The Interagency Conflict Assessment Framework

The USG’s Interagency Tool for Conflict Assessment
What are the ICAF Outcomes?

- **Crucial and shared understanding** of the conflict
- Prioritized and “nested” lists of **conflict drivers** and mitigating factors
- A **social systems map** of the situation under consideration
- A report highlighting **“Potential Points of Entry”**
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ICAF Activities

Philippines - Mindanao

November 2010

- 1-Day DC-based ICAF Workshop
  - 22 USG Interagency Representatives
  - 3 Academics

- In-Country ICAF Application
  - Philippines-based ICAF Training
  - Conducted 50 focus groups and interviews with 325 individuals
  - 2-Day Analytical Workshop
  - 16 participants from Embassy Manila and PACOM
  - Briefings with Ambassador, DCM, Interagency
  - PACOM Briefing

ICAF teams visited:

Team 1:  
Zamboanga City  
General Santos City  
Cagayan de Oro City

Team 2:  
Cotabato City  
Davao City
### Core Grievances and Social and Institutional Resilience

**Core Grievances:**
Identity groups’ deep sense of frustration and injustice emerging out of persistent social patterns such as elitism, exclusion, strategic resources (oil, timber), ungoverned space, unmet expectations

- Mindanaoans lament the lack of cultural recognition and respect, and the presence of discrimination.
- Mindanaoans have little trust that government officials have their best interests at heart.
- Mindanaoans experience inequitable access to government services and unequal application/enforcement of laws that govern society.

**Social and Institutional Resilience:**
Identity Groups’ willingness to engage in social patterns such as community organizing, intergroup trust development, peace-building, traditional dispute resolution

- In Mindanao, personal and family relationships are highly valued and durable
- Filipinos evidence the will to survive and persevere, and exhibit an apparent intrinsic entrepreneurship.
- Indigenous persons, Muslims, and Christians co-exist harmoniously when they respect each others’ cultures.
Drivers of Conflict and Mitigating Factors

- **The Conflict Equation:**

  $\text{Key Actor(s)} + \text{Identity Group(s)} + \text{Core Grievance} = \text{Drivers of Conflict}$

- **The Resilience Equation**

  $\text{Key Actor(s)} + \text{Identity Group(s)} + \text{Social & Institutional Resilience} = \text{Mitigating Factors}$
Businesses seek formal control of land by mobilizing GOL to commit to evicting tenants with informal claims to property.

Some politicians seek informal claim to lands by mobilizing ex-combatants to work land/ challenge others working land.

Mano/Gio leaders pursue informal land claims mobilizing urbanites against Mandingo assertions of property rights.
International NGOs (e.g. Indonesia’s Muhammidya) cooperate with Philippine NGOs to promote role of Islam in democracies.

Interfaith groups (e.g. Bishops-Ulama Conference) bring together Muslims, Christians, and IPs for dialogue around shared values.

Religious and secular schools sponsor interfaith dialogues.
ICAF Outputs

Task One: Diagnosis

- Step 1: Core Grievances
- Step 2: Drivers of Conflict
- Step 3: Mitigating Factors
- Moments for Increasing Conflict
- Moments for Decreasing Conflict

Task Two: Pre-Planning

- Step 1: Response Gaps
- Entry Points
Diagnostic Conclusion

• Some vested interests in no peace/no war
  • Some forces dragging Mindanao down
  • Some forces keep it from getting out of hand
  • System co-opts resource inputs

• System changes already in place
  • Reformist leaders
  • Small/Medium private sector
  • “Bridging Leadership”

Increase the health of a system by supporting changes already present in the system and connecting more of the system to itself
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