A principal challenge CEWARN faced, particularly in its early phase of operations, was linking its strong early warning system to an effective response component that generates appropriate and timely actions to curb the spread of violent conflicts. Response actions initiated by CEWARN were often reactive and sluggish. Member States’ efforts to mitigate the cross-border conflicts centred on security responses by military and police forces to separate the warring parties. The response structures known as the Conflict Early Warning and Early Response Units (CEWERU) were ineffective and lacked a coordinated approach to the cross-border dimensions of the violent conflicts. Many of the challenges related to lack of resources needed to mount a timely and effective response.

Aware of the gaps and challenges in its response arm, in 2008 CEWARN began to strengthen the response side of the mechanism. CEWARN sought resources from its development partners for the establishment of a Rapid Response Fund.
FUNDING PEACE: THE RRF EXPERIENCE

The RRF is designed to support CEWARN interventions. It is supervised at regional level by the RRF Steering Committee, and at the national level the RRF is managed by the Conflict Early Warning and Early Response Units (CEWERU). A Technical Support Unit (TSU) handles capacity building and operational tasks, including review and monitoring of projects. Finance and Administration Units (FAU’s) handle the finance administration and reporting. They also support for Local Peace Committees (LPCs). Local level structures also include the field monitors (FMs) who are organically linked to the lead agency or local CSO responsible for the execution of the project.

RRF projects fall into two categories: urgent and regular. The urgent projects comprise emergency responses to violent conflicts at local levels; regular projects are aimed at capacity building and provision of support to the CEWERU structures at local, national and regional levels. Requests for RRF financial support are submitted to the CEWARN Director and to the RRF Steering committee by the CEWERU of the respective IGAD member country. Allocation of RRF resources is project-based, and there are no provisions for meeting recurrent costs. According to the RRF Handbook, allocations of funds are made in two ways.

The CEWARN Director has the discretion to approve a proposal of urgent projects up to US$ 10,000 after consultation with a CEWERU head, Projects of up to US$ 50,000 require approval from the Steering Committee (SteCom) after considering the analysis and recommendation of the collaborating CEWERUs and a technical appraisal by the RRF Coordinator or a designated technical agency. The CEWARN Unit is obliged to appraise submitted proposals within 20 working days using the substantive and formal criteria developed by the CEWERUs. The SteCom reviews the soundness of the appraisals conducted by the RRF Coordinator, and approves the proposals by consensus.
FUNDING PEACE: THE RRF EXPERIENCE

Resources from the RRF have been utilised to support various peace initiatives and the facilitation of inter-district dialogues, responding to cross-border security incidents, addressing conflicts over natural resources, promoting peace through sports and cultural events, capacity building, and applied research. The RRF has funded a total of 55 projects in six countries: Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, South Sudan and Uganda. Out of the total, eleven projects (or 20 per cent) are urgent response activities while the other forty-four projects (or 80 per cent) are other peace interventions and capacity building initiatives.

One of the RRF’s most significant achievements is funding Local Peace Committees (LPC) and providing them with resources required for immediate use during emergencies, enabling the LPCs to mobilize in cases of actual or imminent conflicts. The LPCs have also used the funds to organise cross-border dialogues and peace meetings covering a range of activities including the recovery of stolen livestock, reconciliation efforts, and facilitating access to grazing and water sources. The RRF has assisted the leaders of customary institutions, the LPCs, and local administrators to come together and peer review their performance in the maintenance of law and order and their conflict resolution activities.

A conflict between the Gabra and Borana provides one example of how the RRF is fostering peace between hostile communities. Pastoralist elders of the Oromia Pastoralist Association (OPA) from Ethiopia and the Pastoralist Shade Initiative (PSI) from Kenya brokered a peace negotiation that culminated in the signing of the Maikona-Dukana Agreement in November 2008, ending the long standing inter-communal conflict among the Borana and Gabra along the Ethiopia-Kenya border.

Occasional skirmishes and incidents of stock theft interrupted the peace prevailing between the two communities since the signing. The loss of lives and rising tension also threatened to derail the peace process. In order to deescalate the conflict and sustain the peace, leaders of OPA and PSI organised another peace meeting in the second week of January 2012 and selected “neutral elders” to mediate between the Borana of Teltelle and the Gabra of Dukana. After listening to complaints of the respective parties, the elders decided to resolve the conflict as follows: (i) the Boranas from Teltelle would pay compensation of 75 cows to the Gabra of Dukana for people killed by the former; (ii) the Gabra would accept responsibility for the death of a Borana child and wounding of her mother, and pay compensation of 45 cows to the victim’s families, and; (iii) both communities would apprehend and bring the perpetra-
RRF resources have enhanced the speed and flexibility of emergency response interventions in deescalating tension and inhibiting the spread of conflicts. LPCs and authorities at the lowest level were able to communicate more effectively, to coordinate their efforts to prevent raids and counter-raids, livestock rustling, and to apprehend perpetrators. The real-time sharing of information among the LPCs has improved their capability to undertake rapid joint response actions, as the following example illustrates.

**Enhancing Timeliness of Interventions**

RRF resources have enhanced the speed and flexibility of emergency response interventions in deescalating tension and inhibiting the spread of conflicts. LPCs and authorities at the lowest level were able to communicate more effectively, to coordinate their efforts to prevent raids and counter-raids, livestock rustling, and to apprehend perpetrators. The real-time sharing of information among the LPCs has improved their capability to undertake rapid joint response actions, as the following example illustrates.

**Averting a Counter-raid and Restoring the Peace**

A series of raids and counter-raids were reported between the Jie and the combined forces of Turkana and Matheniko during the first quarter of 2009. In June, three Jie lost their lives and approximately 2000 of their cattle were taken away. The Jie were preparing to retaliate. It was clear a major clash would occur in the absence of action taken to stop the revenge raid. The District Peace Committee in collaboration with a local CBO, Kotido Peace Initiative (KOPEIN), organised meetings with the kraal elders and political leaders of the district to discuss ways to avert the planned attack. Dialogue with the Turkana was initiated to find a peaceful way of settling the standoff and recovering the stolen animals. The District Peace Committee applied for Rapid Response Funds to facilitate the dialogue; the CEWERU National Steering Committee approved the request quickly. Upon securing the funding a cross-border dialogue commenced between the Jie leadership and the representatives of the Turkana and Matheniko communities. Three months of dialogue prompted the community to put aside the sticky issue of recovery and return of livestock, and instead push for reconciliation and sustainable peace. Religious and clan leaders, women, and youth supported their position. The community leaders subsequently came up with a peace accord for cessation of attacks, raids, and count-raids. The peace accord has held since April 2010, despite minor incidents of thefts of livestock.
Averting a Counter-raid and Restoring the Peace

Most of the peace activities in pastoral areas do not directly involve the youth. The youth provide the warriors who mount the attacks and carry out raids and counter-raids. Occasionally the youth openly defy the elders out of frustration and act as spoilers of peace efforts. The RRF seeks to address the problem by organising soccer tournaments, beauty contests and other cultural events between warring factions to encourage reconciliation and enhance peace.

A cross-border Ethiopia-Kenya Youth Soccer Tournament and Cultural Event for Peace was held from April 8-11 2010 in Moyale, Kenya. The project, designed to bring the youth into the peace building efforts, adopted the motto “shoot to score, but not to kill”. The four-day soccer tournament for boys accompanied a beauty contest for girls. These competitions enabled the youth to interact in a peaceful manner, to demystify mutual suspicions, and to help extend the peace network in the Somali Cluster.

CEWARN was able to bring together the youth (boys and girls) from nine districts on the Ethiopia-Kenyan sides of the Somali Cluster together to compete in sports and beauty contest.1 They slept in one dormitory and shared food and facilities for nearly one week, and learnt that they can live together peacefully.

A second cross-border Youth Soccer Tournament under the motto “Play sports, live peace” brought together the same teams that played in the football tournament for a second competition during July 2011, in Moyale, Ethiopia. The sports event helped strengthen the ‘living side by side in peace’ message, enhanced the positive attitudes developed during the first tournament and encouraged confidence among the youth to participate in peaceful competition. The tournament was instrumental in spreading the message of peace through sports, and created a multiplier and trickle-down effect across the small urban centres where the administrations and the youth centres have taken it upon themselves to organise similar sports events in their localities.

---

1 This cluster includes Chalbi, Marsabit, Moyale, and Sololo of Kenya; and Dillo, Dire, Miyo, Moyale (Oromio) and Moyale (Somali) of Ethiopia.
The impact of the Rapid Response Fund interventions among the beneficiary communities can be measured in several ways. First, the utilisation of the RRF in peace-making efforts has contributed to a significant reduction in the level of violence. Secondly, the RRF has been instrumental in improving relations between the pastoral communities in the Somali Cluster and between the Turkana, Matheniko and Jie in the Karamoja cluster. The activities are transforming the confrontational relationship into one of peaceful co-existence marked by cooperation and sharing of resources. Thirdly, the RRF has played a catalytic role in changing mindsets and has helped to significantly reduce the suspicion and mistrust among communities in the Somali cluster. Enmity and belligerence have been replaced by amicable cooperation and collaboration. As one leader declared:

Today this place is overflowing with peace. Peace is the foundation of everything we have. It is a matter of pride and honour that you have worked for peace with a sense of concern and responsibility. We are grateful to CEWARN for providing the funds from RRF sources for organising this and other similar peace events.

The RRF has proved its relevance by filling a critical resource gap in CEWARN’s rapid response activities at the grassroots level. LPCs and government officials attest to the fact that the RRF has played an important role in reducing the level of conflict by enabling speedy exchange of information, instituting preventive measures, discouraging raids and counter raids and by mediating between conflicting parties. The types of response activities implemented -- from building the capacity to facilitating various meetings and tournaments were found to be highly effective and relevant by all stakeholders. A government official from the Southern Region of Ethiopia stated that “the RRF has brought the local peace committees and the government institutions together to work together for peace. The RRF is like the grease and fuel running the peace engine”
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RRF REGIONAL STRUCTURE

REGIONAL --- STEERING COMMITTEE --- CEWARN UNIT

PREVENTION
- De-escalate or resolve violent conflicts. Its scope covers three main types of intervention
  - Support to Conflict Prevention Management and Resolution (CPRM) Projects Initiated at the Local Level
  - Capacity Building to peace Structures: At local, sub-national and national levels.
  - Technical Studies and Applied Research

STAKEHOLDERS

CEWARN

Allocation of funds is strictly project-based and only non-commercial organizations (Government, NGOs, CSOs) are eligible for funding

URGENT PROJECTS
- Must obtain approval for funding by CEWARN Director
- PROJECTS UP TO 10,000 USD

REGULAR PROJECTS
- Must obtain approval for funding by the RRF Steering Committee after considering the analysis & recommendation of the respective CEWARN
- PROJECTS UP TO 50,000 USD
- PROJECTS IN EXCESS OF >50,000 USD

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION UNIT
- Administration of funds received from RRF
- Disbursement of Project Expenses
- Financial reporting

TECHNICAL SUPPORT UNIT
- Development of projects at local level
- Capacity building from local up to national level
- On-going monitoring of projects

LOCAL PEACE COMMITTEE
- Execution of projects under supervision of Local Peace Committees
IMPORTANCE OF THE RRF FOR CEWARN’S FUTURE STRATEGY

CEWARN is in the process of developing a new strategy for the period 2012-2017. Response activities are one of the most important pillars in the upcoming strategy. As stated above, peace initiatives implemented by RRF have effectively assisted in peacefully ending local conflicts as reflected in the declining incidence of raiding, theft, murder and assault. But there are clear limits to local peace initiatives in respect to the root causes underlying violent conflict in the pastoral areas. The political, climatic, and structural causes underpinning conflicts remain unaddressed.

Tackling the root causes is not within the remit of the RRF at this time. Involvement in tackling these conflicts may require macro-level engagement of CEWARN and the RRF in order to play an expanded role within governments through the CEWERUs. This implies engagement of CEWARN with on-going and new initiatives at regional and sub-regional as well as national levels to build linkages and partnerships with other peace and development stakeholders. The IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) is just one example. The IDDRSI’s sixth component focuses on resolving conflicts and building peace.

CEWARN also needs to engage other stakeholders working on education and development across the IGAD region. Educating youth will generate a major peace dividend in the form of combating negative attitudes towards peace building and stamping out harmful behaviour. Development activities for building better livelihoods and improving resilience in the face of disasters are also critical. Improving livelihoods is an integral part of peace building and resolving conflicts. The idea that peace should prevail before development activities are implemented is no longer valid. Given the centrality of enhancing livelihoods for preventing conflicts, it is important that CEWARN rises to this challenge in its new strategy.
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