

A

Appendix I: Glossary



This Glossary is from the *Toolkit on Monitoring and Evaluation of Environmental Peacebuilding*. Copyright © Environmental Law Institute, November 2023.





A

Appendix I: Glossary

This glossary defines and describes key terms used throughout the “Toolkit on Monitoring and Evaluation of Environmental Peacebuilding.” For each term, the glossary synthesizes and integrates commonly used definitions within fields of monitoring and evaluation (M&E), development, environment, peacebuilding, and environmental peacebuilding.

- **Activity:** an action taken to achieve desired outcomes, such as a community training, discussion forum, or the building of an institution.

Activities describe actions that lead to the short- and long-term results of a theory of change (Dolfing 2020). Activities are made possible with inputs and are used to produce outputs.

- **Adaptive management:** an iterative approach to making decisions and managing interventions in situations of uncertainty that relies on making provisional decisions, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, learning, and revision (Holling 1978).

Adaptive management emphasizes learning while doing and can facilitate both the examination of and adaptation to contextual changes in complex or uncertain environments. It is a broad approach that can include many different processes, tools, and initiatives (Simister 2017). Adaptive management specifically responds to change by adjusting the pathways used to achieve goals rather than the goals themselves (USAID 2018). It can be understood within a context of structured decision making as an iterative learning process used to produce enhanced understanding and improved management over time (DOI 2009).

Adaptive management is widely used in environmental contexts (Lin 2011; Webb et al. 2018; Makate et al. 2016; Gregory et al. 2006), peacebuilding (de Coning 2020; Barnard-Webster & Jean 2017; Burnet 2021; Muto & Saraiva 2020), and development (Mercy Corps 2015; ODI 2016; USAID 2020c; Lonsdale & Pruden 2022). Adaptive management is particularly useful in situations where there is imperfect information on the context, uncertainties in the theories of change, and a dynamic, rapidly changing context. It is even more imperative in the context of environmental peacebuilding where those uncertainties occur in each of the environmental, peacebuilding, and development contexts and synergistically interact (Ide et al. 2021).

Within peacebuilding and development spheres, adaptive management is understood as a necessary tool for promoting flexibility and reducing stakeholder tensions while operating in dynamic, insecure contexts (Simister 2018; Forsyth, Queen et al. 2018). In the context of natural resource management, adaptive management is described as a process and approach to generate policies and activities which are considerate of variability within and between ecosystems (UN-REDD 1992; DOI 2009).



● **Conflict:** a dispute among two or more groups deriving from a real or perceived set of incompatible interests and goals.

Conflicts come in a variety of forms, are not necessarily violent, and are not necessarily bad (USAID 2014). Conflicts may or may not lead to outcomes that impede societal security and well-being. Conflicts are widely understood as a natural and inherent aspect of all societies. They are rarely simple, each with its own specific context, circumstances, and histories contributing to its complexity. Some definitions of conflict focus on the peace and security dimensions and the negative impacts of conflict (Igarape 2018).

Conflict does not necessarily involve armed groups and is not interchangeable with violence (Herbert 2017), although conflict may lead to destruction and destabilization. Conflict may result in violence when societal mechanisms and institutions for conflict management and resolution break down (UN Interagency Framework Team for Preventive Action 2010).

● **Conflict resources:** natural resources whose extraction, exploitation, and trade generates revenues that finance and/or drive armed conflict.

Conflict resources are frequently—and often illegally—traded by insurgent groups in exchange for weapons, extracted using forced labor, and their revenues are used to pay combatants and buy equipment and materials (European Commission 2017; Bruch et al. 2019). Conflict resources can change conflict dynamics, providing incentives to target the underlying resources that are financing an opponent's operations, and to continue to undermine peace so that parties can exploit the resources. Moreover, they can inflate "tensions that can escalate into violent

conflict, or feed into and exacerbate pre-existing conflict dynamics” (UN DPA & UNEP 2015, p. 7). To avoid financing armed conflict, many organizations aim to control conflict resource trade and promote “responsible” resource extraction and trade (European Commission 2017).

Some definitions of conflict resources emphasize additional dimensions of conflict resources. For example, the Global Witness (2006) definition includes: the systematic exploitation of resources that contributes to, benefits from, or results in serious violations of human rights, international humanitarian law, or international criminal law.



● **Conflict sensitivity:** an approach whereby there is “a sound understanding of the two-way interaction between activities and context and acting to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts of [an] intervention on conflict, within an organization’s given priorities/objectives” (Conflict Sensitivity Community Hub, n.d).

The concept of conflict sensitivity emerged from the recognition that humanitarian and development interventions do not inherently do good and may, in fact, exacerbate conflict (Paffenholz 2005).

Conflict sensitivity can be applied to all contexts or types of interventions and does necessarily not require changing an intervention’s mandate or objectives; rather, conflict-sensitive interventions are responsive to the context while seeking to achieve their objectives, adapting to evolving conflicts and maximizing opportunities for peace and stability whenever possible (Global Affairs Canada n.d.). A related concept is Do No Harm, which is a minimum standard to avoid doing harm or making a situation worse. However, conflict sensitivity is generally accepted to extend beyond this framework to include the maximization of positive impacts, including for conflict prevention and peacebuilding (Hammill et al. 2009; Saferworld et al. 2004).

● **Environmental change:** describes a “systemic, related cluster” of physical changes to the natural environment, including an accelerating alteration to the climate as well as “biodiversity loss, ocean acidification, fertile soil loss, freshwater depletion and contamination, ... compounded by disruption to global elemental cycles” (Butler & McFarlane 2018, p. 453).

Environmental change derives from both natural and human processes, where natural systems “transform the sun’s energy into matter and cause changes by cycling materials through geological, biological, oceanic and atmospheric processes” and human systems “transform materials and energy into products and services to meet human needs and aspirations” (EEA Task Force 1995). While human processes are thought to have historically contributed to environmental change in “relatively small” ways, human-induced environmental change now alters the flows of material and energy at “unprecedented scales” (EEA Task Force 1995).

Physical environmental change is “accompanied by, and will also precipitate, great social changes” such as changes to food systems and human health (Butler & McFarlane 2018, p. 453). Vulnerability to environmental change is “socially differentiated across gender, class, race, and age” (Barnett 2009, p. 555). Specifically, poor and marginalized populations “tend to be more vulnerable to environmental change” for a number of reasons, including tendencies to be more heavily dependent on at-risk resources and ecosystem services and a greater likelihood to live in areas affected by environmental degradation (p. 555).

- **Environmental peacebuilding:** a meta-framework comprising multiple approaches and pathways by which management of environmental issues is integrated in and can support conflict prevention, mitigation, resolution, and recovery (Ide et al. 2021).

Environmental peacebuilding is neither a distinct school of thought nor a concrete set of activities, but a broad umbrella term used by academics, practitioners, and decision makers to describe the relationships and pathways that emerge at the ne-

xus of environment, conflict, and peace (Dresse et al. 2016). A common element of environmental peacebuilding is the transboundary nature of environmental issues and the resulting cooperation that emerges from within ecosystem borders, rather than politico-territorial borders (Dresse et al. 2018). In the post-conflict context, many environmental peacebuilding interventions leverage and combine peacebuilding and environmental approaches to “build peace and advance post-conflict reconstruction through climate-related activities” (Kirby & Brady 2015, p. xii). It may involve cooperation over natural resource management, disaster risk reduction, and potentially climate adaptation (Conca & Dabelko 2002; Pieterman de Bruin 2022). Other framings of environmental peacebuilding emphasize the role of environment and natural resources in supporting specific peacebuilding objectives around security, livelihoods, economic recovery, basic services, and good governance (Bruch, Muffett, & Nichols 2016). And other framings focus on conflict-sensitive conservation (Conservation International 2017). There are several other related terminologies, such as “environmental security,” “environmental peacemaking,” “ecological peacemaking,” and “environmental diplomacy” (Dresse et al. 2016; Conca & Dabelko 2002).

- **Evaluation:** the systematic assessment of an ongoing or completed intervention’s design, implementation, and/or effects to determine its success, appropriateness, worth, quality, value (including cost effectiveness), and importance.



Evaluations often utilize monitoring data in addition to collecting more in-depth information that provides answers for the “how” and “why” of an intervention (IEG 2022). These assessments can take place at various points during an intervention’s implementation, from beginning to end, and even some time after (USAID 2020b). Decisions regarding when and how to evaluate should be driven by the objectives of the evaluation itself.

A good environmental peacebuilding evaluation captures and links an intervention’s environmental and peacebuilding dimensions. Evaluations should also incorporate methods that explore unintended effects and that are conflict sensitive to the context to ensure that the evaluation is accepted by stakeholders and does not exacerbate existing tensions (Suckling et al. 2021).

When conducting an environmental peacebuilding evaluation, it is also important to right-size an approach to the needs and available resources, incorporate methods that account for complexity and interdisciplinarity, and aim to capture an intervention’s contribution rather than focusing on attribution. Good evaluations of environmental peacebuilding will support the intervention’s objectives and be conflict-sensitive. Relevant evaluation approaches include: after action reviews, causal link monitoring, contribution analysis, developmental, empowerment, formative, rapid, most significant change, and outcome harvesting.

- **Fragility:** describes “the combination of exposure to risk and insufficient coping capacities of the state, system and/or communities to manage, absorb or mitigate those risks” (OECD 2022, p.107).

There is a broad range of fragile contexts, each with multidimensional characteristics that can manifest



differently. Historically, fragility has been used to characterize states. The IMF defines fragile states as those with characteristics that “substantially impair their economic and social performance” and identifies fragile characteristics such as weak governance, limited administrative capacity, persistent social tensions, and violence, among others (FSDR & DEINVEST 2016, p. 1). Common attributes of a fragile state may include: the loss of physical control of its territory, the erosion of legitimate authority to make collective decisions, and the inability to provide reasonable public services (Fragile States Index 2022).

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) notes that fragility “may occur at a subnational level, making it hard to keep the fragile states terminology” (FSDR & DEINVEST 2016, p.1). Accordingly, the OECD utilizes a multidimensional fragility framework to assess contexts’ varying degrees of risk exposure and coping capacities across six dimensions: economic, environmental, human, political, security, and societal (OECD 2022). As of fiscal year 2020, the World Bank revised its methodology to better classify fragility at sub-national levels, defining fragile situations as those with one



or more of the following: (1) the weakest institutional and policy environment based on CPIA scores for IDA countries; (2) the presence of a UN Department of Peace Operation (DPO); and (3) flights across borders of 2,000 or more per 100,000 population, who are internationally regarded as refugees (World Bank 2022).



- **Gender:** a social and cultural construct that distinguishes the attributes associated with women, men, girls, boys, and non-binary individuals.

Gender includes norms, behaviors, expectations, and roles of women or men, girls or boys, and non-binary people in addition to the relationships between them (WHO 2022). Gender is learned through socialization processes (UN Women 2022) and is context- and time-specific so it can change (WHO 2022; UN Women 2022; UNICEF 2017). Gender identity describes an individual's internal experience of gender and may or may not correspond to an individual's sex (i.e., the biological and physiological characteristics of females, males, and intersex persons) (WHO 2022).

While some societies tend to recognize only two genders, man and woman, otherwise known as a gender binary, some people do not identify with either gender and may instead identify with a blend of man and woman, something else, or no gender at all. People who do not fit within the gender binary may describe themselves with terms like “non-binary,” “genderqueer,” or “agender” (NCTE 2018).

As socially constructed, gender is often hierarchical, producing inequalities between women, men, and nonbinary peoples regarding responsibilities assigned, activities undertaken, access to and control over resources, and decision-making opportunities (UN Women 2022; WHO 2022). Gender inequality interacts with other socioeconomic factors including race, class, disability, and ethnicity (UN Women 2022; WHO 2022).

- **Inclusion:** ensuring equal access to opportunities “regardless of differences in personal characteristics or identities” (USAID 2020a, p. 1). Inclusion in M&E means both



including various stakeholder groups—particularly traditionally marginalized groups such as women, minorities, Indigenous people, youth, and people with disabilities—in design, monitoring, evaluation, and learning as well as ensuring M&E processes capture the different effects of an intervention on those various stakeholder groups (e.g., through disaggregated indicators) and including these groups in the sharing or dissemination of information such as evaluation results.

Genuine inclusion necessitates the empowerment and authentic participation (see below) of various stakeholder groups. It also enhances M&E proces-

ses as different perspectives are brought to bear on the design of theories of change, indicators, data collection methods, analysis approaches, and evaluative processes. While practitioners should aim for the highest level of inclusion possible, tradeoffs may need to be made based on the conflict context, resources, and other constraints.

- **Indicator:** in the context of M&E, a qualitative or quantitative variable or piece of information, generally aligning with a theory of change, that helps to measure activities, outputs, outcomes, assumptions, and risks (Lamhauge, Lanzi, & Agrawala 2013; Brooks 2014). Indicators provide the information necessary to understand an intervention's progress and effects, as well as the broader context in which an intervention takes place.

While indicators can capture processes or products and can be qualitative (including perception-based) or quantitative, it is often easiest to track indicators that are unidimensional (UNICEF 2018). It may be, however, that some qualitative indicators are multidimensional, particularly as they relate to the nexus conflict, environment, peace. Because conflict-environment relations manifest differently in different places and at different levels, indicators for environmental peacebuilding M&E are not universally applicable to all interventions. M&E of environmental peacebuilding requires indicators and techniques that link an intervention's various environmental and peace dimensions (Caroli et al. 2021). This linking may entail a combination of: (1) environment-related indicators; (2) peace/conflict-related indicators; and (3) indicators that specifically link changes in the environment and changes in the peace/conflict context.

Indicators for environmental peacebuilding M&E can support monitoring by indicating early warning and adaptation needs, as well as learning by testing theories of change and determining success of intervention design and implementation (Defontaine 2019).

- **Input:** the resources, contributions, and investments necessary for delivering an intervention, including funding, personnel, partnerships, and physical resources such as infrastructure or technology (Harries et al. 2014; Dolfig 2020).

- **Intervention:** an individual project or set of projects, programs, policies, instruments, and activities that are intended to promote change in one or more areas.

Interventions are distinct from change and can represent one of many factors that influence change (Belcher & Palenberg 2018). Interventions typically influence systems from the outside (Burgess 2004).

- **Lagging indicator:** an indicator that tracks changes that actually happened. They are important for evaluation as they provide information about the realized outcomes of past actions (Stevenson et al. 2021). Since the effects of an intervention can manifest over long time scales, lagging indicators are complemented by leading indicators (see below; Ota et al. 2021).

- **Leading indicator:** an indicator tracking certain changes that are expected to lead to other changes. They are useful for predicting or foreshadowing both immediate and long-term changes, and are important for early warning as well as for interventions with long time scales (Ota et al. 2021).





- **Learning:** a systematic process through which stakeholders reflect on and intentionally use the information generated through their M&E activities to better understand

the process and effects of an intervention and seek opportunities for improvement.

Learning is one of the most common objectives of M&E, especially for organizations incorporating a system-based programming approach (Hunt 2014). M&E for learning focuses on capturing information regarding an intervention's implementation process and associated outcomes or effects. Learning encourages practitioners to regularly reflect on progress using either existing processes such as quarterly reports or final evaluations (USAID 2021) or separate learning-focused practices. Reflection on contextual changes as well as implementation challenges, successes, and failures using M&E information is a key part of learning. When possible, reflection activities should be participatory and include the voices of stakeholders, such as local communities (USAID 2021).

When intentionally and continuously used to seek opportunities for improvement, learning can support adaptive management and directly improve intervention implementation (Hunt 2014). Learning can also be utilized to improve organization-wide efficiency, strategic planning, and resource allocation while better integrating environmental and peacebuilding dimensions and informing future decision-making (Hunt 2014). More broadly, learning can help build the limited evidence base for the environmental peacebuilding discipline.

- **Monitoring:** an ongoing and systematic process of collecting, analyzing, and using information about an intervention's activities, effects, and context.



Monitoring is generally composed of indicators and their associated targets and baselines, data collection methods, and regular reviews and reflection on information generated (Lai 2012). While there is often some overlap with evaluation, monitoring is generally descriptive and relies on quantitative and qualitative indicators. Monitoring information is used continuously in the day-to-day management of an intervention to track progress against initial plans, functioning as evidence for strategic decision-making, learning, and results achievement (UNDAF 2017). Monitoring can reveal whether the theory of change is still valid or needs to be adapted during implementation or as the context changes (UNDAF 2017; INTRAC 2017). Monitoring is a crucial tool to assess both the intended and unintended effects of an intervention, and whether the intervention needs to be reconsidered (Lemon & Pinet 2018).

Monitoring is particularly important when working in insecure contexts, as it can support early warning by providing indications that there may be problems before they escalate further (UNDAF 2017). When collecting and sharing monitoring information, practitioners can utilize participatory ways of assessing an intervention's information environment and address concerns around transparency and information sensitivity (U.S. Global Development Lab 2019). If done well, the monitoring process itself can support the objectives of an environmental peacebuilding





intervention. To do so, it is essential that monitoring be undertaken in a conflict-sensitive way and that the safety and security of stakeholders is balanced with participation and transparency.

- **Negative peace:** the absence of direct violence and war.

Coined by Johan Galtung (1964), negative peace describes the absence of a state of war, direct violence, or overt oppression; it may be achieved through violent means. Examples of negative peace include a ceasefire agreement during a war or the presence of an armed force to dissuade unrest (Jakubowski 2021). The absence of direct violence and war does not ensure the absence of psychological violence, structural violence, injustice, repression, or rights restrictions nor does it indicate how long-term peace may be strengthened or maintained (COE 2022). Contrast with “positive peace” (see below).

- **Outcome:** the results of an intervention. Outcomes are often changes in knowledge, attitudes, awareness, skills, behaviors, or the natural or physical environment. In a theory of change, outcomes can be defined as short-, medium-, or long-term (although such designations are not inherently necessary).

While outputs can be measured immediately follow an intervention’s activities, outcomes usually manifest over a longer period of time (Dolfing 2020). Measuring outcomes can help validate theory of change assumptions about how and why change occurs or can indicate when assumptions may need to be adapted (FBK 2018).

- **Output:** the direct and immediate results of an activity, limited to the scope of a project’s duration (Dolfing 2020).

Outputs describe the result of an activity, including who is affected—directly and indirectly—and what is produced (Kolko 2012). For example, if an activity entailed training women in Energy Management Systems, the output would be that women are trained in Energy Management Systems.



- **Participation:** the active involvement of stakeholders, in this case as part of the M&E process. Participation exists along a continuum, from informing and consulting to collaborating and empowering, and can involve different stakeholder groups, including intervention staff, partners, country-based officials, and participants or beneficiaries (INTRAC 2020).

When done well, participation enhances inclusion (see above) by involving different stakeholder groups (see below) in design, data collection, analysis, and assessment processes. While there is wide agreement that interventions and their M&E should be participatory, the degree and nature of the participation may be shaped by considerations of conflict sensitivity as well as available time, staff, and other resources.

- **Participatory process:** a process that engages stakeholders. Participatory processes range from sharing information to consultation, codesign, and collaborative implementation. These processes emphasize the inclusion and validation of diverse stakeholder groups, especially marginalized or at-risk groups, as well as local populations.

A highly participatory M&E approach entails the active involvement of intervention participants, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders from the beginning to the end of the intervention cycle. Participatory



processes actively engage local populations and empower them to participate in decision-making processes that affect their lives (UN DESA 2017). Participatory approaches emphasize process, rather than results or products (WHO 2016). Through the process of engaging diverse and underrepresented groups, participatory approaches can enhance understanding of different perspectives that can form a basis of mutualism and joint action (UN DESA 2017).

Participatory processes often emphasize “local conflict handling potential” and, as a result, generally have high levels of legitimacy and credibility (Nascimento et al. 2004, p. 6). Local engagement can also improve M&E outcomes by resolving data access issues, enhancing dispute mechanisms, mitigating implementation risks, and building long-term local capacity (UN DESA 2017). Bottom-up participatory M&E practices are not meant to replace top-down M&E practices, but rather to enhance M&E by using “local initiatives as a vehicle to create a greater impact on peacebuilding interventions” (Chivasa 2019, p. 198). Conflict-sensitive participatory approaches, particularly those involving local people, require transparency about M&E risks and activities to ensure information accuracy and avoid increasing tension or triggering violent expressions.



● **Peace:** describes a relationship between two or more parties that functions to manage conflict without violence and advance a common vision of a life with dignity, rights, and capacities for all (Berkowitz 2014).

Peace is not the absence of conflict, but the ability to “manage conflict without violence” (USIP 2011). That said, the absence of violence characterizes only a narrow version of peace that is relatively insecure, otherwise termed by John Galtung (1964) as “negative peace” (see “negative peace,” above). Broader definitions of peace often address structural violence within social, economic, and political systems (Richmond 1997), as well as “fundamental recognition of freedom and dignity of all people” (Leckman et al. 2014, p.6).

The above quoted authors, define peace through four components: (1) as an outcome, or the absence of violence; (2) as a process, or “efforts to negotiate freedom from violence through the creation of social bonds;” (3) as a human disposition, or a social orientation to secure freedoms and foster capacities; and (4) as a culture that “fosters a sense of global citizenship” (2014, p.6).

● **Peace dividend:** “timely and tangible deliverables, which in particular contexts can facilitate social cohesion and stability, build trust in the peace process, and support the state to earn legitimacy under challenging conditions” (McCandless 2012, p.16). Peace dividends tend to result from low-cost, small-scale interventions that can be planned and implemented over a short timeframe (UN Peacekeeping, n.d.).

Historically, peace dividends have rested on the assumption that “increased expenditures on social spending”—and a resulting decrease on military spending—promotes peace (McCandless 2012, p. 16). The UN and other international actors now understand the term more broadly, using it to describe public administration and social deliverables that “reduce social tensions through the provision of tangible, needed services, create incentives for non-violent behavior and support state-building efforts at critical junctures in the peace process” (McCandless 2012, p.2).

To be recognized, peace dividends should be: (1) tangible, including services like economic incentives, health services, and improved food security; and (2) timely, or attributed to political milestones and national governments (Laughton & Crawford 2010). A significant and growing body of evidence demonstrates the potential of peace dividends to both address a conflict’s underlying grievances and (re) build a state’s legitimacy and systems of accountability to society (McCandless 2012, p. 2). That said, peace dividends are not automatic (Hoeffler 2012).

● **Positive peace:** the absence of violence (direct and indirect, including structural violence) and war in addition to the presence of attitudes, institutions, and

structures that enable and sustain peaceful growth and change.

John Galtung coined the term “positive peace” in 1964 and expanded it in 1969 by adding that positive peace has, in addition to the absence of violence, positive components such as social justice and the absence of structural violence. He later refined the typology of positive peace into direct positive peace flowing from verbal and physical kindness, structural positive peace based on freedom and equity, and cultural positive peace legitimizing peace (Galtung 1996, p. 32). Positive peace creates an environment of harmony in which “human potential can flourish” (IEP 2020, p. 2). Positive peace emphasizes that peace can exist in many forms and is more than simply the absence of violence. To endure, positive peace is a process that must be continuously sustained and cultivated over time.

- **Resource curse:** the observed negative correlation between one country’s wealth in terms of natural resources and its “economic, social, or political well-being” (Ross 2015, p. 240).

Coined by Richard Auty (1994) to describe how natural resources can distort the economies of developing countries, he has subsequently attributed it to economic, institutional, and political causes (Auty 2017). The concept of “resource curse” has been used in reference to countries such as Sierra Leone, contrasted with examples such as Botswana (Ross 1999). It has been refined over the years to include an examination of the type of natural resource and enabling conditions (van der Ploeg 2011; Ross 2015).

- **Right-sizing:** a process for adjusting an M&E framework to align its approaches and methods with available resources, needs, the stage of the intervention’s implementation, and context.



Right-sizing is founded on the notion that practitioners cannot do it all and will never have the perfect M&E framework because interventions have finite resources and time, and operations may be bounded by other constraints (GAO 2003; Wolf 2005). Specifically,





right-sizing often consists of ascertaining available data, funding, and staff, as well as the needs, time-frame, and other considerations (such as security), and then selecting the necessary and appropriate M&E measures.

Right-sizing can be an ongoing process that occurs throughout M&E design and implementation (Armada et al. 2018). For example, practitioners can right-size systems maps, theories of change, indicators, data collection, and evaluations. When right-sizing an M&E framework, transparency with partners about priorities, constraints, and related actions is essential (Rathinam et al. 2019).

● **Stakeholder:** an individual or group that is impacted by and/or has an interest in a particular decision, intervention, or context.

Recognized interests are diverse and include tangible and intangible interests such as those related to livelihood, food security, financial needs, identity, culture, religion, and the enjoyment of an area. There may be differential interests within a community based on gender, age, disability, and other characteristics. These need to be taken into consideration when identifying and mapping stakeholders.

Stakeholder engagement is usually achieved through participatory processes, including participatory M&E (see “participatory process,” above). There can be a wide range of stakeholders, and when time and resources are finite, it can be challenging to decide how many people to engage and from which stakeholder groups (UN DESA & UNITAR 2020).

In some contexts, stakeholders are referred to by other terms. For example, many First Nations communities in Canada prefer the term “rightsholders” (Resource Works 2014). It is important to be context- and conflict-sensitive when defining and engaging stakeholders.

● **Sustaining peace:** is a conceptual and operational framework guiding UN actions.

According to the UN Security Council and UN General Assembly’s resolutions (S/RES/2282 2016 p.8 & A/RES/70/262 2016,p. 8), sustaining peace “should be broadly understood as a goal and a process to build a common vision of a society, ensuring that the needs of all segments of the population are taken into account, which encompasses activities aimed at preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict, addressing root

causes, assisting parties to conflict to end hostilities, ensuring national reconciliation, and moving towards recovery, reconstruction and development, and emphasizing that sustaining peace is a shared task and responsibility that needs to be fulfilled by the Government and all other national stakeholders, and should flow through all three pillars of the United Nations engagement at all stages of conflict, and in all its dimensions, and needs sustained international attention and assistance.”

The concept was coined by an advisory group of experts that was appointed by the UN Secretary-General to perform the ten-year 2015 Review of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture (UN 2015). In 2016, the UN Security Council and General Assembly adopted resolutions to mark the shift of priorities of the UN peacebuilding agenda toward the concept of “sustaining peace.” The emphasis has been, among others, on inclusive decision-making and on “long-term policies that address economic, social, and political aspirations” to build institutional capacity (United Nations & World Bank 2018, p. xix). During the 2020 UN Peacebuilding Review, it was noted that the main remaining challenge was the lack of financing for sustaining peace (Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation 2021).

● **Systems approach:** a conceptual and operational way to understand and manage situations in which there are multiple interacting actors, elements, and dynamics, often characterized by feedback loops and adaptive management (von Bertalanffy 1968; Senge 1990; Richmond 1993; Sweeney & Sterman 2000).

A systems approach is “a way of seeing interconnections among structures, behaviors and relationships, that can help us identify the underlying causes and uncover opportunities for creating positive change” (CDA 2016a, p. 3). In practice, systems approaches consist of a set of processes, methods, and practices (such as systems mapping) that investigate elements of a conflict and their relationships from “various dimensions (sectoral, levels of governance, spatial scales, temporality)” and from different perspectives (Fortier 2020, p. 2). Such approaches can supplement the information provided by other models, forming a basis for strategic discussion regarding intervention entry points, opportunities, theories of change, and methods for addressing conflict dynamics (CDA 2016a). They require working across organizational boundaries and government levels (Catalan 2018; Fortier 2020).

Because environmental peacebuilding often operates within complex, adaptive, and evolving systems with multiple actors that are interconnected, systems approaches can provide a useful framework for monitoring and adapting to emergent and often unpredictable outcomes. That said, it is key for organizations incorporating systems thinking to adopt a complementary learning-focused M&E approach, which will allow them to reflect on how internal and external factors resulted in specific implementation outcomes (Hunt 2016).



● **Theory of change:** a description or depiction of how and why an intervention is anticipated to contribute to a desired change in a particular context (Taplin & Clarke 2012; Brest 2010). It identifies the desired long-term goals of an intervention as well as the specific outcomes that must be achieved for those goals to be realized—and how they are related causally. It often also includes activities, outputs, and risks, and/or assumptions.

Theories of change can take multiple formats, including narrative theories of change often characterized by “if, then, because” statements (CDA 2016b, p. 50) as well as graphical representations involving boxes for each activity, output, outcome, etc.

The theory of change is both a process and a product that should be revisited regularly throughout M&E design and implementation (Starr & Fornoff 2018). Theories of changes complement results frameworks, such as a logical framework or log frame (INTRAC

2017). The theory of change requires practitioners to determine long-term goals and pathways to achieving those goals; it also informs the development of other M&E elements, such as indicators that track progress through the intervention toward its objectives (Starr & Fornoff 2018). A theory of change helps to identify assumptions about a conflict’s underlying causes and dynamics as well as the conditions necessary for change that need to be tested within the monitoring system (UNDAF 2017).

Theories of change “must be driven by sound analyses, consultation with key stakeholders, and learning on what works and what does not in diverse contexts drawn from the experiences of the UN and its partners” (UNDAF 2017, p. 4). Jones (2011) emphasizes how theories of change can improve overarching policies, enhance decision making, create accountability for stakeholders, and guide future M&E activities.





References

Armada, Nygiel B., Regina Therese M. Bacalso, Rina Maria P. Rosales, & Alfredo T. Lazarte. 2018. "Right-Sizing as a Strategy for Allocating Fishing Effort in a Defined Marine Ecosystem: A Philippines Case Study." *Ocean & Coastal Management* 165: 167-184, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.08.018>

Auty, Richard M. 1994. "Industrial Policy Reform in Six Large Newly Industrializing Countries: The Resource Curse Thesis." *World Development* 22(1): 11-26.

Auty, Richard M. 2017. "Resource Curse." *International Encyclopedia of Geography: People, the Earth, Environment and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786352.wbieg0423>

Barnard-Webster, Kiely, & Isabella Jean. 2017. *Adaptive Peacebuilding Programming Through Effective Feedback Loops: Promising Practices*. Peacebuilding Evaluation Consortium.

Barnett, Jon. 2009. "Environmental Security." *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, 553-557. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-008044910-4.00774-4>

Belcher, Brian, & Markus Palenberg. 2018. "Outcomes and Impacts of Development Interventions: Toward Conceptual Clarity." *American Journal of Evaluation* 39(4): 478-495. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214018765698>

Berkowitz, Devra. 2014. "Peace Means Dignity, Well-being for All, Not Just Absence of War – UN Officials." UN News. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2014/09/476992>

Brest, Paul. 2010. "The Power of Theories of Change." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Spring):45-51.

Brooks, Nick. 2014. "Indicators for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Adaptation." International Institute for Environment and Development. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep01608>

Bruch, Carl, Carroll Muffett, & Sandra Nichols (eds.). 2016. *Governance, Natural Resources, and Post-Conflict Peacebuilding*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203109793>

Bruch, Carl, David Jensen, Mikiyasu Nakayama, & Jon Unruh. 2019. "The Changing Nature of Conflict, Peacebuilding, and Environmental Cooperation." *Environmental Law Reporter* 49(2): 10134-10154.



Burnet, Jennie E. 2021. "Transitional Justice as Interruption: Adaptive Peacebuilding and Resilience in Rwanda." In *Resilience, Adaptive Peacebuilding and Transitional Justice: How Societies Recover after Collective Violence*, 94-110. Cambridge University Press.

Burgess, Heidi. 2004. "Intervention Processes." *Beyond Intractability*. https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/large_scale_intervention

Butler, C.D., & R.A. McFarlane. 2018. "Climate Change, Food Security, and Population Health in the Anthropocene." *Encyclopedia of the Anthropocene* 2:453-459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809665-9.09745-7>

Caroli, Giulia, Ignacio Madurga Lopez, Grazia Paccillo, & Peter Läderach. 2021. "Measuring Climate Security: Are Peaceful Countries Immune to Climate-Related Security Threats?." CGIAR. <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/115593>

Catalan, Daniel. 2018. "What is a Systems Approach?" OECD iLibrary. <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/51e1a91d-en/index.html?itemId=/content/paper/51e1a91d-en>

CDA. 2016a. *Designing Strategic Initiatives to Impact Conflict Systems: Systems Approaches to Peacebuilding*. CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. <https://www.cda-collaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Designing-Strategic-Initiatives-to-Impact-Conflict-Systems-Systems-Approaches-to-Peacebuilding-Final.pdf>

CDA. 2016b. *Reflecting on Peace Practice (RPP) Basics: A Resource Manual*. CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. <https://www.cdacollaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Reflecting-on-Peace-Practice-RPP-Basics-A-Resource-Manual.pdf>

Chivasa, Norman. 2019. "A Participatory Approach to Peacebuilding Evaluation in Seke District, Zimbabwe." *International Journal of Action Research* 15(3): 198-216. <https://doi.org/10.3224/ijar.v15i3.03>

COE (Council of Europe). 2022. "Peace and Violence." The Council of Europe Portal. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/compass/peace-and-violence>

Conca, Ken, & Geoffrey Dabelko (eds.) 2002. *Environmental Peacemaking*. Johns Hopkins University Press and Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Conflict Sensitivity Community Hub. n.d. "What is Conflict Sensitivity?" <https://www.conflictsensitivityhub.net/index.php/conflict-sensitivity/>

Conservation International. 2017. "Increasing Conflict Sensitivity in Conservation." In *Environmental Peacebuilding Training Manual*, 41-50.

Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation. 2021. "The Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace Agenda." https://www.daghammarskjold.se/hrf_faq/peacebuilding-sustaining-peace-agenda/

de Coning, Cedric. 2020. "Adaptive Peace Operations: Navigating the Complexity of Influencing Societal Change Without Causing Harm." *International Peacekeeping* 27(5): 836-858. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13533312.2020.1797500>

Defontaine, Catherine. 2019. "Setting up Early Warning and Response Systems to Prevent Violent Conflicts and Save Lives." World Bank Blogs. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/dev4peace/setting-early-warning-and-response-systems-prevent-violent-conflicts-and-save-lives#comments>

DOI (United States Department of the Interior). 2009. *Adaptive Management: US Department of the Interior Technical Guide*. <https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/uploads/TechGuide-WebOptimized-2.pdf>

Dolfing, Henrico. 2020. "Project Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes, Impact and Results." <https://www.henricodolfing.com/2020/09/project-inputs-outputs-outcomes.html>

Dresse, Anais, Itay Fischhendler, Jonas O. Nielsen, & Dimitrios Zikos. 2018. "Environmental Peacebuilding: Towards a Theoretical Framework." *Cooperation and Conflict* 54(1): 99-119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836718808331>

Dresse, A., J. Ø. Nielsen, & D. Zikos. 2016. "Moving Beyond Natural Resources as a Source of Conflict: Exploring the Human-Environment Nexus of Environmental Peacebuilding." Thesis Discussion Paper No. 2016-2. Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

Environmental Peacebuilding Association (EnPAX). 2022. "About Environmental Peacebuilding." <https://www.environmentalpeacebuilding.org/about/>

European Commission. 2021. "Conflict Minerals Regulation." Trade. https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/development-and-sustainability/conflict-minerals-regulation_en

EEA (European Environment Agency) Task Force. 1995. "Environmental Changes and Human Development." In *Europe's Environment—The Dobbris Assessment*, edited by David A. Stanners & Philippe Bourdeau, 676. European Environment Agency.

FBK (Fund Against Child Labour). 2018. "Developing Your Theory of Change." Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. https://english.rvo.nl/sites/default/files/2018/11/FBK_theory_of_change_guidelines_0.pdf

FSDR (Financing for Sustainable Development) & DEINVEST. 2016. "Selected Definitions and Characteristics of 'Fragile States' by Key International Actors." International Labor Organization. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/--ed_emp/documents/terminology/wcms_504528.pdf

Forsyth Queen, Emily, Jessica Baumgardner-Zuzik, Elizabeth Hume, & Melanie Greenberg. 2018. *Snapshot of Adaptive Management in Peacebuilding Programs*. Alliance for Peacebuilding. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5db70e83fc0a966cf4cc42ea/t/5e67eba0bb05e514aa9c-deea/1583868843637/Snapshot_of_Adaptive_Management_2018.pdf

Fortier, François. 2020. "Connecting the SDG Dots through Systems Thinking." UNSSC. https://www.unssc.org/sites/default/files/u3/systems_thinking_for_a2030.pdf

Fragile States Index. 2022. "What Does State Fragility Mean?" <https://fragilestatesindex.org/frequently-asked-questions/what-does-state-fragility-mean/>

Galtung, Johan. 1964. "An Editorial." *Journal of Peace Research* 1(1): 1-4.

Galtung, Johan. 1969. "Violence, Peace and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6(3): 167-191.

Galtung, Johan. 1996. *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. SAGE Publications.

GAO (United States General Accounting Office). 2003. *Overseas Presence: Rightsizing Framework Can Be Applied at U.S. Diplomatic Posts in Developing Countries*. United States General Accounting Office. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pcaab108.pdf

Global Affairs Canada. n.d. "Conflict Sensitivity Tip Sheet." https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/funding-financement/conflict_sensitivity-sensibilite_conflicts.aspx?lang=eng

Global Witness. 2006. *Breaking the Links Between Natural Resources, Conflict and Corruption: Annual Report 2006.*

Gregory, Robin, Lee Failing, & Paul Higgins. 2006. "Adaptive Management and Environmental Decision Making: A Case Study Application to Water Use Planning." *Ecological Economics* 58(2): 434-447. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.07.020>

Hammill, Anne, Alec Crawford, Robert Craig, Robert Malpas, & Richard Matthew. 2009. *Conflict-Sensitive Conservation Practitioners' Manual.* International Institute for Sustainable Development.

Harries, Ellen, Lindsay Hodgson, & James Noble. 2014. *Creating Your Theory of Change: NPC's Practical Guide.* 2014. New Philanthropy Capital.

Herbert, Sian. 2017. *Conflict Analysis: Topic Guide.* GS-DRC. <https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/ConflictAnalysis.pdf>

Hoeffler, Anke. 2012. "Growth, Aid and Policies in Countries Recovering from War." OECD. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/docs/WP1%20Growth%20Aid%20and%20Policies.pdf>

Holling, C. S. (ed.). 1978. *Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management.* Wiley.

Hunt, Charles T. 2014. "A Framework for Monitoring and Evaluating the Impact of UNPOL." In Charles T. Hunt (ed.), *UN Peace Operations and International Policing: Negotiating Complexity, Assessing Impact and Learning to Learn.* Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315813486>

Hunt, Charles T., Cedric de Coning, & Bryn Hughes. 2016. "Avoiding Perplexity: Complexity-Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation for UN Peace Operations." In Emery Brusset (ed.), *Complexity Thinking for Peacebuilding Practice and Evaluation.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Ide, Tobias, Carl Bruch, Alexander Carius, Ken Conca, Geoffrey D. Dabelko, Richard Matthew, & Erika Weinthal. 2021. "The Past and Future(s) of Environmental Peacebuilding." *International Affairs* 97(1): 1-16.

IEG (Independent Evaluation Group). 2022. "What is Monitoring and Evaluation?" <https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/what-monitoring-and-evaluation>

IEP (Institute for Economics & Peace). 2020. *Positive Peace Report 2020: Analysing the Factors that Sustain Peace.* <http://visionofhumanity.org/resources>

Igarape Institute. 2018. "Defining Conflict Prevention." *The Handbook of Conflict Prevention*, 6-20. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep20660.5>

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP. 2021. UNDP Evaluation Guidelines. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf

INTRAC. 2017. "Theory of Change." <https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Theory-of-Change.pdf>

INTRAC. 2020. "Participatory M&E." <https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Participatory-ME.pdf>

Jakubowski, Benjamin. 2021. "Positive and Negative Peace." Growing Democracy Project. <https://growingdemocracyoh.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Positive-and-Negative-Peace.docx.pdf>

Jones, Harry. 2011. *A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluating Policy Influence.* Overseas Development Institute.

Kolko, Jon. 2012. *Wicked Problems: Problems Worth Solving: A Handbook & A Call to Action.* AC4D.

Lai, K.C. 2012. *Stocktaking of M&E and Management Information Systems.* FAO/World Bank Cooperative Programme.

Lamhauge, Nicolina, Elisa Lanzi, & Shardul Agrawala. 2013. "The Use of Indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation of Adaptation: Lessons from Development Cooperation Agencies." *Climate and Development* 5(3): 229-241.

Laughton, Sarah, & Nicholas Crawford. 2010. "Peace Dividends." In *UN Peacebuilding: An Orientation*, 8. United Nations. https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/sites/www.un.org/peacebuilding/files/documents/peacebuilding_orientation.pdf



Leckman, James F., Catherine Panter-Brick, & Rima Salah. 2014. "Peace is a Lifelong Process: The Importance of Partnerships." In James F. Leckman, Catherine Panter-Brick, & Rima Salah (eds.), *Pathways to Peace: The Transformative Power of Children and Families*. MIT Press.

Lemon, Adrienne, & Mélanie Pinet. 2018. "Measuring Unintended Effects in Peacebuilding: What the Field of International Cooperation Can Learn from Innovative Approaches Shaped by Complex Contexts." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 68:253-261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2017.09.007>

Lin, Brenda B. 2011. "Resilience in Agriculture through Crop Diversification: Adaptive Management for Environmental Change." *BioScience* 61(3): 183-193. <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2011.61.3.4>

Lonsdale, Jane, & Mark Pruden. 2022. Guidance Note: Practical Introduction to Adaptive Management. DT Global.

Makate, Clifton, Rongchang Wang, Marshall Makate, & Nelson Mango. 2016. "Crop Diversification and Livelihoods of Smallholder Farmers in Zimbabwe: Adaptive Management for Environmental Change." *SpringerPlus* 5:1135. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-2802-4>

McCandless, Erin. 2012. *Peace Dividends and Beyond*. The United Nations. https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/sites/www.un.org.peacebuilding/files/documents/peace_dividends.pdf

Mercy Corps. 2015. "Managing Complexity: Adaptive management at Mercy Corps." https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/2020-01/Adaptive%20management%20paper_external.pdf

Muto, Aki, & Rui Saraiva. 2020. "Assessing Context-Specific Peacebuilding Approaches in Contemporary Armed Conflicts: From High-Level Mediation to Middle-Out Linkage in Syria and from Adaptive Mediation to Nationally-Owned Peacebuilding in Mozambique." *Asian Journal of Peacebuilding* 8(2): 241-264. <https://doi.org/10.18588/202011.00a128>

Nascimento, Daniela, Michelle Jacobs, & Sarah Keeler. 2004. "Building Peace through Participation: A Case Study of Northern Ireland." In Alexander Gray, Deirdre Kelleher, & Edward Moxon-Browne (eds.), *Conflict Resolution and European Legacies of War*. Centre for European Studies, 15-28. <https://www.ces.uc.pt/nucleos/nep/documentos/DanielaNascimento.pdf>

NCTE (National Center for Transgender Equality). 2018. "Understanding Non-Binary People: How to Be Respectful and Supportive." <https://transequality.org/issues/resources/understanding-non-binary-people-how-to-be-respectful-and-supportive>.

OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2022. *States of Fragility*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c7fedf5e-en>

Ota, Liz, Jennifer Firn, Robin L. Chazdon, Nestor Gregorio, Sharif A. Mukul, Ricardo A.G. Viani, Claudia Romero, & John Herbohn. 2021. "Using Leading and Lagging Indicators for Forest Restoration." *Journal of Applied Ecology* 58(9): 1806-1812. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13938>

Paffenholz, Thania. 2005. *Third-Generation PCIA: Introducing the Aid for Peace Approach*. Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management. https://www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Handbook/Dialogue_Chapters/dialogue4_paffenholz.pdf

Pieterneel de Bruin, Sophie. 2022. "Security Dimensions of Climate Change Adaptation." In *Research Handbook on Climate Change Adaptation Law*, Edward Elgar Publishing, 392-412.

Rathinam, Francis, Priyanka Cardoz, Zeba Siddiqui, & Marie Gaarder. 2019. "Transparency and Accountability in the Extractives Sector: A Synthesis of What Works and What Does Not." 3ie Working Paper No. 33. International Initiative for Impact Evaluation.

Reiling, Kirby, & Cynthia Brady. 2015. "Climate Change and Conflict: An Annex to the USAID Climate-Resilient Development Framework." USAID. https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1866/ClimateChangeConflictAnnex_2015%2002%2025%2C%20Final%20with%20date%20for%20Web.pdf

Resource Works 2014. "Rights-holders not Stakeholders – A First Nation Perspective on Resource Development in BC." https://www.resourceworks.com/rights_holders_not_stakeholders_a_first_nation_perspective_on_resource_development_in_bc

Richmond, Barry. 1993. "Systems Thinking: Critical Thinking Skills for the 1990s and Beyond." *Systems Dynamics Review* 9(2): 113-133.

Richmond, Oliver P. 1997. *Peace: A Very Short Introduction*. OUP Oxford.

Ross, Michael L. 1999. "The Political Economy of the Resource Curse." *World Politics* 51(2): 297-322.

Ross, Michael L. 2015. "What Have We Learned about the Resource Curse?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 18:239-259.

Thakore, Digvisjaysinh. 2013. "Conflict and Conflict Management." *Journal of Business and Management* 8(6):7-16.

Saferworld, International Alert, APFO, CECORE, CHA, & FEWER. 2004. Conflict-Sensitive Approaches to Development, Humanitarian Assistance, and Peacebuilding: A Resource Pack. <http://www.international-alert.org/publications/conflict-sensitive-approaches-development-humanitarian-assistance-and-peacebuilding>

Senge, Peter M. 1990. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Doubleday/Currency.

Simister, Nigel. 2018. "Adaptive Management." INTRAC. <https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Adaptive-management.pdf>

Starr, L., & M. Fornoff. 2016. *Theory of Change: Facilitator's Guide*. TANGO International and The Technical and Operational Performance Support (TOPS) Program.

Stevenson, Simone L., Kate Watermeyer, Giovanni Caggiano, Elizabeth A. Fulton, Simon Ferrier, & Emily Nicholson. 2021. "Matching Biodiversity Indicators to Policy Needs." *Conservation Biology* 35(2): 522-532. <https://doi.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/10.1111/cobi.13575>

Suckling, James, Claire Hoolohan, Iain Soutar, & Angela Druckman. 2021. "Unintended Consequences: Unknowable and Unavoidable, or Knowable and Unforgivable?" *Frontiers in Climate* 3(October): 1-12.

Sweeney, L. B., & J.D. Sterman. 2000. "Bathtub Dynamics: Initial Results of a Systems Thinking Inventory." *System Dynamics Review* 16(4): 249-286.

Taplin, Dana H., & Helene Clark. 2012. *Theory of Change Basics: A Primer on Theory of Change*. ActKnowledge, Inc. http://www.theoryofchange.org/wp-content/uploads/toco_library/pdf/ToCBasics.pdf

UN (United Nations). 2016. "Convention on Biological Diversity: Text of the Convention." <https://www.cbd.int/convention/text/>

UN (United Nations). 2022. "A New Era of Conflict and Violence." <https://www.un.org/en/un75/new-era-conflict-and-violence>

United Nations & World Bank . 2018. *Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict*. World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/28337>

UN DESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs). 2007. *Participatory Dialogue: Towards a Stable, Safe and Just Society for All*. United Nations.

UN DESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs) & UNITAR (United Nations Institute for Training and Research). 2020. *Stakeholder Engagement & the 2030 Agenda: A Practical Guide*. https://sustainable-development.un.org/content/documents/2703For_distribution_Stakeholder_Engagement_Practical_Guide_spreads_2.pdf

UNDG (United Nations Development Group). 2017. *UNDAF Companion Guidance: Monitoring and Evaluation*. United Nations.

UN DPA (United Nations Department for Political Affairs) & UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2015. *Natural Resources and Conflict: A Guide for Mediation Practitioners*. <https://www.unep.org/resources/report/natural-resources-and-conflict-guide-mediation-practitioners>

UNGA (United Nations General Assembly). 2016. Resolution 70/262. A/RES/70/262. 12 May.

UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund). 2017. *Gender Equality: Glossary of Terms and Concepts*.

UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund). 2018. *UNICEF Strategic Plan 2018-2021: Indicator Manual*. <https://www.unicef.org/media/55526/file/UNICEF%20Strategic%20Plan%20Goal%20Area%203%20Indicator%20Manual%20Ver.%201.7.pdf>

UN Interagency Framework Team for Preventive Action. 2012. *Land and Conflict*. United Nations. https://www.un.org/en/land-natural-resources-conflict/pdfs/GN_ExeS_Land%20and%20Conflict.pdf

UN Peacekeeping. n.d. "Quick Impact Projects for Communities." <https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/quick-impact-projects-communities>

UNSC (United Nations Security Council). 2016. Resolution 2282. S/RES/2282(2016). 27 April.

UNSDG (United Nations Sustainable Development Group). 2017. *Theory of Change: UNDAF Companion Guide.* <https://unsdg.un.org/resources/theory-change-undaf-companion-guidance>

UN Women. 2022. "OSAGI Gender Mainstreaming—Concepts and Definitions." <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/conceptsanddefinitions.htm>

USAID (United States Agency for International Development). 2014. *Water and Conflict Toolkit.* USAID. <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1866/WaterConflictToolkit.pdf>

USAID (United States Agency for International Development). 2020a. "Implementation Tips for USAID Partners." Inclusive Development 13. <https://www.ngoconnect.net/sites/default/files/2021-05/Inclusive%20Development%20-%2013%20-%20Inclusion%20in%20M%26E.pdf>

USAID (United States Agency for International Development). 2020b. "The Global Learning for Adaptive Management Initiative (GLAM)." USAID Learning Lab. <https://usaidearninglab.org/resources/global-learning-adaptive-management-initiative-glam>

USAID (United States Agency for International Development). 2020c. "USAID Evaluation Policy." USAID. https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Evaluation_Policy_Update_OCT2020_Final.pdf

USAID (United States Agency for International Development). 2021. "How to Note—Activity MEL Plan." USAID Learning Lab. https://usaidearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/htn_activity_mel_plan_final2021.pdf

USAID (United States Agency for International Development). 2022. "Discussion Note: Adaptive Management." USAID Learning Lab. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PBAAJ032.pdf

U.S. Global Development Lab. 2019. "Considerations for Using Data Responsibly at USAID." USAID. <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/15396/USAID-Using-DataResponsibly.pdf>

USIP (United States Institute of Peace). 2011. *Peacebuilding Toolkit for Educators.* High School Edition. USIP.

Van der Ploeg, Frederick. 2011. "Natural Resources: Curse or Blessing?" *Journal of Economic Literature* 49(2): 366-420.

Von Bertalanffy, Ludwig. 1968. *General System Theory: Foundations, Development.* New York: George Braziller.

Webb, J. Angus, Robyn J. Watts, Catherine Allan, & John C. Conallin. 2018. "Adaptive Management of Environmental Flows." *Environmental Management* 61:339-326. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-017-0981-6>

WHO (World Health Organization). 2016. *Taking a Participatory Approach to Development and Better Health: Examples from the Regions for Health Network.* World Health Organization, Regional Office for Europe.

WHO (World Health Organization). 2022. "Gender and Health." <https://www.who.int/health-topics/gender>

Wild, Leni, Matt Andrews, Jamie Pett, & Helen Dempster. 2016. "Doing Development Differently: Who We Are, What We're Doing and What We're Learning." Overseas Development Institute.

World Bank. 2022. "Historical Overview: The World Bank Group's Classification of Fragile and Conflict Affected Situations." <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/373511582764863285-0090022020/original/FCS-Historialnote.pdf>

Wright, Quincy. 1957. "International Conflict and the United Nations." *World Politics* 10(1): 24-48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009223>



