CHAPTER 3

Understanding environmental conflicts

B.5 Knowing the context and partners
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This session aims to present a path from the definition of environmental conflict seen as a specific moment of confrontation between different alternative projects on land and resource use. The session continues with an examination of the theoretical models generally used to explain that environmental conflicts are based on three approaches: scarcity and environmental security, negotiation, eco-citizenship and environmental justice. The next stage presents the relevant aspects to focus for observing and being positioned in an environmental conflict: the evolution of the conflict through the stages of latency, visibility and, in some cases, transformation; dynamic mapping of the participants involved in a socio-environmental conflict and the environmental issues dispute. The session closes with some operational guidelines about living in socio-environmental conflict, focused specially in the role of planning conflict prevention through the use of some tools that could complement the professional tasks of the environmental engineer: Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment.
LEARNING OUTCOMES

After you actively engage in the learning experiences in this module, you should be able to:

- Recognize a conflicted situation as being a creative and expressive opportunity of the plurality of projects presented in a territory.
- Identify conflicts already in the latency stage without waiting for triggering situations which lead to visibility or to destructive growth.
- Know some tools to prevent conflicts along with design and programming tools generally used by the environmental engineer.

KEY CONCEPTS

These concepts will help you better understand the content in this session:

- Socio-environmental conflict
- Territory and plurality of projects
- Social opposition and role of citizenship
- Citizenship, justice and participation
- Latency and visibility of socio-environmental conflict
- Resolution, management and transformation of socio-environmental conflict
- Tools to prevent socio-environmental conflict

GUIDING QUESTIONS

Develop your answers to the following guiding questions while completing the readings and working through the session:

- What provokes socio-environmental conflicts? The scarcity and loss of environmental resources? The inability to negotiate and reach agreements? The search for greater justice and participation in environmental decision-making processes?
- How to not to find yourself in a conflict? How to proceed in a conflict? How to prevent environmental conflicts?
INTRODUCTION

The decisions about the environment and natural resources often go beyond a question of technique, because it is not only necessary to choose the best project with the best technology, or to define a long term policy or plan for managing the territory or establish the best location to act. The knowledge of the techniques and design and programming procedures learnt during university studies must interact with the capacity to discover the territory about to be used.

Since it is a "discovery", not everything is registered on the maps, and the integration of the environmental engineering guideline legacy is necessary to manage the decision-making processes characterized by scientific uncertainty and evolving rule systems. Above all, it requires knowing how to face the social dimension of the territory, that is which are the stakeholders, the interests and the values each part assigns to the environmental issue and to the decision-making process. This situation of uncertainty, complexity, ambiguity, conflict of interest, alternative projects, proposals of methods and techniques in competition, is a rich terrain for the growth and development of conflicts.

It can be simplified to assuming that any physical or regulatory intervention done in a territory is likely to arouse conflicting behaviours in relation to the upcoming proposal. Conflict refers to a situation in which two or more parties believe to have conflicting interests and act to limit the rival’s action and ensure the achievement of its objectives. Apart from the perception of an incompatibility between objectives, the conflicts are generated and reinforced by other elements such as: divergent interests, a history of past relationships that showed situations of abuse, considered scare resources, ambiguous rules in the allocation of resources and the relationships between the parties. This is a very general definition of conflict which will try to be limited only to the environmental conflict.

CORE: GUIDELINES TO THE SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICT

Conflicts are an essential part of social relations as to occasions of changing and redefinition of rules of social parties’ relations, and between society and natural resources and the environment. The conflicts on environmental, territorial or landscape issues regard public work (or public decisions) or private investment (productive settlement) that are not acceptable for some of the social groups. Mobilization and opposition can be of proximity, when the intervention is judged to be too close and able to influence the daily life or the place of residence, but also upper-local and global: for example the mobilization against European policy on GMOs or against oil extraction in Amazon.
DEFINITIONS AND VOCABULARY

Within the professional work of the environmental engineer, three types of environmental conflicts can be recognized. The first category of conflict includes social opposition towards interventions seen as dangerous to the environment and to health. An example is the local mobilization against the realization of infrastructure works, installations for the treatment of waste (from incineration to composting plants), production plants with hazardous working, just to mention some of the infinite cases. These choices imply environmental impacts focused in one place, in which “a few” suffer as opposed to the benefit obtained from “many” who live far away from the impacted place. However, these conflicts are not only from a proximate point (the highway behind a home), as mobilization can consist in environment conflicts “far away” and global, as the mining in Brazil, the use of pesticides in the agricultural crops in Ecuador, the depletion of mangroves to feed the shrimp’s world market (Paul and Røskaft, 2013). In these cases the environmental conflict take charge of a preventive approach, showing an active civil society that is not willing to wait until the environmental damage is done to ask for a restoration.

A second category of conflict concerns the decisions which should ensure environmental or landscape protection: think of the buffer zones around springs, landscape constraints, limit the mining of resource or emissions into the atmosphere, or the limitation of the duration of the hunting season for hunters. A typical example is the institution of protected areas, whereas mobilizations are generated from the perception of limitations to the activities carried out until the that moment and, in some cases, especially in developing countries, to the endangering of subsistence economies in the face of environmental protection aimed at the marketing of eco-tourism (Adams and Hutton, 2007; Castro and Nielsen, 2003; Liu et Al, 2010).

Finally, there is a third typology of conflict regarding opposing the realization of infrastructures such for the production of renewable energy, in particular the wind energy, but also small hydroelectric productions or cogeneration from biomass. In this type of conflict, environmental protection (through the development of the renewable energy) is confronted with environmental damage production (in the wind case, in particular to the landscape and the avifauna), provoking a sort of conflict between alternative environmentalists (Breukers, Wolsink, 2007; Van der Horst, 2007).

Ultimately, are these three typologies of conflict so different or have they got something in common? In the first case of the prevention of environmental damage, is the refusal of a model of industrialization that works at the expense of the environment; a sort of conflict between the environment and the economy. In the second case of protected areas, limitations on mining and on the use of land, it seems that the economic
interest prevails over the environmental one. In the third case of renewable energies, there is a confrontation between two different models of environmental management.

To answer this question an operational definition can be included to the three different typologies of environmental conflict: **environmental conflicts are precise moments of confrontation between different alternative projects of use of land and resources that show the difficulties and weaknesses of the decision-making procedure in how to include participants in complex decisions.** The environmental conflict, more than an opposition to any decision, represents a growing demand of citizen involvement towards a territory lived in and built collectively (De Marchi, 2004; 2009; 2011; De Marchi, Natalicchio, Ruffato, 2010). Hence, the environmental conflict is not reduced to a dispute over resource only in quantitative and qualitative terms, but over the value and the significance this resource has to the different social groups in the building process of the territory.

In fact, from this moment is called socio-environmental conflict, adopted from the Latin American approach to highlight the indissoluble relation issue that link each territory between social relations and the ones with the ecologic component of the site. Moreover, a second element is introduced regarding the vocabulary used to describe the socio-environmental conflicts and, in particular, the stakeholders.

Generally, in scientific literature two terms are used: “proponent” and “opponent”. **The proponent represents the public or private entity holder of a design and regulatory project proposal that is “challenged” by the opponent of one or more “opponents” groups.** For example, the proponent could be a company that decides to build a big wind plant in an area with natural features and fittings, and the opponent could be the residents committee of the fraction near the plant, a hunters’ association, etc. **The proponents could get support from the local administration and from the local construction companies who would see some of their problems solved, while the opponents could find a consensus with the citizens of the town site of the plant and on one or more environmental associations.** In the other hand, if the conflict was seen in the Latin American approach in research and practices on environmental conflicts (De Marchi, Natalicchio, Ruffato, 2010), the citizens’ committee which mobilized against the plant would be called “the main actor” while the company would be “the antagonist”.

According to this last approach, the role of the citizenship which challenges the plans designed for a territory is emphasized, while using the term “proponent” is recognized the action to change by the public and private initiative and the citizenship by a hindering size. Hence, it needs to pay attention to the terms used in the analysis of the environmental conflict, precisely because the words are not neutral and are likely to strongly influence what you are observing. It is the case of the NIMBY syndrome (Not In My Back Yard). This syndrome could impact any citizen which lives near a public works proposal site. It could be
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a simple problem of proximity to generate environmental conflict. Actually the syndrome does not explain a thing; it in fact creates a distorted view of the processes, not allowing finding a constructive and creative way within the management of conflict. If proximity were the trigger of the generation of environmental conflict, nothing could be done but to make the citizen accept the proposal, maybe trying to demonstrate that it will not cause any damage. However, the NIMBY syndrome represents the first stage of a more complex one which could be evolved into NIABAY (Not In Anyone’s Back Yard), to reach the “final stage” where the syndrome would turn even into NOPE (Nowhere On Planet Earth) (De Marchi, 2011).

In some cases, the conflict rouses ideological and root dimensions. This bringing out local interests and selfish views viscerally contrary to the industrial model embraced by the whole planet. It is clear though that decision-making processes, in which the opposition boils as if it were sick of an “against a proposal” syndrome, creates tautologies which cannot explain nor help to understand and face the conflict in a constructive way.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICTS BETWEEN SCARCITY, NEGOTIATION AND CITIZENSHIP

What is an environmental conflict? The blind opposition to any change near home or the participation in the choices regarding the place you live in? Mechanical answers to environmental loss, an ideological battle against modernity and change, or a project about new territories? Essentially, is it about resource flow such as environmental goods and services, or the relationship between society and sites? Research and practices, which have been working for years in conflicts, highlighted the existence of one out of the three following aspects (De Marchi, 2004):

• scarcity of resources and the need to launch paths of environmental security;
• negotiating skills of the parties involved in the conflicts;
• citizenship and environmental justice.

In a conflict each one of the parties use behaviours to block and avoid the other to reach the objectives, and these behaviours are reinforced by the perception that resources are scarce. In fact, according to theorists of scarcity and environmental security, the environmental conflicts are generated mostly because of the resource scarcity, by a quantitative decrease, hence, less arable land, less fishery resources, less forest area; or more often, because of the loss of it, for instance, by the aggravation of the air and water quality following pollution (Dabelko, 2008; Ullman, 1983).

Consequently, scarcity could create rather violent conflict between individuals, groups, organizations (States), to which should be replied to proactively, identifying signs of risk, or by investing in more police (for internal conflicts) or in strengthening military force (for a
conflict between States). The environment would act as an independent variable that would push automatically the social groups to confrontation/dispute (Homer-Dixon, 1991; 1994)(Figure1).

![Figure 1 Scarcity and environmental security model by Homer-Dixon (1991). The deterministic model requires that the environmental effects are a consequence of the seven categories of scarcity/loss: greenhouse effect, degradation of the ozone layer, acid rain, deforestation, degradation of agricultural soils, consumption and water pollution, dwindling fish stocks. The environmental effects could generate four typologies of social effects: decrease in agricultural production, economic decline, displacement of the population, disintegration of the traditional relationships. This path gives rise to three types of conflict: simple scarcity, group identity, relative deprivation.

This theoretical model has recently collected new interest and consensus regarding what could be the impacts on climate change. Ecological battles between States or internal conflicts caused by the resource scarcity because of the climate change would make the States redefine their security agendas and introduce the environment as the most relevant issue, putting in act the alleged environmental security (PPPC, 2014). The model of scarcity and environmental security update the Malthusian catastrophe model, and is based on an environmental determinism that seems to leave no space for human action (De Marchi, 2004).

In contrast with the catastrophic environmental security approach, the negotiation models believe that environmental conflict is caused by the incapacity of parties to manage the breaking of existing agreements to make new suitable ones to the current situation, but even more to respond to the future changes.

The negotiation models are used when managing public environmental dispute in the United States and have by now a codified intervention mode which allows to (Menkel-Meadow, 2012; Susskind et al., 1999; White, 2009):

- use mediators to ease the process;
- have dialogue and build a climate of trust and respect between parties;
- build a shared path between parties to face the dispute in a constructive way;
- conclude the path by ratifying the agreement between parties.

However, the required process to build a climate of collaboration eased by the mediator must be productive, that is it must lead to the achievement of an agreement that ratifies the end of the conflict. The agreement assesses the mediator’s capacity on future opportunities, the client’s ability to launch a negotiation process (public administration, company) and the parties’ satisfaction.
Yet, the priority of the agreement hides two critical elements: the first of a theoretical nature and the second of a practical one. From the theoretical point of view it is presumed that all the stakeholders are equals, and so they can sit down easily in a negotiating table offering the same cognitive resources. In fact, the job of the mediator is focused to the negotiating method, with the purpose to make the parties acquire knowledge of two aspects: the necessity to build beneficial agreements for everyone and not only for a single party, the need to measure the difference between the advantage created by any kind of agreement and the lack of agreement called BATNA (Best Alternative To a Negotiated Agreement) (Bobbio, 1992).

Therefore, it is assumed that all stakeholders are equal and have the same negotiating power. The diversity of power between parties is not only expressed by the cognitive abilities (which are, in fact, often “level off” in a way during the process) nor by other resources: temporary, informative, economic, etc., which some stakeholders have greater power and so they can influence the modality of the dispute’s development. For example, a group of citizens that must sit in a negotiating table with a powerful company engaged in fracking, or a group of indigenous people with an oil company. Lots of mediators reflect on the difference of power of the participants around the negotiating table (Gensberg, 2003), but is not yet formalized a procedure to respond to these situations, as the final agreement is still the crucial element to assess each negotiation process.

A second critical aspect of the negotiation models concern the conclusion of the conflict and the possibility to build long-term agreements which ensure fair and equal solutions to all stakeholders. There are many intractable conflicts in which are difficult to get into an agreement (Asah et al., 2012) and agreements that are too fragile because they were built by the lack of in-depth reading about the power dynamic at stake (Engel and Korf, 2005; Griewals and Rauschmayer, 2014; Temper and Martinez-Alier, 2013).

The third approach, the environmental justice and eco-citizenship, shares with the negotiation models the centralization of action and social responsibility in environmental issues and conflicts. However, the central question is not to build an agreement to recompose interests but to face the stakeholders’ rights of resource access and management, and of inclusion in the decision-making (Buchanan, 2013; Buijs et al., 2011; De Marchi, 2004; Reynaud, 1984).

The starting point is that societies and the environment do not relate directly but through the mediation of the territory, that is a group of physical works build by men and rules which ensure the social reproduction in time and at the same time the reproducibility of resources (sustainability) (Shmueli, 2008; Vallega, 1995).
The loss of a resource or the regulation which ensures its quality and leads to the access and use of resources and sites, are the typical social product that does not depend so much on the resource nor the society. For instance, public goods such as health and school, in some social contexts are completely public and in others completely private, with all the variations in between. This works also for environmental issues, where, for example, simple societies have also rules for hunting and fishing, with rules for crop rotation or priorities and sequences for harvesting precise forest products. Industrialized or post-industrialized societies define the rules relative to the use of land (from the public parks to the productive areas), to resource quality (as the limitation of emissions into the atmosphere). This group of operations that control the method of use among individuals, groups, institutions can be called “governance” and consists in the non-visible part of the organization of a territory, see Figure 2.

Figure 2 Peace Research Institute of Oslo model (PRIO) for explaining environmental conflicts, see the governance’s role and the coexistence of conflict and cooperation (from Rønnfeldt C.F., 1997; Smith e Østreng, 1997)

Therefore, between resources and social groups there are rules: the governance (see Figure 3), and conflicts and cooperation are behaviours that coexist in the context of social relations with environmental resources. According to the eco-citizenship approach, conflicts are not caused by resource scarcity but by a crisis in the rules and management of rights on use of resources. It can happen that the rules are not adequate to social change or to the change in the conditions of a resource, or that the rules are violated (environmental injustice), or that the unstable long-term situations of cooperation ask for a redefinition of the rules (Hjort-af-Örnas, 1996; 2008).

Eco-citizenship and environmental justice work also in territories with plural projects created in conflicted situations. That is because often there is no room for confrontation when it comes to alternatives on territorial development: only great participants (States, companies, and public administration) have the capacity to employ a visible planning power that can,
however, let the weakest projects develop through the stages of conflict. Environmental conflict does not represent much of a confrontation/dispute of a work nor its significance and decisions in a context of plural projects to restore the territory (Figure 3).

Figure 3 Typologies of urban conflicts in relation to the prism of sustainability (economy, environment, equity, livability). Conflicts for gentrification emerge when plans for urban regeneration act in central districts for attracting high-income population and moving the low-income one to the suburbs (adapted from Sze e Sovacool, 2013)

OBSERVING THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICT: MOMENT AND COMPONENTS

How not to find yourself into conflict? How to act in a conflict? How to use conflict as a participatory planning workshop? The first aspect to examine to understand the practice in environmental conflict is that conflicts move according to the timeline which we can identify three moments (De Marchi, 2004):

• latency;
• visibility;
• transformation.

Latency is the “present not present” of the conflict that is the moment in which only the conflict experts can feel that something is breaking up in the existing cooperation. Occasionally stakeholders are conscious that something is breaching but have no intentions to see the process; sometimes parties are not aware that they are in close to the rift point. However, working in a territory requires paying attention to the existing strength or weakness of the rules of cooperation. A community that accepted years before the realization of a
waste dump could not agree to accept its expansion. The acceptance could have occurred with difficulty but also with the conviction that the limited net volume would have been used in a few years, reducing this way the number of heavy vehicles in the zone. It is crucial to read the latency period in-depth for planning an intervention, so one do not find themselves in conflict by the lack of reading more than by the lack of arising from truly unpredictable circumstances.

**Visibility is the moment in which conflict between stakeholders is notorious and it results in the rupture of continuity with previous practices.** Therefore, it is necessary that the parties aware of the existing conflict situation decide to mark the end of the cooperation, or that one of the stakeholders acts convinced that the decision could be acceptable and in the end they face an unexpected conflict.

If there is an intervention in the visibility moment it is reasonable to ask two questions. One is about the need to understand the path that leaded to the conflict, and above all, the distinctive elements of conflict/cooperation situations. The other question is related to the necessity to know how to act in an existing conflict: to avoid any intervention using the escalation or waiting for causality; or launching programs on negotiation to reach to an agreement between stakeholders.

Taking the previous example, there is a group of citizens of the location where the waste dump is installed that wants to block the gates to prevent the entry of trucks. At this point it could be evident and known in a regional or national level that an extension of the dump is planned since the net volume is reaching its capacity, and that this new stage is totally unacceptable for the citizens.

How to proceed? Call security force and clear the area? Let it go and do nothing, suspend the vehicles and locate in another dump while waiting for the protestors to get tired? Or assesses another suitable site and cancel the existing expansion of the dump? Or try to find a way to the next moment of the conflict, the transformation?

**Transformation is the third moment of conflict and does not happen frequently in a theoretical perspective of conflict management nor in practice.** More often is referred as resolution of conflict, which is a sort of agreement that eliminates its visibility. On the other hand, transformation means putting attention not only to the environmental conflict but also to the conflicting atmosphere, and rewrite new rules based on an inclusive process. Hence, new rules between parties, society and the environment are involved.

Supposedly to resolve this conflict; which regards both, the municipality of Moreira dos Pantanais and also the whole region of Alto Pantanal; there is an overall picture about waste management, typology and localization of a list of projects, and modalities to recognize the
different weights bourn by its nearby community. There is no resolution insurance, it could be a long process, but there will be a way for a constructive and creative modality for managing a complex decision.

After assessing the timeline and when to observe the conflict, it is time to highlight who and what to observe in a socio-environmental conflict (De Marchi, 2004) focusing in three elements:

• the dynamic map of stakeholders in conflict;
• the interaction mode of stakeholders in conflict;
• the environmental issues subjected of controversy

The map of the stakeholders involved in the conflict cannot be seen as a picture taken in the visibility moment but as a cinema take that comes along with the development of the conflict from the latency moment until the eventual transformation moment (Figure 4).

During a conflict some stakeholders can be present the whole time (from the latency to the transformation moment), some intervene only in limited moments, some drop off and others will get in, and, above all, the conflict can generate new participants. Taking again the example before, is necessary to follow in a dynamic way the different stakeholders (citizen, municipal administration, companies engaged in waste management, etc.) to mark their presence or absence in the different moments of the conflict, and to understand when they drop off and get in.
The second aspect to examine is the interaction mode of the stakeholders, analysing the way the territory and the conflict are read in connection with themselves and the other parties in stake, the projects they are willing to create through the conflict, the establishment of alliances, the resources they can mobilize, the action modes (charges, disinformation, mobilization, boycott, pressure on politicians and administrators, etc.).

Among the stakeholder aspects in the environmental conflict it is extremely important to note that the environmental and territorial issue may be subject to controversy, the resource flow put at risk, the rights to access these resources, the potential health and environmental risks, and the local or international level of the environmental issue.

In the example analysed, it could have intervening elements of environmental risk related to water pollution caused by the waste dump, to a significant impact produced by noise and vibrations of vehicles, to a public intolerance to odor emissions, to the loss of the affected area of the dump. Apart from conditioning the resources put in risk, the alternatives and the transformation would act for a complex environmental regeneration and for the creation of alternative projects on development in the region.

CONCLUSIONS: LIVING IN SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICT

As a conclusion these are the indicative guidelines for “living” in environmental conflict, focused on two fundamental moments: creative management and prevention. Managing the conflict means to intervene in an existing conflict situation, that is in the visibility moment. In this case it is necessary to overtake the exclusion processes that generated the conflict, suggesting room to confront alternative projects and redefine a new decision-making process that learn from mistakes and permit to develop a new stage of solid and fair cooperation based on the transformation of the relations that lead to conflict.

However, the transformation cannot be seen as coming from the bottom, but it is necessary to adopt a complex perspective described as “popular diplomacy” (Sharoni, 1997) that sees the transformation of the conflict through the combination of interventions, from the bottom, from the above and from the outside.

In the example given, that is the outburst of conflict followed by the proposal of an expansion of the waste dump, it is clear that there is no sense to let the dealing of the conflict come from the bottom, hence, that the community deals directly with the company responsible for the waste management or with municipality administration. Interventions that comes from outside (e.g.: facilitators, environmental associations) and from above (e.g.: Region) that redefine a new policy to waste management are fundamental for the transformation of a conflict.
A creative management of a conflict requires the capacity to combine the visions from the bottom, from above and from the outside, precisely because social, institutional and environmental relations of a site do not end in the place but continue in the network that links it with other realities. It is in practice a more and more multipart thought in complex contexts where “the same things” can have different point of view, and where “everybody is right, even the one that says that not everybody is right” (Sclavi, 2003).

Finally, is it possible to prevent the arousal of a destructive conflict in the moment in which a territorial decision is about to be made by using the participatory and inclusion tools from different stakeholders in the decision-making process to the full; along with the planning, programming and assessing tools commonly used by environmental engineers, which are specifically elaborated to prevent conflict. In fact, environmental conflict can be generated when the decision excluded some territorial stakeholder or when the participatory intervention was not correctly managed. However, the intervention occurs often in the latency moment without an accurate and complex territorial analysis, and not realizing the existence of conflict and therefore, sometimes without wanting it, it is likely to increase the destructive size of the conflict.

In a preventive way, to investigate the latency of conflicts and carry out a complete territorial analysis, here are three available tools: Social Impact Assessment (SIA) is the first tool that most of the time cooperates with the well-known Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and assesses the impacts and manages the implications of the programmed interventions (Barrow, 2010; Esteves et al, 2012; Persson, 2006; Prenzel and Vanclay, 2014; Vanclay, 2006).

SIA involves a complex interface between society and the environment and the different chains of impacts: whether in direct social impacts, meaning the influence of a plan or project on various social components of a territory, or in indirect social impacts, hence the social consequences of an environmental impact. Except in some Countries, an SIA is not a mandatory tool like an EIA. However its voluntary use, even if not expected, could ease the analysis of the direct and indirect social impacts, allow the social feasibility assessment of interventions and recognize forms of inclusive participation and management in the decisions (Figure 5).
For example, when there is an intervention in indigenous territories it is mandatory to use the free, prior and informed consent procedure from the articles 10, 19, 29, 32 by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (06-51207) and from the Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, 1989 (No. 169) by the International Labour Organization. In many Countries where there are indigenous peoples, the free, prior and informed consent is mandatory and regulated by national law. However, often the procedures for reaching the Prior consent are carried out only to legalize the regulatory requirement but have no substantial power for territorial analysis and for information and achievement of the free and prior consent of indigenous peoples on the proposed interventions. This way the risk to generate even more destructive conflicts grows and obliges to appeal in both, national and international court (for violation of human rights) and what years later (court timing processes) can lead to the block of the existed interventions for not using correctly the path of the free, prior and informed consent.

The third tool is the Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) (Austin, Fisher, Wilson, 2003) or “Do No Harm” (Anderson, 1999). These are tools made in the scene of humanitarian action and of post conflict interventions based on the knowledge that some interventions, proposed with aiding aims in a post conflict situation, revealed unexpected effects, maintained high levels of uncertainty and declined the possibilities to build an effective peace. Not only humanitarian activities, but also development cooperation experienced difficulties to obtain results capable of promoting an equitable development and ensuring the empowerment of the weak stakeholders.
PCIA is a group of tools that try to make an ex-ante assessment of the impact on the local context for different parties and on the intervention adequacy to promote cooperation and peace or maybe generate new and even more critical ones (Bush, 1998; 2005).

“Do No Harm” (Anderson, 1999; Austin, Fisher, Wilson, 2003) can be used in an ex-ante assessment during the preparation of the intervention program and as a support to the design (also participative) and it is structured in 7 stages (Table 1). Considering that latency of conflicts can be identified and analyzed before elaborating and working in a program or project, an extended and consolidated use of a SIA, free, prior and informed consent and a PCIA can ease the dialogue between the decision-maker and the local participants by reducing the arousal of destructive conflicts.

**Table 1 Do No Harm approach in 7 stages (by Anderson, 1999; Austin, Fisher, Wilson, 2003)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The conflict context</td>
<td>In this first stage it is verified if the geographical scale on the analysis suits the tolerance of relations between social groups, conflicts and proposed interventions. Afterwards it is necessary to analyze the past and current territorial history to recognize the elements that are still significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The conflict and sources of tension (<em>Dividers</em>)</td>
<td>It consists in paying attention to all angles of the conflict: the moments of latency, visibility, the level of generated violence; the stakeholders involved, the resources at stake, the causes and history of conflict; observe how conflict is used to reach other aims by some of the parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The collaborative processes and the cooperation capacities on local peace (<em>Connectors</em>)</td>
<td>Notice the ongoing collaborative processes despite violent conflict present along latent and visual ones; recognize the institutions that are carrying out or have carried out management actions in the conflict and their capacity to reactivate after violent moments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The project</td>
<td>Examine according to the territory and latent and visual conflict: consistency with the objectives of the project; the location activity; the relevance of the proposed methodologies; the staff’s mode of selection; the project’s organizational and decisional structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Projects impacts in the conflict situation</td>
<td>Examine how resources and communication activated by the project influence collaborative or conflictive processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The alternatives to intervention</td>
<td>Recognize the alternatives that reduce conflict dimensions and reinforce collaborative capacities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Project alternatives and redefinitions assessment</td>
<td>Reevaluate stages 4, 5 and 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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