

Summary of Presentations by Panelists and Closing Remarks  
Seminar, “Inclusivity in Rebuilding States: Focusing on Inclusivity of Peace Negotiations and Its  
Impact on Post-Conflict Peacebuilding” (6 June 2013)

July 18 Version

**Main Presentation**

**Christopher Coleman (Head of Mali/Sahel Unit, UN Department of Political Affairs):**

Mr. Coleman focused on the lessons learned from the Sudan peace talks from 2002-2005, in which he participated as a member of the UN Observer Delegation. At that time, the Sudan had already experienced 20 years of war; thus, the stakes were high. The talks began in earnest with the signing in July 2002 of the Machakos Protocol, a slim document that became the basis for the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). The agreement included several key elements on political inclusion: religion, customs, and traditions (sources of inspiration for the Sudanese people); establishing a democratic government, taking into account national and religious diversity; and gender equality.

There was the hard reality that many Sudanese in the North did not consider the Sudanese government as their representative; and many Sudanese in the South thought that the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM) was not representative of Southerners.

Coleman stressed that it was impossible to include everybody at the negotiation table. He acknowledged that there may have been too few representatives at the table. However, the mediators needed to first reach an agreement between the two major parties: the Government of Sudan and SPLM.

At the same time, he stressed, the CPA explicitly specified the institutional arrangements for more representative government as well as equitable allocation of resources. The peace process also spawned, informally, broader consultative circles, which included different parties that were not signatories of the CPA but were still crucial to the peace.

Mr. Coleman argued that one major lesson from the CPA negotiation is that the principle of inclusive politics needs to be enumerated from the start. He emphasized the importance of the initial agreement in 2002, which created the framework for 2½ years of negotiation aimed at achieving more inclusive governance arrangements in Sudan. At difficult moments in the process, it was important to be able to refer back to the 2002 Machakos Protocol.

The second lesson is that an inclusive political process requires a sense of ownership by the major parties. Enabling them to build the necessary consensus took time. It would have been a mistake to try and rush that process. The international community must be willing to invest the time to help the parties address real concerns and be patient enough to get to this point.

The third lesson is that the peace process requires continuous support and occasionally some pressure from outside actors. In the case of the Sudan mediation, the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), comprising the countries of the sub-region, provided the framework. Kenya provided the Chief Mediator, who was supported by the envoys of Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Uganda. The Chief Mediator was also supported by the so-called troika (Norway, UK, and the U.S.); Italy as co-chair of the IGAD Partners Forum; the UN and eventually the AU. It is not always good to have so many outside stakeholders so closely involved, but in this case it worked well because all parties shared sufficient interests in a peaceful outcome. On the basis of that convergence of interest they were able to work closely together. Still, it required a lot of consultations throughout the negotiating process to maintain consensus among the outside stakeholders to produce one outcome. This was a necessary investment.

Fourth, the inclusivity of peace negotiations within a conflicted country is very different from traditional mediation between two states. Given that many conflicts in today's world are intra-state rather than inter-state, mediators need to be equipped accordingly. The strengthening of the UN's mediation capacity since 2005 reflects this requirement. As the demands of mediation continue to evolve, the requisite capacities must be continually adapted.