wrong on one point. He believes that if communication is only non-violent, solutions will come. I believe there is an underlying conflict you have to solve. But we part much more dramatically in another way. He has patented the word ‘non-violent communication’. I find that unacceptable.”²²

Discussion Notes Within Sphere Project Regarding Professionalization and Certification

The following Notes have been extracted from:

http://www.sphereproject.org/component/option,com_docman/task,doc_details/gid,144/Itemid,203/lang,English/

These notes are unedited.

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 1
Fostering Accountability and Quality among Humanitarian Aid Agencies through a process of Accreditation:

History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere

The first two sections of this paper – History and Overview of current options – were commissioned by the Sphere Project at the request of the Sphere Board, and were written by Manohar Shenoy, independent consultant. Terms of Reference for his consultancy are available from the Sphere office on request. Section 3 of the paper, Potential contribution from Sphere, was prepared by the Sphere Office, based on a paper prepared for CARE by Sean Lowrie, Clare Smith and Sally Austin (see footnote 17). Section 4, An Accreditation/Certification System -how could Sphere fit in?, was prepared by the Sphere Office.

A paper commissioned in 2000 by the then Sphere Management Committee: Loubna Freih, ‘Increasing Accountability among humanitarian NGOs in Disaster Response: A study for the Sphere Project Management Committee’ is also relevant. It contains a section on accreditation (pp 13-14). It is available from the Sphere project website at <http://www.sphereproject.org/about/account.htm>

1. History:

Recognizing the need to strengthen humanitarian aid efforts globally by enhancing the quality of response and accountability to beneficiaries, international humanitarian aid agencies developed a

number of codes and standards to strengthen their collective response to the many global crises that had emerged in the early 1990s. The Providence Principles (1993)¹, InterAction's "Best Practices for Disaster Work"² and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent's Code of Conduct (1994)³ were some of these initial efforts.

Despite these initial efforts, the entire international community including humanitarian aid agencies failed to respond adequately and in a timely manner before and during the genocide in Rwanda. The failure of the global community in preventing and responding to the aftermath of the genocide led to two notable recommendations to the humanitarian sector by the Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda (JEEAR-1994)⁴ 1) Self-Managed Regulation wherein under this option NGO networks would be assisted in acquiring greater capacity to monitor member compliance with the Code and Standards and 2) An International Accreditation System. Under this option core criteria for accreditation would be developed jointly by official agencies and NGOs.

¹ Humanitarian Action in times of war: A handbook for practitioners (Larry Minear and Thomas Weiss), also <http://www.jha.ac/article/a094.htm> (Pyrrhic Victories and collapse of Humanitarian Principles-October 2002).

² <http://www.interaction.org/pvostandards/index.htm>

³ <http://www.ifrc.org> also of interest may be

http://www.ifrc.org/what/health/hivaids/code/files/options_paper_sign_on_implementation.pdf

⁴ http://www.um.dk/danida/evalueringsrapporter/1997_rwanda also

<http://www.odihnp.org/report.asp?ID=2607>

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 2
The genocide in Rwanda led to considerable soul searching by the international humanitarian sector leading to most humanitarian aid agencies favouring greater self-regulations⁵. This led to the formation of the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Learning (ALNAP) in 1996, The People in Aid Code (1997) and the Humanitarian Ombudsman Project, later renamed the Humanitarian Accountability Project (1999), which became in 2003 Humanitarian Accountability Partnership-International. The recommendations also helped catalyse the development of the Sphere Project *Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response* (first edition 2000). The Red Cross Code of Conduct and Sphere's Minimum Standards have been widely adopted by a large number of humanitarian aid agencies, including some of the UN agencies⁶.

Subsequent crises since Rwanda nevertheless witnessed similar failures of the humanitarian sector, the latest being that following the tsunami of December 2004. The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition (TEC) notes, "On self-managed regulation, it is notable that not one of the quality codes introduced in the last 15 years has any real enforcement mechanism"⁷. The Tsunami Evaluation Coalition refers to the JEEAR and reiterates again the need for an International Accreditation systems⁸. Following the tsunami, the Clinton NGO Impact Initiative (Working Group on Professionalism) has also commissioned a study on "Professionalism of International Humanitarian Agencies" to see what measures need to be taken to introduce higher quality and accountability in the working of these agencies. The study is currently in progress and its findings are shortly to be announced.

Though the effort over the last decade has been towards increased self-regulation, there have been some efforts by a few agencies, notably HAP-I to raise the accreditation issue to a higher level of debate. However the bulk of these discussions have centered on benchmarking and drawing up standards and indicators of quality management⁹. The Humanitarian sector is still a long way from having a fully autonomous accrediting body. A few INGO's through individual initiative have moved towards accreditation through ISO 9000, notably MedAir, but these have been the exceptions.

⁵ Regulating Humanitarian Interventions: Alex Jacobs, Mango, April 2003.

(<http://www.mango.org.uk/pool/regulatinghumanitarianAJ3Apr03.pdf>)

⁶ Overview of Accountability Initiatives, Jan 2006-Kathrin Dombrowski-One World Trust

(<http://www.oneworldtrust.org/pages/download.cfm?did=353>)

⁷ <http://www.tsunami-evaluation.org/the+TEC+synthesis+report.htm> (page 85, Conclusions and

recommendations).

8 Accreditation ‘refers to the formal recognition by a specialized body - an accreditation body - that a certification body is competent to carry out... certification in specified business sectors. Accreditation is like certification of the certification body. An Accrediting Body, Agency, or Association is a nongovernmental entity that sets standards for accreditation, administers the process of accreditation, and provides assistance, as it is able to institutions, programs, and the general public. Accreditation is a process by which an institution periodically evaluates its work and seeks an independent judgment by peers that it achieves substantially its own objectives and meets the established standards of the body from which it seeks accreditation.’² Certification ‘refers to the issuing of written assurance (the certificate) by an independent, external body that has audited an organization’s management system and verified that it conforms to the requirements specified in the standard. Certificates issued by accredited certification bodies - and known as “accredited certificates” - may be perceived on the market as having increased credibility.³ Registration ‘means that the auditing body has recorded the certification in its client register’. The organization’s management system has therefore been both certified and registered. (HAP-International). (<http://www.hapinternational.org>)

* See endnote for some definitions of these terms

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 3

2. Current Options:

12 years after the *JEEAR recommendations the TEC reiterates that the international relief system should establish an accreditation system to distinguish between agencies that work to a professional standard in a particular sector, from those that do not or have not done so. They suggest a two type regulatory process wherein on the one hand an external regulator judges the quality of work done, and on the other hand the market regulates players within it.* The TEC notes that without external drivers, the incentive for change within organisations remains low, continuing to affect performance (see footnote 7). Some initiatives towards accreditation or better self-regulation are listed below.

1. InterAction launched a pilot initiative called **Self-Certification plus** in 2004. This initiative is designed to raise the accountability bar by testing a new methodology developed to promote greater consistency and rigor in the way members annually self-certify their compliance with the PVO Standards (see footnote 2). Self-Certification Plus is a learning exercise both for InterAction and its members. Evidence for 3 sets of standards are required: 1. Governance and Administration, 2. Core Universal Program Standards and 3. Organisational Commitment Standards.⁹ Of central interest is whether the evidence defined for each standard is viable and useful in practice in determining standard compliance, and whether the methodology proposed is useful and easy to follow. This system is designed more towards self-regulation than towards setting up an accreditation system.

2. HAP-International has taken the lead in promoting an **accreditation system**. HAP-I’s efforts is based on:

- a) Defining indicators and benchmarks of “quality management” for the Accountability Principles
- b) Adopting standards for the process of accreditation
- c) Granting “accredited status” to suitable certification/registration bodies¹⁰.

The ISO 9000 model guides HAP-I.

3. The aim of the International Disasters Response Law, Rules and Principles Project (IDRL Project) is to reduce the vulnerability and suffering of people affected by disasters through the promotion and development of international disaster response law mechanisms to better facilitate the provision of expedient and effective international humanitarian assistance. Experience in the field has demonstrated the need for improvement in the legal framework to better facilitate disaster response activities. Lengthy customs processes for relief goods, difficulties obtaining over-flight or landing rights, communications restrictions and visa restrictions are just a few of the barriers to the delivery of urgently needed disaster response activities. Whilst there are many international laws and regulations applicable in times of disaster, ranging from multilateral and bilateral treaties to various “soft law” provisions and loose guidelines, the knowledge and application of these rules appears to be limited. In some instances, there may be no international laws or regulations in place at all, creating further barriers to effective disaster response¹¹. The

IDRL Project's main function is to strengthen existing International Laws to facilitate improved disaster response. It does not seek to provide accreditation to NGOs but to facilitate their work by advocating to host governments the adoption and implementation of existing international laws.

⁹ InterAction's PVO Standards Self Certification Plus Guidelines- August 2006

(<http://www.interaction.org/pvostandards/index.htm>)

¹⁰ Accreditation, the HAP Way Forward-December 2004. (<http://www.hapinternational.org>)

¹¹ What is the IDRL project? -IFRC (http://www.ifrc.org/docs/pubs/disasters/IDRL_FactSheet01.pdf)

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 4

One of the key outstanding questions, however, is how governments can distinguish between 'credible'/professional humanitarian agencies, and others. The possibility of using the use of Sphere as an indicator of credibility has been raised, but remains a question for debate.

4. Besides recommending an Accreditation System (see footnote 8), the **TEC** also recommends **market forces** to regulate players. However this can be as challenging as having a regulatory body. Crucially market forces should imply that end beneficiaries be the final judge of quality, transparency, accountability, adequacy and timeliness of delivery. However these people are often the most disadvantaged during a crisis and have often lost their right or capacity to be included or heard (see foot note 7).

5. AusAID has developed a comprehensive system of **accreditation** of NGOs. NGOs need to be accredited by AusAID to be eligible for funding through AusAID NGO Schemes. These schemes (e.g. AusAID NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) and Country and Regional Cooperation Agreements) are aimed exclusively at Australian NGOs. Accreditation is also required for some programs that are substantially funded through Australian NGOs (e.g. Humanitarian Relief Programs). In addition to obtaining initial accreditation, if an NGO wishes to continue to access AusAID funding, it must apply for reaccreditation every five years. Peer review is the central feature of the accreditation process, with the Committee for Development Cooperation as the joint AusAID NGO advisory body working with the NGO community as a whole and the individual NGO under review. The individual review is designed to be a collaborative process that allows for ongoing exchange between the review team and the NGO¹².

6. EFQM (European Foundation for Quality Management) ¹³ is a not for profit foundation with a commitment to help organisations to excel in what they do. For EFQM **Commitment to Excellence** involves two main stages: **Self-Assessment**: The first stage is Self Assessment, which involves assessing the organisation against 9 criteria of the EFQM Excellence Model, in order to understand current performance. Second is the Site Visit. During the site visit, organisations are required to demonstrate their successful deployment of at least 3 improvement plans, based on the outcome from the Self-Assessment.

7. Société Générale de Surveillance (SGS): NGO Benchmarking¹⁴. The purpose of NGO Benchmarking developed by SGS is to provide NGOs, as well as the donor community and the public at large, with an independent assessment based on a comprehensive set of perspectives, namely:

- Dimensions of Best Practices: Board of Trustees, Strategic Framework, Integrity Management, Communication and Public Image, Human Resources, Fund-Raising - Resources Allocation and Financial Controls, Outcomes, Operations and Continuous Improvement.
- Contributors' Expectations: Transparency, Efficiency and Effectiveness
- Management Components: System, Activities (Programmes/Projects), Human Resources, Finance
- Continuous Improvement: Plan, Do, Check, Act.

¹² Accreditation of Non Governmental Organisations-AusAID

(http://www.ausaid.gov.au/au/ngo/pdf/accreditation_policy.pdf#search)

¹³ <http://www.efqm.org>

¹⁴ http://www.ch.sgs.com/ngo_benchmarking

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 5

SGS measures compliance against a comprehensive set of Best Practices criteria (translated into

Objectively Verifiable Indicators) taken from a large selection of Standards and eligibility requirements currently used by public sector agencies. A very unique methodology enables the audited NGO to translate its results into a focused Continuous Improvement program.

8. ISO: ISO 9000 standards have eight **quality management principles** on which the quality management system standards of the revised ISO 9000:2000 series are based. These principles can be used by senior management as a framework to guide their organization towards improved performance. The principles of ISO 9000:2000 focus on improving performance by establishing 1) Customer Focus 2) Leadership 3) Involvement of People 4) Process Approach 5) Systems approach to Management 6) Continual Improvement 7) factual Approach to Decision Making 8) Mutually beneficial supplier relationships. Benchmarks for logistics already exist in the private sector through the ISO standards. For example DHL, a partner with the UN system provides technical know-how for logistics for Emergencies and Health Systems (notably for cold chain solutions), and is ISO compliant, with benchmarks and processes in place.

9. People in Aid ¹⁵The People In Aid "Code of Good Practice in the management and support of aid personnel" is the result of years of international collaboration by dozens of agencies. The Code is a tool to help agencies offer better development aid and disaster relief to communities in need, and is an important part of their efforts to improve standards, accountability and transparency amid the challenges of disaster, conflict and poverty. The Code reflects the growing attention of aid groups on issues of health and safety, diversity and equality, and is relevant for agencies engaged in development and advocacy as well as emergency response. The revised People In Aid Code: 1) Enshrines the overarching principle that "people are central to the achievement of our mission". 2) Aims to improve the quality of assistance provided by international and host country staff. 3) Offers agencies the best framework for effective human resources management, helping them assess and raise their performance.

The Code comprises seven principles: health, safety and security; learning, training and development; recruitment and selection; consultation and communication; support, management and leadership; staff policies and practices; and human resources strategy. Each of the seven principles is qualified by a number of indicators. People in Aid could be encouraged to develop appropriate benchmarks and indicators for Humanitarian Personnel possibly through a process of accrediting individuals, although this is clearly more problematic and difficult.

10. Mango ¹⁶exists to help aid agencies and NGOs to work more effectively. Mango helps **strengthen their financial management** by providing: 1) financial training for NGO staff; 2) finance staff work with NGOs; 3) publications, including their free guide; 4) professional networking opportunities; 5) consultancy services. Mango also contributes to raising professional standards in the NGO sector, for instance through their Who Counts? Campaign.

Concluding Remarks:

Despite the several Codes and Standards developed since the Rwanda crisis and their adoption by an increasing number of NGOs, the self-regulatory mechanism has exposed many weaknesses, foremost among them being a lack of accountability to the beneficiaries. The larger organisational

¹⁵ <http://www.peopleinaid.org/code>

¹⁶ <http://www.mango.org.uk/about/professionalstandards.asp>

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 6 and systemic difficulties encountered over a decade of humanitarian crises remain, underscoring the variability of will, capacities and response of the different implementing agencies and the inability of the donor community, separated from the end beneficiary, to play a regulating and/or enforcement role.

Of the various approaches indicated above, the HAP-I approach has some attractive features within it. For one its reach is global through a process of decentralization and accrediting certifying bodies. This reduces any North South divide. Secondly it is modeled along the lines of ISO, now established and widely accepted globally by the private sector.

However there are significant challenges to having one (or some) accrediting body/ies and a host of certifying bodies attached to it as has been suggested by HAP-I. HAP-I has already noted

some of these challenges in their paper, “Accreditation, the HAP Way Forward”. The universal acceptance of one accrediting body faces significant challenge. The opposition by some Francophone NGOs to the Sphere Standards and the Red Cross Code of Conduct and the subsequent development of the Quality Project, is indicative of the challenges in getting the humanitarian sector to universally accept one or a few accrediting bodies. Significant too is the challenge in developing a decentralized system of certification that can adhere to the same stringent standards globally.

The TEC recommends benchmarking quality parameters and certifying processes within sectors and functions rather than organisations as a whole. While this will probably meet less resistance from humanitarian aid agencies, it nonetheless places considerable burden on the Accrediting and Certifying bodies. The process of monitoring and enforcement of standards also remains unclear, given that self-regulation has only worked partially. This requires greater consultation and debate with various agencies, UN bodies, governments, civil society and informed communities.

Defining standards and benchmarking quality parameters and ensuring that the cross cutting themes are embedded in the project design by keeping end beneficiaries foremost in all calculations could be the start of a certification process. This will undoubtedly require a number of benchmarks and indicators, but the Sphere Project is already uniquely placed to respond to some of these sector-wide challenges. However the Sphere Project requires strengthening in the “softer” aspects of participation, initial assessment, targeting, monitoring (by communities). Issues pertaining to protection also need to be benchmarked in a more stringent manner as this has a direct bearing on how agencies identify and reach out to the most vulnerable. This could be another area where the Sphere project could play a useful role.

3. Potential contribution from Sphere to a system of accreditation: Risk or Opportunity¹⁷

Although an accreditation system might offer an opportunity to spread wider and enforce the application of Sphere, it also presents a risk of possible misapplication of it. Understanding what it means to be in “compliance with Sphere” and how objective judgments can be made about it, are critical if Sphere is to be used as part of quality parameters for any future certification process.

¹⁷This section is extracted and edited from the report “Conflict, Compliance and Sphere: What it means for CARE Sudan in DARFUR”, a discussion paper prepared by Sean Lowrie (independent consultant), Clare Smith (CARE International UK) and Sally Austin (CARE Sudan) – August 2005.

http://www.sphereproject.org/component/option,com_docman/task,doc_details/gid,123/Itemid,203/lang,English/

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 7

A possible working definition of Sphere compliance can be:

The reflective and practical application of Sphere guiding principles (Humanitarian Charter), common standards and relevant technical standards, in a co-ordinated, sensitive and flexible manner, taking into consideration the context in which humanitarian assistance is delivered.

1 - Application of the Humanitarian Charter and Code of Conduct

The Humanitarian Charter starts with an articulation of fundamental humanitarian principles, followed by a statement of roles and responsibilities, concluding with statements on quality and accountability. The Code of Conduct contains ten principles. An agency would have to demonstrate that it has reflected upon and applied all of the sections of the HC and C of C in such things as individual decision making, project activity selection, or decisions not to do certain things to maintain a humanitarian identity. This is not to suggest that long diaries of decisions and discussions be recorded, but it is to suggest that some form of periodic reflection on the wider ethical issues occur.

2 - Application of the common process minimum standards

Within the latest edition of Sphere there is a chapter detailing eight common process minimum standards starting with participation, followed by assessment and other stages of the disaster response project cycle, and concluding with staff capacity and support. These minimum standards would be relevant to all forms of humanitarian projects, whether in the four life sustaining sectors or not. Each of the minimum standards is expanded upon by the key indicators.

When making judgments about whether an agency has met one of these minimum standards, the key indicators and corresponding guidance notes would have to be referred to. Meeting these minimum standards would therefore have to be in a contextually appropriate way, within the agency control.

3 - Application of the relevant technical minimum standards

Compliance would imply that minimum standards that are relevant to the project are met, through judgment with regard to the key indicators. As above, it is important to ensure that the key indicators are met in a contextually appropriate way, given the information in the guidance notes and an appropriate contextual analysis.

4 - Co-ordinated, sensitive and flexible manner

It should be clear that a degree of judgment is required in determining whether an agency complies with Sphere. The final aspect of Sphere compliance should be demonstrated reflection, and a deeper and shared understanding of how to apply the Sphere handbook in a manner that builds the quality of our response and doesn't detract from it. This can involve co-ordination between agencies.

Challenges of Sphere Compliance

Making decisions about how an organization should implement its programmes to be in compliance with Sphere according to the above definition is not without challenges. Programmes and projects would need to be guided by Sphere and not be hostage to it or blinded by it. Project goals will in most cases need to use adapted Key Indicators, that take into account the local and wider contexts and our interaction with them. Minimum Standards and Key Indicators would need to be applied to target areas in a manner that is reflective and highly concerned with the nature of the wider contexts and overarching nature of problems. Without holistic analysis and significant debate around determining what Sphere compliance means, organizations might misuse the Sphere handbook, with the risk of in fact exacerbating human vulnerability for some of those we want to assist.

Challenge # 1: Common misperceptions about Sphere

An unfortunate yet common misperception of the Sphere handbook is confusing quantitative Key Indicators with Minimum Standards. For example, many people will claim that the "Sphere standard" for water is 15 litres per person per day. In fact, it is not. 15 litres pppd is just one of five Key Indicators for that particular Minimum Standard which actually says: "All people have safe and equitable access to a sufficient quantity of water for drinking, cooking and personal and domestic hygiene..." As a matter of fact, less than ten percent of Sphere indicators are quantitative.

One consequence of this misperception is that some aid workers believe that the Sphere handbook has limited value in complex environments. A more dangerous consequence is that aid workers and donors have attempted to apply the quantitative indicators to their target IDP groups without due regard for the Minimum Standards, the wider conflict dynamics, or for the living conditions of the surrounding host populations. For example, donors pressure their implementing NGO partners to attain the quantitative indicator for water in IDP camps when the surrounding community has much less than 15 litres per person per day.

There are some instances where displaced populations will be malnourished, weak, sick and vulnerable. Their immediate survival may depend on receiving services that are of a higher level than the surrounding population. For example, malnutrition is corrected through food of a high nutritional value. Another example would be that due to the higher degree of vulnerability to disease, displaced populations may need more clean water than a more stable and less vulnerable population.

On the other hand, free food and free water provided in an IDP camp can disrupt markets in the surrounding host population, and even pull people from the surrounding host communities into the IDP camp because life is better for them inside the camp than outside.

Evidently therefore the question of service levels between displaced and host populations is not easily answered. The misapplication of Sphere occurs when one doesn't know the question even

exists, or when one believes there is an easy answer to project design which is drawn from the quantitative “easy indicators” in the Sphere handbook.

The misperception about what is contained in the Sphere handbook is easily disseminated, because the quantitative indicators are easy to talk about. Overworked and stressed NGO staff will look to a quick solution, and can be attracted to the quantitative “easy indicators”.

Technocratic, blind application of a limited subset of the Sphere Minimum Standards was a major concern for the detractors of the Sphere Project during the debates after the launch of the project.

Challenge # 2: Ensuring that all relevant standards and indicators are considered

The second major challenge in applying the Sphere handbook is about ensuring a sufficient level of awareness about the framework and syntax structure of the Sphere handbook. It would appear that a large majority of the humanitarian community believe meeting the quantitative indicators is a primary objective of achieving ‘Sphere compliance’.

To illustrate, let us again consider that 15 litres pppd is one of approximately 70 indicators for the 11 Minimum Standards in the water/sanitation sector. The perversion of mistaking it for the water access standard, or mistaking it for all water standards is that questions of hygiene promotion, Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 9 water quality and water use are forgotten. Moreover, wider questions of participation, project cycle management and conflict sensitivity are similarly forgotten.

In another way, let us consider the following fictional scenario. An agency, responsible for water and sanitation in an IDP camp, estimates the total population of IDPs to be 10,000. Consulting Sphere, the programme manager divides the total population by 20 and decides that the provision of 500 latrines for the camp will be in compliance with Sphere. The agency sub-contracts a provide sector construction firm, which constructs the high quality latrines in under two weeks. Does this scenario comply with Sphere? The answer, should it need to be stated, is no. The use or achievement of one indicator does not mean that the agency complies with Sphere.

Challenge # 3: When there is insufficient capacity or insufficient resources to meet Sphere

The third challenge that stems from an insufficient awareness is a reluctance to take programmatic risks. An example would be the desire to limit the numbers of beneficiaries served by an agency to enable “Sphere to be met” in one group of people before expanding operations to a second group. This strategy (identified earlier this year in a Tufts University livelihood study on Darfur¹⁸ as “humanitarian containment”) might result in some people receiving no assistance at all. This is a clear breach of the Humanitarian Charter.

The conclusions of this study explain: “... A recommendation made by the research team relating to the international humanitarian response: Minimum standards can rarely be achieved at the height of an emergency and pragmatic decisions must be made as to the best strategy to achieve the progressive realization of rights for all affected groups. The strategy among some international groups interviewed was to expand only when minimum standards had been achieved in their current programme, which is a strategy for humanitarian containment not humanitarian action. This strategy may be linked with the plethora of evaluations that are underway, and therefore it may be helpful to review the purposes of these evaluations to ensure they are not contributing to the strategy of ‘risk free’ programming. (In other words agencies might play safe and keep their programmes small, manageable and risk- free in order to ensure that they will have the best possible evaluation).”

“Humanitarian containment” is a misapplication of Sphere. The problem is not inherent within Sphere, but the problem is how we use Sphere. In fact, the Sphere handbook on page 14 says: “... in the initial phase of a response, for example, providing basic facilities for all the affected population may be more important than reaching the Minimum Standards and indicators for only a proportion of the population. This handbook cannot cover every question or resolve every dilemma. What it can do is serve as a starting point, using standards and indicators based on consensus derived form years of experience and good practice; guidance notes designed to offer practice direction; and the Humanitarian Charter, which suggest a legal framework and a basic for advocacy”

Challenge # 4: Ensuring agencies address needs of host communities

The needs of host communities (and non-affected communities) should also be more prominent in the Sphere handbook. The delivery of services to the Sphere standards exclusively to IDP camps, ignoring the surrounding host populations, and indeed the population in general will severely impact on the effectiveness of the response and will impact on the conflict.

¹⁸ “Darfur Livelihoods Under Siege” by Helen Young, Abdul Monim Osman, Yacob Aklilu, and Rebecca Dale of the Feinstein International Famine Centre, Tufts University – <http://nutrition.tufts.edu/research/famine/>

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 10
For example, consider the following fictional scenario: in a long running chronic conflict, where population displacement occurs periodically, an agency hires a drilling rig and constructs a highyield borehole in an IDP camp that ensures more than 15 litres of water per person per day. The IDP camp is located just outside a small town that has an existing system of small businesses (donkey carts) that sell and deliver water. These water deliverers support extended families. With the opening of the borehole, everyone from town stops paying for water, and collects water from the camp for free. The water deliverers are put out of business.

Is this in compliance with the Sphere standards? If you read the fine print, there are a few examples in the text of the Sphere handbook that implore the agency to consider the host population. This issue critically requires greater prominence in the handbook for complex emergency situations.

Those are only some of the challenges and risks that can practically face agencies that try to comply with Sphere without significant reflection, or adopting a more holistic analysis of the context in which they are working in.

4. An accreditation/certification system: how could Sphere fit in?

Sphere does not have formal members; it is "owned" by those who use it. This ownership is based on the informal acknowledgement of added value. As discussed above, so far no formal compliance mechanism to ensure adherence to the standards has been put in place. This section examines how Sphere could fit, if an accreditation/certification system were adopted.

In order to make the discussion as concrete as possible, the accreditation/certification system being proposed under the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) International Accountability Principles is taken as a model, into which a Sphere compliance tool could fit. However, such a tool should also fit within other forms of accreditation/certification systems.

Background to the proposed HAP-International accreditation/certification system

At present, HAP-International is in the process of drafting a set of measurable, actionable and affordable **Performance Benchmarks** set within an explicit framework of shared values. Combined, these values and the performance benchmarks define the quality of humanitarian action for those seeking to comply with the HAP Accountability Principles. They are the basis upon which monitoring, complaints-handling, and quality assurance certification are carried out,¹⁹ in a process of validation for its members. This process might form the basis of a future quality management and accountability accreditation/certification system.

HAP-I is modelling a decentralised accreditation/certification processes along the lines of ISO 9000 series of “Quality Management” Standards²⁰. In this context, Quality Management means

¹⁹ See draft Humanitarian Accountability and Quality Management Standard draft document at: [http://www.hapinternational.org/pdf_word/347-](http://www.hapinternational.org/pdf_word/347-HAP%20Standard%203rd%20Draft%2027%20July%2006.pdf)

[HAP%20Standard%203rd%20Draft%2027%20July%2006.pdf](http://www.hapinternational.org/pdf_word/347-HAP%20Standard%203rd%20Draft%2027%20July%2006.pdf)

²⁰ See the HAP accreditation Policy paper, “Accreditation: The HAP way forward”,

<http://www.hapinternational.org/en/complement.php?IDpage=73&IDcomplement=65&IDcat=10>

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 11
what the organization does to fulfill the “customer’s” quality requirements and any applicable regulatory requirements, while aiming to enhance customer satisfaction²¹.

The certification process proposed within this model will issue written quality assurance certificates from an accredited body, stating that a successfully validated organisation meets the Performance Benchmarks specified in the HAP Accountability and Quality Management Standard. Detailed Performance Benchmarks identified cover the following areas:

1. Applying HAP’s Accountability Principles through a quality management system

2. Implementing a transparent public information policy
3. Gaining consent from beneficiaries or their proxies and specified stakeholders
4. Capacity building
5. Improving the competence of staff
6. Running a safe and accessible complaints handling system
7. Continuous improvement in accountability and quality management systems

Sphere within an accreditation/certification system?

The question is now where does Sphere fit within an accreditation/certification system such as the one being proposed by HAP International? How can the Sphere Minimum Standards complement HAP-International Performance Benchmarks?

HAP-International Performance Benchmarks verify an organization's internal quality management system, and whether the delivered humanitarian action respected the needs, concerns, capacities and disposition of affected people. However there is still a need to assess whether humanitarian assistance provided meets or exceeds recognized minimum standards pertaining to the welfare and safety of the intended beneficiaries. In particular, whether it is satisfying specific affected people's quality requirements²² in 'life saving' areas of Water, Sanitation/Hygiene Promotion, Shelter, Food security/Nutrition/food aid, and Health Services. The Sphere Minimum Standards can provide a complementary and a very powerful tool to fulfill this need.

Stated differently, the HAP-International Accountability and Quality Management Standard is describing how accountable humanitarian organisations should manage their internal processes and activities in a way that delivers quality humanitarian action that respects the needs, concerns, capacities and disposition of affected people. Sphere is attempting concretely to describe the quality of the provided humanitarian assistance - *which is the output of a Quality Management System*.

As Sphere represents a practical articulation of the rights-based approach, the underlying principle of Sphere is that all people have a right to such quality assistance - regardless of political, ethnic or geographical specificity. The Sphere Minimum standards define the requirements for **life with dignity** in relatively general terms, while the indicators attach either qualitative or quantitative values to associated standards. Together the Sphere standards and indicators may usefully inform any aspect of humanitarian action, from assessment and evaluation to quality assurance auditing.

²¹ See <http://www.iso.org/iso/en/iso9000-14000/understand/inbrief.html>

²² Within the context of ISO 9000, Quality refers to all those features of a product (or service) that are required by the customer.

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 12

Sphere and the certification process: Sphere Review

Any process of conformity assessment for certification to the HAP-International Accountability and Quality Management Standard can use other existing voluntary Quality Standards whenever relevant, to complement the assessment of compliance to the overarching HAP-I Accountability Principles. Such standards include the Sphere Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response, the People in Aid Code and the ECB²³ 'Good Enough' Guide to Accountability and Impact Assessment in Emergencies.

In the case of Sphere, it can be used as an efficient auditing or review tool, especially at the programme/project and field levels, to assess conformity with the Accountability Principle related to "*demonstrating compliance with the standards that apply in [their] humanitarian assistance work through monitoring and reporting*²⁴."

Given the complexities described in section 3 above, related to making judgments about Sphere compliance, a special auditing/review process should be used, which takes into consideration those challenges. This should avoid misjudgments or wrong decisions about the actions required to ensure compliance to Sphere Standards.

Learning from CARE experience in running Sphere Learning Audit/Review Processes²⁵, it has been concluded that a successful Sphere compliance review should be an opportunity to reflect on

project work from a quality and accountability perspective. However, as detailed in section 3, it is essential to use the entire Sphere handbook. Because the interplay between the project and its context is so important, it is crucial not to focus on any one part of the handbook (e.g. sector standards), without considering the others (e.g. principles, process standards, or the context). Although this could lead to meeting successfully one particular standard, it could also lead to more significant non-compliance elsewhere. We need to be aware of the range of different aspects that make up compliance.

Typically, the Sphere Audit/Review process involves running a 3-4 days participatory on-site self-evaluation workshop. A review team of up to 25 participants from the organization and other (agency, partner, local authority or donor) staff reflect on the project, using Sphere as a tool, and consult with project participants to find out whether the project is in compliance with Sphere. By the end of the workshop, participants should have developed ownership of future actions agreed, and have more of a stake in ensuring their implementation.

Reflection throughout a Sphere Review workshop should also be based on the following ideas:
²³ ECB2 is the Emergency Capacity Building Project: Accountability and Impact Assessment, a project of the InterAgency Working Group, consisting of Care International, Oxfam GB, Save the Children Alliance, Mercy Corps, Catholic Relief Services, World Vision International and International Rescue Committee
²⁴ See HAP Accountability Principles number 5 where it states that “members regularly monitor and evaluate compliance with Standards, using robust processes”, Draft Humanitarian Accountability and Quality Management Standard draft document at:

http://www.hapinternational.org/pdf_word/347-HAP%20Standard%203rd%20Draft%2027%20July%2006.pdf

²⁵ See CARE Sphere Audit/Review reports on the Sphere website at :
http://www.sphereproject.org/component/option,com_docman/task,cat_view/gid,78/Itemid,203/lang,English/

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 13

- That there is not such a thing as “the perfect project”, and we are committed to continuously strive to learn and make positive changes to our project work
- That the context in which we carry out our programming is complex and challenging, and that we can face many decisions, challenges and dilemmas during the life of a project.
- That we can benefit from getting together, to share and collect our experiences on Sphere challenges

At every stage of this process, the idea of striving for Sphere compliance should help the participants to challenge themselves and each other to reflect more critically on the quality of their work, and to identify actions to move towards better compliance. This involves reflecting on the principles set out in the Humanitarian Charter, the process standards (in Chapter 1, Standards Common to all Sectors), as well as the technical standards within the Sphere handbook. The review process should be also designed to be a learning opportunity for participants. It should not be punitive or evaluative, and should include the following objectives:

- To understand and use Sphere practically
- To reflect on and practice accountability to the communities with which we work
- To document practitioners’ experience about Sphere implementation, challenges and compliance in practice

A Sphere Audit/Review process should be implemented periodically for the same programme or project. The resulting reports should be made public and can be the basis for a review by professional peers. Both self-study and peer reports could be the basis, with other auditing reports, for decisions on granting certified status.

Conclusion

A tool for Sphere compliance, based on a Sphere Review or Audit, could therefore be developed as part of an accreditation/certification system. The tool would then be used to support the process of certifying whether an organisation is reaching performance standards for humanitarian assistance, such as those being developed by HAP International.

Outstanding issues do however remain:

- What kind of process within individual organizations would be needed in order to perform

judgments on Sphere compliance?

- What could be the risks and implications of such a process, particularly in terms of costs and therefore accessibility to smaller/poorer agencies, particularly national ones? At what level would 'Sphere compliance' be judged - project, country, globally in the case of international organizations? The resource implications of judging organization-wide Sphere compliance as part of a certification process are likely to be significant.

Sphere Project

December 2006

Accreditation: History, overview of current options and potential contribution from Sphere 14

Endnote

Some definitions:

Standards: Standards are a level of excellence or attainment that are regarded as a measure of adequacy.

Benchmarks are a level of stratified Performance Criteria that a system/process is expected to meet. For example

Advanced Performance Top level—indicates general competence &/or performance in all benchmarks within a standard and exceptional performance in a few.

Proficient Performance Commonly the performance standard—indicates general competence &/or performance in all benchmarks within a standard.

Basic Performance Indicates general competence in most benchmarks within a standard with difficulties in some of the benchmarks.

Novice Performance Indicates difficulties in a majority of benchmarks within a standard.

Indicators are a set of qualitative or quantitative performance measures.

Endnotes – Annex 1:

¹ Breedyk, Gord, Civilian Peace Service Canada (CPSc), "Value Added, by Canadian Organization – with a focus on CPSc and Canadem", Working Document drafted for CPSc (June 2007)

² Breedyk, Gord, Civilian Peace Service Canada (CPSc), "Value Added, by Canadian Organization – with a focus on CPSc and Canadem", Working Document drafted for CPSc (June 2007), See also White Paper Annex on Certification

³ See TRANSCEND home page: <http://www.transcend.org/>

⁴ TRANSCEND <http://www.transcend.org/>

⁵ Dr. Johan Galtung, CPSC Conference, St Paul University, April 2007

⁶ TRANSCEND home page: <http://www.transcend.org/>

⁷ Dr. Johan Galtung, CPSC Conference, St Paul University, April 2007

⁸ Dr. Johan Galtung, CPSC Conference, St Paul University, April 2007

⁹ Marsha A. Lake Eyre, "Certification, Professional Association – Legitimacy & Effectiveness", Royal Roads University, August 2006

¹⁰ Canadian Institute for Conflict Resolution (CICR), Civilian Peace Service Canada (CPSC) and the McMaster Centre for Peace Studies workshop, March 22-23.06 at St. Paul University in Ottawa entitled "Peacebuilding As a Profession - Developing Competencies and Curriculum for Unarmed Peacebuilding". (following up on the Feb.7-9, 2005 CPS Consultation, with which Nonviolent Peaceforce Canada partnered).

¹¹ Marsha A. Lake Eyre, "Certification, Professional Association – Legitimacy & Effectiveness", Royal Roads University, August 2006

¹² Marsha A. Lake Eyre, "Certification, Professional Association – Legitimacy & Effectiveness", Royal Roads University, August 2006

¹³ Marsha A. Lake Eyre, “Certification, Professional Association – Legitimacy & Effectiveness”, Royal Roads University, August 2006

¹⁴ unarmed civilians, professionally trained and accredited, based on shared Core Values and Key Competencies, who perform as a recognized, accepted and effective element in peace-making, peacekeeping and peace building.

¹⁵ adapted from CPSC concept paper

¹⁶ Core values, critical for professional peace work, include empathy, humility, personal maturity, sound judgment, sincerity, strong desire for social justice and peace for all, willingness to learn. (from CPSC Competency Paper, drafted by D. Ross McNaughton, May 2007)

¹⁷ Key competencies include: Communication, conciliation, conflict Analysis, facilitation, mediation, negotiation, operational planning, peace building, personal security, strategic thinking, teamwork. (ibid)

¹⁸ *In addition to Peace Professional credentials, Specialized Peace Professionals would have additional credentials in particular fields: (insert examples, e.g. health, legal, engineering, theology, etc. etc.)*

¹⁹ <http://www.departmentofpeace.ca/> committed to establishing a Department of Peace within the Government of Canada. We are part of a growing movement now embracing 24 countries. Nepal, a nation that has been wracked by civil war for many years, was the most recent to form a Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction in March, 2007. The Solomon Islands was the first nation to declare and Costa Rica is expected to do so by the end of June 2007. In support of this initiative, there are now 8 chapters across Canada, 19 organizations representing about 120,000 Canadians, including such prominent peacebuilders as Senator Doug Roche and the Hon. Lloyd Axworthy.

²⁰ *Again, a CPS competency-based approach begins with the assessment of potential candidates against Core Values as an entry qualification. Competencies would include assessment of results achieved during volunteer or professional engagements in areas of conflict. CPSC would apply PEACE (Peace Equivalency Assessment and Certification) standards. These would build on methodologies applied, for example, by TRANSCEND University, whereby (in the words of Dr. Johan Galtung, at the third Civilian Peace Service Canada conference held from April 3 to 5, 2007): “ We experimented with the following: we expected people to be able to define and do research in 2 conflicts; to have mediated in 2 conflicts, be teaching about 2 conflicts, disseminated effectively to media about 2 conflicts... the action, teaching, dissemination and research of conflict. This is now raised to 3 conflicts. We certify when the person feels in command of those three cases.”*

²¹ Marsha A. Lake Eyre, “Certification, Professional Association – Legitimacy & Effectiveness”, Royal Roads University, August 2006

²² Dr. Johan Galtung, CPSC Conference, St Paul University, April 2007