

DO NO HARM PROJECT

Do No Harm in Mindanao: Ingenuity in Action

March 2010



*Michelle Garred
Nicole Goddard*

This document was developed as part of a collaborative learning project directed by CDA. It is part of a collection of documents that should be considered initial and partial findings of the project. These documents are written to allow for the identification of cross-cutting issues and themes across a range of situations. Each case represents the views and perspectives of a variety of people at the time when it was written.

These documents do not represent a final product of the project. While these documents may be cited, they remain working documents of a collaborative learning effort. Broad generalizations about the project's findings cannot be made from a single case. CDA would like to acknowledge the generosity of the individuals and agencies involved in donating their time, experience and insights for these reports, and for their willingness to share their experiences.

Not all the documents written for any project have been made public. When people in the area where a report has been done have asked us to protect their anonymity and security, in deference to them and communities involved, we keep those documents private.

Introduction

The Do No Harm Framework for Analyzing the Impact of Aid on Conflict was introduced in the 1999 book, *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—Or War*, by Mary B. Anderson, the Executive Director of CDA Collaborative Learning Projects (CDA) at the time. Following the publication of Anderson's book and the development of training modules, the Do No Harm Project¹ of CDA began working to mainstream Do No Harm among humanitarian and development aid workers. Since that time, innumerable trainings have taken place, a cadre of trained Do No Harm trainers work within organizations or as private consultants, and many aid workers have taken up the tool in their work. This case study examines the use of the Do No Harm (DNH) framework and lessons in Mindanao, Philippines as well as its arrival and spread in the region.

In 2006, the Do No Harm Project began a series of reflective case studies to gather evidence about how practitioners are learning, thinking about, using and spreading the DNH tool and lessons. In addition to these questions, we have been hearing stories about how DNH has changed people's thinking as well as their work and personal lives. In each of the nineteen cases in this series, practitioners offer a wide range of applications for DNH, as well as recommendations for CDA, for their donors and for their organizational superiors to better apply the tool in their context.

Methodology & Overview of the Case Study

During March 2010, we, Michelle Garred, an independent consultant, and Nicole Goddard, the Do No Harm Project Field Associate, spent nine days in Davao City, Mindanao, preceded and followed by three-day stays in Manila. We conducted eighteen case study interviews, discussing a semi-structured series of questions in both individual and group formats, with over 40 DNH practitioners. In addition to the case study interviews, we facilitated a two-day DNH Consultation among DNH practitioners in Davao City, and a similar half-day Consultation in Manila. The great majority of participants were from Mindanao, working in local, national and international organizations across a wide variety of sectors. There were also Manila-based Filipinos working at the national level, and expatriates representing the German Civil Peace Services, AUSAID, and Voluntary Service Overseas (UK).

The strength of this case study comes from the commitment and capacity of the colleagues who shared their experiences. The case's limitations pertain to the colleagues that we were unable to reach. Mindanao is a vast territory, and our short stay in Davao did not permit us to maximize contact with colleagues based in other parts of the island. Our interviews were conducted in English, with English-Visayan translation ably provided in several instances by the participants. All the major people groupings of Mindanao were involved in this process, but the proportion of representation was not ideal. We believe that this case study accurately reflects many key DNH usage patterns in Mindanao, but we are mindful of the important stories yet to be told.

The case study is organized in much the same way that our interviews unfolded. We began each interview with a brief introduction of our purpose and process, which are presented here in the

¹ **A note on language:** When it was started, the Do No Harm Project was known as the Local Capacities for Peace Project or LCP. Following the publication of the book, *Do No Harm*, practitioners and CDA began referring to the project and the tool as "Do No Harm" or "DNH." Some practitioners learned of the tool as LCP, and continue to refer to it as such. In this case study, we use the terms LCP, DNH, Local Capacities for Peace and Do No Harm interchangeably.

Introduction and Methodology sections. (Following those sections in the case study, we include a short discussion of the context of Mindanao, to place practitioners' experiences of DNH usage within that context.) We asked interviewees to share their DNH stories, including their first introduction to DNH and how they had used and were currently using the tool, as described in the sections on DNH Dissemination and Training and DNH Usage Patterns & Impacts. We also asked what factors in the Mindanao context, or the context of the individual practitioner's work or life, had helped or hindered their use of DNH. We include these factors in the sections on Supports to DNH Uptake, Barriers to DNH Uptake, and Barrier, Support and an Opportunity. At the end of each conversation, we asked for the interviewee's recommendations for the future of DNH, as reflected in the final section, Implications for Future Thinking about DNH. During our discussions, many examples of especially unique or creative usage emerged, and these stories are spread throughout the case, in much the same way they came up in our conversations. Throughout the process, we have also built on the emergent findings of CDA's other country-specific reflective case studies, taking special note of the diverse ways in which people are using DNH effectively, as both a conceptual lens and an analytical tool, and of the factors that help people move from training to application.

We would like to thank all those who took time away from their work or personal lives to be interviewed and to attend the Davao and Manila consultations and share their stories with us. Many have suggested additional contacts and helped us to connect with more people than we would have been able to otherwise. We would like to offer special thanks to the following people: Sister Joan Castro organized a half-day meeting with key members from the Davao Ministerial Interfaith Group, as well as individual meetings with other DMI members. She also provided translation during interviews and accompanied us on our visit to the Davao City Jail. Father Thomas Catarata arranged for our trip to the jail and a special meeting of the detainees to discuss DNH. Irene Santiago and Scheherazaide Pahn organized the Davao City and Manila consultations.

The Context of Mindanao

Mindanao Island, known for its abundant natural resources, is the southernmost of the three major regions that make up the Philippines. Mindanao's three major people groupings include the Lumads (Indigenous Peoples), the Bangsamoro (formed when some Indigenous Peoples converted to Islam following the 14th century arrival of Arabian Muslim traders), and the migrants arriving in the 20th century from the Visayan Islands to the north. Within each major people grouping are numerous ethnic groups, often speaking distinct languages and dialects. The Philippines was a colony of Spain for 370-380 years and of the USA for 50 years, but the inclusion of Mindanao within colonial boundaries was disputed and many Bangsamoro groups did not accept colonial rule.

Under both US rule and the post-independence Republic of the Philippines, government resettlement schemes offered Mindanawan land to migrants from the Visayas, who eventually became numerically dominant. Many Bangsamoro and Lumads were displaced from land, and politically and economically marginalized. The Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) was formed in 1968, and Visayan citizen militias were quickly organized as a response. Local skirmishes escalated into all-out warfare in the 1970s. Subsequent peace talks between the government and the MNLF led to the establishment of limited autonomy in several provinces, but implementation has been contested. Cyclical warfare continues between the government and the breakaway Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF). The most recent flare-up was in August 2008, displacing a half million residents of South Central Mindanao, and derailing peace talks until 2010. The USA maintains a controversial troop presence due to its concerns about the role of Mindanao in the global and regional "war on terror."

In addition to the government–MILF conflict, Mindanao is also affected by the national conflict between the government and the communist New People’s Army, and by local clan conflicts. Land use policy relating to transnational agriculture and mining corporations is a subject of increasingly tense debate. Local dynamics vary widely; some parts of Mindanao experience open violence, others are affected by latent tensions, and still others are relatively stable. Mindanao boasts a large and influential civil society, engaged in humanitarian and development assistance, peacebuilding, advocacy, grassroots empowerment and religious services, all of which sets the stage for vibrant capacity and creativity in DNH usage.

DNH Dissemination and Training

DNH was introduced in Mindanao through three primary sources: German Development Cooperation Organizations, World Vision Development Foundation, and the Mindanao Commission on Women. Each source is described below, including their unique interpretations and applications of DNH, and their dissemination of DNH to others. As each source has disseminated DNH through its own networks, their streams of influence have sometimes converged with each other, and with other conflict sensitivity approaches in use in Mindanao. These sources have also contributed to a significant ‘export’ of DNH capacity to other parts of the Philippines and the Asia-Pacific Region.

German Development Cooperation Organizations. German Technical Cooperation (GTZ)² has been a source of frequent DNH training in Mindanao and the Visayas region, for both its own staff and external partners. During our visit, we were unable to meet with GTZ staff, as GTZ staff had recently relocated their office to Butuan City in the Caraga region of northern Mindanao, and key DNH trainer Juvy Loyola was traveling outside the country. GTZ is currently developing a Conflict Sensitive Resource and Asset Management Programme in Caraga. Both GTZ and the German Development Service (DED)³ have developed conflict sensitivity approaches that include the DNH concept, and use of the DNH framework as one of the available tools. DED requires a conflict sensitivity analysis for all projects being implemented in the Philippines. Juvy Loyola of GTZ has provided DNH training to numerous external partners, including the first DNH training for the staff of the national government’s Office of the Presidential Advisor on the Peace Process (OPAPP), which significantly shaped OPAPP’s subsequent conflict sensitivity work.

World Vision Development Foundation⁴ (WV) began introducing DNH in Mindanao in 2000, as part of a broader initiative to explore the applicability of DNH to community development work (as opposed to humanitarian response) in the Asia-Pacific Region. Two DNH Centers of Learning were established, one in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia, and the other in Sarangani Province, Mindanao. In Sarangani, WV provided DNH training to the staff and trustees of its local implementing partner SARCODFI, and then worked with them to pilot the application of DNH within the program design, monitoring and evaluation cycle. The role of religious leaders was viewed as strategic in Sarangani, so WV provided DNH training to a group of Catholic, Protestant⁵ and Muslim leaders, and assisted them in meeting together to discuss

² Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit

³ Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst

⁴ World Vision Development Foundation is a national-level organization in the Philippines, and part of the broader World Vision International partnership.

⁵ Many Protestants in Mindanao prefer to be called ‘Evangelicals.’ We use the term ‘Protestants’ here to ensure clarity among our international readers.

community well-being. The WV staff members involved in this effort, from the local Center of Learning to the regional line management, have become committed DNH resource persons, and have continued to lead DNH work in their subsequent WV postings.

Based on the experiences in the Sarangani Center of Learning, WV set out to integrate DNH into its community development programming on a Mindanao-wide basis. In the Southern Mindanao zone, DNH efforts have aimed at in-depth application of DNH to the programming cycle in cooperation with the local implementing people's organizations, and use of DNH with groups of religious leaders who contribute a multi-faith spiritual nurture component to WV programming. DNH analysis approaches emphasize participatory community-based DNH assessment. With the support of WV Peacebuilding Specialist, Herminegilda (Hermie) Presbitero-Carrillo, the Davao City development program has become a hub of innovation. Hermie has spearheaded DNH training and mentoring for WV's Davao-area partners, including the Davao Ministerial Interfaith, Inc., and the Davao Children for Peace and Development Association.

Ten years on, WV's DNH capacity continues to emanate from its community development infrastructure. DNH is also applied in humanitarian responses to conflict-related displacement and natural disasters, as led by staff who gained their DNH skills in previous community development postings. WV's DNH capacity building strategy is marked by an emphasis on repeated exposure, hands-on practice and follow-up mentoring. WV's original DNH trainers were equipped in Training of Trainers events (ToTs) led by CDA staff.⁶ Those original trainers have multiplied themselves, through at least four DNH ToTs in Mindanao, and numerous other ToTs around the Asia-Pacific Region. WV uses the term "Local Capacities for Peace" rather than DNH, reflecting interagency usage at the time they originally took up the tool, so "LCP" language is used throughout WV's partner networks. Trainers from WV have also provided DNH workshops to staff of external agencies.

The Mindanao Commission on Women (MCW) has become a source of DNH dissemination in Mindanao through the initiative of its director Irene Santiago. Irene first learned of DNH through her friendship and collaboration with Mary B. Anderson. She has since incorporated selected concepts and components of DNH into her peace training, thus disseminating DNH through various Mindanowan peace and development networks. During this process, Irene shared DNH with co-trainers Marides Guardiola and Carmela Ariza. The three later worked together to provide a series of trainings on Peace and Conflict Sensitive Programming (PCSP), on behalf of the national OPAPP, to selected local government units and other peace process stakeholders. The customized PCSP model currently in use by OPAPP includes significant DNH components.

Other conflict sensitivity approaches in Mindanao. The work of Kenneth Bush, now Research Coordinator at the University of Ulster's International Conflict Research Institute (INCORE), has been influential in Mindanao. In 2003, Bush tested parts of his Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) framework, and trained PCIA resource persons in Mindanao, with support of the Philippines-Canada Local Government Support Programme. Bush's PCIA has influenced OPAPP PCSP model, which also includes DNH concepts and components. Other important influences have come through Catholic Relief Services, and the Mindanao Peacebuilding Institute which they co-founded with the Mennonite Central Committee and CAFOD. These colleagues do not focus specifically on DNH, but they raise awareness of the importance of conflict sensitivity in aid and peacebuilding interventions.

⁶ Training of Trainers Nairobi 1999, and Bangkok 2001.

DNH 'exports' from Mindanao. The strong DNH capacity developed in Mindanao has not remained only in Mindanao. Within the Philippines, the OPAPP PCSP model is designed for country-wide usage. DNH has become the foundation of WV's national peacebuilding strategy, with DNH training and community-based assessment underway around the country, and DNH helping to inform WV's partnerships with religious institutions. At the international level, CRS' Deng Giguiento introduced colleagues to conflict sensitivity during a deployment to East Timor. WV's resource persons in Mindanao have supported DNH usage in Cambodia, and in tsunami response programs in Aceh (Indonesia), Sri Lanka, India and Thailand. The DNH testing in the Sarangani Center of Learning has shaped WV tools in use around the world, including a manual for community-based DNH assessment, and a meso-level framework for 'Integrating Peacebuilding and Development' (iPAD).

DNH in the Religious Sector: Davao Ministerial Interfaith

The roots of Mindanao's ethno-religious conflict lie in land and governance disputes, but the overlap between ethnicity and religion has made religion an important secondary element. The moral authority of religious leaders holds influence for either conflict or peace. With this in mind, World Vision Development Foundation (WV) began facilitating local inter-faith gatherings in Davao City in 2002, expanding the pool of religious leaders involved in the development work of implementing partner Unity for Progress Davao.⁷ These leaders organized themselves as the Davao Ministerial Interfaith (DMI), a service-focused organization of over 50 Catholic, Evangelical and Muslim members, chaired by Pastor Ereberto P. Gopo (Protestant). DMI also mentors sister inter-faith groups in other southern Mindanao provinces.

DMI founders attended their first DNH training, provided by WV, in 2003. They applied DNH in their own lives and found it very useful. DMI soon adopted a policy requiring all new members to undergo training in DNH and the *Culture of Peace*, as a "mind-setting" preparation for inter-faith engagement. In the words of one Protestant Pastor: "It opened my mind. I found that religion is not to debate, but to share."⁸ DMI also supports DNH assessments of partners' development programs, and uses DNH in their own planning. In DMI's neighborhood-based care groups, DNH catalyzed the idea of creating an inclusive inter-faith and inter-generational format. DNH analysis has helped care group leaders to adjust their worship styles, scripture usage and communication patterns, making possible an unusual integration of Roman Catholic and Protestant members. DMI is still working towards integration between Christians and Muslims in the care group program, recognizing that significant change takes time.

DMI is committed to sharing DNH, and has its own pool of trainers led by Sister Joan D. Castro (Roman Catholic). Their Training of Trainers was similar to the CDA model, contextualized to emphasize latent conflict, and broken into two separate sessions to accommodate busy schedules. DMI has partnered with action research facilitator Michelle Garred to explore how religious audiences use DNH. Their findings detail how DNH contributes to individual and relational transformation among religious leaders, and how Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages differ between the aid and religious sectors. DMI also partners with the Davao City Jail, where DMI Officer Ustadz Ahmad G. Ampuan Al-Hadj (Muslim) serves as a chaplain. DMI provides training and mentoring to the multi-faith members of the Union of Prisoners for Peace.⁹ These detainees use DNH for both personal development and planning religious support services inside the jail. In July 2010, the detainees were trained as DNH trainers, marking a new milestone of DNH innovation (See Annex 3 for more information).

⁷ Hugpong sa Kalambuan sa Dabao, Inc.

⁸ *Transformed Together: A Journey with Local Capacities for Peace*, Davao Ministerial Interfaith, Davao City, 2010. Page 24-25.

⁹ Hugpong sa mga Binilanggo Alang sa Kalinaw, or HUBIKA

DNH Usage Patterns & Impacts

The range of organizations using DNH in Mindanao is strikingly diverse. In terms of vertical spread, it ranges from grassroots civil society to the government's national efforts through OPAPP. In terms of sectoral breadth, DNH practitioners include not only the humanitarian and development assistance sectors from which DNH originated, as spearheaded by agencies like GTZ and WV, but also strong representation in less traditional sectors. Those less traditional sectors include peace work, religious services, youth empowerment, local governance and advocacy. The advocacy themes include gender, child/human rights, and environmental protection and natural resource management, often integrated with development and/or peace work. Mindanao features some unique applications of DNH in the less traditional sectors.

Issues arising during DNH analysis. Most contexts feature certain DNH issues, or types of unintended negative impact on conflict, that arise consistently across agencies. In Mindanao, perhaps the most pervasive issue is *exclusion*, or the question, "Who is included and who is left out when agencies select beneficiaries and partners?" Mindanawan society is divided along ethnic, religious and socio-economic lines. There is much overlap between those demographic factors, with Visayan migrants being predominantly Christian (majority Catholic & minority Protestant), Bangsamoro being predominantly Muslim, and Lumads divided between those transnational faiths and their own indigenous beliefs. In general, Visayan migrants hold more economic power than either Bangsamoro or Lumads. Civil society agencies have often reflected and reinforced these divisions by catering to mono-ethnic and mono-faith constituencies. Exclusion along religious lines is often linked to tensions around proselytism and conversion. However, some sectors of civil society now nurture a growing ethos of inclusion, linked to the popularization of the Tri-People concept.

Another set of prominent DNH issues revolves around the question of how agencies shape their *relationships with conflicting parties*. During humanitarian response, aid agencies may be simultaneously presented with protection offers from the national military, and with the possibility that their assistance could benefit insurgent forces or local armed groups affiliated with either side. In community development work, bias and corruption in governance is a concern, because agencies work very closely with local officials, and they want to partner in ways that promote good governance. The frequent election periods can be particularly challenging. Tony Apat of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese Center for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue pointed out that "sometimes after the election you need to start all over again to review projects and build relationships in the community." This operating environment is extremely complex, prompting more than one DNH learner to ask: 'Do no harm' to whom? And according to whose perspective?

Similarities to other case studies. A number of the DNH usage patterns at work in Mindanao have also been observed in CDA's other reflective case studies, and in the issue papers that document emerging patterns across contexts. First, it is clear that DNH, though originally developed as a program planning tool, is also used extensively for *personal development*. Among humanitarian and development assistance agencies, WV and its partners have consistently described how DNH helps local people to develop mindsets that are inclusive of Mindanao's ethnic and religious diversity. Numerous German expatriate workers recount how DNH's Implicit Ethical Messages have been influential in shaping their personal ethics and behaviors. This individual impact is seen even at the national level, with OPAPP official Rolly Asuncion describing how DNH and conflict sensitivity becomes a "way of life" among his own peacebuilding colleagues, because "you cannot give away what you do not have." Personal development sometimes becomes a foundation for organizational development, with the Davao

Ministerial Interfaith requiring all new members to undergo DNH training, “to prepare their minds for inter-faith fellowship.”

Additionally, practitioners in Mindanao use DNH in two distinct ways: *as a tool and as a lens*. Tool-style users tend to conduct rigorous explicit analysis using the DNH framework as a guide. Lens-style users tend to see a community in terms of its dividers and connectors, and implicitly monitor their own activities as catalysts that can impact relationships. There appears to be some linkage to a person’s level of exposure. After one training event, most people start out using DNH as a lens. If they receive additional training or mentoring some, but not all, will also begin to use DNH as a tool. Nonetheless, both the tool and the lens usages of DNH can be effective, whenever they help DNH users to make better programming decisions. Both lens and tool users are found at all levels, ranging from local people’s organizations to national OPAPP. Practitioners seem to agree that, whether DNH is a tool or a lens, the most important thing is to ensure that DNH insights get applied and operationalized, so that they can help improve program design.

Many people use *selected aspects of DNH*, such as the Dividers and Connectors components, and the concept of unintended negative impact. Dividers and Connectors raise people’s awareness of the context that surrounds them, particularly the existence of diverse social groups and the tensions between them. This increased attention to context leads naturally to an increased awareness of the impact of one’s own actions. Analysis of impact is often done implicitly and intuitively, consistent with the use of DNH as a lens rather than a tool.

It is also common for practitioners to place a selective emphasis on the ‘Do No Harm concept,’ in reference to the importance of avoiding unintended negative impact. This concept has become widely used, and has taken on various meanings. To some people, ‘Do No Harm’ refers specifically to exacerbating conflict by damaging inter-group relationships. To others, ‘Do No Harm’ has come to refer more broadly to any type of harm that might be done to a project participant. Some interview participants mentioned that such harm might stem from disempowering a community, or failing to consider long-term needs and capacities in the midst of a short-term project cycle.

Opinions differ in Mindanao about the suitability of *DNH for peacebuilding work*. Catholic Relief Services and GTZ tend to see DNH as a useful minimalist tool for avoiding unintended negative impact in humanitarian and development assistance work, but they do not substitute DNH for peacebuilding. On the other hand, WV has made DNH the conceptual and practical foundation for its broader conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding efforts. WV peace specialists articulate a conceptual distinction between DNH and peacebuilding, and they work on both approaches in a linked manner. However, among WV’s generalist staff and partners the terms ‘DNH’ and ‘LCP’ are often perceived as equivalent to ‘peacebuilding.’ Further, WV partners such as the Davao Ministerial Interfaith use DNH to enhance inter-group relationship building in ways that have peacebuilding outcomes.

Finally, humanitarian and development assistance agencies seeking to ‘mainstream’ DNH and conflict sensitivity articulate the risk of DNH being reduced to ‘*check-listing*.’ That is, DNH may get written into a proposal without being actively used. Or, busy implementing staff may have so many program quality issues to consider, including DNH, gender, disability, child protection, environmental protection, etc., that DNH gets reduced to an afterthought. One German expatriate explained that among German speakers, this idea translates to DNH being used as a “value seal” to ensure the approval of donors.

Combining DNH with Other Tools. Tool combinations are prevalent in Mindanao, and have much to contribute to DNH learning. At the national government level, *OPAPP's Peace and Conflict Sensitivity Program* (PSCP) module has been called “a fusion of PCIA and DNH.” PSCP is provided as capacity building support to the Regional KALAHI Convergence Groups, which are composed of local government officials, civil society representatives and other stakeholders, and serve as OPAPP's local counterparts in supporting the peace process. The four-day training includes significant technical detail, but the overriding objective is that participants will develop a conflict sensitivity ‘lens’ for viewing and shaping their work. PCIA (popularized by Kenneth Bush) is a project-level analysis that is similar to DNH in its logic of how aid impacts conflict, yet different in several other respects. PCIA assesses the risk of how contextual factors might impact project operations, in addition to the classic DNH analysis of how the project might impact on the context. PCIA also places more emphasis on indicator development, and the ethics of grassroots empowerment, particularly in community development settings. The PCIA development process has placed less emphasis than the DNH Project on the breadth of field-based learning and testing.

The overall structure of the PCSP analysis process is based on PCIA. The primary DNH influences are the conceptual focus on how project activities can unintentionally impact conflict, and the use of Dividers and Connectors to analyze what OPAPP staff member Eric Lopez calls “practical ways to look beyond the surface of relationships.” PCSP training also includes the DNH module on identifying Options for Redesign, including the Options Game. PCSP features PCIA's emphasis on facilitating grassroots stakeholders to develop their own indicators, based on local experience. One PCSP user commented that it's sometimes difficult for participants to identify indicators, but analyzing DNH Dividers and Connectors can help bring potential indicators to light. The module developers have shared that their ability to incorporate DNH into PCSP was limited by a lack of access to DNH training, information, and resource people. One developer also felt, based on the information available, that DNH was not as grassroots-oriented as she had hoped.

Among the German Development Cooperation Organizations, DED is beginning to mainstream *GTZ's Peace and Conflict Assessment* (PCA) throughout all its work in the Philippines, under the coordination of Miriam Riechers. PCA was developed by Thania Paffenholz and Luc Reychler of the University of Leuven. PCA aims to take a comprehensive macro-level view of development programming, synthesizing the existing conflict sensitivity approaches (including DNH), while increasing emphasis on risk assessment, monitoring, and the explicit integration of peacebuilding. PCA draws on DNH in at least three ways. First, the ‘Do No Harm principle,’ referring to the avoidance of exacerbating existing conflict, is emphasized as an overarching ethical rule. Second, DNH analysis in its original form is suggested as a minimalist approach for checking unintended negative impact in development programs that do not have any explicit peace-related objectives (classified as conflict intensity C-0). For programs that do have peace objectives – including every program in Mindanao and the Philippines - PCA recommends analysis tools other than DNH. Finally, PCA also suggests that the DNH framework in a slightly modified form can be used for a broader purpose, to consolidate and analytically process all the data collected using other tools.

In addition to combining DNH with other conflict sensitivity tools, some practitioners are also adapting the DNH core concepts for use in other aspects of aid work. Bonie Belonio of the World Vision Asia-Pacific Regional Office describes his team's vision for using the skeleton of the DNH framework to build their ‘Local Capacities for Resilience Framework’ against the risk of natural disasters. The central concept is that within a Context of Disaster Risk, all communities possess both Vulnerabilities and Capacities (instead of Dividers and Connectors). The programming choices of development workers can

impact those Vulnerabilities and Capacities in either positive or negative ways. As in the original DNH framework, if this analysis uncovers unintentional harm, then development workers can identify Options for Redesign in order to improve the program's impact. Bonie's team sees the DNH concept as a good fit for resilience work, and they hope that the existing familiarity of WV staff with DNH would make it easy for them to understand this new resilience framework.

World Vision Development Foundation uses the DNH framework in its entirety, and then builds on it to create other tools. In the Philippines, WV peacebuilding staff pair DNH training with another module called the *Culture of Peace*, as a two-step capacity building introduction for staff and partners. The *Culture of Peace* teaches the history of Mindanao from the diverse perspectives of different ethno-religious groups, in effect informing the DNH analysis of Dividers and Connectors. It also helps local participants to reflect on their own positioning in the Mindanao context, which contributes to their personal development. Also, reflecting WV efforts internationally, WV in the Philippines has made DNH the foundation of its broader efforts towards conflict-sensitive program design. At the local level, DNH is used in various formats, including a participatory community-based assessment process that combines DNH analysis with facilitation skills in focus group, interviewing and Participatory Learning and Action (PLA). To address zones of broader scope, WV uses Integrating Peacebuilding and Development analysis at the meso-level, and Making Sense of Turbulent Contexts at the macro-level, both of which incorporate the DNH elements of Dividers, Connectors and Impact. These internationally-used tool combinations were influenced by the outputs of the DNH Center of Learning in Mindanao.

The above examples provide a small window into the *wealth of tools circulating in Mindanao*, for use in the closely related fields of community development, humanitarian response, conflict sensitivity, peacebuilding, advocacy and governance. In one sense, this reality reflects the strong capacity of Mindanawan practitioners, including their ability to effectively use tools coming from the outside, as well as develop, test and disseminate their own approaches. At the same time, there is some concern that with so many tools circulating in Mindanao, some practitioners may find it difficult to discern and select those that best meet their needs. Father Albert Alejo of the Ateneo de Davao University has cautioned that conflict sensitivity analysis should not become so narrowly focused that people lose sight of indigenous capacities and resources for peace and development. In his words, "We need to be conflict sensitive, not conflict-focused, or conflict-obsessed." Tony Apat has suggested that the whole mix of tools should be studied, evaluated and organized into a collection, stripping away the 'branding' of the tool originators, and creating a user-friendly toolkit that meets local needs. Finally, a number of practitioners are grappling with questions of how DNH links to the consideration of other social impact issues, such as gender, child rights and human rights. In the Davao City DNH Consultation, participants expressed concern that such cross-cutting themes are often conceptualized as running parallel to each other, with little consideration of how they are inter-related. One experienced DNH trainer expressed an ongoing discomfort regarding DNH usage in situations of human rights violation. In his words: "When do you stop being conflict sensitive and turn to protection?"

Barriers to and Supports for DNH Uptake and Use

During interviews, many people said things like, "We wanted to do this, but..." or "That really helped us a lot," when talking about how and why they learned DNH or used the DNH framework and/or lens to their work. When this information was not offered as a part of the conversation, we asked what factors in the context supported DNH use, and what held it back. Around some of these factors there was consensus among participants. Other factors were mentioned by some people as a Support and others as a Barrier.

Supports for DNH

The Tool

Practitioners told us the DNH framework itself supported their uptake and use. Whether they applied DNH as a tool, or as a lens, people talked about the transformative nature of their training. They said that the tool was “an eye-opener,” or that it “changed what it meant to do my best,” or, “it’s a journey of understanding.” Rolly Asuncion, from OPPAP told us, “It is not just a tool...People use it in casual conversations around the office.” One consultation participant said, “What endears me with the framework is the use of the word, ‘options.’ You don’t get stuck, there is always a way forward.”

As mentioned above, many people use DNH *in combination with other tools*. Often people applied it alongside participatory methodologies as a means of drawing a context analysis out of stakeholders. Ruel Fegarido, a World Vision Disaster Management Specialist and DNH trainer said that using DNH with PLA during an introductory session with staff members, “helped dig up some information on the context. Participants were not hesitant to share what they knew about the context because of the PLA tools we used.” Some practitioners used DNH to facilitate dialogue among mixed groups of stakeholders. Marides Guardiola told us, “I used DNH in a training that included military. Then it became a dialogue, not just a workshop. It should always be that way.”

Many people characterized DNH as “practical,” “useful” and “based in reality.” People said they saw real changes in the context and responses from beneficiaries after they began implementing DNH. Others mentioned ways they use DNH beyond their work, in their home and family lives to help understand personal conflicts. World Vision’s group of youth DNH trainers told us that they often mediate disputes among their family members using DNH concepts, and we heard similar stories in the very different context of the Davao City Jail. Several HUBIKA members said that DNH was useful when talking to different groups of detainees or settling arguments among their fellow prisoners. Tony Apat of the Archdiocesan Center for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue (ACEID) said, “DNH concepts help us seriously share our work, to be sincere about our activities. It gives power to the community and helps us think about the timeframe of our partnership to determine how best to maximize this time.” Rolly Asuncion mentioned the practicality of using DNH to plan programs in places where the community and staff do not share a culture, “DNH reminds implementers not to get in the way of their own work and to be watchful of the values and norms of local culture.”

Bonie Belonio, a DNH trainer who currently serves as World Vision’s Asia-Pacific Regional Resilience Program Officer, told us about his earlier years of experience with DNH. While working as a WV Operations Manager in Mindanao and Aceh, Bonie applied DNH not only to programmatic decision-making, but also to managing staff: “In each team meeting, I make a point that there is some bonding time for staff. Those who are in conflict can be on a team together in bonding activities. I need to also ensure that I have time to listen to staff, and that that time is balanced. I need to listen to everybody, not just the most vocal, the most dominant, or those who are closest to me. LCP is helpful to get staff to focus on common values.”

Other people talked about *personal transformations* they underwent after learning DNH. Sister Joan Castro, of the Davao Ministerial Interfaith group told us, “Religious leaders should be a good example in the community. It is a challenge in Mindanao not to be a divider or to exacerbate dividers when you are a religious leader. LCP is not only a tool for analysis, but for transformation from exclusive to inclusive.”

Sister Joan told the story of her introduction to DNH, which took place during the practicum phase of a World Vision ToT. She had been invited to be trained by new trainees. After the first day of the training, Sister Joan did not feel that DNH applied to her. "I felt confused about Dividers and Connectors and Impacts. When your intentions are good, isn't it always a good impact? I believed that the Lord would straighten any crooked lines I made. I will do my best, but God will take care of the rest. Maybe negative impacts were part of God's plan." At the end of the first day of training, Sister Joan told the trainer, Bonie Belonio, that she did not feel that DNH was a good fit for her work or her ministry. He asked that she stay in the training and try to open her mind, that she remember that she does good work, but that sometimes there are unintended negative impacts to even the best work.

Still skeptical after the training, Sister Joan provided the trainer with her action plan to share the tool with her Healing Ministry working group, which visited Catholic patients in hospitals to offer comfort. The group decided to broaden their focus, and began to visit not only Catholic patients, but also those of other faiths. After eight years, and more exposure to DNH as a practitioner and a trainer, Sister Joan's perspective has changed. "I still do my best, but doing my best now includes knowing the context of the community fully and being accountable for my impacts."

The People

As in many places, the community of aid workers in Mindanao contains a robust *network of individuals as well as various networks of organizations that share learning and information* in formal and informal ways. In many cases, individuals function independently from their organizations on matters that they find personally meaningful or fulfilling. Many interviewees mentioned both the formal (organizationally mandated) and informal ways that individuals had supported their uptake or use of DNH.

Within World Vision there is a structure for training and supporting staff in their understanding, use and continuing development of DNH. This structure is also extended and made available to implementing partners. Hermie Carrillo told us, "continuous monitoring from Abikök (Riak of World Vision International), Monitoring and Evaluation Assessment of the Centre of Learning to observe how we did it, and being part of assessment teams really helped to understand DNH."

Individuals act as *champions* for DNH; they challenge their colleagues to think in conflict sensitive ways, they ask probing questions and help with project planning. Within World Vision in Mindanao there are several such people working within the organization and with implementing partners, though Hermie Carrillo is now the designated DNH point person. World Vision had planned for several years to establish her full-time Peacebuilding Specialist position, which carries responsibility for DNH mainstreaming. The DMI group looks to Sister Joan Castro as its DNH Team Leader, a trainer and someone to help reflect and think through impact. Within Catholic Relief Services, Ida "Deng" Giguiento and Orson Sargado manage the peacebuilding program, and their goal is to mainstream peacebuilding and conflict sensitivity into all of CRS's programmatic areas, especially emergency response. Deng, who worked for a time in East Timor on the emergency response following conflict there had credibility with the emergency response team. "I had the experience, the gray hairs, and the time in country to battle with those guys. They would shout that they were busy, and I would shout back questions about their projects. I don't believe the assertion that 'we don't have time,' or 'we're stressed.' Your response comes from your idea that you shouldn't deepen dividers."

Through the existing networks of organizations, there are a large number of capable DNH trainers working in Mindanao. Because of this capacity, DNH can be self-sustaining in Mindanao, not requiring the intervention of external agencies to 'refresh' the DNH knowledge base.

The Context

Many people said to us, during the course of our interviews and consultations, that there was an *understanding of the need for peace* in Mindanao. They said that this attitude exists among the general population, and it helps trainers and practitioners teach and use DNH. Because of this understanding, the population is aware of and sensitive to the tools and methodologies that organizations are using in their work. Because the context has had a large scale conflict over a large area for a long time, there is a high degree of scrutiny of efforts at peacebuilding in Mindanao. Dinah Dimalanta, who currently works for World Vision in Cambodia, was part of the initial roll-out period of DNH in Mindanao. She told us that when she began to work with DNH in Cambodia, “I was amazed at how [practitioners in Cambodia] saw LCP to be relevant in their context because in the context of the Philippines, there are many more divisions.”

There is also a strong history of civil society efforts in the Philippines. Grassroots efforts for peace arise in all sectors and (as mentioned above) even organizations working in the environmental sector view their context with a peacebuilding lens and incorporate conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding into their programming decisions.

The Konsult Mindanaw project commissioned by the Bishops-Ulama Conference in 2009 conducted over 300 focus group conversations with more than 5,000 people throughout Mindanao. The project asked four questions: 1) What is your vision of peace in Mindanao? 2) What are your recommendations for the peace talks? 3) What other activities must we do to attain broader peace? And 4) What are you willing to sacrifice for the sake of peace in Mindanao? After analyzing the evidence of this massive exercise in listening, Konsult Mindanaw issued recommendations for peacebuilders on six platforms: Sincerity, Security, Sensitivity, Solidarity, Spirituality and Sustainability. One of the major organizers of the Konsult Mindanaw process, Father Albert Alejo, summarized the conundrum for aid workers, “How do we make the development people more conflict sensitive and the peace people more focused on livelihoods? There is always a struggle to connect the two.”

Barriers to DNH Uptake

Training and trainers

Almost universally, interviewees said that *one DNH workshop was not sufficient* to lead to regular and sustained DNH use. We heard several estimates from three to seven workshops before a trainee would be proficient or confident enough to apply DNH in their work. Some people suggested that perhaps more workshops was not the answer, rather a structure for backstopping and coaching new trainees was needed. Sister Joan told us, “My first exposure was only that, exposure. There was no monitoring, no follow-up. I didn’t fully understand the tool. With one exposure, there is a tendency to focus on Dividers and Connectors, to misinterpret the tool as only Dividers and Connectors, without Options and Redesign. A first training doesn’t really lead to use.” Marides Gardiola made a similar observation, “Many people attend workshops and trainings and assess their projects in the context of the training, but they don’t apply it afterwards. In one workshop (the participating organization) did an assessment during the workshop, but then they didn’t go back and validate it.” Ruel Fegarido, a World Vision Trainer shared this view, “You cannot appreciate LCP in one or two meetings. I started to appreciate it after the third workshop. That was when I saw how it could be helpful and useful in my work.”

Although many people mentioned the robust network of trainers in Mindanao as a support for DNH, OPAPP, based in Manila, told us that they had a difficult time finding DNH resource people. Even for

those smaller organizations and individual consultants based in Mindanao that function outside of the DNH networks, finding a trainer or a training to join can be challenging. One World Vision staff member told us about the geographical capacity gaps in the Philippines, “Most of the LCP capacity in the Philippines is in Mindanao. The capacity did not spread to the rest of the country until 2006-2007.”

Attitudes

When training DNH, some trainers come up against the challenges or perceived challenges of participants’ attitudes towards one another. In these cases a detailed understanding of the context is extremely important when discussing the conflict. Anne Schaefer, of DED, told us that during her trainings, “Connectors are very easy to talk about, but Dividers are difficult if you don’t know who the conflict parties are. It can be difficult for a foreigner but it can be dangerous for a local.” Hermie Carrillo of World Vision agreed, “There is a feeling of discomfort when asking about Dividers with tri-people groups in Mindanao.”

Some interviewees mentioned that the numerous tools available and in use for peacebuilding, community dialogue and conflict sensitivity in Mindanao overwhelms some practitioners to the point that they became “over-tooled and unable to distinguish between them,” according to Tony Apat. An OPAPP representative said that sometimes people become intimidated by the information they get from a conflict analysis, “People are sometimes scared that they will do harm. Sometimes you cannot prevent it. Sometimes there are other things in the context that cause harm.” Anne Schaefer echoed this, “The problem with DNH is that it makes life as a practitioner very difficult. You can see what people do and how they screw up. Screw ups cannot be covered by saying, ‘it is a cultural difference’ once you know DNH.”

Systems and Structures

Several people mentioned that *corruption in government* can hinder an individual or organization’s ability to use DNH. DNH practitioners do not want to reinforce patterns of corruption. Further, it can be particularly difficult for agencies to implement DNH within their own projects if diversion of resources, favoritism and/or infighting are present within the political system. Such dynamics are perceived nationwide at all levels of government, occupying a consistent place in media reports and political analysis. The challenges can take on a unique form within the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM), where several of our interviewees have worked. One interviewee, speaking based on his experience in ARMM, said, “It is very challenging for staff to implement DNH because of the government system and the corruption and group dynamics that exist. It’s going to take some time to change that.” It is important to note, that interviewees thought that this barrier could be overcome, and that there were opportunities for change and reform in the system. For example, DNH has helped agencies to maintain independence from local political pressures in their beneficiary targeting decisions. A handful of local government leaders both inside and outside of ARMM have been trained in DNH, and have stated that they found it very useful.

One organization mentioned that they faced practical problems in implementing DNH in their work addressing flood relief in Quezon Province (near Manila). The staff needed to transfer goods from the warehouse to the community. It was suggested that they hire the military to protect the goods with guns. Staff opposed allowing the armed escort, but were unable to convince the military officers. “As much as possible, we don’t allow armed men to join us, in order to keep the trust of the community,” one staff member told us.

Another system that people mentioned as a barrier for DNH was the *aid system* itself: the dynamics of the donor-NGO relationship, internal organizational structures, and the project cycle. Many people felt that DNH was a difficult tool to classify, in terms of its purpose, audience and outcomes, so it was sometimes dismissed by some aid workers. “I critically thought about the tool, ‘this is for development aid workers and I don’t work in development’ so I didn’t use some parts of it,” Marides Gardiola told us. Within Catholic Relief Services, the peacebuilding department expressed frustration at the difficulty of “trying to convince” the rest of the organization to incorporate peacebuilding principles into their work. In 2003, the Peace and Reconciliation Department (PRD) managed an emergency response because there was no established emergency response department. The response was determined to be a success, and yet, after an emergency response department was established, the PRD is still doing a great deal of internal advocacy to incorporate conflict sensitivity into other CRS departments. CRS staff told us, “Emergency people don’t see the relevance. Every time there is an emergency, we have external people designing the response. We advocate to include local people who understand the context and cultures. Outsiders need to understand the local context. You need to situate your expertise within the context.” Among other possibilities, CRS staff have drafted a checklist that might help external responders en route to an emergency, providing guidance on what types of information to seek about the local cultures and issues.

The CRS team also expressed frustration that donors do not want to fund peacebuilding activities. “There is short-term thinking with donors at CRS. Peace work is long term. Peace programs are only supported in CRS because it is part of the agency’s core identity.” From another perspective, an interviewee from a donor organization said, “Since becoming a trainer, I’ve noticed lots of lip service to DNH for donor approval in proposals. Organizations say, ‘we do DNH’ and donors approve their proposals because they don’t have the time to check.” This attitude toward conflict sensitivity was perceived by those on the ground as well. One aid worker told us, “Management sees conflict sensitivity as a sector—a box to check. There is little recognition of impacts this has on how we conduct our work and how communities perceive our work.” One interviewee, who worked at the field level in his organization said, “There is sometimes a disconnect between what is said and what is done, between the values expressed by the organization and the values expressed by the work.” Marides Gardiola saw the problem slightly differently, “Many organizations are still doing pre-packaged programs.” Tony Apat agreed, “There is a perception in the community when you bring in projects that ‘You are just using us to get funds. You should be accountable to us.’”

Within organizations, managers and staff both expressed a sense of helplessness when it came to monitoring for DNH use on the ground. Hermie Carillo told us, “We cannot force ADP [Area Development Program] managers to integrate LCP because they have the freedom to apply or not apply tools in their ADPs. Currently, not all of our ADP managers are trained because of the transition. We have lots of new managers now. If part of the team doesn’t understand the principles, it’s hard to do the work. You can’t do the work if you’re still in the process of convincing them.” For someone in the middle, between donors and field workers there is an additional burden of convincing both staff, organizational superiors and donors, which one interviewee described, “You need to be purposeful about what you have learned. You need to be strong, especially with those at a higher level. They need factual information in order to be won over.”

Finally, some people expressed a frustration with the types of programming choices that are being made, especially by peace workers in Mindanao. Tony Apat said, “Peace workers/builders/evangelizers in Mindanao don’t have a comprehensive approach.” Father Albert Alejo characterized the problem slightly differently, “There is a high rate of interfaith dialogue in Mindanao. The problem is that the

dialogue Christians talk to the dialogue Muslims, but there is no discussion between the dialogue Christians and the prejudiced Christians. We need more intra-faith dialogue, peace people need to focus their conflict sensitivity inward.”

Barrier, Support and an Opportunity

Despite identifying significant barriers to learning, using and monitoring DNH, it is important to note that the people we interviewed, as well as those attending the consultation, were all steadfast DNH users, and their use of DNH had not been curtailed by these barriers. While they determined that many of the barriers were beyond their control, they were committed to working on the ones that they could change. And, though they saw certain factors as supports, they also felt that they could be improved upon and made to function better.

Many people, both those we interviewed and those that attended the consultation, wanted more out of the DNH network in Mindanao. People expressed a desire to be more connected and do more sharing with other practitioners. Many people are developing new tools or new applications of DNH and practitioners wanted to be able to give and receive feedback. At the consultation, participants expressed a desire to schedule more meetings and some people suggested beginning an online community for information sharing and coordination. Deng and Orson from CRS suggested creating such an online community as well as doing annual or semi-annual reflection including grassroots organizations and INGOs to share case studies and experiences.

Government in the Philippines, and particularly Local Government Units (LGUs), are very active and have extensive interface with civil society. The LGUs themselves have a major influence on inter-group relations at community level, sometimes promoting peace and other times fostering conflict. Further, civil society agencies need to consult and cooperate with LGUs in nearly everything they do. LGUs can act as a barrier to the forward momentum of an organization’s work, but can also act to support that work and take it further. For this reason, LGUs were of particular interest as an opportunity to move DNH forward in Mindanao. Consultation participants were especially interested in working with LGUs and perhaps the Department of the Interior to introduce conflict sensitivity into the government planning processes. A few interviewees have trained local government leaders in DNH, and found that they had a positive reaction to the training. One LGU in Sarangani Province, in particular, had changed some of its policies to be more sensitive to conflicts in the communities it served.

People identified that there is a challenge in communication with and between government entities at different levels. While in Manila, we learned of conflict sensitivity work that OPAPP was doing with LGUs in Mindanao. This is a significant step towards incorporating peacebuilding and conflict sensitivity at the local government level, but at the time of our visit, none of the local interviewees or consultation participants in Mindanao had been aware of this national OPAPP initiative. Still, aid workers in Mindanao are continuing to make efforts to share conflict sensitivity with LGUs, to help enhance the work of those LGUs, and to facilitate their own project implementation and the communication processes between civil society organizations and government offices. In addition to LGUs, opportunities for collaboration with other government structures include disaster response, as Deng and Orson from CRS noted, “Relief is large in the government sector. We need to reach out to leaders and orient them in DNH.”

Some practitioners expressed challenges implementing DNH in Mindanao because the context is so complex. Bonie Belonio said, “Some issues cannot be addressed as ‘dividers’ like human rights and land

issues, because they violate human rights so non-violence is no longer relevant. Can you use DNH for protection and lose sight of impacts on the community?” Other people framed this as a problem with the framework itself. One consultation participant said, “Sometimes people become so tied to the framework that they feel they have to use the whole thing. If they cannot see a way to use it, they may give up.” There was a real sense among interviewees that conflict sensitivity can become overwhelming and even frustrating. Anne Schaefer said, “If you want to do DNH correctly, you go home and explode inside from the frustration.” People expressed concern that some practitioners would stagnate because they had too much information, or asked too many questions.

Finally, there are many languages and dialects in Mindanao. During the consultation, participants had a long discussion of the particular challenges that come with such a poly-lingual community. Translations are costly and time consuming and though most people are familiar with more than one language spoken in Mindanao, it can be challenging to train DNH to local communities using less widely-spoken dialects. In some communities, transferring materials into non-written form may be necessary, because some community members may be unable to read or write. Many trainers we spoke to were able to overcome this challenge by using artwork and storytelling in trainings, rather than written case studies.

In Mindanao, a context with a long history of political, economic, ethnic, and religious conflicts, language and semantics often cause problems even for those very familiar with the context. One consultation participant said, “Words can be so sensitive across communities. For example, Catholics do not like the word ‘pastor,’ and some Evangelicals do not like to be called ‘protestant.” Another participant said, “It is important to consider how we talk about the community. In Tagalog, people often say ‘Bababa sa community,’ meaning, ‘we go down to the community.’ But it is important not to imply that the community is beneath us.” These examples, and others, served as constant reminders that language can act as a divider or a connector in Mindanao.

Youth Trainers: Davao Children for Peace and Development

Mindanao is home to the only known group of teenage DNH trainers. These youth have played the central role in a pilot program on Empowering Children as Peacebuilders, in partnership with World Vision Development Foundation (WV) and Unity for Progress Davao (Hugpong sa Kalambuan sa Davao). In 2008, WV conducted an introductory DNH workshop for thirty youth participants aged twelve to fifteen years, and then invited sixteen of them to continue on to the DNH Training of Trainers. The multi-ethnic selection was based on interviews, discussions with their parents, and recommendations from other adults such as school teachers. To provide additional support, the youth trainers also participated in *Culture of Peace* training, and their parents received orientation on DNH.

In youth DNH trainings, the content is the same as the adult version, which comes as a surprise to those who consider DNH too complex for young minds! The facilitation methodologies are creatively modified for younger audiences. WV’s master trainer Hermie Carrillo wrote a new DNH training case study, which analyzes the selection of children for development activities in an ethnically and religiously diverse community. The methodology also makes extensive use of role play and visual art, such as a graphic drawing that depicts the stages of the interagency DNH Project in the form of a human body. Each time the youth facilitators prepare to conduct a training, WV assists them by providing an advanced DNH refresher workshop, and creating ‘space’ for the youth to work as a team to freely develop their own instructional materials.

The youth trainers have formed the Davao Children for Peace and Development Association, and developed policies to ensure inclusive membership along ethnic and religious lines. They talk openly about DNH as a source of

personal growth: “From a shy girl who doesn’t know how to express herself and from somebody who doesn’t care about the things around me, I have changed...I now believe that if only we work hand in hand, we can transform lives and reform damaged relationships” (Fahra, DNH Facilitator). The youth have provided half-day DNH orientation sessions in Davao City schools, and traveled with WV to provide full-length DNH trainings for diverse groups of children in other parts of the Philippines. In 2010, youth empowerment will reach a new level when the teen trainers collaborate with WV on the first DNH Training of Trainers to be led by youth, for youth participants

Implications for Future Thinking about DNH

The diverse and innovative ways in which practitioners are using *Do No Harm*, particularly in light of the rich operational learning environment in Mindanao, have highlighted some useful questions for the future. These questions are likely to resonate across the aid, development and peace sectors, making them relevant for DNH resource people both inside and outside of CDA.

How can we support the holistic consideration of DNH together with other cross-cutting themes? The DNH framework is well suited to the consideration of how a particular sectoral or project will impact the surrounding context of conflict. However, as pointed out by participants in the Davao City DNH Consultation, impact on conflict is just one of a growing range of cross-cutting themes that agencies are required to consider. Other themes include gender, disability, environmental impact, human rights and protection. In the words of interviewee Alex Mayers, a VSO volunteer working with the Philippine Muslim Welfare Society: “I consider DNH to be one of a batch of lenses.” If DNH practice is focused exclusively on conflict impacts, without a conceptual linkage to other social impact issues, then some lens-style users may find DNH increasingly difficult to use, and some tool-style users may develop DNH-focused tunnel vision. The Mindanao case study points to some important emergent questions:

1. Should DNH workshops include a brief awareness-raising session on unintended social and environmental impacts, broadly defined, before focusing specifically on unintended impacts *on conflict*?
2. Could DNH resource materials provide guidance and/or practical examples on how DNH considerations can be integrated with other cross-cutting themes?
3. How can agencies make purposive decisions about which cross-cutting themes require higher prioritization in a particular socio-political context? Once a priority cross-cutting theme is identified, how can agencies maintain a focus on that theme throughout the project life cycle?
4. In light of the increasing emphasis on rights-based approaches, how should aid workers grapple with the perceived dissonance between rights and DNH? Is DNH always compatible with human rights and protection, or are there occasional tradeoffs? What practical guidance is available for analysis and decision-making?

What can we learn from the combination of DNH with other conflict sensitivity tools? Such combinations include the Peace and Conflict Sensitivity Program (PCSP) developed by the Office of the Presidential Advisor on the Peace Process (OPAPP), the Peace and Conflict Assessment module used by GTZ, and the linkages of DNH to *Culture of Peace* training and resilience work within World Vision (WV). These tool combinations are particularly interesting when considered in light of the emergent findings of CDA’s other reflective case studies. Our observations include the following:

1. Those aspects of DNH that are most broadly used *in general* appear to be the same aspects that are selected for *combination with other tools*. Practitioners are using Dividers, Connectors, and the concepts of unintended negative impact and re-design. People who combine DNH with

other tools may find the additional model of the DNH framework¹⁰ to be more useful than the original, since the additional model places its emphasis on Dividers, Connectors and impact.

2. Practitioners are less likely to use the detailed aspects of DNH impact analysis, such as unpacking of the aid program and identifying the patterns of Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages (RTs and IEMs). The reasons vary widely. Lens-style users tend not to talk about impact analysis, but they do it intuitively, based on their previous learning about RTs and IEMs. Seeing a change in a Divider or Connector, lens-style users implicitly understand when the change is caused by RTs and/or IEMs, but they tend not to make this linkage explicit when they communicate their analysis to others. In contrast, when tool-style users do not use the detailed aspects of DNH impact analysis in their original form, it is because they have chosen to revise or replace them. RTs and IEMs are the aspect of DNH that changes most significantly from one sector to another. RTs and IEMs manifest differently in development than in humanitarian response, and the Davao Ministerial Interfaith has identified some entirely new IEMs in the religious sector, which highlight the intangible impacts of religious beliefs, practices and leadership. Further, the developers of PCSP have opted to substitute PCIA's impact analysis components for DNH's, in part because PCIA encourages local participants to identify their own context-specific patterns and indicators, which contributes to local 'ownership.'
3. Development practitioners from agencies such as Caritas, DED, and WV make persistent suggestions and efforts aimed at combining DNH with grassroots facilitation approaches such as Participatory Learning and Action. The DNH framework and technical terms need to be conveyed using artistic expressions, localized examples and the everyday language of people who are not aid workers. It may be useful for agencies that have developed such tools to share them via the CDA networks.

How can we improve the rate of DNH application? Practitioners agree that the most significant challenge in using DNH is ensuring that the analysis gets applied and operationalized to influence programming. The Mindanao interviews affirmed some of the learnings from CDA's other reflective case studies. Most importantly, as pointed out by participants in the Davao City DNH Consultation, "just attending one seminar is not enough." People need repeated DNH exposure and mentoring. DNH trainees are more likely to progress towards application if they have applied DNH to their own lives and begun to overcome personal biases. Organizations are more likely to operationalize DNH when they keep their understanding of the 'DNH concept' focused on conflict (rather than 'harm' broadly defined), and when they ensure good collaboration between their DNH resource people and their operational decision-makers.

Despite these learnings, there is a lingering sense of frustration that heavy investments in DNH training, while usually popular among workshop participants, produce less DNH application than desired in agency programming. DNH trainers are anxious to explore how the proportion of participants applying DNH might be increased, and/or how participants can reach application more quickly. In this regard, it may be helpful to consider the emerging learnings on lens versus tool usage, and their implications for DNH training practices. In the past, DNH trainers tended to assume that effective DNH application implied tool-style usage. However, CDA's reflective case studies have surfaced the proposition that lens-style usage is also sufficient to improve programming. If this proposition proves true, then it implies that perhaps lens- and tool-style users could be trained in significantly different ways. DNH training needs

¹⁰ The Additional Model of the DNH framework was developed in 2009, based on evidence from the first of the reflective case studies. The paper, "A New Model of the DNH Framework" is available on the CDA website: http://www.cdainc.com/cdawww/pdf/issue/dnh_framework_paper_Pdf.pdf

could be assessed based on the job descriptions, learning styles and organizational cultures, and a decision could be made whether to train for tool usage or for lens usage.

Tool-style usage requires conceptual grasp, detailed analytical accuracy, and hands-on practice in analyzing real projects and identifying options for re-design. Training for tool-style usage is a multi-step process accompanied by mentoring, which requires significant amounts of time and money. On the other hand, training for lens-style usage might focus more on grasping key DNH concepts as illustrated by examples. This is a shorter training process and, though it still requires follow-up, it consumes fewer resources. Participants may be more likely to progress towards application if they are trained using methods that fit their own needs and usage preferences. Training initiatives will consume fewer resources, and may be able to reach more people, if some of those people are trained as lens users. This exploratory idea may warrant further consideration as the learnings of the reflective case studies continue to accumulate.

ANNEX 1

Interview Guide Questions

1. How did you first come into contact with DNH? (If trained, who provided the training, and who were the other participants?)
2. How do you use DNH in your work?
3. What factors make it easier or more productive to use DNH? What factors make it harder or less productive to use DNH?
4. What is the most significant change you've observed since using DNH? (Potential levels: individual, organizational, inter-agency, community, Mindanao-wide.)
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve DNH use and uptake?
6. Do you have any questions for us?
7. Are there any other people that you think we should interview regarding DNH?

Optional context-specific questions for further probing:

- a. When you do DNH analysis in your own context, what are the most important issues/learnings that commonly arise?
- b. Regarding DNH training, what approaches have you seen used in Mindanao? What approaches do you find more useful? Less useful?
- c. For trainers: In your experience, what is the most rewarding part of delivering a DNH workshop? What is the hardest part? Have you developed any DNH training innovations? Any suggestions for improving the DNH trainer's manual?
- d. What other tools do you use for project planning, or for conflict sensitivity, or for peace work? How does DNH relate to those other tools?
- e. In what operating areas does your organization use DNH? (Is it used just Mindanao, or also other areas of the country?)

Examples / Learnings on using DNH as a peacebuilding tool?

ANNEX 2
List of Interviewees

DATE	NAME	ORGANIZATION
3/08/10	Alex Mayers	VSO Bahaginan/Philippine Muslim Welfare Society
3/09/10	Marides Gardiola	Mediators Network—Trainer/Facilitator
3/10/10	Cristeta Gallano	Caritas/Rotary Club of Downtown Davao/Davao River Initiatives
	Ruel Fegarido	World Vision Development Foundation —Disaster Management Specialist
	Ust. Sara Abdullah	Davao Ministerial Interfaith – LCP Trainee
	Fr. Albert Alejo	Ateneo de Davao University/Konsult Mindanaw
3/11/10	Orson Sargado	Catholic Relief Services —Peacebuilding Program Manager
	Ma. Ida “Deng” Giguinto	Catholic Relief Services —Peacebuilding Training Coordinator
	Fr. Thomas Cataata	Davao City Jail— Regional Chaplain for the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology
	Datu Zaldy Dulom	Davao Ministerial Interfaith - LCP Trainee
3/12/10	Sister Joan Castro	Davao Ministerial Interfaith —LCP Team Leader
	Pastora Shirley Papio	Davao Ministerial Interfaith
	Pastor Rey Batiancla	Davao Ministerial Interfaith
	Salvador “Brother Buddy” Veloso, Jr	Davao Ministerial Interfaith
	Bonie Belonio	World Vision International —Regional Resilience Program Officer
3/13/10	Herminegilda Presbitero-Carillo	World Vision Development Foundation —Peacebuilding Specialist
3/15/10	Anne Kathrin Schäfer	DED – Peace & Conflict Advisor to Green Mindanao
3/16/10	Pastor Ereberto Gopo	Davao Ministerial Interfaith —Chair
3/17/10	Tony Apat	Archdiocese Center for Ecumenical & Interreligious Dialogue
	Fr. Thomas Cataata	Davao City Jail— Regional Chaplain for the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology
	Sister Joan Castro	Davao Ministerial Interfaith – LCP Team Leader
4/2/10	Dinah Dimalanta	World Vision Cambodia (formerly WV in Mindanao)

ANNEX 3

Prisoners Unite for Peace *(originally published in the DNH email newsletter, Summer 2010)*

by Michelle Garred

Thirty diverse participants gather for an introductory training in Do No Harm. They emerge with a vision for unity, and an understanding of how to contribute through their own actions. One participant explains: “We live this peace in our own self first, and then we extend it to our surroundings.” The story sounds pleasantly familiar, a scenario oft-repeated among aid workers around the world.

But look again! This DNH training is far from typical, for the participants are religious volunteers, detained and awaiting trial in a teeming urban jail.

DNH was introduced in the Davao City Jail in Mindanao, Philippines in mid-2009. The Reverend Father Thomas Augustine Catarata, Regional Chaplain for the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology, envisioned detainee peace education as an outgrowth of his own background in inter-faith dialogue. The Mindanao conflict is mainly ethno-political in nature, but religious identity is closely associated with ethnicity, leading to secondary tensions between Roman Catholic, Protestant and Muslim groups. Father Tom observed that the tensions found in local communities were also reflected inside the jail, contributing to a volatile atmosphere, and detracting from the detainees’ rehabilitation. He also saw the jail’s multi-faith religious volunteers, men who provide in-house spiritual support to their fellow detainees, as a resource to be tapped. Upon introducing inter-faith peace education, Father Tom states: “I am truly convinced of this approach, because I’ve witnessed the suffering of people due to war, misconceptions about faith, religion and ‘the other guy.’ We have to start from this point, the formation of people’s minds.”

To put his idea into action, Father Tom linked up with Ustadz Ahmad G. Ampuan, an Islamic religious teacher and visiting chaplain to Muslim detainees. Ustadz Ampuan is a leader in inter-faith collaboration, who has nurtured a vision for jail-based DNH training since he himself became a DNH trainer in 2007. Ustadz Ampuan’s colleagues in the Davao Ministerial Interfaith (DMI) stood ready to help facilitate inter-faith interactions and to provide training on DNH and other peace-related approaches. For the past five years, DMI has used DNH as a pillar of the “mind-setting” curriculum that is provided to all prospective Catholic, Protestant and Muslim members. DNH is also used for project planning, but it is personal growth applications of DNH that have most profoundly shaped the nature of relationships between DMI’s members.

Upon Father Tom’s request, DMI’s Sister Joan D. Castro first organized a workshop called Culture of Peace, which covers the macro-history of Mindanao, and helps participants to reflect on their own identity and role in that context. This was followed by a Do No Harm Workshop, covering standard DNH content plus illustrations drawn from the multi-faith religious sector. The same thirty detainees gathered for both workshops, including ten Catholics, ten Protestants and ten Muslims. Each workshop, normally three days long, was stretched to five days to accommodate the jail’s scheduling requirements. Participants experienced an ‘eye-opener’ during the DNH workshop, as the venue was intentionally rotated between the jail’s small Catholic chapel, Protestant chapel and mosque. For many, it was the first time to enter the unfamiliar worship space used by a different religious group. During Muslim prayer times, all workshop participants showed respect by ceasing activity and observing silence.

After the DNH training, the participating detainees were eager to pursue peace together. In August

2009, with the help of Father Tom and the endorsement of Jail Chief Inspector Ferdinand Pontillo, they formed an association called 'HUBIKA.' HUBIKA stands for Hugpong sa mga Binilanggo Alang sa Kalinaw, or Union of Prisoners for Peace. They began meeting monthly, and held their first public events during the annual Mindanao Week of Peace in November 2009. The activities included original music compositions, ethnic dancing, poetry and painting, all promoting peace and justice in Mindanao, and all held inside the jail. When CDA Field Associate Nicole Goddard and Consultant Michelle Garred visited in March 2010, they were greeted by the sight of wall-sized peace murals surrounding the jailyard gates, a colorful visual display created during the Week of Peace.

During that visit, HUBIKA members also shared with Nicole and Michelle how DNH and Culture of Peace have impacted their lives and their work. Like DMI participants, HUBIKA members have developed more inclusive mindsets, through forming relationships with each other, and progressively overcoming the pervasive bias and mistrust between religious groups. When HUBIKA members plan religious festivities inside the jail, access is no longer restricted to members of their own faith group. Instead, parts of this year's Islamic New Year and Christian Holy Week celebrations were held on the central basketball court, where all detainees could observe and learn. Further, HUBIKA members feel that DNH and Culture of Peace have enhanced their skills in listening and mediating conflict between detainees by providing them with contextual understanding of the "dividers" and "connectors" that affect relationships. One Muslim member said with great satisfaction: "Even though I'm detained, I still have the capacity to contribute to peace."

As a result of this encouraging growth, HUBIKA has a big vision for the future. In April 2010, DMI facilitated a reflection workshop for HUBIKA members using their new publication *Transformed Together*, which documents action research learnings on DNH usage in the religious sector. In the longer term, HUBIKA members would like to offer DNH and Culture of Peace training for many more detainees, at least one per cell group. They hope to expedite this learning by holding their own Training of Trainers inside the jail. Father Tom aims to expand the pilot peace education program, which he considers a "tool of de-radicalization for both Christians and Muslims," into other facilities through the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology. Likewise, DMI Chair Pastor Erving Gopo states, "Our desire is that HUBIKA will be an agent of transformation, and that it will be replicated in other jails."