

# Innovative and Sustainable Approaches to Supporting Peacebuilding

Dr. Craig Zelizer

CENTER FOR  
CONFLICT STUDIES



# Innovative and Sustainable Approaches to Supporting Peacebuilding

Dr. Craig Zelizer

CENTER FOR  
CONFLICT STUDIES

## **İstanbul Enstitüsü**

İstanbul Enstitüsü toplumsal, iktisadi ve siyasal alanlarda yenilikçi bilgi ve fikirler üretmek amacıyla yüksek kaliteli, nesnel ve derinlemesine analizler yapma hedefiyle kurulmuştur. Amacımız bu bilgi ve fikirler ışığında müreffeh, barış dolu bir dünya için en güvenilir ve uygulanabilir analizleri karar vericilerin kullanımına ve kamuoyunun hizmetine sunmaktır.

Innovative and Sustainable Approaches to Supporting Peacebuilding

## **İSTANBUL ENSTİTÜSÜ**

İstanbul Toplum Siyaset ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Enstitüsü  
Tophaneli Caddesi, Aygün Sokak, Altunizade Plaza No:4/A  
Altunizade/ Üsküdar/ İSTANBUL, TÜRKİYE

**Yazar: Dr. Craig Zelizer**

**İstanbul Enstitüsü Yayınları**

Birinci Basım: Ekim 2015

Copyright © Ekim 2015

Tüm hakları saklıdır. İstanbul Enstitüsü izni olmadan bu yayının hiçbir kısmı elektronik ya da mekanik yollarla (fotokopi, kayıtların ya da bilgilerin arşivlenmesi, vs.) çoğaltılamaz.

Bu yayında belirtilen görüşlerin tümü yazarlara aittir ve İstanbul Enstitüsü'nün kurumsal görüşleri ile kısmen ya da tamamen örtüşmeyebilir.

# CONTENTS

Abstract	6
Introduction	7
The Growth Of Peacebuilding	8
What Are The Sources And Scope Of Funding In Peacebuilding?	9
Sustainability	12
Innovation	14
Social Entrepreneurship	14
Crowdfunding	17
Social impact bonds	19
Ethics, Further Research And Concluding Thoughts	20
Works Cited	22
Contact	25

## Abstract

Over the past 20 years, peacebuilding has rapidly grown as a field. Thousands of organizations are having an increasingly positive impact on reducing conflict and facilitating peaceful transformation of societies. Activities range from grassroots work at the community level to facilitating improved relations between identity groups, to working at the national level building societal resilience, and at the regional and international levels to develop improved institutional and human capacity to respond to conflict.

In order to maximize the impact of peacebuilding there is a need to develop a long-term approach, and vision, as well as sustainable programs and institutions. However, there is a fundamental challenge regarding the long-term needs of countries in conflict, and the relatively short-term nature of funding provided by most donor organizations. Although in recent years the recognition of the need for sustainable peacebuilding work has increased, in practice there has been little consensus of what sustainability means, or how to achieve it in a competitive and often short term driven funding environment.

This paper focuses on two main issues. The first is the concept of sustainability and how donors and peacebuilding organizations operationalize the term in practice. The second is exploring innovative ways that peacebuilding organizations are advancing sustainable financing through new tools such as social entrepreneurship, crowdfunding, social impact bonds, and other innovations as the field grows into peacebuilding 3.0.

## Introduction

Over the past 20 years, peacebuilding has rapidly grown as a field and is having an increased positive impact on reducing conflict and facilitating the peaceful transformation of societies. There are now thousands of organizations that dedicate, in whole or in part, a substantial portion of their work in this area. Activities range from grassroots work at the community level, to facilitating improved relations between identity groups, to working at the national level to improve societal resilience, and at the regional and international levels to develop improved institutional and human capacity to respond to conflict.

In order to maximize the impact of peacebuilding there is a need to develop a long-term approach, vision, sustainable programs and institutions. However, there is a fundamental challenge regarding the long-term needs of countries in conflict, and the relatively short-term nature of funding provided by most donor organizations. Although in recent years there has been increasing talk about the need for peacebuilding work to be sustainable, in practice there has been little operationalization of what sustainability is, or how to achieve it in a competitive funding environment.

There are numerous sources of financial support for peacebuilding work around the world, ranging from foundations, governmental and intergovernmental contracts and grants, individual donors and many new emerging trends. Most traditional donor funding doesn't provide a long-term safety net to help facilitate sustainable peace. Organizations frequently need to stretch to fit their projects and goals to the donor's interests. In addition, in countries affected by conflict, there is frequently little or no domestic capacity to provide sustainable support for peacebuilding type activities.

This paper will explore two main issues. The first is the concept of sustainability and how donors and peacebuilding organizations operationalize the term in practice. The second is the examination of innovative ways that peacebuilding organizations are advancing sustainable financing through new tools, including social entrepreneurship, crowdfunding, social impact bonds, and other new trends as the field grows into peacebuilding 3.0.

---

## The Growth of Peacebuilding

---

The Alliance for Peacebuilding (AFP, 2012) carried out an innovative study entitled *Peacebuilding 2.0 Mapping the Boundaries of an Expanding Field*, in which they explored the growth of the sector. In the report, AFP (2012, 15) defined peacebuilding 1.0 as a field that emerged largely out of conflict resolution processes such as “mediation, negotiation and dialogue and social movements such as the nuclear disarmament efforts that began to that increased their work with the end of the cold war.”

As peacebuilding has grown into its 2.0 version, there are several key aspects to take into consideration. Peacebuilding has now expanded to something much greater and is now being integrated across diverse sectors ranging from technology, to humanitarian relief and security, creating what Zelizer (2013) terms “integrated peacebuilding” to illustrate the cross sectoral nature of the field. A strong infrastructure has emerged that is facilitating increased collaboration and impact among the many stakeholders involved in peacebuilding and related fields (AFP, 2012; Zelizer, 2013).

Peacebuilding has increasingly become a part of the larger development discourse and practice. Many bi-lateral development agencies, ranging from USAID to DFID, have started units that are now engaged in peacebuilding activities (Zelizer, 2013). Major multilateral organizations such as the United Nations have numerous branches actively engaged in peacebuilding activities, such as the United Nations Development Program, UN Women, and the UN Peacebuilding Fund. Other institutions such as the African Union and the Organization of American States have increased their work in this area as well.

There are also regional and international networks that have formed in the past decade to help the field coordinate efforts, advocate for increased funding and support, and document and learn from best practices as well as failures. In almost every region, there are now networks convening key organizations. These include global networks such as the Global Partners for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, subdivided into 14 sub regions, the Alliance for Peacebuilding, the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office, as well as other more specific regional networks such as the West African Network for Peacebuilding (GPPAC, nd; Zelizer, 2013).

Despite the growth in peacebuilding activity, the field still remains drastically underfunded and is dwarfed by its richer cousins in development, humanitarian relief and other sectors.



## What Are The Sources and Scope of Funding in Peacebuilding?

To date it has proven very difficult to generate accurate figures about the nature and scope of funding for peacebuilding around the world. A significant portion of the challenge is due to the diffuse nature of the term and difficulty in defining what peacebuilding is and isn't. Some organizations use peacebuilding to refer to a particular activity, while many use the term to refer to the wider field (Zelizer, 2013). As Zelizer (2013, 8) explains, "the debate over terminology is unlikely to be settled anywhere in the near future."

This conceptual and definitional confusion makes a clear understanding of the nature of the peacebuilding industry challenging. Unlike international development assistance, where there are relatively clear standards, there is no centrally agreed upon tracking mechanism for peacebuilding funding around the globe. The Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) has made some efforts to track spending, which will be discussed below. Yet but much greater efforts need to be made.

In exploring the nature of funding for peacebuilding, it is first important to highlight several key figures regarding the global economy and spending on key priority areas, such as defense. For example, The World Bank (2015) calculated that in 2014 the Total Global World Economic Output was 77.87 USD Trillion.

In terms of the global cost of violence and conflict, the Institute for Peace and Economics (2014, 10) estimated that cost of violence containment for 2012 was 9.46 trillion USD or 1,300 USD "for each person in the world." IPE also estimates that the global cost of violence containment is more than 11% of the Gross World Product (2014, 4).

The Institute for Peace and Economics acknowledges that money is needed to contain violence, but the current amounts are based on a fundamental mismatch of priorities, needs, and outcomes. As the report explains (Institute for Peace and Economics, 2014, 5), "much of the expenditure on violence containment is fundamentally unproductive, and if redirected toward more productive pursuits, would improve government balance sheets, company profits and ultimately, the productivity and wellbeing of society."

In further exploring violence containment a particularly significant amount goes to global defense spending which in 2012 totaled more than 1.5 trillion dollars.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile total spending on the 15 UN peacekeeping missions (United Nations, n.d.) with over 100,000 staff is less than 10 Billion USD per year.

The overall level of international development assistance provided by the 29 bi-lateral development agencies that are members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of (OECD Development) in 2014 was 135.1 billion USD. The DAC only includes official development provided by mostly Western bi-lateral aid agencies.<sup>2</sup> Increasing support is also coming from emerging donors, such as Turkey, Brazil, Qatar, China, and others.

It was only in 2004 that conflict, peace and security became a sub-category of development activity in the DAC. This is divided into a number of areas ranging from security system reform, to peacebuilding, to removal of land mines. Funding in 2004 in this area was over 800 million USD, increasing to a high of over 3 billion USD in 2010 and dropping to 2.8 billion USD in 2012 (OECD Stats).

Aside from bi-lateral assistance, a large number of private foundations also provide support for peacebuilding. Much of the funding in the early days came from private foundations, such as the Hewlett Foundation (2005), over a 20-year period, invested over 160 million USD in US and international conflict resolution programming. Many other foundations, both large and small, have also provided critical support. In an effort to better coordinate the field's foundational support, a group of funders (almost exclusively US based) formed the Peace and Security Funders Group in 2009 (PSFG, 2010; Zelizer, 2013).

In a report on collective funding by the PSFG for peace and security in 2008 and 2009 (more recent data isn't reported by the group), total funding for the larger field from US based foundations was 257 million USD (2010, 11). The organization doesn't have a specific peacebuilding category, but the closest ones might be the categories of preventing and resolving violent conflict, which received over 67 million USD in support (PSFG, 2010, 11).

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://press.ihs.com/press-release/aerospace-defense-terrorism/global-defence-budgets-overall-rise-first-time-five-years>

<sup>2</sup> See <http://www.oecd.org/dac/dacmembers.htm#members>

In addition to organizational donors, it is very difficult to gather comprehensive data on what percentage of funding comes from individual donors. In the US alone, total charitable giving for 2013 was 335.17 billion USD, with individuals providing 72% of total funding.<sup>3</sup> Thus, individual private donations can be a significant percentage of funding, but to date it is difficult to find accurate figures for the peacebuilding field. One example of an organization that has built a substantial individual donor base is the UK-based organization Peace Direct (n.d.) that funds and supports local peacebuilding efforts in conflict-affected areas. In 2012, the organization's total budget was almost 900,000 GBP, with 31% of all support for their work coming from over 2,000 individual donors, and 65% from grants (Peace Direct, n.d.).

In exploring the various mechanisms for maintaining support, it is clear that although the level of support for peacebuilding has increased, the overall level of funding is still low in comparison to the need and resources spent in other sectors. An astonishing example is that more money is spent each year on caring for and buying supplies for pets in the US than the US provides for international development assistance (Manning 2014; Zelizer 2013). In a similar vein, global spending on cosmetics is over 220 billion USD per year, far outpacing spending on development.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=content.view&cpid=42>

<sup>4</sup> See <http://www.redorbit.com/news/technology/1112694499/global-cosmetics-manufacturing-industry-market-research-report-now-available-from/>

---

## Sustainability

---

One of the central issues confronting peacebuilding, and most development-programming, is the issue of sustainability. John Paul Lederach (1997), a leading peacebuilding scholar, has emphasized that it can often take a generation or more to create the relational and structural changes needed to foster sustainable peace. Often sustainability is a box that organizations check when soliciting funds from donors and vice-versa, without being adequately developed.

A key issue is that much of the peacebuilding work in the world has become projectified (Zelizer, 2013). As Zelizer (2013, 49) explains, “One of the fundamental challenges in the international aid and conflict industry is that most donors support efforts on a short-term, project-focused basis.” It is crucial to emphasize that there is a significant difference between the short-term nature of much of the project-focused work and sustainability of the field.<sup>5</sup>

There is still a long way to go in operationalizing and defining sustainability in peacebuilding. Currently, most donors require organizations applying for support to explain how the project and the overall work will be sustainable. In a recent USAID (2012, cited in Zelizer, 2013, 305) sponsored call for conflict management funding, the agency highlighted sustainability by emphasizing “the proposed activity must promote, strengthen and be supported by sustainable local organizations that can champion sound concepts, innovative practice and changes beyond the life of the award.” While this is a wonderful concept to strive for, in practice things are very different.

In resource-strained, conflict-affected societies it can be difficult for organizations to survive, let alone meet all the goals outlined by USAID. In addition, organizations often need to do the “funding dance”, where programs are created or modified in a way that may not be central to an organization’s core mission or the building of peace, but fit the goals and interests of donor organizations (Zelizer, 2013). As Zelizer (2013, 305) explains, “there is often a significant gap between donor priorities and local needs.”

---

<sup>5</sup> Woodrow Peter and Craig Zelizer, personal correspondence on LinkedIn, Feb 28, 2014

Moreover, civil society may have a perverse chain of accountability, and be more accountable to international donors and needs, than to local needs. As a review of civil society activity in Bosnia-Herzegovina conducted by a UK based organization (Sterland, 2006, 15) summarized, “The immediate chaos of severe humanitarian crisis and the subsequent response of international aid agencies to renovate shattered infrastructure and stimulate social reconstruction provided a climate for the early burgeoning of civil society sectors which, consisting of numerous, donor-dependent, Western-style NGOs, were weak, fragmented and largely unrepresentative of the societies in which they operated.”

Another crucial issue to highlight regarding sustainability is that the field is becoming professionalized (AFP, 2012; Zelizer, 2013). While this is a wonderful development and can help improve the practice, effectiveness, and impact of peacebuilding, there is also danger for many of those entering peacebuilding not as a profession but out of pure necessity to foster change and resist conflict in very difficult environments frequently confusing for their time or risk. The field needs to carefully explore the proper balance between professionalism and grassroots peacebuilding done by committed individuals. It may be entirely possible to sustain some peacebuilding work through volunteer based social movements that do not require extensive financial support. Yet although even the most grassroots of movements will require some support for transport, food, and other expenses that may arise in the course of activities.

Paffenholz et al. (2010) also discuss the challenge that many community based efforts that aren't formal NGOs, face in obtaining resource support from donors. Community institutions that do not fit the format of international donors, while engaging in excellent work, may not receive support.

In examining the overall level of support for the field, AFP found (2012, 26) that many of its 66 members (in 2014 closer to 80) have very small budgets. Over 60% of AFP members have a budget of less than 500,000 USD per year and AFP calculates the total collective budget of their membership is around 52 million USD. This is a fraction compared to the over 13 billion USD collective budget of the members of Interaction, the leading U.S. based humanitarian and development network (AFP, 2012, 26). The challenge is that there needs to be much greater research into the financial composition of the budgets in terms of where the resources come from, but there is little indication of strong innovation taking place in the field. Unsurprisingly, the top obstacle that Alliance for Peacebuilding (2012, 31) members identified to effective peacebuilding is the lack of resources (with over 81% identifying this as a key problem).

Many organizations are struggling to stay afloat, let alone find innovative means of remaining sustainable. While some of the largest organizations such as Search for Common Ground, Interpeace and Partners for Democratic Change have managed to build robust budgets in the tens of millions of US dollars, as well as a diverse funding pool, for most institutions this is not the case.

## Innovation

As highlighted, the lack of resources to support peacebuilding is a major obstacle to scaling up the impact and reach of the peacebuilding field. As explained in the AFP report (2012, 45), “Scarcity of resources is a very serious obstacle in the peacebuilding field. Peacebuilding 2.0 will be effective and sustainable only if there is ample funding to support the expensive and time-consuming process of coordinating action across a wider cross-section of practice. Addressing this funding scarcity requires joint advocacy, creative methods to request or seek funding from new and traditional donors, linking with the energy and resources of the private sector, and joint fundraising (as opposed to competing for scarce resources in the field).”

Within the larger field of social change, over the past two decades there have been several key areas of innovation around raising resources through creative means. These include social entrepreneurship and business, crowdfunding, direct giving and social impact bonds. Some of these approaches are already being used in the peacebuilding sector as a means of growing the field’s work, but much remains to be done. In this section, each of these innovations will be explored with brief and relevant examples from the field.

### Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship is a booming field that has grown exponentially over the past few decades. Similar to the peacebuilding field, social entrepreneurship has proven very challenging to define, as the concept has different meanings and definitions. One unique factor in social entrepreneurship is that in many cases the approach also incorporates business-like principles (and even operates as a business) in scaling up change (Dees, 2001).

There are many existing intersections between peacebuilding and social entrepreneurship as both seek to foster creative disruption, facilitate large-scale policy change, find innovative ways of creating social values, and maximize accountability. In fact, one of the key social entrepreneur institutions, the Skoll Foundation (n.d.), is actively investing at the intersection of the two fields. Skoll defines social entrepreneurs as “society’s change agents, creators of innovations that disrupt the status quo and transform our world for the better.” Since the foundation was created in 1999 (Skoll, Peace and Security, n.d.), it has awarded more than 400 million USD, and Peace and Security is one of its core areas of focus.

There are many other key organizations working at the intersection of social entrepreneurship and peacebuilding. One is Ashoka, which is a pioneer. Over the past three decades Ashoka has selected over 3,000 fellows who are changemakers in their respective societies and sectors.<sup>6</sup> Out of the fellows, approximately 80-100 focus on peacebuilding, related issues as a central theme of their work (Paul, 2011). Once selected, fellows generally receive three years of financial support, so that they can devote their attention to scaling up their work. In addition, they receive extensive support, coaching and mentoring from Ashoka staff and the global Ashoka fellow community. In terms of peacebuilding, as former Ashoka Peace Program Manager Roshan Paul (2011) explains, “[...] these visionaries believe in the possibility of solutions that do not yet exist – and go on to create them [...] social entrepreneurs focus on changing the rules of the system that is creating the conflict.”

One of the peacebuilding organizations that has adopted social entrepreneurship as a core strategy in its mission and practices is the Partners for Democratic Change Global Network. Founded in 1989, Partners has a global network of 22 independent centers working in conflict-affected countries around the globe. A central point of their model is the deliberate decision to support innovative and locally led centers that almost always have a leading social entrepreneur as the founder in each country. As explained in a recent evaluation report (Partners 2013, 5-6) of their global programs “Partners believes the work of local social entrepreneurs to make a difference in their own countries is strengthened and legitimated by technical and relational support from an international network of like-minded professionals facing similar challenges.”

There are several key lessons for funding in the peacebuilding field to draw from the field of social entrepreneurship. One is the need to explore creative means to scale up funding and impact. This can include diverse approaches to funding that go beyond the traditional channels, to looking at fee-for-service and business models, corporate partnership, and other means.

In particular, the peacebuilding field could do much more to expand its fee-for-service and business approaches. What this means in practice is finding ways to provide services, whether it be training, research, capacity building or other activities for a fee. Ideally this particular revenue stream can support not only a core part of an individual’s salary or the larger organization, but be a means to help maintain and grow peacebuilding work. This is similar to a “Robin Hood” type of approach (sans theft) of obtaining resources from clients and using the extra funds to do direct work in the field.

Among the Partners for Democratic Change Centers (Partners 2013, 23), “about half the Centers have either created “for-profit” businesses providing fee-for-services to individuals and businesses to supplement their non-profit business (often with shared staff between the for-profit and non-profit arm) or have added a fee-for-service funding stream within their Center.”

---

<sup>6</sup> See <http://ashoka.org>

There are also relatively untapped opportunities in the business sector in general. Total foreign direct investment by private sector business in 2012 was over 1 trillion USD, with over 600 billion USD being invested in developing countries (Zelizer, 2013). The total remittances that diaspora populations living outside of their home countries have sent back during the year topped 350 billion dollars (Zelizer, 2013). Both of these could be more connected to peacebuilding initiatives where possible.

There are several other notable examples of social entrepreneurial approaches to facilitating and funding peacebuilding. Over the past several decades as the corporate social responsibility field has grown, there has been a strong push by many businesses to move beyond the pure profit motive, and also ensure business operations benefit people and the planet, something also known as the triple bottom line. More recently there has been a push to add peace in creating a quadruple bottom line. One of the most well known innovators in this area is Daniel Lubetzky. He is a social entrepreneur who founded Kind Bars, a healthy power bar now approaching nearly a billion dollars in sales each year. He also founded Peaceworks, which uses business approaches to facilitate economic growth and positive interaction in conflict zones<sup>7</sup>. Peaceworks has a commitment to not only advancing economic growth and understanding through its business operations, but also to ensuring that 5% of all profits go to peacebuilding. To date the majority of these funds have gone to support One Voice, one of the leading organizations in Israel and Palestine advocating for a just two-state solution to the conflict.

On a more micro level, noted scholar and practitioner Dr. Mark Young has used his extensive expertise in negotiation, business, and training to build a successful consulting practice where he conducts training and coaching for leading private sector institutions in Europe. From the funds raised through private sector work with a small foundation awarding approximately 60,000 USD in grants per year, he funds innovative conflict and peace work around the world.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See <http://peaceworks.com>

<sup>8</sup> Private conversations with Dr. Young. For more information see <http://rationalgames.org>



## Crowdfunding

Crowdfunding (CF) is an innovative way many organizations, entrepreneurs, and artists are attracting investment in their work around the world. The modern crowdfunding movement emerged in 1997 (Fundable, n.d.), when a band funded their tour through donations from US fans. According to Lehner (2013, 289), crowdfunding is a “means of tapping a large dispersed audience, dubbed as ‘the crowd’, for small sums of money to fund a project or a venture. CF is typically empowered by social media communication over the Internet, for example embracing user-generated content as guides for investors.”

Crowdfunding is not a completely new concept. For generations, families, friends, and communities pooled together resources to support many different types of projects, ranging from social welfare, to business, and charity (Fundable, n.d.). What is new about crowdfunding is the intensive use of new media to scale up the global reach.

Since 1997, there have arisen dozens of crowdfunding platforms around the world, with many specializing in a particular niche such as the music or film industry, start-up technical firms, and several in international development industries. In some ways crowdfunding is rapidly changing the donor landscape: instead of traditional donor mechanisms, individuals and organizations can now reach out to a global community of potential donors who want to invest in their ideas. According to Deloitte (2013), crowdfunding in 2013 reached 3 billion USD.

The top crowdfunding platform related to international development is Global Giving. This site was launched in 2002 its mission is to “catalyze a global market for ideas, information, and money that democratizes aid and philanthropy” (Global Giving, n.d.). Since its launch Global Giving has been able to raise over 100,000,000 USD and to support almost 10,000 projects with contributions from almost 400,000 donors (Global Giving, n.d.)

One of the pioneers of crowdfunding, Kickstarter (n.d.), recently topped a milestone of having reached over 1 billion USD in funding, with almost 6 million people supporting projects and funding of over 57,000 projects. It is important to note for all crowdfunding websites, including Global Giving and Kickstarter, that having a project listed on the website does not mean the project will be executed and reach its goal. On Kickstarter (n.d.), for example, only about 43% receive full funding.

Global Giving tracks the funding for its projects in broad categories including education (its top funded category), health, and children. Unfortunately Global Giving doesn't have a subcategory for tracking funding or the number of peacebuilding projects. In a search on their site, 12 of its current projects have peacebuilding linkages (in all or in part)<sup>9</sup>. In another search on the major crowdfunding platforms it also became apparent that there are few peacebuilding projects listed.

Crowdfunding is not a magic solution to raising funds, as individuals and organizations need to be able to compete in the increasingly crowded funding marketplace. In addition, they still need to have a compelling product, and story, and still work within the dominant project-focused paradigm. However, there is still tremendous potential to scale up work around peacebuilding and crowdfunding. This area needs more work and research.

In a similar vein, another relatively new movement has begun to develop in international development: this consists of providing funds directly to poor communities in developing countries. Give Directly is one of the pioneers in this area. In its model it selects some of the poorest communities in Kenya and Uganda, and through a rigorous selection process provides unconditional cash transfers directly to individuals. The concept is that individuals on the ground will best know how to use the resources, which can help lift them out of poverty. In an independent study (Haushofer. & Shapiro 2013) of Give Directly's work in Kenya, scholars found a positive impact on poverty, revenue streams and many other areas.

To date, there has not been a similar program of unconditional cash transfers to conflict affected communities (yet there have been many conditional cash transfers for DDR programs, public works projects, etc.). This also is something that could be worth integrating into peacebuilding work.

---

<sup>9</sup> See <http://www.globalgiving.org/dy/v2/content/search.html?q=peacebuilding>

## Social Impact Bonds

Another recent development in the funding world is the launch of a relatively new vehicle to fund social programs, called Social Impact Bonds. These programs originated in the UK but have now started to sprout up around the globe. Conroy (2013, 1) defines the phenomenon of social impact or “pay for success” bonds as one in which “a private investor funds a non-profit or other social service provider with the goal of achieving a social good, such as reducing unemployment rates or prison recidivism; if the goal is reached, government savings from the benefits of the program are paid to the investor by the government. If the program fails to reach the predetermined benchmark, the cost of the project rests entirely with the investor.”

Social impact bonds are based on rigorous monitoring of progress and results, and they transfer the risk of a project being successful largely to the private sector (Liebman. & Sellmand, 2013). The first one was launched only in 2009 in the UK and is focused on reducing recidivism as prisoners leave the prison of Peterborough. The fund has raised over 8 million USD (Social Finance, 2012, 9). To date most Social Impact Bonds have focused on social and policy issues within a particular developed country. The Center for Global Development and Social Finance (2013) pioneered the concept of Development Impact Bonds. As explained in their recent policy report (CGD, 2013, 20), “like other results-based approaches, DIBs aim to align development funding more directly with improved social outcomes and increase the accountability of development spending. However, unlike other approaches, DIBs also provide a source of capital for interventions to be implemented, and allow governments or service providers to share risks with private investors.”

Stone Conroy (2013) has carried out pioneering research on the potential for social impact bonds to be linked to peacebuilding work. Unfortunately, to date no such bond has been designed. As Conroy explains (2013, 16), “If SIBs are truly going to take a larger role in delivering social services and development work, it would behoove professionals in the business and peacebuilding world to examine how SIBs fit into the mix.”

---

## Ethics, Further Research and Concluding Thoughts

---

As stated previously, the funding and sustainability of peacebuilding is a critical issue as the world continues to confront the challenge of preventing, managing, and responding to the too frequent outbreak of violence and the devastating impact it has around the world. There is no single magic solution to increasing funding to levels that would truly support revolutionary work. However, it is clear that in today's resource constrained environment organizations need to undertake more innovative efforts to expand support from diverse financial stakeholders. This, of course, is in addition to urging policymakers and others to increase their support for the peacebuilding field.

Sustainability, moreover, does not only refer to financial sustainability. In a report from AUSAID (2000), some other key factors in sustainability include participation and ownership, building capacity, and influencing policy, among others.

It is important to note that each potentially new form of funding also has inherent risks and challenges. Although crowdfunding is dramatically changing the funding landscape, there is a danger that funding may not go to the projects that need it the most or that will have the most impact, but instead to the ones that appear to frame their message in the "coolest digital terms." While Social Impact or Development Impact Bonds can work, there are many critiques, including the risk that privatizing a public responsibility can raise inherent ethical dilemmas about the nature of public policy.

In considering innovation, therefore, there is a need to ensure that a realistic and also critical approach to any single effort is taken and not a blind jump on the latest innovative funding model.

There is also a need for much greater research on sustainability in peacebuilding in general, and developing better tools for tracking funding where possible. Key questions include:

- What are the primary sources of funding for the field globally, regionally and locally?
- How does the fact that most funding comes from governmental and intergovernmental sources affect the independence of organizations and practice?
- Which organizations have managed to create flexible and innovative models of funding and how can these be used to inspire others?
- What skills are needed in the next generation of practitioners in this area?
- What do academic programs need to teach to improve innovation and sustainability?
- How can the field best capture, document and share lessons on innovation?

The tremendous growth of the peacebuilding field has done a great deal to help facilitate more peaceful relations in countless communities around the globe. However, as emphasized throughout this document, many challenges remain, and there is a desperate need to scale up innovations in the field.

---

## Works Cited

---

Alliance for Peacebuilding (AFP). 2012. *Peacebuilding 2.0: Mapping the Boundaries of an Expanding Field*, December 1, 2013, [http://www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org/site/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/AfP-Mapping-Report\\_online\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org/site/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/AfP-Mapping-Report_online_FINAL.pdf)

AusAID. 2000. "Promoting Practical Sustainability." Accessed Feb 20, 2014, <http://aid.dfat.gov.au/Publications/Documents/sustainability.pdf>

Center for Global Development & Social Finance. 2013, "Investing in Social Outcomes: Development Impact Bonds." Accessed Feb 20, 2014. <http://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/investing-in-social-outcomes-development-impact-bonds.pdf>

Conroy, Stone. 2013. "Social Impact Bonds and the Extractive Industry: Conflict Through Innovative Investments" Presented at Leadership for Peace and Prosperity Conference at the University of San Diego October 3-5, 2013

Dees Gregory. J. 2001. "The Meaning of "Social Entrepreneurship." Accessed March 1, 2014. [http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees\\_sedef.pdf](http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees_sedef.pdf)

Deloitte. 2013. "TMT Technology Prediction." Accessed March 1, 2014 <http://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/technology-media-and-telecommunications/articles/tmt-technology-predictions-2013-crowd-funding-portals.html>

Fundable (n.d.) "History of Crowdfunding" Accessed February 20, 2014. <http://www.fundable.com/crowdfunding101/history-of-crowdfunding>

Global Giving (n.d.) "About us". Accessed March 1, 2014, <http://www.globalgiving.org/aboutus/>

Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (n.d.) Accessed Sep 1, 2015. <http://www.gppac.net/our-network>

Haushofer Johannes and Jeremy Shapiro. 2013. "Policy Brief: Impacts of Unconditional Cash Transfers" Accessed Feb 20, 2014. [http://web.mit.edu/joha/www/publications/Haushofer\\_Shapiro\\_Policy\\_Brief\\_UCT\\_2013.10.22.pdf](http://web.mit.edu/joha/www/publications/Haushofer_Shapiro_Policy_Brief_UCT_2013.10.22.pdf)

Hewlett Foundation 2005. "The Hewlett Foundation's Conflict Resolution Program Twenty Years of Field-Building." Accessed February 1, 2014. <http://www.hewlett.org/uploads/files/HewlettConflictResolutionProgram.pdf>

Institute for Economics & Peace. 2014. "The Cost of Violence Containment." Accessed March 5, 2014. <http://visionofhumanity.org/sites/default/files/The%20Economic%20Cost%20of%20Violence%20Containment.pdf>

Kickstarter (n.d.) One billion. Accessed March 10, 2014, <https://www.kickstarter.com/1billion>

Lederach, John Paul. 1997. *Building Sustainable Peace in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Lehner, Othmar Manfred 2013. "Crowdfunding social ventures: a model and research agenda." *Venture Capital* 15 (4), 289-301.

Liebman Jeffery. And Alina Sellman. 2013. "Social Impact Bonds: A Guide for State and Local Governments". Harvard Kennedy School, Social Impact Bond Technical Assistance Lab. Accessed Feb 20, 2014. <http://hkssiblab.files.wordpress.com/2013/07/social-impact-bonds-a-guide-for-state-and-local-governments.pdf>

Manning, Susan 2014 "US Trade Group: Spending on Pets at an all time High." ABC News, March 13, 2013. <http://abcnews.go.com/Health/wireStory/ap-exclusive-americans-spend-56-billion-pets-22894765>

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2014. "Development aid stable in 2014 but flows to poorest countries still falling

" Accessed Sep 5, 2015 <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/development-aid-stable-in-2014-but-flows-to-poorest-countries-still-falling.htm>

Paul, Roshan. 2011. "What is Social Entrepreneurship in Peacebuilding" Accessed March 2, 2014. <http://www.insightonconflict.org/2011/12/what-is-social-entrepreneurship-in-peacebuilding/>

Paffenholz, Thania.. 2010. *Civil Society and Peacebuilding. A Critical Assessment*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner Press.

Partners for Democratic Change. 2013. "Sustainable Investment in Local Capacity for Development and Peace." By Dr. Nike Carstarphen. Accessed March 1, 2014, <http://www.partnersglobal.org/Partners%20External%20Evaluation%202013.pdf/>

Peace Direct. n.d. Financials. Accessed March 1, 2014, <http://www.peacedirect.org/about/financials>

Peace and Security Funders Group. 2010. "Peace and Security Grantmaking 2008-2009, by US Foundations." Accessed March 2, 2014. <http://peaceandsecurity.org/publications/>

Social Finance. 2012. "A New Tool for Scaling Impact: How Social Impact Bonds Can Mobilize Private Capital to Advance Social Good." Accessed Feb 20, 2014. <http://www.socialfinanceus.org/pubs/new-tool-scaling-impact-how-social-impact-bonds-can-mobilize-private-capital-advance-social-goo>

Skoll Foundation (n.d.), About the Foundation. Accessed March 1, 2014. <http://www.skollfoundation.org/about/>

Skoll Foundation. n.d. Peace and Human Security. Accessed March 1, 2014. <http://www.skollfoundation.org/issue/peace-and-human-security/>

Sterland, Bill. 2006. "Civil Society Capacity Building in Post-Conflict Societies: The Experience of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo" , INTRAC, Praxis Paper No. 9, Accessed Feb 20, 2014. <http://www.intrac.org/resources.php?action=resource&id=404>

The World Bank. 2013. "Crowdfunding's Potential for the Developing World." Accessed Feb 19, 2014. [www.infodev.org/crowdfunding](http://www.infodev.org/crowdfunding)

The World Bank. 2015. "World Development Indicators Database." Accessed July 10, 2015. <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/download/GDP.pdf>

The Economist. 2013 "Pennies from heaven", Oct 26th [<http://www.economist.com/news/international/21588385-giving-money-directly-poor-people-works-surprisingly-well-it-cannot-deal>]

United Nations. n.d.. Peacekeeping Operations Financing, Accessed March 5, 2014. <https://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/financing.shtml>

UNDP. 2013. Fast Facts, Conflict Prevention. Accessed March 1, 2014, [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/fast-facts/english/FF\\_conflict\\_prevention\\_08022013%20%282%29.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/fast-facts/english/FF_conflict_prevention_08022013%20%282%29.pdf)

Zelizer Craig (editor), 2013 Integrated Peacebuilding: Innovative Approaches to Transforming Conflict Boulder, CO: Westview Press



---

## Contact

---

**Address:**

Georgetown University,  
Associate Director,  
Conflict Resolution Program,  
3240 Prospect Street,  
Washington, DC 20007

**E-mail:**

[cz52@georgetown.edu](mailto:cz52@georgetown.edu)





CENTER FOR  
CONFLICT STUDIES



istanbul  
enstitüsü

İSTANBUL TOPLUM SİYASET VE  
EKONOMİ ARAŞTIRMALARI ENSTİTÜSÜ  
TOPHANELİOĞLU CAD. AYGÜN SOK.  
ALTUNIZADE PLAZA NO: 4/A ALTUNIZADE  
ÜSKÜDAR, İSTANBUL / TÜRKİYE  
[www.istanbulinstitute.org](http://www.istanbulinstitute.org)  
Tel: 0216 545 94 09