Technical Working Group on the Confluence of Urban Safety and Peacebuilding Practice

**Report on the first meeting of the Technical Working Group
Corregidora, Mexico, 23-25 March 2015**

Geneva, 23 April 2015

Introduction

The United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG), UN-Habitat's Safer Cities Programme (SCP) and the Geneva Peacebuilding Platform in collaboration with the Municipality of Corregidora (Mexico) co-organized the first formal meeting of the Technical Working Group (TWG) on the Confluence of Urban Safety and Peacebuilding Practice. The meeting took place in Corregidora (Quéretaro, Mexico) 23-25 March 2015 and brought together around 33 senior experts on urban safety and peacebuilding practice (see Annex 1). For the programme see Annex 2.

This report accounts for the meeting results with respect to entry points for an integrated approach on urban safety and peacebuilding, and the gathering of promising practices about city level programmes and initiatives that combine elements of urban safety and peacebuilding. The report also provides an outlook on next steps.

This report has been prepared by the Geneva Peacebuilding Platform. Special thanks go to all participants for their comments and inputs for previous versions of this report.

About the Technical Working Group

The TWG brings together focal points on urban safety with practitioners from the community of peacebuilding, peace mediation and conflict prevention in order to help craft solutions to the rapidly increasing risk of conflict and insecurity in urban settings.

During a 2-year period, the objectives of the Technical Working Group are to network urban safety and peacebuilding practitioners, to expand the evidence base of practice at the nexus of urban safety and peacebuilding, and to develop an integrated approach on urban safety and peacebuilding. By achieving these objectives, the Technical Working Group contributes to major agenda-setting processes, including the HABITAT III summit in October 2016.

The Technical Working Group meets under the auspices of the United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG) and is facilitated by UN-Habitat's Safer Cities Programme and the Geneva Peacebuilding Platform. The Technical Working Group also works in the context of the progress on city initiatives within the Global Network of Safer Cities (GNSC).

1. Entry points for an integrated approach

The meeting identified several elements as entry points for articulating an integrated approach to urban safety and peacebuilding. These entry points are on the one hand about the 'how' of urban safety and peacebuilding approaches, and on the other hand about specific themes that can illustrate the intersection and difference of urban safety and peacebuilding approaches.

About urban safety and peacebuilding approaches

An ***urban safety approach*** aims to develop the capacity of urban, local, and national governments and their partners to initiate effective urban safety policies. Local authorities have a key role to play in addressing the rising public demand to reduce crime and violence. UN-Habitat acknowledges the responsibility of local authorities in preventing crime and violence, and is currently developing UN Guidelines on Safer Cities. UN-Habitat's Safer Cities programme supports local authorities in developing and implementing crime and violence prevention strategies using a systematic participatory approach:

- Identifying and mobilizing diverse local partners that can contribute to reducing and preventing crime and violence;
- Creating a local safety partnership or coalition led by a public leader, ideally the Mayor;
- Assessing, measuring, and understanding the local safety and security problems;
- Developing a local crime prevention strategy and a detailed plan of action;
- Implementing the local strategy through initiatives that work to prevent crime by improving social cohesion and community engagement;
- Institutionalizing the local participatory approach by incorporating security as a cross-cutting dimension in decisions taken by institutions such as local government, the criminal justice system, and civil society. The strengthening of institutions that work in violence and crime prevention often requires training and coaching, institutional reform, and improving urban safety policies.

UN-Habitat's Safer Cities Programme was launched in 1996 at the request of African Mayors seeking to tackle urban crime and violence in their cities. To date UN-Habitat has supported initiatives in 77 cities in 24 countries worldwide.[1]

The ***practice of building peace*** has long-established roots.[2] Peacebuilding often draws on traditional practices to resolve disputes and conflict, and to promote social harmony. While much of this practice does not use the word 'peacebuilding' to describe its activities, it nevertheless understands this practice to be about the use of dialogue, trust-building and consensus-seeking to resolve or manage conflict through non-violent means. In most regions of the world, there are significant capacities and relationships that manage violent

---

[1] For more information about the urban safety approach see http://unhabitat.org/urban-themes/safety/.
[2] For two recent reviews on peacebuilding thought and practice see V.Chetail and O. Jütersonke (2015) *Peacebuilding: A Review of the Academic Literature*. White Paper Series No.13. Geneva: Geneva Peacebuilding Platform. A. Sow (2015**)** *Peacebuilding: A Review of the Policy Literature***.** White Paper Series No.14. Geneva: Geneva Peacebuilding Platform. Both papers are available at http://www.gpplatform.ch/whitepapers/discussions/discussions.

and non-violent conflict. In some regions, such capacities and relationships are part of the traditional cultural heritage. The terminology of 'peacebuilding' was initially associated with Peace Studies in the 1970s and 1980s.[3] In Peace Studies, the popular distinction between 'positive' peace (condition of good management, orderly resolution of conflict, harmony associated with mature relationships) and 'negative' peace (the absence of turmoil, tension, conflict and war) underlines that peacebuilding has been both about ending violent conflict and about building mature relationships to manage and mitigate violent or non-violent conflict.[4]

In the UN system, the 1992 Agenda for Peace introduced the terminology of 'peacebuilding' more systematically into UN vocabulary. Prior to the Agenda for Peace, UN actors would look at 'peacebuilding' as something that would be mainly done by non-governmental organisations. But, at the time of the hand-over between Secretary-Generals Perez de Cuellar and Boutros Boutros Ghali, it was recognised that the UN could engage in certain 'peace inducing' activities that did not really fall into the UN's existing 'peacekeeping', 'peacemaking' or 'good offices' roles. Hence the need for a new term that would describe these activities.[5] The 'Agenda for Peace' defined 'post-conflict peacebuilding' as 'action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict'. However, 20 years later, the post-conflict framing of peacebuilding has been overtaken by the evolution of violent conflict and the ensuing adaptation of the response. Peacebuilding practice now occurs in a wider variety of contexts ranging from fluid political transitions to regions under increased stress due to climate change, rapid urbanization, or contentious large-scale investments.[6]

The 'how' as an entry point

Entry points for the articulation of an integrated approach exist when looking at 'how' of urban safety and peacebuilding approaches. TWG discussions suggest that the following points offer potential entry points.

- Dialogue and negotiation: Dialogue and negotiation are one of the most important tools to advance both peacebuilding and urban safety approaches. Both approaches share a belief that an exclusive focus on heavy-handed, securitized, and violent approaches is not effective to achieve higher levels of urban safety and peace.

- Process: Many peacebuilding and urban safety programmes or initiatives are based on iterative process designs that allow for greater ownership of the process by local actors and constituencies. This focus on iterative process also highlights that many practitioners are sceptical towards programmes that are implemented without considered context

---

[3] For a history of the peacebuilding terminology, see S. Ryan, 'The Evolution of Peacebuilding', in R. Mac Ginty (ed) *Peacebuilding: Ideas and Foundations (Volume 1)* (London: Sage, 2014) pp. 1-13.
[4] K.E. Boulding, *Stable Peace* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978) ; J. Galtung, 'Three Realistic Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking and Peacebuilding', *Impact of Science on Society* 26: pp. 103-115, 1978.
[5] A. Wennmann (2015) *Peacebuilding: Evolution, Trends, Visions.* White Paper Series No.18. Geneva: Geneva Peacebuilding Platform. Available at http://www.gpplatform.ch/whitepapers/discussions/discussions.
[6] See also Geneva Peacebuilding Platform (2015) *White Paper on Peacebuilding.* Geneva: Geneva Peacebuilding Platform. Available at http://www.gpplatform.ch/white-papers/whitepapers.

specific issues, and that are imposed and directed from outsiders without any constructive inclusion at the community or city level.

- Bottom up: Urban safety and peacebuilding approaches share the notion that lasting outcomes are built from the bottom-up and are context specific. The bottom up nature of programmes and initiatives does not mean that all activities focus at the local level, rather it emphasises that local efforts must be vertically connected across different levels (sub-national, national, regional, international) and be horizontally connected to different practice and experience at the same level or on the same issue elsewhere. Bottom-up approaches foster local ownership, a key ingredient for long-term sustainability.

- Multi-stakeholder partnerships: Urban safety and peacebuilding practitioners share a belief that programmes and initiatives cannot be controlled by any single actor but are multi-stakeholder initiatives. The ability to forge lasting partnerships across institutions and sectors is an important aspect for sustainability. Mutually supportive – even if different – interests (political, commercial, social, environmental etc.) can be a key component for the achievement of higher level of urban safety and peace, even if the perception about interests can infuse tension into a process that needs to be managed.

- Leadership: Peacebuilding and urban safety programmes and initiatives often grow because of the leadership of a specific individual or group. It merits attention to have a closer look at the notion of leadership at different levels, and also distinguish the categories of leadership that are of key importance in advancing the urban safety and peacebuilding agenda. Better understanding of the roles, responsibilities or limits of leadership of different actors could inform joint approaches for urban safety or peacebuilding practice. Beyond leadership *in support* of higher levels of urban safety and peace, how to deal with leadership *opposing* such processes must be more systematically integrated into programmes. Such so-called 'spoilers' can have important interests to oppose urban safety and peacebuilding approaches and can be located in formal or informal governance systems, or be affiliated to regular or illicit markets.

- Systems: Urban safety and peacebuilding approaches share a 'systems' logic on programmes and intervention. On the one hand, this logic implies a tendency towards integrated approaches that work across institutions and sectors and at different levels. On the other hand this logic highlights the enabling and disabling power of the systems that affect urban safety and peacebuilding dynamics. For instance laws, policy, or markets can have important enabling or disabling functions for urban safety and peacebuilding (e.g. restrictive counter-terror legislation, social segregation or heavy-handed security policies, or markets for drugs or counterfeit goods) and represent opportunities and challenges to reaching higher levels of urban safety and peace.

Thematic entry points

Another set of entry points for the articulation of an integrated approach exist when looking at specific themes. TWG discussions suggest that the following themes offer potential entry points.

- Process design: There can be significant learning between peacebuilding and urban safety practitioners by exchanging practical experience about process design. The peace mediation field has articulated many lessons in mediation guidance notes relevant for urban safety programmes. A specific issue from the urban safety perspectives is to receive better information about the practice of discrete engagements of 'difficult actors' that pave the way for longer term programmes or initiatives. Likewise, the progressive legitimation of processes through strategic design is an issue of central relevance across peacebuilding and urban safety field.

- Violence reduction: Stopping violence is an important *short term* issue for both peacebuilding and urban safety practitioners. There is a lot of practice from the peace mediation field with respect to ceasefires, while on the urban safety side there is significant practice of gang truces. An important shared concern is how to advance ceasefires or truces amid ongoing violence and the lessons of this issue could be beneficial to both practice communities.

- Violence prevention: Urban safety and peacebuilding approaches recognized that an exclusive focus on violence reduction will neither advance higher levels of urban safety or peace; medium to long term programmes and initiatives are necessary to ensure that violence is reduced sustainably. More importantly, urban safety initiatives help build a culture of prevention which reinforces peacebuilding. Prevention approaches to urban safety and peacebuilding combine structural prevention measures (address causes of crime and violence) and situational prevention measures (reduceing opportunities for specific crime and violence problems though for instance urban planning and management or public spaces).

- Transitional justice:[7] Peacebuilding practitioners have a lot of expertise with respect to transitional justice processes and addressing the sometimes sensitive tension between retributive and restorative justice approaches.[8] Urban safety practice could adapt this knowledge with respect to gang engagement, youth programming or urban safety initiative in conflict and crime affected contexts. From the urban safety perspective, a critical issue would be how transitional justice approaches could be applied to leaders of gangs or crime groups, or corruption networks.

- Security sector reform: Issues such as civilian control over armed forces, the political economy of the security sectors, or community-based policing, there is a significant practical base to inform an integrated approach to peacebuilding and urban safety. From the urban safety perspective a functioning security sector is key because predictable and effective law enforcement offers greater incentives to participant in programmes offering alternative livelihoods and economic opportunities.

---

[7] Transitional justice refers to "the set of judicial and non-judicial measures that have been implemented by different countries in order to redress the legacies of massive human rights abuses. These measures include criminal prosecutions, truth commissions, reparations programs, and various kinds of institutional reforms. Transitional justice is not a 'special' kind of justice, but an approach to achieving justice in times of transition from conflict and/or state repression." International Centre for Transitional Justice (2009) *What is Transitional Justice?* Available at https://www.ictj.org/sites/default/files/ICTJ-Global-Transitional-Justice-2009-English.pdf.
[8] M. Wenzel, T.G. Okimoto, N. T. Feather, and M. J. Platow (2008) 'Retributive and Restorative Justice' *Law and Human Behaviour* 32:375–389.

- Constitutional review: Peacebuilding practice has a record in facilitating constitutional reviews as part of political transformation processes. At the urban level, the issue of 'city constitutions' or 'city pacts' has been growing as a means to provide an overall framework for violence prevention and public space management. These discussions occur at different levels but may nevertheless be an entry point for an integrated approach for urban safety and peacebuilding.

- Monitoring and accountability: Monitoring and accountability are shared priorities across peacebuilding and urban safety practice. Both fields struggle with the question of accounting for 'outcomes' or 'results' as part of programme evaluations requested by donors. Urban safety approaches are advanced with respect to establishing more permanent monitoring infrastructures such as observatories, yet many technical and operational issues remain to be harmonized within and between countries. Key issues are independence from political interference and the impact of better information on changes in policy and attitudes.

- Capacity building, training and learning: Urban safety and peacebuilding communities are mainly trained separately. There is opportunity to review existing learning programs for these two (multi-sectoral) communities and explore how to launch integrated training programmes under the umbrella of city level prevention strategies. A specific emphasis lies on *capacity building*, a broader notion than training, which goes beyond individual skills building and involves institutional strengthening. Many existing learning programmes are already multi-sectoral. For example the participants in the World Bank e-learning program come from government, civil society, law enforcement, academia, among others. Also e-learning course on reducing urban risk reduction offered by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITATR) could be a useful guide.[9] It would be very interesting to think through how integrated training programs for both (already multi-sectoral communities) might look like and which tools would be prioritized at city level. IN order to advance this theme, Ideaborn prepared a paper for the TWG meeting with the aim of moving towards articulating a common training agenda for peacebuilding and urban safety practitioners.

2. Gathering of promising practices

Overall feedback

TWG discussion produced several observations about the focus and management of the gathering of promising practices, city level programmes and initiatives that combine elements of urban safety and peacebuilding practice.

- The process should reduce the emphasis on 'evidence' and focus more on 'practical experiences' or 'promising practices'. The reason is that the generation of 'evidence' is contentious and practically challenging in many contexts; it is also beyond the operational scope of the TWG as systematic evidence gathering on programmers

---

[9] See *Urban Risk Reduction: Developing and Implementing Resilience Action Plans for Cities,* http://www.unitar.org/event/urbanrisk.

and initiatives would require significant human and financial resources. The TWG should be attentive to the construction of evidence points and the relationship between a specific evidence base as a foundation for prescribing a specific type of policy or approach.

- There was broad agreement about the importance of systematizing the gathering of promising practices in the peacebuilding and urban safety fields. A starting point can be the gathering of selected existing publications and analysis of promising practices across peacebuilding and urban safety communities. This can include a literature review focusing on the entry points for articulating an integrated approach to urban safety and peacebuilding identified above.

- The guiding questions developed for gathering information about urban safety or peacebuilding programmes are considered useful and should be used as part of the gathering of promising practices (see Annex 4). The guiding questions also serve the objective to systematise the feedback along the nature, implementation, outcomes, as well as financing of a programme or initiative.

The meeting also identified specific efforts of organizations represented at the meeting that may be able to contribute to the gathering of specific experience of programmes or initiatives (using the guiding questions) or of practices relating to the specific themes (see above).

Specific cases

Public space and prevention

- Corregidora, Mexico – Municipality of Corregidora – public space creation and prevention – case study: El Garambullo case study (submitted)
- Aguascalientes, Mexico – Fundación Convive Feliz – Creation of public space and prevention – specific contribution to be discussed
- Cape Town, South Africa – Violence Prevention though Urban Upgrading – specific contribution to be discussed

Youth programmes and exits from violence or gangs

- Guadalajara, Mexico – Colegio de Jalisco – alternative livelihoods for youth – case study: Tianguis Cultural de Guadalajara (submitted)
- San Salvador, El Salvador – World Vision – Youth programmes and exit from gangs – specific contribution to be discussed
- Panama City, Panama – Fundacion Jesús Luz de Oportunidades – Youth programmes and exit from gangs – specific contribution to be discussed
- Bogota/Medellin, Colombia – Ideaborn Foundation – Youth programmes and exit from violence though sports and arts – case study: *Fondo Recuerdo* – specific contribution to be discussed

<u>Social cohesion and access to public services</u>

- Mexico City, Mexico - Laboratorio de Cohesión Social México - Unión Europea – specific contribution to be discussed

Input from larger organizations

- The gathering of promising practice can also be strengthened in relation to the practice experience across programme portfolio on urban safety of larger organizations such as the World Bank, the IDRC, UNHABITAT, SEGOB, CESUP, Interpeace, and The Hague Institute for Global Justice.
- A bilateral follow on will be necessary to identify what exactly these organizations can contribute to the gathering of promising practices.

3. Outlook

Broader strategic outlook surrounding the TWG

- <u>Ensure embedding of urban safety in the Habitat 3 Agenda</u>: This is to be done in a holistic manner based on good practise over the past two decades in particular including integrated, multi-sectoral approaches such as built interventions (public space and urban management systems), social crime prevention elements, institutional crime prevention, participatory approaches, as well as well documented, monitored and evaluated approaches aiming for impact on an improved Quality of Life of residents.

- <u>Strengthen urban safety and peacebuilding link</u>: Strong interest to identify and articulate synergies, linkages and areas of cooperation between peacebuilding and urban safety approaches and that these are part of the Habitat 3 agenda with the aim to have integrated/joint programmes in the urban sphere.

- <u>Regional platforms to strengthen exchanges and coordination</u>: Regional centres of excellence on safety as a public good are established and functional under the banner of the GNSC and as platforms for the exchange of promising practices across different settings.

Relevant meetings to advance the TWG objectives

17-23 April 2015, Nairobi	Preparatory meetings and GC 25 UN Habitat
May 2015, Addis Ababa	African Union technical meeting on safety guidelines for Africa and new Urban Agenda
3-4 June 2015, Bogota	2nd Steering Committee Meeting of GNSC, including agenda items on urban safety guidelines, New Urban Agenda, technical and political cooperation South- South
8-9 June 2015, Frankfurt,	German Crime Prevention Congress with focus on cost-benefit of crime prevention

3rd quarter 2015   TWG meeting in Beirut (TBC)

1st quarter 2016   TWG meeting in Cape Town (TBC)

Sometime in 2016   15th World Conference Cities and Ports, Rotterdam

Summer 2016   Potentially conference in Geneva to advance collaboration between urban safety and peacebuilding fields in preparation for Habitat III

October 2016, Quito   Habitat III – Ecuador

Next steps

1. <u>Meeting report</u>: Report of Corregidora meeting circulated and presented at preparatory meeting of GC25, in Nairobi, 17-23 April 2015.

2. <u>Consolidation of TWG</u>: Reconfirmation of organizations and contact point that are willing to participate in TWG process (by end April/early May).

3. <u>Outreach on promising practise</u>: Building on the results of the Corregidora meeting, TWG organizers are to review the process to gather promising practices (specially with respect to systematization) and subsequently start targeted outreach to gather practice (by end April/early May).

4. <u>Stocktaking report</u>: UNOG, UNHABITAT, and Geneva Peacebuilding Platform to draft a stock taking report about TWG by late May 2015 to be circulated at GNSC meeting in Bogota, 3-4 June 2015.

5. <u>Planning of future meetings</u>: Organizers to reach out to Beirut (via World Vision Lebanon), Cape Town (via VPUU), and Geneva (via UNOG) for future meetings. Exploration of where and how a meeting in Seoul would make sense to cover the Asian continent.

Annex 1: Programme

<u>Monday, 23 March 2015</u>

9.00   Welcome and introductions
Luis Antonio Zapata Guerrero, Municipality of Corregidora
Juma Assiago, UN-HABITAT, Nairobi
Achim Wennmann, Geneva Peacebuilding Platform, Geneva

9.30   Dialogue and trust-building processes with urban gangs
Kick-off presenter: *Francisco Jimenez*, Interpeace, Guatemala; *Franz Vanderschueren*, Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Chile

11.00 Break & refreshments - networking time

12.00 Conflict prevention and alternative dispute resolution in the city
Kick-off presenter: *Francesco Vincente,* Social Cohesion Laboratory, Mexico City; *Agnese Macaluso*, Institute for Global Justice, The Hague

14.00 Lunch

16.30 Corregidora site visit

19.30 Dinner at the invitation of the Municipality of Corregidora

<u>Tuesday, 24 March 2015</u>

9.00   Armed violence reduction and monitoring infrastructures
Michael Krause, VPUU, Cape Town; *Javier Hernandez*, UNODC, Mexico City

11.00 Break & refreshments - networking time

12.00 Group work building on the White Paper on Peacebuilding and the draft UN Guidelines on Safer Cities
- Group 1: Focus: Evidence gathering - Cases, scenarios and typologies for practice at confluence on urban safety and peacebuilding. Rapporteur: *Achim Wennmann*, Geneva Peacebuilding Platform
- Group 2: Focus: Integrated approach - Preliminary elements for an integrated approach on urban safety and peacebuilding. Raporteur: *Juma Assiago*, UN-HABITAT

13.30 Presentation and discussion on group work findings

14.00 Lunch

16.30 Corregidora site visit

19.00 Guided Tour of Querétaro

9.00   Reflections on site visits in Corregidora
        Facilitated by Luis Antonio Zapata Guerrero, Expert in urban safety

10.00   Open forum – issues we did not have time to discuss

12.00 Press conferences

12.30   Outlook and next steps
        Juma Assiago, UN-HABITAT
        Achim Wennmann, Geneva Peacebuilding Platform

14.00   End of meeting - people can leave to airport - optional lunch for those who stay

Annex 2: List of participants

1. César Alarcon Gil, National Autonomous University of México, Mexico City; Member of UNESCO chair about economic and social transformations on international drug problems
2. Juma Assiago, HSO/Lead, Global Network on Safer Cities (GNSC), Safer Cities Programme, Local Government and Decentralisation Unit, UN-HABITAT, Nairobi
3. Ernesto Bejarano Sanchez, Mayor of the Municipality of Corregidora, Mexico
4. Haydee Beatriz Cartagena de Leiva, Coordinating Unit for the Promotion and Protection of Childhood, Adolescence and Youth, World Vision, El Salvador
5. Lluvia Castillo, Centre de Seguridad Urbana y Prevencion (CESUP), Mexico City
6. Javier Diez, Director, Educación Popular y Capacitación (EPOCA), Mexico City
7. Salomé Flores, Coordinator of the Centre of Excellence INEGI on Justice, Security and Victimization Statistics, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Mexico City
8. Carmen Franco Alba, Fundación Convive Feliz, Aguascalientes
9. Sergio Salvador García García, CESUP, Mexico City
10. Magdalena García Hernandez, Mujeres Iberoamericanas en Red por la Igualdad Presupuestal, la Transparencia y la Rendicion de Cuentas, Mexico City
11. Nathalie Gendre, Project Manager, Ideaborn Foundation, Bogota, Colombia
12. Markus Gottsbacher, Senior Program Specialist, Safe and Inclusive Cities (SAIC), Ottawa, Canada
13. Jaume Guardans, Director, Ideaborn Foundation, Bogota, Colombia
14. Lucila Guerra, Subsecretaria de Prevención y Participación Ciudadana, Mexico City
15. Javier Hernandez, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Mexico City, Mexico
16. Francisco Jimenez, Latin America Office, Interpeace, Guatemala City, Guatemala
17. Michael Krause, CEO, VPUU NPC Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading, Cape Town South Africa
18. Jose Luis Leal Sanabria, Presidente, El Colegio de Jalisco, Guadalajara, Mexico
19. Karla Lugo, CESUP, Mexico City
20. Agnese Macaluso, Researcher, Conflict Prevention Program, The Hague Institute for Global Justice, The Hague, Netherlands

21. Verónica Martinez-Solares, Coordinadora de Proyectos de Investigación y Desarrollo, Proyectos Estratégicos Consultoría, Mexico City
22. Sabine Palmreuther, Senior Operations Officer, World Bank Group, Washington DC, USA
23. Diego Bernardo Ríos Hoyo, Centro de Atención Municipal, Corregidora, Querétaro, Mexico
24. Ibeth Rodriguez, Subsecretaria de Prevención y Participación Ciudadana, Mexico City
25. Rodrigo Alejandro Rodríguez Flores, World Vision, El Salvador
26. Martin Torres, CESUP, Mexico City, Mexico
27. Octavio Urquidez, Secretario Técnico del Consejo Consultivo, El Colegio de Jalisco, Guadalajara, Mexico
28. Pavel Vallejo, CESUP, Mexico City
29. Franz Vanderschueren, Director, Urban Safety Programme, Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Chile
30. Francesco Vincenti, Coordinador Asistencia Técnica Internacional   "Laboratorio de Cohesión Social México - Unión Europea", Mexico City, Mexico
31. Achim Wennmann, Executive Coordinator, Geneva Peacebuilding Platform
32. Luis Antonio Zapata Guerrero, Expert in Urban Safety, Corregidora, Mexico
33. Rafael Zevallos, Director Ejecutivo, Fundacion Jesús Luz de Oportunidades, Panama

Annex 3: Input documents

(a) Documents to inform the discussion about the elements for an integrated approach on urban safety and peacebuilding
- White Paper on Peacebuilding (Geneva Peacebuilding Platform 2015) (EN)
- Draft UN Guidelines on Safer Cities (EN)
- UN Standards and Norms on Crime Prevention (EN)

(b) Completed questionnaires
- Corregidora (SP)
- Guadalajara (SP)
- Netherlands (EN)

(c) Thematic pieces
- Towards and integrated approach to training in peacebuilding and crime prevention (ideaborn)
- Gender based violence in Ciudad Juarez (SP)
- Introduction to peacebuilding the city (Krause and Jütersonke 2013) (EN)
- Entry point for peacebuilding at the city level (Milliken 2014) (EN)
- If mayors ruled on Somalia (Menkhaus 2014) (EN)
- Introduction to conflict prevention strategies in the city (Wennmann 2013) (SP).

Annex 4: Guiding questions for the gathering of promising practices

This Annex describes lead questions for the gathering of promising practices combining elements of urban safety and peacebuilding practice at the city level. Specifically, this effort focuses on:

- The use of dialogue, trust-building, and consensus-seeking processes for programmes and initiatives aiming to improve urban safety, citizen security and the quality of life at the city level; and
- Practice that has been advanced in urban context by city level actors (e.g. mayor's offices, community organizations, companies) or by organizations active in the fields of peacebuilding, conflict prevention, or peace mediation.

The questions serve the objective to systematise the feedback along the nature, implementation, outcomes, as well as financing of a programme or initiative.

The gathering of promising practices takes place in the context of the Technical Working Group on the Confluence of Urban Safety and Peacebuilding which meets under the auspices of the United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG) and is facilitated by UN-Habitat's Safer Cities Programme and the Geneva Peacebuilding Platform.

Submission guidelines

- **Deadlines for submission: 30 June 2015, COB**
- Be concise and to the point and limit yourself to the key items.
- Provide an authentic and honest analysis based on the best available data and understanding.
- Please submit your answers in a word document and feel free to annotate any documentation.
- The questions can be answered in English, Spanish and French.
- Use one questionnaire per programme or initiative. Should you have multiple programmes or initiatives, please make multiple submissions.
- Please send your submission to **Dr. Achim Wennmann**, Executive Coordinator, Geneva Peacebuilding Platform: **achim@gpplatform.ch.**

Guiding questions

A. About the programme or initiative
1. What is the name of the programme or initiative?
2. What was the specific nature of the dialogue, trust-building, and consensus-seeking processes in the programme or initiative?
3. What was the overall problem the programme or initiative was supposed to address or prevent? What was the overall context of the programme or initiative?
4. What was the target group, target area and duration of the programme or initiative?
5. What was the theory of change applied?

B. Implementation

    6. Who was responsible implementing the programme? Were there any partnership arrangements to implement the programme? How many individuals were involved in the implementation (paid staff / volunteers / general population)?

    7. What were the three most important elements that helped achieve the aims of the programme or initiative? And how?

    8. Was there any specific role of leadership? If yes how did leadership influence the implementation?

    9. What were the three most important challenges during the implementation? How did they affect the implementation?

    10. To what extent do you think the activity is replicable in other national, cultural, urban or rural contexts?

C. Outcomes

    11. What monitoring framework was used for the programme or initiative? Which specific goals were set (if any)?

    12. What were the most important outcomes of the programme and initiative in qualitative and/or quantitative terms?

    13. Was there a difference of opinion or perception about the outcomes among the stakeholders or target group?

    14. Are there any publications that present and discuss your programme or initiative and its outcomes in detail.

D. Financing

    15. What was the cost of the initiative (per year/total) (state national currencies and USD equivalent).

    16. Who financed the initiative? Was there a specific financing mechanism?

    17. Was financing of the initiative tied to specific conditions? If yes, what were these conditions?

E. Other observations

    18. Do you have any other observations about the programme or initiative?

F. Information about this submission

    19. What organization submitted this information?

    20. Who is the contact point for this information? (name, title, e-mail, telephone)