



# From Protests to Paper: Using PeaceFem to Analyse Women's Inclusion in Peace Processes

Laura Wise



PEACE ANALYTICS SERIES



THE UNIVERSITY  
of EDINBURGH



Author: Laura Wise

PeaceRep: The Peace and Conflict Resolution Evidence Platform  
School of Law, Old College, The University of Edinburgh  
South Bridge, Edinburgh EH8 9YL

Tel. +44 (0)131 651 4566

Fax. +44 (0)131 650 2005

E-mail: [peacerep@ed.ac.uk](mailto:peacerep@ed.ac.uk)

[PeaceRep.org](http://PeaceRep.org)

✉ [@Peace\\_Rep\\_](https://www.instagram.com/Peace_Rep_)

**f** <https://www.facebook.com/PeaceRepResearch>

**in** <https://www.linkedin.com/company/peacerep/>

This research is supported by the Peace and Conflict Resolution Evidence Platform (PeaceRep), funded by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO) for the benefit of developing countries. The information and views set out in this publication are those of the authors. Nothing herein constitutes the views of FCDO. Any use of this work should acknowledge the authors and the Peace and Conflict Resolution Evidence Platform.

About the author: Laura Wise is a Research Fellow and Programme Co-ordinator with PeaceRep at the University of Edinburgh, and a co-creator of the PeaceFem app. Laura's research explores the margins of peace processes and their intersections with the politics of inclusion. She currently focuses on local peace processes, non-dominant minorities, and gender. Laura holds an MA in Comparative Ethnic Conflict from Queen's University Belfast and a BSc Econ in International Politics from Aberystwyth University.

The author would like to thank Fiona Knäussel, Christine Bell, and Adam Farquhar for their comments on the report. Thanks to Allyson Doby and Rick Smith of Smith Design Agency for production work.

Cover images: Getty Images. All images may be subject to copyright. ©2023  
Design: Smith Design Agency

# Contents

Key Findings	1
Introduction	3
1 Inclusion Modalities in Peace Processes	4
2 Gender Provisions in Peace Agreements	5
3 Enabling and Constraining Factors for Women's Inclusion	9
4 Data Limitations	12
5 Conclusion: Implications for the Women, Peace and Security Agenda	14
Appendix I: PeaceFem Data	21
Appendix 2: Enabling and Constraining Factors on Women's Inclusion in Peace Processes	25
About PeaceFem	27



## Peace Analytics Series

**PeaceRep's Peace Analytics Series features the research methodology underlying the PeaceTech innovations of the PeaceRep programme.**

The series includes: data scoping research; 'how to' discussions relating to particular challenges in the field of visualisations and geocoding; and other proof-of-concept tech-based innovations, such as the use of natural language processing. It is intended to present the methodologies and decisions behind our PeaceTech digital research, to make it transparent, and to contribute to establishing a new research digital infrastructure in the field of peace and conflict studies, by supporting others to reuse and repurpose our methodologies and findings.

## Key Findings

- Of the 24 peace processes featured on the PeaceFem app, direct representation and consultations were the most common modalities of including women in those processes between 1993 and 2016.
- Peace agreement provisions for women's participation and gender equality were more prevalent than those ensuring women's roles in implementation of the agreement or providing for women's protection.
- The precise factors that enable women's inclusion are specific to each context, but there are some common threads across peace processes – such as having an active civil society and a pre-existing presence of women in public life.
- Constraining factors preventing women's inclusion are also context-specific, but again there are some commonalities across processes – such as insecurity, violence against women, and negative societal attitudes towards women's political participation.
- As peace processes become increasingly fragmented and new technologies create both threats and opportunities for women's inclusion, the PeaceFem App provides insight into women, peace and security practices at a time when challenges to gender justice and peace seem greater than ever.



## Introduction

First published in 2020, PeaceFem is a mobile app that illustrates women's inclusion in peace processes around the world.<sup>1</sup> A contribution to the growing field of PeaceTech – the use of technology to support peacebuilding and peace mediation – the app brings together data on women and peacemaking in one easy-to-use app in English, Arabic, French, and Indonesian. It is intended for use as an information tool by women's rights advocates, mediation and negotiation teams, as well as other actors working in peace and security, and to act as inspiration for anyone interested in inclusive peace mediation. PeaceFem provides information about strategies and modalities that women have used to influence peace agreements, the enabling and constraining factors that shaped the space for influence, and the gender provisions in the peace agreements that resulted, with some information on how well they were implemented.

The app matches data from the [PA-X Gender Peace Agreement Database](#) (Peace and Conflict Resolution Evidence Platform: PeaceRep),<sup>2</sup> the [Women in Peace and Transition Processes case study collection](#) (Inclusive Peace),<sup>3</sup> and the [Towards Inclusive Peace: Mapping Gender Provisions in Peace Agreements case study collection](#) (Monash Centre for Gender, Peace, & Security).<sup>4</sup> The resultant dataset covers 39 peace agreements across 24 peace processes in 22 countries, from 1993 to 2016, with a focus on agreements from peace processes in which women played a key role, and/or important gender provisions were agreed.<sup>5</sup> These case study projects were chosen due to the possibility of matching them with peace agreement data included in PA-X, and the similarities of issues investigated by both the Women in Peace and Transition Processes and the Towards Peace: Mapping Gender Provisions in Peace Agreements projects (particularly both projects' analysis of enabling and constraining factors for women's inclusion). They also enabled coverage of a wide regional cross-section of peace processes where the resultant peace agreements included gender references, and where there was available case study information on women's roles or mobilisation efforts to influence the peace process.

By combining these three data sources (see Appendix 1 on how each project underpins the app),<sup>6</sup> PeaceFem creates an overarching story of women's engagement with each peace process, from pre-negotiation strategising to resultant peace agreements, through to implementation of these agreements<sup>7</sup> or gender provisions agreed later on in the process. PeaceFem is a record of women peacemakers' determination to influence transitions from violent conflict to peace. The app is also a unique dataset for supporting our understanding of women, peace and security practice over the past 30 years.



# 1 Inclusion Modalities in Peace Processes

Research from Inclusive Peace categorises seven common ways that women are included in peace processes: Direct Representation; Observer Status; Consultations (Official, Unofficial, and Public) Inclusive Commissions; High-Level Problem Solving Workshops; Public Decision-Making; and Mass Action. These can be used in combination or as distinct modalities for women to access arenas of discussion or to apply pressure during a peace process, and may have particular usefulness at different stages of a process.<sup>8</sup>

Of the 24 peace processes covered by PeaceFem, 22 (92%) included women through direct representation. Women were represented either in negotiations – for example, women acted as advisors for both the Zapatistas (EZLN) and the Government in the [Chiapas process in Mexico](#)<sup>9</sup> – or in transitional governments that emerged from the process, such as the women who comprised 26% of elected representatives in [South Africa's](#) first National Assembly in 1994.<sup>10</sup> This makes direct representation the most commonly utilised women's participation modality in peace processes between 1990 and 2016, which is perhaps surprising given [data on women's participation](#) in negotiations, which suggests that women are not widely represented as members of conflict parties in negotiations.<sup>11</sup> However, as PeaceFem is a dataset of peace processes where there was a gender component in at least one peace agreement resulting from that process, rather than all peace processes, this is not necessarily reflective of women's direct representation across all peace negotiations. Rather, it shows that of the different ways that women are included in peace processes, direct representation is the most common, and therefore it is simultaneously possible for women to be underrepresented as negotiators in peace processes more broadly. This underrepresentation is one of the motivations for developing the PeaceFem app: to support women who are trying to leverage forms of inclusion by providing accessible examples of others' experiences.

It is less surprising that 'consultations' (83%) and 'mass action' (54%) are the next most common modalities of women's inclusion in peace processes – as these are often the only tools that those excluded from direct talks have to influence them. In [Guatemala](#), for example, women's organisations were part of the Assembly of Civil Society, a formal, non-binding advisory group whose recommendations fed into the official negotiations.<sup>12</sup> In recent years, consultative bodies comprised of women from across conflict lines, such as the [Yemeni women's Technical Advisory Group \(TAG\)](#), and the [Syrian Women's Advisory Board \(WAB\)](#), have become prominent mechanisms used in UN-led processes to feed into negotiations through UN Special Envoys.



One of the most famous mass actions in a peace process is the mobilisation of [Liberian women](#), who barricaded the negotiation room at the talks in Accra, Ghana, threatened to undress to put pressure on the participants, and launched a nationwide 'sex strike' as part of their campaign for peace.<sup>13</sup> In [Bougainville, Papua New Guinea](#), women escalated their action by directly intervening in the conflict, i.e. by 'insert[ing] themselves physically between warring groups, or wrap[ping] their arms around combatants in a bid to halt gun fights.'<sup>14</sup>

'Public decision-making', such as putting a peace agreement and/or constitution to a public vote for ratification, is the least common inclusion modality in the PeaceFem dataset, which was used in only 3 out of 24 peace processes (12%) – in [Northern Ireland](#),<sup>15</sup> [South Africa](#),<sup>16</sup> and Zimbabwe.<sup>17</sup> The limited use of this as an inclusion modality is consistent with data on the use of referendums in peace and transition processes between 1990 and 2023, which shows that although [referendums can be an important mechanism for constitutional change](#) in conflict-affected states,<sup>18</sup> only 5 per cent of peace agreements contain references to holding referendums.<sup>19</sup> However, this modality may broaden participation from beyond elite women to women with suffrage rights across the country, and therefore could potentially be a way of including women as diverse citizens, rather than only women with the resources (such as high levels of education) or support to access political spaces.

When reviewing data on women's inclusion, it is important not to view presence as equal to active participation or influence. It should also not be assumed that women participating in a peace process will serve as advocates on behalf of women across society, and it would be essentialist to expect that of women who come to negotiations with their own politics, views, constituencies, and agendas. Qualitative investigation of women's roles and influence within negotiations is therefore a crucial part of 'counting' women's inclusion in peace processes, which is why the PeaceFem app links to in-depth case studies conducted by Inclusive Peace and Monash GPS for each peace process featured on the app (see Appendix I).





## 2 Gender Provisions in Peace Agreements

The Women, Peace and Security agenda includes four pillars as set out in UN Security Council Resolution 1325: 1) women's role in conflict prevention; 2) women's meaningful participation in peacebuilding; 3) protection of women and girls during and after conflict, and; 4) women's specific needs during post-conflict reconstruction.<sup>20</sup>

However, PeaceFem shows that these pillars are not referenced equally across peace agreements, and that even within particular pillars, the strength of provisions across processes can be highly varied. PeaceFem analyses each peace agreement included on the app for provisions relating to: women's participation; gender equality; new institutions for women; international women's rights; institutional reform; particular groups of women (such as displaced women); development; violence against women; protection; transitional justice; and implementation. For agreements where data is available from Monash GPS, PeaceFem also records whether gender provisions were implemented (as of 2019).<sup>21</sup> The app enables searches by peace agreement provision category, which facilitates comparison of agreements from different processes that reference the same issues.

Of the peace agreements included in PeaceFem, the most common gender provisions relate to 'women's participation' (72%) and 'gender equality' (66%). As women's meaningful participation in peacebuilding is a key pillar of the WPS agenda, it is interesting to see that this is a common feature of comprehensive peace agreements across diverse contexts. However, often general references are more prevalent than detailed provisions. There is an important distinction between peace agreement provisions that commit conflict parties to enacting gender quotas in the process or transitional institutions (such as the [National Dialogue Outcomes Document in Yemen](#))<sup>22</sup> and provisions that affirm the importance of women's participation but do not provide detailed mechanisms for ensuring it (such as in the [Tokyo Declaration for Afghanistan](#)).<sup>23</sup> Whilst rhetorical references to women's participation in peace agreements are often a hard-won gain for women's equality advocates, and can potentially act as a useful 'hook' for advocacy, there is also a risk that rhetorical provisions fail to lead to concrete arrangements for women's meaningful inclusion later on in the process, as they can be hard to operationalise.<sup>24</sup> There is also a difference between peace agreement provisions that merely affirm the importance of gender equality, to provisions that enshrine equality as a constitutional right.

For example, Article 11 of the 2012 [Provisional Constitution of Somalia](#) says that all citizens, regardless of sex, shall have equal rights and duties before the law, and the state must not discriminate against any person on the basis of gender,<sup>25</sup> whereas the [Statement of Principles on Long-term Issues and Solutions](#) from the Kenya National Dialogue simply 'recognized that the issue of inequality along gender lines remains a key challenge for gender.'<sup>26</sup> Equal rights on the basis of gender may support women's meaningful participation in future peace processes and political institutions by giving them a legal basis to challenge exclusion from transitional processes, and therefore these two categories of peace agreement provisions are inextricably linked.

Among the least common gender provisions in peace agreements on PeaceFem are those relating to women's involvement with implementation (26%). This includes references to women's roles in implementing the peace agreement, and any women who signed or witnessed the agreement as a representative of women (rather than women who signed the agreement in another capacity, and not explicitly as representing women's groups).<sup>27</sup> Even if women are directly represented in negotiations across many of the peace processes listed on PeaceFem, their participation does not necessarily translate into them signing the resultant peace agreements, or producing agreements with commitments to their role in implementation. Whilst some agreements take a detailed gender-sensitive approach to implementation (for example, the Final Agreement in Colombia),<sup>28</sup> others require knowledge and experience of gender issues to take part in an implementation commission, but does not stipulate that such experts are women (for example, the Provisional Constitution of Somalia).<sup>29</sup>

The limited number of PeaceFem references to women's roles in agreement implementation aligns with PA-X data on gender references across different peace agreement stages, as 'the inclusion of women in peace agreement texts tends to be located in the more comprehensive stages of the agreement, with little consideration given to women and gender at either pre-negotiation stages of a peace process, or implementation stages.'<sup>30</sup> The low level of provisions for women's role in implementation may concern gender equality advocates, given that the implementation phase of peace processes 'often entails an ongoing renegotiation of the agreement or the overarching political change process'.<sup>31</sup> If gender equality advocates are not involved in this phase, there is a risk that inclusion gains made earlier on in the process may be renegotiated, or undone.<sup>32</sup>



Another category of gender provisions that rarely comes up in peace agreements on PeaceFem is that of women's protection (26%). This general lack of references to protection of women and girls in peace agreements is out of sync with the prevalence of threats towards women peacebuilders and political activists in conflict transitions. However, it is important to note that provisions referring to Violence Against Women (VAW) and Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) are counted as a separate category on PeaceFem (appearing in 41% of agreements), and may also contribute to protecting women during conflict – for example, by including sexual violence as a ceasefire violation, as in [agreements](#) between the government of Indonesia and the Free Aceh Movement.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, perhaps provisions that facilitate women's protection, even if not explicitly phrased as doing so, are more prevalent in peace agreements than it initially appears when looking at gender provisions as disaggregated categories.

Gender references relating to Transitional Justice (TJ) are the least common in the PeaceFem set of peace agreements (23%), and address TJ from a gender perspective to varying levels of comprehensiveness. In the [Final Agreement for Colombia](#), for example, parties agree that 'the Comprehensive System for Truth, Justice, Reparations and Non-Recurrence has a gender-based approach, which responds to the particular characteristics of the victimisation in each territory and each population, and in particular to the needs of women and children'.<sup>34</sup> In Yemen, the [National Dialogues Outcome Document](#) committed to a 30% quota of women in the newly established transitional justice commission.<sup>35</sup> However, some of the transitional justice provisions on PeaceFem risk relying on gender binaries of victimhood, which may gloss over the complexities and politics of defining who is or is not considered to be a victim of armed conflict.<sup>36</sup> For example, references in the [Sun City Agreement](#) for the DRC that emphasise women's vulnerability and their victimhood, without providing for their contribution to transitional justice processes, could potential reify heteronormative ideals of women as victims rather than agents of change in conflict transitions.<sup>37</sup> Interestingly, the [Darfur Peace Agreement](#) does refer to women as a 'vulnerable group', but also provides that the 'Darfur Rehabilitation and Resettlement Commission will establish restitution procedures that are gender sensitive. The procedures shall contain positive measures to ensure that women are able to participate on a fully equal basis in the process,' thereby acknowledging that women can be both victims of gender based violence and agents to enact transitional justice.<sup>38</sup>



### 3 Enabling and Constraining Factors for Women's Inclusion

The peace processes featured on PeaceFem all include information on factors which enabled and constrained women's meaningful participation during the conflict transition. These entries are informed by case studies conducted by Monash GPS and Inclusive Peace, and matched to each peace process (as generated from the PA-X Peace Agreement Database).<sup>39</sup> By treating the app as a small dataset, it is possible to look for commonalities across the diverse contexts included on it, and assess which factors are most prevalent for either supporting or blocking women's inclusion in peace processes. When this is done, the PeaceFem dataset shows that enabling and constraining factors for women's inclusion are highly context-specific, and come about because of a confluence of reasons in each case. There are, however, some common threads which can be identified by grouping similar factors from across cases to generate categories of factors (see Appendix 2).

The most common categories of enabling factors refer to the presence of women and civic actors in public life prior to the emergence of – or during an earlier stage – of a peace process. Many of the peace process case studies on PeaceFem refer to the pre-existing involvement or representation of women in political life as having a positive impact on women's ability to mobilise for inclusion. Women in [Tunisia](#) have a long history of political organisation, including in anti-colonial resistance struggles, and prior to the Arab spring had effectively advocated for women's rights – a history of organisation that they could draw on to inform their engagement with Tunisia's political transition that began in late 2010.<sup>40</sup> Similarly, the presence of a strong or active civil society was also considered to have enabled inclusion across multiple peace processes included on PeaceFem. For example, civil society groups in the [Philippines](#) 'are overwhelmingly composed of women', and a lead negotiator in the Mindanao peace processes has credited CSOs for successfully maintaining pressure on the negotiations to include gender provisions in the peace agreements.<sup>41</sup> It seems that the existing presence of women in politics can have both a symbolically representative benefit, by demonstrating that women do in fact belong in public life, and through organisational knowledge and capacity to support widespread mobilisation.



Factors that constrain women's inclusion can be viewed as resulting from both context and process, although these strands are interlinked as processes often mirror the societies they are addressing.<sup>42</sup> Insecurity, political violence, violence against women (VAW) and sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) were classed as constraining factors in multiple case studies, creating environments that were difficult for women to operate in, and making political participation and activism highly dangerous. In [Iraq](#), 'the violence and social divisions that occurred following 2003 have become barriers for women's participation'.<sup>43</sup> In [Myanmar](#), 'high rates of violence against women and gender-based violence across all ethnic communities in rural and urban settings' limited their ability to engage in local and national politics.<sup>44</sup> Patriarchal societal attitudes towards women's political involvement was also cited as contributing to women's exclusion from peace processes across the dataset. Women's inclusion in the [South African](#) peace process was hampered by patriarchal societal values that viewed women's primary role as domestic, rather than public, and there was resistance from traditional leaders against constitutional reforms for gender equality.<sup>45</sup> In [Northern Ireland](#), male politicians publically belittled and questioned the value of women's political participation,<sup>46</sup> reflecting a wider patriarchal atmosphere which included graffiti attacks on the homes of politicians such as Monica McWilliams, telling her (and other women active in public life) to "get back to the kitchen".<sup>47</sup>

Even when they are able to access positions in negotiations and transitional institutions, women still have to contend with societal values that can constrain their input. For example, the ability of women members of the Constituent Assembly in [Nepal](#) 'to access decision-making roles and influence decisions is hindered by patriarchal gender norms',<sup>48</sup> and this is argued to have limited their full and equal participation in transitional politics. Women participants of the Sun-City negotiations for the [Democratic Republic of Congo \(DRC\)](#), 'were encouraged to only address "women's issues," namely sexual violence' and were excluded from discussions of military issues.<sup>49</sup> These examples suggest that the impact of high-level inclusion modalities such as direct representation or women's consultative bodies might be limited if these are not supported by mechanisms to improve women's access to political participation in public life more broadly.<sup>50</sup> For example, work towards direct representation of women may need to be combined with protection mechanisms for women human rights defenders or plans for monitoring and supporting women's substantive representation in transitional bodies when there is elite resistance to their inclusion. Simply counting participating women as successful 'inclusion' risks ignoring the gendered power dynamics within negotiations, and the ways that women's substantive contributions can be minimised.

Finally, technical process structures such as exclusive selection procedures and limited decision-making power constrained women's inclusion in some of the peace processes listed on PeaceFem. In the Bonn negotiations for [Afghanistan](#), the selection criteria for the talks was criticised as being non-transparent and the selection process rushed, leading to the process not being fully representative of Afghan society. Even when women were included in the process (through interventions by the international community), 'decision making was mainly done by powerful actors outside of the talks', limiting their influence within the negotiations.<sup>51</sup> In the run up to the talks for [the DRC](#), 'the selection procedure for armed groups was carried out by internal nomination, from which very few women were selected', whilst the selection process for civil society groups and political parties was done through local elections, which also limited women's inclusion as this approach 'favoured candidates with an already-established political profile'.<sup>52</sup>

However, exclusive selection mechanism did not constrain inclusion across all peace processes – in some contexts, women actually used the selection criteria to leverage greater inclusion. The [Northern Ireland](#) Women's Coalition opportunistically used a special electoral low threshold mechanism that was intended to help include smaller parties connected to paramilitaries in the talks by running cross-community candidates in multiple electoral units across Northern Ireland.<sup>53</sup> This strategy and mechanism meant that they won enough of the vote share to qualify for seats in the talks, thereby co-opting a peace process structure that was designed for including armed – rather than civic – actors, and disrupted the dominant understanding that inclusion agendas in Northern Ireland should only address sectarian identities, rather than gender. In other contexts featured on PeaceFem, women consistently fought back against exclusive selection procedures, looking for new routes into the talks when other strategies failed.



## 4 Data Limitations

Although PeaceFem offers a new way of investigating women's inclusion in peace processes, as with all datasets there are limitations, and openly discussing the limits of PeaceFem data is a part of responsible women, peace and security scholarship.<sup>54</sup> There are methodological choices needed when building a dataset that forms the backend of an app that are different to building a dataset primarily for scientific analysis (due to app format, design, and download size), and therefore some of the decisions made to produce PeaceFem reflect that different purpose.

The first limitation is case selection of agreement stage. PeaceFem focuses mainly on framework peace agreements (both comprehensive and partial),<sup>55</sup> and predominantly one or two agreements from each peace process. This choice is due to the data interoperability between Inclusive Peace and/or Monash GPS case studies that provided contextual information on women's participation and the particular peace agreements with gender provisions on PA-X Gender (as peace agreements are the app's main unit of analysis). In particular, we needed to choose case studies that had strong data across Inclusive Peace and/or Monash GPS case studies. There is still value in this – as the first smartphone app of its kind that we are aware of, this smaller case selection provides a clear picture of what women can achieve if enabled, and the types of provisions they view as important. It also supports more robust comparison of women's inclusion across peace processes.

Second, the app only includes peace agreements that deal with intra-state conflict: agreements that attempt to resolve conflict within a state, rather than conflict between states. However, as this is the main practice of peacemaking – 78% of all peace agreements from 1990 to 2002 were dealing with intra-state conflict<sup>56</sup> – it is a significant category of peace agreements to explore inclusion questions. For intra-state conflicts, there is a wide availability of consistently comparable peace process case study data, as it is a level of agreement making that is frequently the focus of women, peace and security advocates.

It is worth noting that beyond intra-state conflict, there is a wider picture of women's inclusion (or exclusion) at other conflict and process levels, such as agreements between states, and local peace processes. Local peace processes are increasingly receiving attention from policymakers and women, peace and security advocates as an arena of peace where women are active in shaping complex and fragmented conflict dynamics through strategies such as tribal and cultural norms.<sup>57</sup> Further comparative research is vital to assess women's inclusion across all types of peace processes, rather than just intrastate peace processes dealing with nationwide conflict.

Third, PeaceFem does not currently provide implementation data for all gender provisions in peace agreements featured on the app. The estimated implementation status is a text representation of whether a provision has been fully, partially, or not implemented. It reflects a numerical score given to each provision according to the knowledge about the provision among the community, the implementation status of the infrastructure required to realise the provision, and the evidence of or potential for this provision to have a positive outcome on gender equality when implemented. The implementation data for some agreements on PeaceFem was provided by Monash GPS, but their dataset does not fully match the list of peace agreements included in the PeaceFem app, as this implementation dataset was created for a different research project, rather than specifically for PeaceFem.<sup>58</sup> Again, including this data in the app demonstrates that there is value in expanding the implementation data to cover all agreements in the PeaceFem app to enable cross-process comparison.

Finally, the PeaceFem app is not an appropriate tool for establishing cause and effect, as more extensive research would be required to make causal arguments about the efficacy of particular modalities or the impact of enabling and constraining factors on peace agreement implementation. However, showing the pipeline of process from pre- and post-agreement strategic approaches retains value for women's rights advocates grappling with similar circumstances within their own contemporary peace processes, as it demonstrates ways that women have previously navigated that pipeline, and what they managed to achieve.





## 5 Conclusion: Implications for the Women, Peace and Security Agenda

What does reflecting on the stories on PeaceFem tell us about the Women, Peace and Security Agenda after thirty years of activism? Whilst this review is not an exhaustive quantitative study of women's inclusion across all peace processes since 1990, PeaceFem does show that the paths to peace are long and varied, and pursuing an inclusive peace requires navigating extensive challenges. It also demonstrates the determination of women from 1993-2016 to continue a long tradition of women organising for peace, and refusing to accept narrow and exclusive processes as the default means of negotiating transitions.

As the nature of peace processes are changing, so are the barriers that women's rights advocates have to broach in order to gain access to negotiation spaces. Peace processes are increasingly becoming fragmented as part of complex nested conflicts, and women face more potential opponents to their inclusion, having to navigate extensive networks of conflict actors across different brokerage spaces.<sup>59</sup> Instead of one set of talks between a government and an armed opposition group with one negotiation room to protest outside of, there are now multiple, fluid processes with diverse sets of actors to try to convince the merits of inclusive processes.

Since the Women, Peace and Security agenda emerged from the violent conflicts of the 1990s, new arenas for pushing back against women's inclusion have emerged. Many of the peace processes featured on PeaceFem are from the pre-digital era, when peace agreements were drafted on typewriters and disseminated via fax machines, and before mass ownership of smartphones made electronic communication instant and virtually limitless. With this new technology came new methods of threatening women's political participation: cyber harassment and surveillance. Whilst physical and economic insecurity still prevent women's full public participation in conflict transitions, women's rights advocates now also have to contend with violent threats communicated with the tap of a button, and the risk of having their peacebuilding activities monitored electronically, putting them under even greater insecurity.<sup>60</sup> This evolution of threats makes the protection pillar of Women, Peace and Security even more critical to support the full realisation of commitments to women's meaningful participation.<sup>61</sup>

These new threats to inclusion, however, can also present opportunities. Multiple fora of negotiations and a diversity of conflict actors across a fragmented political landscape means that there are also multiple entry points for women's influence.<sup>62</sup> If actors at particular levels or processes are particularly resistant to inclusion, perhaps other players in other processes may be more receptive, or may have different interests that women can work with to leverage access. Mass ownership of internet communication technologies now makes mobilising women and advocating for gender justice across borders more accessible than ever before, a transition that has only accelerated since the Covid-19 pandemic moved many Women, Peace and Security activities and partnerships online.<sup>63</sup>

When conflicts emerge in the 2020s, undoubtedly new challenges to women's inclusion in peace processes will also arise. However, PeaceFem shows us that women's activism is often creative, indomitable, and sometimes successful at ushering in a more gender just peace. Their stories offer inspiration to women's rights advocates fighting for inclusion in contemporary peace and transition processes, and lessons on how to overcome some common barriers to inclusion.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> PeaceFem is available to download via Google Play and Apple Store, in English, Arabic, French, and Indonesian. For more information see: <https://peacerep.org/digital-resources/peacefem/>
- <sup>2</sup> Bell, C., Badanjak, S., Beaujouan, J., Forster, R., Epple, T., Jamar, A., McNicholl, K., Molloy, S., Nash, K., Pospisil, J., Wilson, R., Wise, L. (2023). PA-X Codebook, Version 7. PeaceRep, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh. Available at: [www.peaceagreements.org](http://www.peaceagreements.org)
- <sup>3</sup> Making Women Count in Peace Processes. Geneva: Inclusive Peace & Transition Initiative (Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies). Available at: <https://www.inclusivepeace.org/theme-posts/women-peace-and-security/>
- <sup>4</sup> Towards Inclusive Peace: Mapping Gender Provisions in Peace Agreements. Monash University: Monash Gender, Peace & Security. Available at: <http://mappingpeace.monashgps.org/the-project/>
- <sup>5</sup> PeaceFem Version 2 (2022). To request a copy of the dataset file in .xlsx format, please contact the PeaceFem team via email: [peacefem@ed.ac.uk](mailto:peacefem@ed.ac.uk)
- <sup>6</sup> For more information on the data sources and data matching, see Appendix I and PeaceFem User Guide: Version 2 (2022). Available at: <https://peacerep.org/digital-resources/peacefem/>
- <sup>7</sup> PeaceFem includes unpublished data on peace agreement implementation provided by Monash Gender, Peace & Security. Implementation data was available for 15 of the agreements listed on PeaceFem. For more information on Monash GPS implementation research, see True, J., & Riveros-Morales, Y. (2019). Towards inclusive peace: Analysing gender-sensitive peace agreements 2000–2016. *International Political Science Review*, 40(1), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512118808608>
- <sup>8</sup> Paffenholz, T., Ross, N., Dixon, S., Schluchter, A., True, J. (2016). "Making Women Count - Not Just Counting Women: Assessing Women's Inclusion and Influence on Peace Negotiations," Geneva: Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative (The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies) and UN Women.
- <sup>9</sup> Ross, N. (2018). Women in Peace & Transition Processes. Mexico (1994–2001), Case Study. Geneva: Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative (The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies).
- <sup>10</sup> Abey, M., and Galindo, J. (2018). Women in Peace & Transition Processes. South Africa's Democratic Transition (1990–1998). Geneva: Inclusive Peace & Transition Initiative (The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies).
- <sup>11</sup> Council on Foreign Relations (2023). Women's Participation in Peace Processes, 1992-2019. Available at: <https://www.cfr.org/womens-participation-in-peace-processes/>
- <sup>12</sup> Zachariassen, A. (2018). Women in Peace and Transition Processes. Guatemala (1994–1999). Geneva: Inclusive Peace & Transition Initiative (The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies).
- <sup>13</sup> Zanker, F. (2018). Women in Peace & Transition Processes. Liberia (2003–2011). Geneva: Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative (The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies).

- <sup>14</sup> George, N. (2018). Bougainville, Papua New Guinea: Gender and participation in the wake of a partially "gendered" peace agreement. *Monash Gender, Peace & Security*, p. 5.
- <sup>15</sup> Bramble, A. (2018). *Women in Peace & Transition Processes. Northern Ireland (1996–1998)*. Geneva: Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative (The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies).
- <sup>16</sup> Abey and Galindo. (2018). *South Africa's Democratic Transition (1990–1998)*.
- <sup>17</sup> A referendum was held in Colombia in 2016 to ratify the Final Agreement, however, this is not referred to as an modality for women's inclusion in the Monash GPS case study.
- <sup>18</sup> Tierney, S. (2018). *Reflections on referendums*. The Hague: International IDEA.
- <sup>19</sup> 96 out of 2003 peace agreements signed between 1990 and 2023 include provisions for using a referendum as part of the peace and transition process. PA-X Version 7 (2023), search: sub-issue 'Referendum'. <https://www.peaceagreements.org/>
- <sup>20</sup> United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000).
- <sup>21</sup> See supra note 7.
- <sup>22</sup> Yemen, National Dialogue Conference Outcomes Document. <https://www.peaceagreements.org/wview/1400>
- <sup>23</sup> Afghanistan, Tokyo Declaration Partnership for Self-Reliance in Afghanistan from Transition to Transformation (Tokyo Conference). <https://www.peaceagreements.org/wview/864/>
- <sup>24</sup> Buchanan, C. (2021). *Gender-inclusive peacemaking: strategies for mediation practitioners*. Mediation Practice Series. Geneva: Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, p. 35.
- <sup>25</sup> Somalia, Provisional Constitution of The Federal Republic of Somalia. <https://www.peaceagreements.org/wview/1360/>
- <sup>26</sup> Kenya, National Dialogue and Reconciliation: Statement of Principles on Long-term Issues and Solutions. <https://www.peaceagreements.org/wview/688>
- <sup>27</sup> Bell, Christine, Sanja Badanjak, Juline Beaujouan, Robert Forster, Tim Epple, Astrid Jamar, Kevin McNicholl, Sean Molloy, Kathryn Nash, Jan Pospisil, Robert Wilson, Laura Wise (2020). *PA-X Codebook: Women, Girls, and Gender (PA-X Gender)*, Version 4. Political Settlements Research Programme, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh. [www.peaceagreements.org/wsearch](http://www.peaceagreements.org/wsearch)
- <sup>28</sup> Colombia, Final Agreement to End the Armed Conflict and Build a Stable and Lasting Peace. <https://www.peaceagreements.org/wview/1845/>
- <sup>29</sup> Somalia, Provisional Constitution of The Federal Republic of Somalia. <https://www.peaceagreements.org/wview/1360/>
- <sup>30</sup> Bell, C., and McNicholl, K. (2019). 'Principled Pragmatism and the 'Inclusion Project': Implementing a Gender Perspective in Peace Agreements'. *feminists@law*, Vol 9, No 1, p.1.

- <sup>31</sup> Bramble, A., and Paffenholz, T. (2020). *Implementing Peace Agreements: From inclusive processes to inclusive outcomes*. Oslo Governance Centre: United Nations Development Programme, p. V.
- <sup>32</sup> Report of the Secretary-General on women and peace and security (S/2022/740) (2022). United Nations. Available at: <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/report-secretary-general-women-and-peace-and-security-s2022740-enarruzh>
- <sup>33</sup> Indonesia/Aceh, Cessation of Hostilities Framework Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Indonesia and the Free Aceh Movement. Indonesia/Aceh, Agreement Reached by both Field Commanders of the RI and the GAM.
- <sup>34</sup> Colombia, Final Agreement to End the Armed Conflict and Build a Stable and Lasting Peace. <https://www.peaceagreements.org/wview/1845/>
- <sup>35</sup> Yemen, National Dialogue Conference Outcomes Document. <https://www.peaceagreements.org/wview/1400>
- <sup>36</sup> Jamar, A. (2021). The Exclusivity of Inclusion: Global Construction of Vulnerable and Apolitical Victimhood in Peace Agreements. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 15(2), 284–308.
- <sup>37</sup> Democratic Republic of Congo, Intercongolese Negotiations: The Final Act ('The Sun City Agreement'). <https://www.peaceagreements.org/wview/404>
- <sup>38</sup> Sudan/Darfur, Darfur Peace Agreement. <https://www.peaceagreements.org/wview/350/>
- <sup>39</sup> Some case studies were matched to one peace agreement, but not another agreement within the same process as it was clear from the case study that some aspects of women's inclusion related to one agreement or phase of negotiations but not the other (especially when there was a long temporal gap between phases of the peace process or agreements).
- <sup>40</sup> Monash Gender, Peace & Security (2018). Tunisia: A situational analysis of women's participation in peace processes.
- <sup>41</sup> Davies, S.E. (2018) Philippines: A situational analysis of women's participation in peace processes. Monash Gender, Peace & Security, p. 9.
- <sup>42</sup> Inclusive Peace separate enabling and constraining factors into 'context' and 'process'; however, I argue that closer reading of the case studies shows that there is a symbiotic relationship between peace processes and the societal contexts that they are addressing, and that factors cannot easily be categorised between the two.
- <sup>43</sup> Chilmeran, Y. (2018). Iraq: A situational analysis of women's participation in peace processes. Monash Gender, Peace & Security, p. 6.
- <sup>44</sup> Davies, S.E. (2018). Myanmar: A situational analysis of women's participation in peace processes. Monash Gender, Peace & Security.
- <sup>45</sup> Abey and Galindo. (2018). South Africa's Democratic Transition (1990–1998), p. 13.

- <sup>46</sup> Bramble, A. (2018). Women in Peace & Transition Processes. Northern Ireland (1996–1998), p. 13-14.
- <sup>47</sup> Avila Kilmurray and Monica McWilliams (2011). 'Struggling for Peace: How Women in Northern Ireland Challenged the Status Quo', *Solutions Journal*, 2 (2) 41-54.
- <sup>48</sup> Hewitt, S. (2018). Nepal: A situational analysis of women's participation in peace processes. *Monash Gender, Peace & Security*. pp. 6-7.
- <sup>49</sup> Zachariassen, A. (2017). Women in Peace and Transition Processes. Democratic Republic of the Congo (2001–2003). Geneva: Inclusive Peace & Transition Initiative (The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies), p. 9.
- <sup>50</sup> For more on the relationship between the 'participation' and 'protection' pillars of WPS, see Turner, C., and Swaine, A. (2021). *At the Nexus of Participation and Protection: Protection-Related Barriers to Women's Participation in Northern Ireland*. International Peace Institute.
- <sup>51</sup> Kellog, M., and Paffenholz, T. (2019). Women in Peace & Transition Processes: Afghanistan (2001-2005) Geneva: Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative (The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies), p. 8.
- <sup>52</sup> Zachariassen, A. (2017). Women in Peace and Transition Processes. Democratic Republic of the Congo (2001–2003), pp. 8-9.
- <sup>53</sup> Bramble, A. (2018). Women in Peace & Transition Processes. Northern Ireland (1996–1998), p. 11.
- <sup>54</sup> Nagel, R. (2019). *The Known Knowns and Known Unknowns in Data on Women, Peace and Security*. LSE Women, Peace and Security Working Paper Series, p. 16.
- <sup>55</sup> With the exception of: Indonesia/Aceh, Cessation of Hostilities Framework Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Indonesia and the Free Aceh Movement (ceasefire); Indonesia/Aceh, Agreement Reached by both Field Commanders of the RI and the GAM (ceasefire); Myanmar, The Framework for Political Dialogue (pre-negotiation); Myanmar, The Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) between The Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar and the Ethnic Armed Organizations (EAO) (ceasefire); Philippines/Mindanao, Annex on Normalization to the Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro (FAB) (implementation); Afghanistan, Tokyo Declaration Partnership for Self-Reliance in Afghanistan from Transition to Transformation (implementation); Afghanistan, The Resolution Adopted at the Conclusion of the National Consultative Peace Jirga (pre-negotiation). These agreements were included due to the existence of Inclusive Peace and Monash GPS comparative case studies for the peace processes and gender provisions in the peace agreements, alongside (or in the absence of) framework agreements resulting from those processes.
- <sup>56</sup> Of the 2002 peace agreements listed on PA-X between 1990 and 2022, 1575 are either intrastate agreements relating to intrastate conflict (1326), or inter-state agreements relating to intrastate conflict (252). 80 peace agreements are interstate, relating to conflicts between states, and 344 are local agreements.
- <sup>57</sup> Parry, J. (2022). *Women's Participation in Local Mediation: Lessons from Iraq, Libya, Syria and Yemen*; UN Women; Wise, L., Forster, R. & Bell, C. (2019). *Local Peace Processes: Opportunities and Challenges for Women's Engagement (PA-X Report, Spotlight Series)*. Edinburgh: Global Justice Academy, University of Edinburgh.

<sup>58</sup> See supra note 7.

<sup>59</sup> Bell, C., and Wise, L. (2022). The Spaces of Local Agreements: Towards a New Imaginary of the Peace Process, *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 16:5, 563-583; Bell, C., and Wise, L. (2022). Peace Processes and Their Agreements. In: Mac Ginty R., Wanis-St. John A. (eds) *Contemporary Peacemaking*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

<sup>60</sup> Knäussel, F. (2020). Social Media, Blockchain, Big Data & Co: How do we support women mediators in peace processes in a technology-driven world? Political Settlements Research Programme. Available at: <https://peacerep.org/2020/06/29/social-media-blockchain-big-data-co-how-do-we-support-women-mediators-in-peace-processes-in-a-technology-driven-world/>

<sup>61</sup> Report of the Secretary-General on women and peace and security (S/2022/740) (2022).

<sup>62</sup> UN Women (2021). Women's Meaningful Participation in Peace Processes: Modalities and Strategies Across Tracks. Available at: <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2021/06/proceedings-womens-meaningful-participation-in-peace-processes>

<sup>63</sup> For a discussion on the impact of Covid-19 on women peacebuilders engagement with ICTs see Agnieszka Fal-Dutra Santos, A., Salamat, N., Bölüköğlu, S., Baron, K., Choi, C., and Gasperetti, H.M. (2022) 'Lockdown on Peace? COVID-19's Impact on Women Peacebuilders', *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 29(4) pp. 1273-1276. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxab050>



## Appendix I: PeaceFem Data

PeaceFem data	Data description	Data source
Peace agreement	Formal, publicly available document, produced after discussion with conflict protagonists and mutually agreed to by some or all of them, addressing conflict with a view to ending it.	PA-X Peace Agreements Database – PeaceRep, University of Edinburgh <a href="https://www.peaceagreements.org/">https://www.peaceagreements.org/</a>
Peace agreement metadata	Country/entity: This line lists all countries and entities that are party to the peace agreement. Agreement Name: This is the full title of the peace agreement, which links to the agreement's text in PDF format. Agreement Date: The agreement was signed on this date. Conflict details: A link to <a href="https://www.peaceagreements.org">peaceagreements.org</a> , where a description to the wider conflict that the agreement belongs to can be found.	PA-X Peace Agreements Database – PeaceRep, University of Edinburgh <a href="https://www.peaceagreements.org/">https://www.peaceagreements.org/</a>
Peace or transition process	A formal attempt to bring political and/or military protagonists of conflict, to some sort of mutual agreement as to how to end the conflict.	PA-X Peace Agreements Database – PeaceRep, University of Edinburgh <a href="https://www.peaceagreements.org/">https://www.peaceagreements.org/</a>





PeaceFem data	Data description	Data source
Inclusion modalities (strategies)	Summaries in this box are derived from publicly available case studies on women's inclusion and participation in peace processes, from Inclusive Peace's 'Women in Peace and Transition Processes' series and/or the Monash Centre for Gender, Peace & Security 'Mapping Peace' project. Users can access the full case study via the hyperlink in each entry. The one exception is the entry for the Zimbabwe post-election process, which is based on PeaceRep desk-based research.	Women in Peace and Transition Processes - Inclusive Peace; Toward Inclusive Peace: Mapping Gender Provisions in Peace Agreements - Monash Centre for Gender, Peace & Security
Gender provisions in peace agreement	Summaries of each gender provision in the agreement, clustered into 11 categories, are derived from coding on the PA-X Gender database. In longer agreements, some provisions are substantially shortened and only highlight the gender elements contained within for accessibility. Users can access the full PA-X Gender database via hyperlink, or the agreement PDF for the entry to read full text provisions of the agreement.	PA-X Gender Peace Agreements Database - PeaceRep University of Edinburgh <a href="https://www.peaceagreements.org/wsearch">https://www.peaceagreements.org/wsearch</a>



PeaceFem data	Data description	Data source
Gender provisions implementation data	<p>The estimated implementation status of provisions is provided by the Monash Centre for Gender, Peace and Security. This is a text representation of a numerical score given to each provision according to the knowledge about the provision among the community, the implementation status of the infrastructure required to realize the provision, and the evidence of or potential for this provision to have a positive outcome on gender equality when implemented.</p>	<p>Toward Inclusive Peace: Mapping Gender Provisions in Peace Agreements - Monash Centre for Gender, Peace &amp; Security</p>
Enabling and constraining factors for inclusion	<p>Summaries in this box are derived from publicly available case studies on women's inclusion and participation in peace processes, from Inclusive Peace's 'Women in Peace and Transition Processes' series and/or the Monash Centre for Gender, Peace &amp; Security 'Mapping Peace' project. Users can access the full case study via the hyperlink in each entry. The one exception is the entry for the Zimbabwe post-election process, which is based on PeaceRep desk-based research.</p>	<p>Women in Peace and Transition Processes - Inclusive Peace; Toward Inclusive Peace: Mapping Gender Provisions in Peace Agreements - Monash Centre for Gender, Peace &amp; Security</p>



PeaceFem data	Data description	Data source
<p>Gender provisions in other peace agreements from the same process</p>	<p>This hyperlink takes users to a timeline of all other agreements in this peace process that contain gender provisions, drawing from data on the PeaceRep PA-X Gender database.</p>	<p>PA-X Gender Peace Agreements Database – PeaceRep, University of Edinburgh <a href="https://www.peaceagreements.org/wsearch">https://www.peaceagreements.org/wsearch</a></p>



## Appendix 2: Enabling and Constraining Factors on Women's Inclusion in Peace Processes

Enabling Factors	Constraining Factors
Inclusive selection criteria for participation	Inclusive selection criteria for participation
Coalition-building	Division amongst women's groups
Women responding to process needs	Emergency (e.g. public health epidemic, natural disaster)
Early involvement of women and/or preparedness	Exclusive selection procedures
Effective transfer and advocacy strategies	Heterogeneity of women's identities and/or polarisation along ethnic lines
Gender policy and legislation	Insecurity and political violence
Pre-existing involvement/representation of women in process/political life	Lack of funding
Gender quota	Lack of gender sensitive peace agreement and/or implementation
Submitting written input to process	Lack of inclusion mechanism
Use of referendum to ratify agreement	Lack of particular process mechanisms (e.g. transitional justice, ceasefire monitoring)
Gender references in peace agreements/constitution	Lack of public support

Enabling Factors	Constraining Factors
Informal influence	Limited decision-making power
Grassroots peacemaking experience	Limited support of mediators
Public buy-in	Low representation of women in politics
Strong and/or active civil society	Negative attitudes of participants towards gender issues
Support (mediator, third parties, regional/international actors)	Patriarchal socio-cultural norms
Support (conflict parties or elites)	Poverty/economic inequality/ low levels of education
Support (financial and technical)	Resistance from conflict parties and/or political parties
Customary norms	Violence Against Women and/or Sexual and Gender Based Violence

Created by compiling all enabling and constraining factors listed on PeaceFem, and grouped to create common categories. This was done without referring to the list of common enabling and constraining factors produced by Inclusive Peace (<https://www.inclusivepeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/infographic-women-influence-factors-en.pdf>) in order to see what categories could be deduced from the PeaceFem dataset, which draws on factors from both Inclusive Peace and Monash GPS case studies. However, there may be some crossover due to the use of Inclusive Peace case studies to populate PeaceFem. This is an illustrative – not an exhaustive – list of enabling and constraining factors for women's participation.

## About PeaceFem

This research is an output for the Peace and Conflict Resolution Evidence Platform, which is funded by the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), UK for the benefit of developing countries. The information and views set out in this publication are those of the authors. Nothing herein constitutes the views of FCDO. Any use of this work should acknowledge the authors and the Peace and Conflict Resolution Evidence Platform.

PeaceFem is a collaboration between UN Women, Inclusive Peace, the Monash University Centre for Gender, Peace and Security, and the PeaceRep: Peace and Conflict Resolution Evidence Platform at the University of Edinburgh. The project has been financially supported by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) in cooperation with Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH. PeaceRep/University of Edinburgh data was supported by UK Aid from the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), and Monash data was supported by Australian Research Council Linkage Project, 'Toward Inclusive Peace: Mapping the Gender Provisions of Peace Agreements'. Inclusive Peace data was supported by Inclusive Security, UN Women, and the Governments of Norway, Switzerland, Germany, Finland, and Turkey. The information and views set out in this publication are those of the authors. Nothing herein constitutes the views of PeaceFem partner organisations or funders.



✉ [info@peacerep.org](mailto:info@peacerep.org)

f [PeaceRepResearch](#)

X [@Peace\\_Rep\\_](#)

in [PeaceRep](#)

[www.peacerep.org](http://www.peacerep.org)

[www.peaceagreements.org](http://www.peaceagreements.org)

## About Us

PeaceRep: The Peace and Conflict Resolution Evidence Platform is a research consortium based at Edinburgh Law School. Our research is rethinking peace and transition processes in the light of changing conflict dynamics, changing demands of inclusion, and changes in patterns of global intervention in conflict and peace/mediation/transition management processes.

Consortium members include: Conciliation Resources, Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations (CTPSR) at Coventry University, Dialectiq, Edinburgh Law School, International IDEA, LSE Conflict and Civiness Research Group, LSE Middle East Centre, Queens University Belfast, University of St Andrews, University of Stirling, and the World Peace Foundation at Tufts University.

PeaceRep is funded by the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), UK.



THE UNIVERSITY  
of EDINBURGH



**PeaceRep**  
Peace and Conflict  
Resolution Evidence  
Platform

PeaceRep: The Peace and Conflict Resolution Evidence Platform  
[info@peacerep.org](mailto:info@peacerep.org) | <https://peacerep.org> | @Peace\_Rep\_

University of Edinburgh, School of Law  
Old College, South Bridge EH8 9YL