



# **REPORT**

## **Civil Society Conference on Armed Violence and Development**

Measuring and monitoring armed violence

Strengthening assistance to victims and survivors

Amsterdam, 24-25 January 2011

## Summary

In January 2011, 34 representatives of civil society organizations and independent experts met in Amsterdam to share experiences on how to address the problem of armed violence. Recognising that armed violence has gained significant international attention since 2006, and agreeing that efforts to achieve concrete reduction in armed violence should focus on practical actions that are evidence-led, two groups (respectively) addressed the following questions:

- How governments, in collaboration with other actors, can strengthen national systems to measure and monitor armed violence; and
- How understanding the rights and needs of armed violence victims and survivors can support more effective armed violence reduction efforts.

The central objective of the conference was to establish agreement among participants on common principles that can inform advocacy and action in the fields of armed violence monitoring, and victim assistance. It was envisaged that increasing international coordination among civil society policy experts and practitioners can strengthen the call for greater international attention to the problem of armed violence; strengthen collective capacity for advocacy in international disarmament, security and development fora;<sup>1</sup> and strengthen standards in the practical development of armed violence monitoring systems, and rights-based programmes with victims and survivors on the ground.

Statements of Principles for national armed violence monitoring, and for assistance to victims of armed violence are included with this report under annexes 1 and 2.

### Ways forward in 2011

- Disseminate principles to relevant civil society actors and experts internationally, to build and widen common agreement among advocates and practitioners, with a strong emphasis on armed violence-affected countries;
- Develop technical standards and practical guidance (e.g. on national armed violence monitoring) to promote with potential pilot Member States;
- Develop collective messaging on the need for better armed violence data and monitoring, and the need for greater recognition of the rights and needs of victims and survivors of armed violence in relevant international policy processes (including the Arms Trade Treaty, the Programme of Action, and the Geneva Declaration Ministerial Review Summit);
- Explore options for collaboration on the two conference themes among participant and wider civil society organisations.

*The conference was structured as follows:*

Day 1: After a short introductory session, the two groups met separately to discuss issues related to their chosen theme, and to identify principles to be presented as a statement in plenary on Day 2.

---

<sup>1</sup> Such as the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), the Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons (PoA), and the 2011 Geneva Declaration Ministerial Review Conference.

Day 2: Groups reconvened to review two statements of principles and to discuss how to advance these areas of work as part of advocacy efforts in 2011, and in terms of opportunities for practical implementation.

This report sets out the main issues discussed in each group and during the joint session. It also contains several annexes including both conference statements as well as the full list of participants, the agenda of the conference and a calendar of opportunities for 2011.

For any additional information and comments on the conference, please contact Serena Olgiati, AOAV Policy Advisor, [solgiati@aoav.org.uk](mailto:solgiati@aoav.org.uk).

## **Measuring and Monitoring of Armed Violence**

Participants addressed questions relating to the purpose, content, structure and usage of a comprehensive national armed violence database and system.

Discussions were structured around the following questions:

- Why monitor armed violence at national level?
- What data/indicators to monitor?
- How to gather data?
- What structure should a national monitoring system have and who should be involved in the monitoring?
- How to practically use the national monitoring system?

### **Why monitor armed violence at national level?**

Participants considered ethical, political and practical reasons for advocating stronger attention to national armed violence monitoring – recognizing that monitoring and measuring phenomena like armed violence is inherently political, and that any monitoring system needs to be explicit and transparent about its values, methods and purpose.

It was generally agreed that, although considerable data on armed violence already exists in most countries, such data are, in many cases, incomplete, poorly integrated and/or inaccessible to stakeholders including across government, in civil society, and among the affected communities and victims themselves. A key finding in this discussion was the central importance, through strengthening a national level and system of monitoring, of integrating existing data.

Participants agreed that a fundamental rationale for national armed violence monitoring lies in the need to build accountability among states to ensure safety and security of their populations, and to hold states responsible to this end. National monitoring represents a concrete response to existing international obligations under international humanitarian and human rights law, as well as more recent international agreements including the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development, and the Oslo Commitments on Armed Violence.

Participants also recognized the critical importance of national monitoring as the basis for building effective responses to the problem of armed violence. Monitoring armed violence at the national level enables differentiation of specific affected areas or communities within countries, different types of armed violence problem, and hence timely, targeted and appropriate humanitarian responses. National monitoring also enables analysis of patterns of armed violence, building understanding of underlying factors that increase risk, and hence supporting early warning capacity and, ultimately, effective prevention.

Participants emphasised that a national level of armed violence should support collection and analysis of data which is closer to the ground, allowing affected communities to contribute to a system of monitoring which is based on their perspectives and needs, and allowing for evaluation of specific programmatic interventions. Related to this, it was noted that national armed violence monitoring supports national level recognition of, and legal, policy and practical support to the victims and survivors.

Participants noted that national armed violence monitoring represents a powerful practical measure of good governance, reflecting willingness on the part of states to address a fundamental humanitarian and societal issue in the spirit of transparency, openness and commitment to truth.<sup>2</sup> It was noted, by the same merit, that the process of building national armed violence monitoring depends on – and actively supports – strengthening trust between government ministries and departments, and with civil society stakeholders, and that selecting country-specific armed violence metrics can create a platform for public debate on and awareness of the issue.<sup>3</sup>

### **What to monitor?**

Participants started by considering the utility and role of existing international data-sets on armed violence. It was agreed that, whilst these can be useful for cross-comparison between countries (with a potential for ranking and comparative performance internationally), there are questions about their accuracy in relation to individual country circumstances, the data on which they draw, and their utility for responding to specific violent incidence. It was agreed that they are relevant more as background information with regard to national monitoring endeavours.

Participants agreed that, in determining what kinds of data to monitor, it was vital to have a clear sense of the purpose of a monitoring system, and that the primary purpose for national monitoring was for national-to-local accountability and effective armed violence reduction, rather than national-to-international comparison or ranking.<sup>4</sup>

Participants noted that the central purpose of a national armed violence monitoring system is to record weapon-related violent harm, of whatever kind, occurring within a specific (sovereign or other) territory. In this respect, monitoring should be, first and foremost, ‘people-centred’ – that is, recording all incidence of physical harm regardless of other political or legal qualification (e.g. ‘crime’, ‘conflict’, ‘terrorism’, other).

There was discussion of the potential complexity of selecting cross-nationally standard data on armed violence, where types of violence and contextual conditions vary significantly around the world. Distinction was made between ‘core’ data (that is, data relating primarily to the immediate, direct physical and psychological effects of armed violence in terms of mortality and morbidity), and data informing about wider ‘dimensions’ of armed violence incidence and impact, and ‘indicators’ which could include, for example, more qualitative metrics of perceptions and responses.

Participants agreed that national monitoring should draw on existing data sets as much as possible, and that a monitoring system can be built progressively, starting with core data that should be common to any national monitoring. These core data were agreed essential to include:

---

<sup>2</sup> It was also noted by several participants that openness in monitoring problems of armed violence can reduce vulnerability of states to leakage of ‘sensitive information’ and ‘data dumps’.

<sup>3</sup> Participants identified information ‘gatekeeping’ as being one of the major obstacles to effective national monitoring systems – unwillingness to share data dictated by political reasons or by concerns over confidentiality. NGOs also need to be aware not to become ‘gatekeepers’ themselves by being the only ones in possession of data and therefore positioning themselves in a very sensitive (potentially dangerous) situation. To prevent gatekeeping, participants agreed that it is necessary to establish the benefits that national monitoring can provide and to stress the common humanitarian purpose that collective and open monitoring supports.

<sup>4</sup> At least in the first instance, it was noted that national monitoring systems and data should be constructed with a view to compatibility with other monitoring countries in the longer-term. It was equally noted that comparative analysis of national armed violence monitoring practices and/or capacities could be a useful and ‘rankable’ international data-set.

- Weapon-related violent death (including details of time/location where possible)
- Weapon-related violent injury (including details of time/location where possible; & including type of trauma and psychological impact)
- Type of weapon used and history/provenance of weapon
- Basic demographics of victims/perpetrators (gender, age, ethnicity; where possible name or other relevant identifier, e.g. religion, political faction, geographical location)

Participants emphasized that it would be important to consider sources of core data, to ensure continuous availability of consistent data categories.

Beyond core data – and dependent on available resources and capacity – wider data should be gathered to complement core information, deepening capacity to analyse and understand the nature, form of armed violence, and to design and evaluate responses. Such data would require building in, and integrating, qualitative data-gathering and analysis methods, alongside quantitative data (see below, *How to Gather*).

Complementary data may include:

- Data on wider forms of armed violence, including gendered and sexual violence
- Case studies in specific affected ‘hot-spots’
- Community-level studies (where community profiles can be assessed as reasonable proxy for wider regional or national context)
- Perception surveys (to assess subjective conditions of security/insecurity relative to actually ongoing armed violence<sup>5</sup>)
- Assessment of policies, capacities and programmes explicitly (or inferrably) targeting armed violence (incidence, impact, victims/survivors, weapons, root causes<sup>6</sup>)

Participants also agreed that it would be important to evaluate periodically the utility of a national monitoring system, through metrics including openness and accessibility of information gathered, participation in analysis of information, and use of information in forming policy and programming.

### **How to gather data?**

It was felt strongly among participants agreed that much data on armed violence already exists – but existing data can be better used.

Where data on core aspects of armed violence are lacking, options for filling gaps could include insertion of armed violence-relevant questions into existing local and national-level surveys<sup>7</sup>, as well as supporting design and conduct of new surveys where necessary.

In terms of community data, participants considered the importance of ‘proxy studies’ through which studying one community can serve as an indicator itself – as long as it is known exactly how and in what ways that community relates to the national picture. Using a proxy indicator by studying a

---

<sup>5</sup> Consistent with prevailing definitions of ‘armed violence’ which include actual and threatened violence (OECD, 2009; UNGA, 2008; WHO, 2002).

<sup>6</sup> The range of core and complementary data set out in this discussion correspond closely to the armed violence conceptual framework set out in the OECD-DAC policy paper ‘*Armed Violence Reduction: enabling development*’ (OECD, 2009), addressing ‘weapons, actors, and institutions’.

<sup>7</sup> Including, e.g. Demographic and Health Surveys, MICS,

community can also provide a good source of qualitative data, i.e. human experiences, which can support advocacy work.

A primary process in building/strengthening national armed violence monitoring, then, should be encouraging sharing of data, and collaborative working to integrate existing data into a nationally comprehensive picture, using transparent methods. Important criteria for data-gathering were: continuity over time (to allow for trend analysis), and integration of data sources and types (e.g. surveillance and survey, quantitative and qualitative). It was suggested that practical approaches to improving national armed violence monitoring should take account of, and where feasible use, new information and communication technologies (ICT).

That said, participants agreed that a national armed violence monitoring system does not, in the first case, need to be complex, and that collaborating actors should aim for a primary system that is 'good enough' to capture accurate, credible, representative and usable data, and that is relatively simple to operate and to participate in.

To ensure credibility, participation and buy-in from relevant stakeholders, it was suggested that a monitoring system should hold and make available data on armed violence in its raw form, as well as processed 'forms'. Data 'processing' – that is application of methodologies to integrate different data sources (e.g. national and local data-gathering systems; police and judicial data, health sector data, data from civil society organisations, and from affected communities) – is a critical feature of an effective national monitoring system. Participants felt that a key practical step in supporting national armed violence monitoring would be to develop internationally-agreed standards and technical guidelines on methods for integrating diverse data sets.

Finally, participants cautioned that any national system for monitoring data on sensitive issues relating to armed violence would have to address the question of protection for individuals and groups who might be exposed to further harm as a result of being included in such systems.<sup>8</sup>

### **What structure should a national monitoring system have and who should be involved?**

A strongly-worded consensus among participants was that victims and survivors of armed violence should be at the centre of advocacy and action to improve national armed violence monitoring systems.

Political will, transparency and trust are all central to ensure effective monitoring of armed violence in one country. In many cases, there is no need to invent a complete new system because it is more a matter of combining different data that is already available under one broader system and to provide a neutral body where all the actors collecting this data can work together.

Participants agreed that, in the ideal circumstances, national armed violence monitoring should be nationally 'owned' – that is, led or enabled by government. It was recognised, though, that there are many examples (for example among emerging economies) of countries in which there is significant capacity to monitor armed violence, but that 'national ownership' results in the exclusion of other stakeholders from the process of data-gathering and analysis. In such instances, a primary practical approach to strengthening armed violence monitoring may be to engage with relevant government

---

<sup>8</sup> This could include, for example, danger of retaliation between parties to armed violence, or exposure to further violence or stigma among victims of gendered and sexual violence.

actors to advocate for 'opening up' of existing national data and monitoring process to a wider group of stakeholders, including civil society and victims and survivors.

It was recognised, also, that there are many situations in which a government is either unwilling or unable to lead on monitoring. In such cases, armed violence monitoring can be designed and built up through collaboration between state and civil society actors, with support where relevant and possible from international organisations and UN agencies. And it was recognised that there are circumstances – including some of the most heavily armed violence-affected countries – where government is largely absent. In such cases, it was suggested that collaboration between civil society organisations and international bodies (such as ICRC and UN peacekeeping missions) can form the basis of effective, coherent monitoring. It was further suggested that in some instances in this category, monitoring is likely to be most effectively organised among international and local civil society.

Three core models, then, were identified in the discussion: where government capacity is high, but participation and access are weak (requiring collective civil society advocacy for greater openness and engagement of stakeholders); where government capacity/will is moderate or weak (requiring practical collaboration in design and management of national monitoring); and where government is non-functioning or absent (requiring civil society-led monitoring).

Certain basic principles were identified as underpinning each of these models: First, the critical importance of openness, access and engagement among state and non-state stakeholders (including government departments, international, national and local NGOs including armed violence reduction practitioners, media outlets, and academic institutions).

Second, the importance of a monitoring system that is, and can be seen to be, neutral (if not independent)<sup>9</sup>. Much existing data-gathering is oriented to specific categories of the phenomenon (through legal and judicial as well as health system taxonomies). A national armed violence monitoring system that reflects the true human and humanitarian nature of the problem in a given polity needs to operate independently of such pre-determining categories.

Third, monitoring systems need to be independent and inclusive not only of all actors but also inclusive in terms of sub-national systems and data. This is important in order to ensure that affected communities can provide their own contribution to the problem and ensure that discussions/actions taken are concretely supporting them.

Fourth, capacity is and will remain a major issue in many country contexts. Whilst national armed violence does not have to be expensive, there is a need to invest in personnel and skills to ensure adequate national capacity. Collaboration with wider national statistical agencies can help in this respect, as can financial and in-kind technical support from donors and NGOs.

---

<sup>9</sup> Various models were discussed, including an 'ombudsman' system, the use of national commissions (such as national small arms commissions, with examples from southern Africa), and the development of 'armed violence observatories' (with examples from a forthcoming paper by the Small Arms Survey).

### **How should a national monitoring system be used?**

Having started the discussion emphasising that national armed violence monitoring systems should be formed on the basis of a clear purpose, participants concluded discussions with a review of agreed characteristics supporting the usefulness of such systems. Key characteristics include:

- Broad stakeholder participation
- Openness and accessibility
- Methodological transparency and rigor
- Neutrality
- Continuity of data and analysis
- Utility to policy-makers and practitioners

National monitoring systems can provide the ground for public dialogue, and can form a valuable contribution to trust-building (and re-building) between government and people. Key to these functions is capacity for clear dissemination of information and analysis.

Evidence from monitoring can strengthen advocacy and policy messaging, raising the political and policy profile of the humanitarian problem. It can also support better design and targeting of programmatic and project interventions, and evaluation of their effectiveness.

In certain cases, monitoring can also provide a platform to address rights violations and judicial reparation. In all these cases it is vital that the information collected by national monitoring systems is public and accessible.<sup>10</sup>

*Based on these discussions, participants summed up key points for a set of principles. These were formulated and included in the statement of the conference and were presented for joint discussion by both groups of participants on day 2*

---

<sup>10</sup> Practical examples were given by B'Tselem, monitoring in Israel and Palestine; the Research and Documentation Centre, researching, recording and communicating armed violence incidence and impact in the Balkans; Gun-Free South Africa, working on preventive strategies amongst others in South Africa; and Danish Demining Group, giving an example of their use of data and monitoring for armed violence reduction programming in Somaliland.

## **Victim Assistance/Survivor Rights and Armed Violence**

Participants in this group included experts and practitioners as well as survivors. Participants organized their discussion around the role of victims and survivors in efforts to reduce and prevent armed violence.<sup>11</sup> A variety of perspectives was sought, considering that whilst the concept of “victim assistance” is well-developed and discussed in various often somewhat narrow frameworks, such as the Mine Ban Treaty (1997) and the Convention on Cluster Munitions (2008), issues relating to victims and survivors has not yet been adequately developed and acknowledged in broader armed violence reduction and prevention discussions.

Discussions were structured around the following questions:

- Who are victims of armed violence?
- What are approaches to assistance to victims of armed violence?
- How documenting victimization can support assistance to victims?
- What is the role of victim assistance/survivor rights in armed violence reduction and development efforts?
- What is the role of victims and survivors in the advocacy for armed violence reduction?

### **Who are victims of armed violence?**

Participants agreed that victims and survivors themselves should be in a position to determine who should be considered a victim of armed violence, and to set out appropriate terminology – and that this would likely differ depending on the context and the specifics of the victimization (e.g. residual unexploded ordnance, landmines and other explosive remnants of war; active explosive weapons use; small arms and light weapons; bladed weapons; other weapon types; gender-based violence, etc). Participants recognized the importance of being inclusive in the definition, whilst at the same time not becoming so broad as to be meaningless.

Participants viewed the purpose of identifying and defining victims in the context of the global burden of armed violence as being a way to expose the human dimension and humanitarian cost of armed violence and, in so doing, to identify the legal, policy and programmatic tools necessary to recognise the rights and support the recovery of people as individual victims, and of societies burdened by armed violence.

Participants discussed what being a “victim” means in different contexts:

- Personal/psychological – where the aim of recovery and rehabilitation is for individuals and communities involved to cease being ‘victims’, to escape from a state of victimhood.<sup>12</sup> The physical and psychological trauma associated with armed violence, compounded with the material loss, the long-term disabilities and the discrimination and exclusion victims face, make it very difficult for the individual to recover and take back the control of his/her life. It was recognized that acknowledgment of the victim, awareness-raising about the causes of victimization and greater development opportunities are key to ensuring recovery and inclusion in society as an equal participating member.

---

<sup>11</sup> It is acknowledged that there are continuing debates regarding appropriate language with which to recognise and discuss the experiences of people affected by armed violence, including terminologies around ‘victim assistance’ and ‘survivor rights’. Participants accepted these ongoing exchanges, but agreed on a common usage for practical purposes of the discussion.

<sup>12</sup> Some participants, for example, mentioned the importance of “freeing the victim” from this state.

- Political/legal – participants recognized that armed violence victimization represents violation of social norms of protection and that defining victims must be an agreed upon collective determination, which is particularly difficult in societies with lack of social cohesion. Being identified as “victim” can be beneficial for the purposes of remedies and benefits, but at the same time, it was recognized that it is often those “victims” who are not subject to legal protections for example in conflict (military personnel) receive greater benefits and better treatment than those who protected (civilians).

Participants agreed that there is a need to target specific victimized populations living in similar circumstances in the prioritization of resources and actions. They also agreed that, although victimisation is context-specific, there are key common characteristics of victimization by armed violence that must be taken into account when determining who is the victim:

- Victims include not only those individuals directly injured, but also their families and communities. This raised the issue of ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ victimisation, and how approaches to assistance differ across the two groups.
- The cyclical nature of violence and victimization means that today’s victims could be tomorrow’s perpetrators. This reinforces the importance of assistance to victims and survivors as an effective form of armed violence prevention.

The terminology of ‘victim’ vs. ‘survivor’ was discussed at length, and it was highlighted that ‘survivor’ represents a more positive and empowering term, rather than ‘victim’. However, it was also presented that the term ‘victim’ is appropriate to use in certain situations, in particular:

- To show that victimization by armed violence extends beyond an individual person, i.e. survivor, and encompasses victims who are killed, injured, as well as their families and whole communities.
- When discussing issues around legal recognition and access to justice, where the term ‘victim’ has corresponding legal obligations recognized by law.

In the principles on victim assistance outlined at the end of this document, both terms were used, in order to ensure that these two aspects are appropriately articulated.

### **How to deliver assistance in recovery and inclusion?**

Participants discussed “peer support” approaches to recovery from trauma, as a low-cost approach that can be replicated in diverse cultural settings. It involves giving practical advice to victims on how to access medical care, manage emotions, boost self-confidence, by someone who has been through a similar experience. By focusing not only on rehabilitation the individual, but also on empowering survivors to advocate for their own legal rights, this methodological approach was seen as a useful way to mobilize the key constituency – victims and survivors themselves in advocacy to prevent and reduce armed violence.

Participants raised the question of whether the specific type of weapon used in armed violence matters in terms of the experience of victimization and in turn, the victim’s path of recovery. It was recognized that, on one hand, similarities in experience matter greatly in the potential for bonding and collective

action among victims but that, on the other, types and hence experiences of armed violence vary greatly, making it more difficult to generalize what different victims need to recover from their trauma.

While most agreed that the context and the nature of the violence matter, it was also recognized that the type of weapon matters only insofar as different weapons cause different types of injury, and in turn, require different type of assistance. Participants agreed that assistance to victims should have as its starting point the individual person, and look to ensure that they have access to rights and services they need to live in dignity. Particular emphasis was placed on the need to ensure economic opportunities to survivors and focus on families as important to effective and sustainable recovery.

Participants identified the need for greater research in this area, to better understand the diverse experiences of victimization by armed violence, and the obstacles survivors face in recovery and inclusion. They cautioned against a one-size-fits-all approach, and emphasized the importance of bringing survivors to the centre of the armed violence reduction and prevention discourse at both policy and programming levels. Participants identified access to justice as a crucial aspect of rights-based assistance that must be given greater prominence, especially in the context of armed violence victimization, to ensure greater government accountability.

#### **How documenting victimization can support victim assistance?**

Participants recognized the key role that documentation plays in ensuring rights of victims and survivors. Without documentation, there is no evidence to access justice and seek redress. At the same time, fear of reprisals, and government unwillingness to confront their failure to protect citizens, and many times their own role in the violence, prevent victims from sharing information.

Whilst data collection was seen as essential, it was also emphasized that lack of data must not be an excuse for not acting to assist victims. Information to be collected for the purposes of assistance to victims includes:

- Objective data – casualty data, which give indication of the scope, trends, and forms of victimization;
- Socioeconomic data – explaining the situation in which the affected person finds him/herself, and their family, and includes comparative assessments to the wider community.
- Data on services provided – collected by communities or survivors, looking at whether programme development is evidence-based, how data are being used by the NGOs, do data inform programme development.
- Data to demonstrate progress – benchmarks must be set in coordination between all actors, data collected on how the activities are implemented. Again, survivors and their families and communities should be involved in the process from the beginning.

Participants recognized the role of statistics demonstrating the scale of harm, and the level of costs associated with armed violence as effective advocacy tools. Local communities and survivors should be lead actors in such advocacy initiatives, as they have the insider knowledge.<sup>13</sup>

In terms of advocacy, using data and concrete experiences from the ground have proven to be effective campaigning tools, and participants discussed the need to ensure that advocacy by survivors and victims, while bringing personal experience and an important perspective, must involve more than the

---

<sup>13</sup> However, it is important to not raise unrealistic expectations nor offer benefits to the communities that cannot be met.

story telling. It was recognized that survivors and victims must be equipped with the skills and information they need to effectively contribute to the substantive issues they are asked to advocate for. Participants discussed survivor participation in the Mine Ban Treaty, the CCM, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the ICC, and others, as successful examples, but also highlighted the need to learn from those experiences, and improve some shortcomings of those initiatives.

### **What is the role of victim assistance/survivor rights in armed violence reduction and development efforts?**

Participants acknowledged the legitimacy of discussing survivor rights and victim assistance and the need to improve on practices. They highlighted the importance of these issues as a necessary component of addressing armed violence more broadly.<sup>14</sup>

Participants discussed the potential of the discussions on victim assistance and survivor rights has to bring back the momentum for the global agenda for armed violence reduction, an agenda to prioritise the global problem of armed violence and strengthen armed violence reduction remains politically sensitive, poorly understood, and low on the priority list of policy makers, among competing agendas. Articulation and advocacy around armed violence victims and survivors can be beneficial for maintaining the momentum of the global discussions on armed violence and development.

Participants also acknowledged that the discussion around survivor rights concepts allow for, and in fact require, involvement of broader range of relevant actors, which are currently not at the table, such as development organizations (e.g. OXFAM), transitional justice (e.g. ICTJ), etc. This helps broaden the reach of our advocacy messages beyond the traditional, mostly disarmament and weapons-related discourse.

Demonstrating solutions by highlighting and show-casing effective programming and advocating with the states to invest in the issue by offering specific policy recommendations for cost-effective support was seen as important way forward. Data collection and bringing the people to the forefront can allow us to demonstrate the concrete change that successful programming can accomplish.

When discussing possible ways to continue the work on victim/survivor rights, participants agreed that instead of aiming for yet another global agenda for survivor rights/victim assistance, there are several processes underway that should be the focal point for inclusion of victim assistance discourse, including the Arms Trade Treaty, the Geneva Declaration, Program of Action on SALW, etc. This was seen as most strategic next step.

### **What is the role of victims and survivors in advocacy for armed violence reduction?**

Whilst all participants agreed that there is a role for survivors and victims and their networks in the advocacy processes for armed violence reduction, many offered words of caution, and highlighted the need to learn from lessons from the past efforts to include survivors to ensure their participation is informed by respect for dignity, is active and focuses on building their capacity beyond just facilitating and paying for the trips to the international meetings.

Participants acknowledged that not all survivors or victims want to or should be activists or advocates. Those that do and have appropriate skills, should be treated as professionals and peers to all others

involved. Participants emphasized that in the past successful advocacy campaigns had active and meaningful involvement of survivors, who participated with specific messages and goals.

Participants also agreed that there is a need to facilitate discussions and enable survivors of different forms of armed violence to have conversations with each other in the near future. This was seen as a way to strengthen and mobilize survivor constituency, and present first hand, the diverse impact that armed violence has, to the governments working on these issues. But, at the same time, all participants around the table agreed that there is no need for another meeting and another rhetorical statement to be adopted. Practical program is needed.

One concrete initiative that was proposed and supported by participants was to organize a meeting around one of the relevant events in 2011. Two possible opportunities include July Arms Trade Treaty Prep Com, and the October GD Second Ministerial Review Summit. This was seen as a good way to highlight the diversity of the group representing affected stakeholders, and an opportunity to begin mobilizing survivors to actively participate in the various efforts at armed violence and development.

IANSA is setting up a Survivor Network, which seeks to set up structured group discussion and help facilitate advocacy work of survivors and on issues of survivor rights on the national level, and complementary to that, the international level. It was suggested that while survivor network will be working on a broader range of issues, it could be used as a platform for collaboration to seek appropriate survivors advocates to directly participate in armed violence and development.

## **Joint Session**

Participants from the two groups met on day 2 to discuss ways in which practices in armed violence data-gathering and monitoring, and in victim assistance, can complement one another. The plenary group discussed how and where to join forces in advocacy on these two areas during 2011.

At the beginning of day 2, the draft statements of principles of both groups were shared with all participants and participants were invited to review and comment on them. One spokesperson per group presented the principles to the room and briefly highlighted discussions around each principle. Following this discussion, statements were revised and final versions can be found in the annex to this report.

### **How can these two areas be mutually reinforcing?**

Participants agreed that collecting data on victimisation is essential in order to highlight the human impact of armed violence. A national monitoring system needs to show the effect/impact of violence on people lives. Data collection though is also central in ensuring that victims and survivors can claim the recognition of their rights and effectively access justice. Data collection is vital in determining the assistance policies and programming that are needed.

Participants all agreed that the inclusion of survivors and victims in national armed violence monitoring can ensure attention to and collection of relevant data which reflect the specific impacts of violence on affected communities, and hence for the design of effective victim assistance programming. Because of their link with communities, survivors can help collecting data at sub-national level in forms that are not

always accessible to other stakeholders. This is particularly important in specific cultural and religious situations, in cases where victims are at risk of retaliation or where there is no collaboration and trust between communities and national authorities.

### **What are upcoming key opportunities in 2011 to raise this agenda?**

*Please refer to the calendar in Annex V for specific dates concerning some of the opportunities below and other key events.*

ATT Process: An armed violence and development framework is a useful lens in advocating for strengthened humanitarian objectives and obligations in the Arms Trade Treaty.

Participants noted that there are ongoing discussions about how victim assistance can be included in the ATT. Civil society actors may be able to use principles set out in this meeting to develop a consensus position, and to provide supportive states with key arguments on the need for acknowledgement of armed violence victims that can be raised in the plenary during the ATT negotiations. Participants also felt that survivors should be more involved in order to help improving and promoting the humanitarian aspect of the treaty.

In terms of monitoring and data collection, several participants noted that the need for better data showing rates and trends of armed violence in countries, as an objective, transparent and verifiable

criterion in determining whether an arms transfer under the ATT is acceptable. It is already clearly accepted that arms transfers approvable under the ATT must not fuel armed violence.

OXFAM and AOAV are preparing a paper on armed violence and ATT that reflects both topics and it will be disseminated during negotiations in support for a strong ATT.

UN POA: In the UN Program of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons (UN PoA), cross-cutting issues such as armed violence and development could be helpful to revitalize discussions. In particular, some participants noted that links could be made between armed violence reduction and practical approaches under the PoA (such as marking and tracing of small arms) to reduce circulation of illicit weapons. It was further suggested, that complementing that to find “new topics” on which to include armed violence arguments such as cooperation and assistance, in terms of what states can do together to fulfil obligations under the UN PoA.

This year marks the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the UN PoA. IANSA is organizing a series of events in which there may be opportunities to raise this issue. Also, there will be a review conference in June 2012 and it will be an important opportunity for civil society to focus on missing elements and to organize specific side events. The importance of ensuring participation of victims and survivors in such processes was raised.

In addition to ATT and UNPoA, there are also the Meetings of States Parties to the Cluster Munition Convention and to the Mine Ban Treaty that will provide opportunities to raise awareness and advance the agenda.

### Geneva Declaration Ministerial Review Conference

This is a key event in 2011 for advocacy on armed violence and development. There will be a series of regional meetings, preparatory to the review, that will be organized in the run up to the Conference.

The Ministerial Review will be focused on programming, and the meeting will show-case programming successes. There will be an outcome document, which aims to be short, reflecting objectives and achievements, and to provide a clear way forward up to 2015.

Participants recognised this as an important opportunity for civil society organizations to work together in the run-up to and in Geneva, to develop common messages and coordinated advocacy efforts to ensure that the outcome document will provide effective and concrete measures for the years to come.

Civil society participation at the Summit itself will be limited to 50 places which means that there is a need to ensure that we get the right breadth of voices in Geneva but also to ensure that the policy documents and key advocacy messages include views of civil society organizations unable to attend.

### **How do we build on these opportunities throughout 2011?**

Main goal for 2011 will be to ensure that armed violence and development is high in governments' agendas around the world. There are several opportunities in 2011 to raise the issues discussed during the conference but it needs to be done in a concerted way.

Participants discussed the possibility of organizing a meeting bringing together survivors to highlight the diversity within this group.

Participants agreed on the following next steps:

- Distribute the statements of principles amongst NGOs that were not in Amsterdam to get their views on these topics and to build a group of engaged civil society organizations that will work together to raise common messaging during key opportunities in 2011 and in capitals with their own governments.
- Share the statements of principles with governments and other key stakeholders as a basis on which to develop joint work on these two topics.
- Build a representative list of (10-15) target countries to engage concretely on the issue of national reporting with a view to get them to present a report possibly during the Geneva Ministerial Review Summit.
- In terms of ATT, raise the importance of including victim assistance to strengthen the humanitarian aspect of the treaty, and the need for data to prove the rates of armed violence in a specific country as a criterion for arms transfers.
- Work with states to ensure that the Ministerial Review Summit of the Geneva Declaration recognizes the need for monitoring of armed violence at the national level and recognizes victim assistance as a core element of the armed violence and development agenda.
- Build a set of strong examples of effective armed violence reduction programming and monitoring systems to present to states to show that it is possible to measure and reduce armed violence.

## Principles for measuring and monitoring armed violence

**Principle 1:** *National armed violence monitoring represents a concrete response to government accountability and governance, and existing international obligations.*

- States are ultimately responsible for the safety and security of their populations. Armed violence, in its various forms, significantly compromises civilian protection and public security.
- Although there are many good initiatives in data-gathering, monitoring for armed violence at the national level is frequently incomplete or unintegrated, and in many cases non-existent.
- National armed violence monitoring is a vital measure of good governance, ensuring accountability and evidence-led policy and practice. It reflects a commitment to the values of transparency, openness, justice and truth.
- National armed violence monitoring is critical to successful prevention of armed violence, and will help strengthen international security and human rights norms.
- National monitoring supports a comprehensive approach to localised issues of weapons-related death and injury. As such, it is a shared benefit from responsible government to affected communities.
- National armed violence monitoring responds to existing obligations under international law, and can build on positive examples of collaboration between states – including the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development, and the Oslo Commitments on Armed Violence – and with civil society.

**Principle 2:** *Armed violence monitoring should be people-centred, focusing on data showing scale and types of death and injury occurring among affected populations.*

- A national armed violence monitoring system should include information on the rates and types of violence occurring, and the types of policies and programmes responding. In this way, the national system would monitor actors (including victims and perpetrators), instruments (that is, weapon type and background history), and institutional responses (that is, policies and programmes instituted and operationalised to reduce and prevent armed violence).
- A national armed violence monitoring system would require, at a minimum, core data, including:
  - Weapon-related violent death
  - Injury (including type of trauma/psychosocial impact)
  - Type and history/provenance of weapon
  - Time and place of death/injury
  - Basic demographics of victims/perpetrators (sex, age, ethnicity or other relevant identifier, e.g. religion, political faction, location; where possible name)
- Wider information should be built into, or used in collaborative analysis with, a national system, including:
  - Other violent incidents (e.g. sexual violence, assault/theft with violence)
  - Public perception of security
  - Laws, policies, capacities, programmes in place to address armed violence
- Information on the utility of the national monitoring system itself should be maintained, including:
  - Metrics showing accessibility of and access to the system

**Principle 3:** *Armed violence monitoring can be built progressively, integrating existing data sources, and augmenting with additional data-gathering, to provide a clear and credible picture of the problem nationally.*

- National armed violence monitoring systems should integrate existing data sources using transparent methods (existing sources usually, where available, include: criminal justice data; health sector data (vital registration, injury surveillance inc. health centre, clinic and hospital data); morgue/mortuary data).
- Where gaps in information can be identified, alternate data approaches such as inclusion of key questions in existing surveys, or commissioning of new surveys, should be encouraged and incorporated.
- National armed violence monitoring systems should incorporate qualitative information (e.g. community/case studies) to complement quantitative data.
- Monitoring systems should adopt, as feasible and relevant, technologies that support data-gathering and submission of information.
- International data-sets can be useful as background information.
- A usable national monitoring system does not have to be complex or costly.

**Principle 4:** *A national armed violence monitoring system should be nationally 'owned', with multiple relevant arms of government and civil society participation (including media and academic actors as well as armed violence reduction and prevention practitioners).*

- National armed violence monitoring should be more inclusive, balancing government and civil society participation, strengthening engagement with armed violence-affected communities, victims and survivors.
- Collaboration to improve recognition and understanding of armed violence can build trust between social actors, in particular between affected communities, civil society organizations, and government institutions; trust is also the basis for the building of good armed violence monitoring collaboration.
- National armed violence monitoring systems should be coordinated by government where possible, enabled by government or alternate authority where official capacity is limited, or led collaboratively among civil society actors where state capacity/commitment is absent.
- A national monitoring system should combine different available data sources, working with or through a quasi-autonomous or neutral body (candidate locations for a monitoring system can be agreed between government and civil society collaborators, but could include, for example, a national university department, a civil society network hub, or national statistical or audit office) with provision for the inclusion of all relevant actors and owners of information with respect to access to data, visibility of data and methods verification, and analysis.
- National armed violence monitoring system should actively support and incorporate sub-national information systems and data.

**Principle 5:** *A national armed violence monitoring system should actively promote public awareness of armed violence, as well as public policy discussion, debate and advocacy.*

- A national armed violence monitoring system should be capable of detecting, analyzing and supporting response to specific armed violence problems rapidly, including strengthening early warning systems and prevention capacities.
- Monitoring should reflect and make available for public access the human consequences of armed violence among victims and survivors.
- Systems should be subject to periodic evaluation of performance.

Amsterdam, 24-25 January 2011

## Principles for assistance to victims of armed violence

**Principle 1:** *Survivors and victims of armed violence must be at the centre of armed violence reduction efforts.*

- Victims include not only the individual survivors directly injured, but families and communities where relevant. Perpetrators can be victims as well.
- Determining who constitutes a victim of armed violence for the purposes of assistance should not be solely based on the cause, but on the individual circumstances and challenges that each person faces as a consequence of victimization by armed violence, including physical and psychosocial trauma, impairment, and the barriers they face to access services and opportunities as a result of discrimination and exclusion in society.

**Principle 2:** *Documenting victimization is essential to effective armed violence reduction and assistance programming.*

- Wide ranging information on victimization is of strategic value in addressing and reducing armed violence and has been historically overlooked in data collection efforts.
- The purpose of documentation is to generate knowledge; provide recognition to the victims; promote accountability from the state; inform, develop and refine programs; and, better determine assistance needs.
- When documenting incidence and impact of armed violence, information about the needs of the survivors, their families and communities should also be included to better ascertain wider impacts.
- Victims and survivors should be actively involved in local and national armed violence monitoring systems.

**Principle 3:** *Assistance to victims must be comprehensive, rights-based and context-specific.*

- Narrow approaches to victim assistance have proven insufficient and holistic multidisciplinary policy and programming is encouraged and required.
- There is a need to gather more information and data and in consultation with the affected communities to determine what constitutes holistic approach to assistance to victims of armed violence.
- Peer to peer support is a valuable tool for delivering psychosocial support to survivors of armed violence and can be community-based; relatively cost-effective; applicable in diverse contexts; and cognizant of human rights standards. As such it should be promoted and its impact on the inclusion, recovery, well-being of armed violence victims studied.
- Access to effective justice (timely, accountable, transparent) is an essential element of ensuring rights of victims.

**Principle 4:** *Recognizing the rights and promoting assistance to victims and survivors of armed violence is a strategic entry point for efforts to curb armed violence and promote development.*

- No one approach will suffice to realize holistic assistance. Multidisciplinary approaches from a diverse range of actors – government, NGOs, business, media – are critical and to be encouraged.
- Rights of victims and survivors of armed violence should be included in multilateral policymaking processes and implementation strategies, including the Arms Trade Treaty, the UN Programme of Action on SALW, the UN International Standards on Small Arms Control, and the Geneva Declaration and others.

**Principle 5:** *Victims and survivors should be actively involved in advocacy efforts for armed violence reduction.*

- Prominent involvement of survivors and appropriate advocates with messages and goals that draw on evidence and experience are essential to robust policymaking and programming. These can be communicated through advocacy, public campaigning, community and media mobilization etc.
- Survivors (and appropriate advocates) should be included and involved in various processes with respect for their dignity and regarded as the peers of those professionally involved in armed violence reduction. .
- Survivors' groups and advocacy networks should be actively supported and facilitated to strengthen their participation in the policymaking and programming. This can be achieved by direct support for project implementation, capacity building, mentoring, networking, information exchange, regular meetings etc.

*Amsterdam, 24-25 January 2011*

## Annex I: List of participants (34)

### 1. Measurement and monitoring meeting

**Save the Children –UK**

[K.Smith2@savethechildren.org.uk](mailto:K.Smith2@savethechildren.org.uk)

Kerry Smith

**Fafo Foundation – Norway**

[Svein.Erik.Stave@fafo.no](mailto:Svein.Erik.Stave@fafo.no)

Svein Erik Stave

**Small Arms Survey – Switzerland**

[elisa.gilgen@smallarmssurvey.org](mailto:elisa.gilgen@smallarmssurvey.org)

Elisabeth Gilgen

**B' Tselem – Israel**

[Suhaira@btselem.org](mailto:Suhaira@btselem.org)

Suhair Abdi

**CERAC – Colombia**

[jorge.restrepo@cerac.org.co](mailto:jorge.restrepo@cerac.org.co)

Jorge Restrepo

**Fomicres - Mozambique**

[forquilha@tvcabo.co.mz](mailto:forquilha@tvcabo.co.mz)

Albino Forquilha

**Norwegian People's Aid - Norway**

[atlek@npaid.org](mailto:atlek@npaid.org)

Atle Karlsen

**Oxford Research Group– UK**

[John.sloboda@oxfordresearchgroup.org](mailto:John.sloboda@oxfordresearchgroup.org)

John Sloboda

**Asociación para Políticas Publicas - Argentina**

[dfleitas@app.org.ar](mailto:dfleitas@app.org.ar)

Diego Fleitas

**SEHLAC – Latin America**

[jchavez@aoav.org.uk](mailto:jchavez@aoav.org.uk)

Juliana Chavez

**Research and Documentation Centre - BiH**

[tokaca@idc.org.ba](mailto:tokaca@idc.org.ba)

Mirsad Tokača

**Handicap-International - France**

[jturton@handicap-international.org](mailto:jturton@handicap-international.org)

James Turton

**Gun Free South Africa - South Africa**

[Natalie@gfsa.org.za](mailto:Natalie@gfsa.org.za)

Natalie Jaynes

**DDG - Denmark**

[Bodil.jacobsen@drc.dk](mailto:Bodil.jacobsen@drc.dk)

Bodil Jacobsen

**AOAV – UK**

[staylor@aoav.org.uk](mailto:staylor@aoav.org.uk)

[solgiati@aoav.org.uk](mailto:solgiati@aoav.org.uk)

[ecann@aoav.org.uk](mailto:ecann@aoav.org.uk)

Sebastian Taylor  
Serena Olgiati  
Esther Cann

**IKV-Pax Christi - Netherlands**

[struyk@ikvpaxchristi.nl](mailto:struyk@ikvpaxchristi.nl)

[boer@ikvpaxchristi.nl](mailto:boer@ikvpaxchristi.nl)

Miriam Struyk  
Roos Boer

## 2. Victim Assistance Meeting

**CEDAC - Burundi**  
[ericniragira@gmail.com](mailto:ericniragira@gmail.com)

Eric Niragira

**KORD – Iraq**  
[rebwarzainadin@gmail.com](mailto:rebwarzainadin@gmail.com)

Rebwar Muhammad

**Handicap International - CH**  
[pvermeulen@handicap-international.ch](mailto:pvermeulen@handicap-international.ch)

Paul Vermeulen

**Handicap International – Belgium**  
[Katleen.maes@handicap.be](mailto:Katleen.maes@handicap.be)

Katleen Maes

**Red de sobrevivientes y personas con discapacidad - El Salvador**  
[mdiaz@redsobrevivientes.org](mailto:mdiaz@redsobrevivientes.org)

Mario Diaz

**The Center for International Stabilization and Recovery – US**  
[rutherkr@jmu.edu](mailto:rutherkr@jmu.edu)

Ken Rutherford

**IKV-Pax Christi – Netherlands**  
[H.rouw@ikvpaxchristi.nl](mailto:H.rouw@ikvpaxchristi.nl)  
[oosterwijk@ikvpaxchristi.nl](mailto:oosterwijk@ikvpaxchristi.nl)

Hans Rouw  
Suzanne Oosterwijk

**Board Member Gun Free South Africa – South Africa**  
[adelek@yeoville.org.za](mailto:adelek@yeoville.org.za)

Adele Kirsten

**IANSA – UK**  
[bruce.millar@iansa.org](mailto:bruce.millar@iansa.org)

Bruce Millar

**AOAV – Liberia**  
[mfuerth@aoav.org.uk](mailto:mfuerth@aoav.org.uk)

Melissa Fuerth

**Quaker Office – Switzerland**  
[datwood@quno.ch](mailto:datwood@quno.ch)

David Atwood

**Independent Consultant**  
[bkawamura@btinternet.com](mailto:bkawamura@btinternet.com)

Betsy Kawamura

**OXFAM International – UK**  
[Oistein.thorsen@oxfaminternational.org](mailto:Oistein.thorsen@oxfaminternational.org)

Øistein Moskvil Thorsen

**AOAV - UK**  
[ncevra@aoav.org.uk](mailto:ncevra@aoav.org.uk)

Nerina Cevra

## Annex II: Conference programme and agendas

<p><b>Sunday 23 January, 19.00-20.30</b> Welcome and Introduction to the Conference <i>Café Karpershoek, Martelaarsgracht 2, 1012 TP, Amsterdam</i></p> <p><b>Monday 24 January, 9.00-18.00</b> Each working group meets separately (see details below) <i>Regardz Zilveren Toren Amsterdam Centrum, Stationsplein 51-53, 1012 AB, Amsterdam</i></p> <p><b>Tuesday 25 January, 09.30-15.30</b> Both groups meet jointly <i>Regardz Zilveren Toren Amsterdam Centrum, Stationsplein 51-53, 1012 AB, Amsterdam</i></p>
--

### **Monday 24 January: Measurement and Monitoring**

On Day 1, participants in the measurement, monitoring and reporting group will have a chance to work through some key questions relating to the content, structure and uses of a comprehensive national armed violence database and system. It is hoped that participants will draw on their own areas of work and expertise to outline different elements of/approaches to measurement and monitoring, and to start to identify ways forward to combine approaches towards national systems equipped to account for the major forms of armed violence ongoing in their jurisdictions.

Each session will be introduced with a 3-5 minute presentation outlining the issues discussed followed by interventions from the floor.

#### **9-9.30am: Introductions and objectives of the meeting**

Facilitator: *Serena Olgjati, AOAV*

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **9.30-10.30am: Session 1: Overview**

Session introduced by *Kerry Smith, SFC; Atle Karlsen, NPA*

Rapporteur: *Esther Cann, AOAV*

*Thematic:*

What is the value of national armed violence monitoring; what systems of armed violence measurement, monitoring and/or reporting do we know of in countries around the world? What appears to work well; what are the major/common data and reporting gaps?

**Why national armed violence monitoring; what kinds of armed violence monitoring appear to work well?**

- How can national armed violence monitoring help improve effective responses to the problems of armed violence?
- Are there examples of national armed violence monitoring that can be used as a model?

**What are major/common gaps in armed violence monitoring?**

- Integration across 'conflict, post-conflict and non-conflict' data-gathering
- Indirect deaths; non-fatal injuries; indirect impacts; sexual and gender-based violence/domestic abuse;
- Community security perceptions;
- Demographic data;
- State-sanctioned violence; non-standard forms of AV (torture, human rights abuses, threat);
- Trend analysis;
- Effective use of data (e.g. in advocacy, planning etc)?

- What are core principles that should inform a national armed violence monitoring and reporting system?

**What is the purpose of a national armed violence monitoring system?**

**11am-1pm: Session 2: Identifying types of armed violence data to include in a national system**

*Session introduced by John Sloboda, ORG; Svein Erik Stave, Fafo; Sebastian Taylor, AOAV*

*Rapporteur: Esther Cann, AOAV*

*Thematic:*

- Which data should be included in a comprehensive national armed violence monitoring system?
- e.g. direct/indirect conflict deaths; non-conflict deaths; sexual/gender-based violence; injury victimization; violent crime; subjective perceptions (insecurity etc); other

**What to monitor?**

- Proxy indicators (e.g. homicide) or actual incidence of armed violence-related deaths and injuries?
- Conflict and non-conflict deaths? How can these be integrated in a single data-set?
- Non-fatal injury; how defined/graded?
- Public perception of security/insecurity?
- Cost, socio-economic impact?
- Is there a core minimum data-set for armed violence monitoring?
- To what extent will the types of data be defined by specific national context? To what extent should national monitoring systems use internationally standardized categories?

- What are the principal mechanisms/methods by which data is/can be gathered?
- e.g. national census; 'official' registries (police, judiciary, health); population-based surveys, localized surveys, programme-based situation/needs assessments; incident reporting

#### How to gather the data?

- Can international data-sets be useful to develop or maintain national armed violence monitoring?
- Does a national monitoring system require a baseline?
- Can survey and surveillance/incident reporting be combined?
- Can community-level data be integrated with sub-national and national-level data?

### 2-3.30pm: Session 3: Identifying relevant actors

Session introduced by director *Diego Fleitas, APP; Elisa Gilgen, SAS*

Rapporteur: *Roos Boer, IKV-Pax Christi*

*Thematic:*

- Which are the main actors that should be engaged in generating a national system?
  - o e.g. ministries of interior, justice, defence, health, other; national/local departments of police, judiciary, public health; international and national/local NGOs, and civil society organizations; community-based associations, victims' associations, academic institutions; media and news-gathering agencies; other
  - o How can diverse actors, their respective armed violence data-gathering approaches, and data-sets be brought together within a national system?

#### Which stakeholders?

- Who are the main armed violence data-gatherers?
- Are new stakeholders/previously excluded stakeholders needed? Who?
- Should the health sector and/or police/justice sector lead national armed violence data-gathering?
- How can community-level, NGO and/or UN data be integrated with official statistics?
- What are the major obstacles to collaboration between AV data stakeholders? Official resistance? Data incompatibility? Lack of communication? Lack of leadership?
- Where can political leadership to build national armed violence monitoring come from?

- Where/in what institutional form would a national armed violence measurement, monitoring and reporting system be sustainably situated?

- o e.g. as a State institution/function; as an independent institutional entity; as a function transitioning over time from independent to State-run

#### What structure? Where?

- Where and in what form could a pilot national armed violence monitoring system be established or developed? Within government? Within an NGO or between NGOs? Within a UN body? Within an academic or media institution?
- Could a national armed violence monitoring system be established as an independent entity? Should national monitoring ultimately be government-owned?
- Are violence observatories the most promising model for national armed violence monitoring?

### 3.45-5.15pm: Session 4: Putting armed violence data to use

Session introduced by *Suhair Abdi, B'Tselem; Natalie Jaynes, GFSA; James Turton, HI France, Bodil Jacobsen, DDG; Mirsad Tokaca, RDC*

Rapporteur: *Roos Boer, IKV-Pax Christi*

*Thematic:*

- How should data and analysis from a national system be used?
  - e.g. evidence base for national armed violence reduction and prevention planning and benchmarking; situation analysis for national or local programmes; baseline for assessing programme effectiveness; early warning mechanism/peace monitoring

**What use?**

- How should a national armed violence monitoring system publish, disseminate and communicate data and analysis?
- How can data and analysis be used with different audiences – central government, ministries & policy-makers, sub-national authorities (municipalities, districts etc), local NGOs, affected communities, the general public, media, international agencies?
- How could a national armed violence monitoring system support better armed violence reduction and prevention interventions (e.g. political/policy attention, programme design, programme evaluation, benchmarking progress, early warning)?

**5.15-6pm: Session 5: Agreeing on a statement of principles**

*Session facilitated by Sebastian Taylor*

*Rapporteur: Roos Boer IKVPax Christi*

*Thematic:*

- Participants will elaborate a statement of principles on the basis of discussions during the day in order to share it with the other group during a joint session on day 2.

**Monday 24 January: Victim assistance**

On Day 1, participants will discuss the background and development of assistance to, and rights of victims and survivors of armed violence, including some of the main challenges, as well as different approaches that exist in the field. It is hoped that participants will draw from their own experience and expertise and, following the day's discussion, will draft a statement reflecting common fundamental principles that should guide future work in this area. This statement will be discussed in the joint sessions on Day 2, and agreed upon as an outcome document of the meeting.

Each session will be introduced with a 3-5 minute presentation, followed by interventions from the floor and general discussion.

**9-9.30am: Introductions and objectives of the meeting**

\*\*\*\*\*

**9.30-11.00am: Session 1: Victims of armed violence**

*Thematic:*

**Who are victims of armed violence?**

**Who counts?**

- Who should be considered a victim? A survivor? What is the distinction?
- What distinctions are made on the ground in terms of who is considered a victim? What is the basis for these distinctions?
- What are some of the political/legal challenges for determining who are victims?
- Victims v. perpetrators dichotomy?
- Is an international definition needed/appropriate?

**11:30-13:00pm: Session 2: Victim assistance – recovery and inclusion**

*Thematic:*

**What are some of the main elements of an effective approach to recovery and inclusion of victims of armed violence?**

**How to deliver assistance in recovery and inclusion?**

- What are some of the different approaches to assistance that have developed over the years, for example, medical, charity, holistic, rights-based?
- What are some of the pitfalls of such approaches? Does one size fit all?
- What are some examples of good practices in working with different types of victims, eg. Victims of gender-based violence, child (girl) soldiers, landmine/cluster munitions victims, etc.?
- What are some cross-cutting aspects/elements that should guide development of programs and policies around assisting victims in recovery and inclusion?

**2pm - 3pm: Session 3: Documenting victimization and victim assistance**

*Thematic:*

**What are some of the ways in which documenting victimization supports victim assistance?**

**Documenting victimization**

- How do we document victimization? What data should be collected?
- Why collect data?
- What are some of the ethical issues involved in the process of collecting data?
- What is the role of victims/survivors in the process?
- What are some of the links between data collection on victims with monitoring and measuring of armed violence?

**3.00-3.45pm: Session 4: Victim assistance in armed violence reduction**

*Thematic:*

- Why victim assistance in armed violence reduction?

**What is the role of victim assistance in armed violence reduction?**

- What are some of the relevant frameworks for assistance to victims of armed violence?
- What are some of the cross-cutting issues in victim assistance – e.g. disability, development, etc.?
- What are some of the challenges that exist in advancing the rights of and assistance to victims and survivors as part of the armed violence reduction framework?
- Is the terminology of “victim assistance” problematic?

**4.00-5.30pm: Session 5: Building norms - victims rights and participation**

- Survivor advocacy and participation*

**Is participation of victims and survivors feasible/desirable?**

- Is there a role for survivors/victim representatives in the advocacy for armed violence reduction? If so, what?
- If desirable, how can survivors participate as advocates beyond their “stories”? What kind of support is needed?
- How to ensure survivors’ interests are represented (with or without survivor participation) adequately in the different relevant frameworks, such as the arms trade treaty, the Programme of Action on SALW, etc?

- Advancing holistic approach to victim assistance in armed violence reduction*

**How to promote victim assistance in armed violence reduction efforts?**

- What are some of the actors that should be involved?
- What are some of the drawbacks/disadvantages?
- What advocacy platforms we could use to promote victim assistance? Internationally? Nationally?

**5.30-6.00pm: Session 6: Conclusion/statement of the meeting**

- Summary and drafting of a statement reflecting the discussion of the day.*

.....

## **Tuesday 25 January: Measurement and Monitoring & Victim Assistance**

On Day 2, participants from both measurement, monitoring & reporting, and victim assistance groups will come together to explore ways in which practices in armed violence data-gathering and monitoring and in victim assistance can complement one another. We will conclude by looking at practical ways forward in armed violence monitoring and victim assistance.

### **9.30-11am: Session 1: Discussion on outcome documents**

*Session introduced by TBC*

*Rapporteur: Juliana Chavez, AOAV*

*Thematic:*

Participants from each thematic group will share the statement of principles with the other group for a shared group discussion/feedback.

### **11.30-1pm: Session1: Mutual strengthening – violence data and victims of violence**

*Session introduced by TBC*

*Rapporteur: Juliana Chavez, AOAV*

*Thematic:*

- Are there practical ways in which armed violence monitoring can help build stronger policy and programming work in victim assistance?
- How might existing approaches to measurement and monitoring need to be modified or developed to strengthen understanding of and response to victims and survivors?
- Are there ways in which victim assistance commitments, policies and programmes can be used to promote stronger commitment to armed violence measurement, monitoring and reporting, and better uses of armed violence data?

#### **Linking data, victims, survivors and action**

- Can armed violence monitoring itself be an effective form of advocacy for victim assistance and survivor rights? How can monitoring be a vehicle for recognition of the victimization caused by armed violence?
- Can legal obligations under victim assistance agreements be used to leverage stronger investment in national armed violence monitoring?
- How can victims and survivors of armed violence play a stronger role in armed violence monitoring? Can stronger participation from armed violence victims and survivors help to develop understanding of victimization, and thus better data-gathering and monitoring methods?
- How can armed violence monitoring ensure ethical issues in working with victims and survivors are addressed?

### **2-3.30pm: Session 3: Ways forward in 2011**

*Session introduced by Serena Ogiati, AOAV*

*Rapporteur: Melissa Fuerth, AOAV*

*Thematic:*

- How do we move forward?
- How do we promote the agenda with governments and other key organizations? What key opportunities exist to promote this agenda in 2011?
- How do we build on discussions during this conference as a group?

### **Annex III: Calendar of opportunities 2011**

#### **January**

24-25, Amsterdam

Civil Society Armed Violence Thematic Conference on measurement and monitoring and victim assistance  
AOAV with support from IKV-Pax Christi

#### **February**

23-25, New York

Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters / 55th session  
UN

23-25, Nairobi

Central and East Africa Regional Seminar on Promising Practices on Armed Violence Reduction  
UNDP, UNREC, GD and Government of Kenya

28 February - 4 March, New York

ATT 2nd Preparatory Committee meeting  
UN

#### **March**

3-5, London

2nd Biennial War Crimes Conference  
Institute of Advanced Legal Studies London

15-18, Kathmandu

Regional Best and Promising Practices Seminar on Armed Violence Reduction and Prevention  
UN Regional Centre on Peace and Disarmament in Asia, Nepal, and Switzerland

22-24, Bogotá

Training workshop for SEHLAC researchers on the implementation of the Oslo Commitments in Latin America  
SEHLAC/AOAV

28 March – 01 April, Geneva

CCW Experts meeting  
UN

31 March - 01 April, Montevideo

Regional ATT seminar  
UNIDIR

#### **April**

15-20, Panama City

IPU General Assembly  
Inter-Parliamentary Union

16-17, Washington D.C

Spring Meetings of the World Bank Group and the International Monetary Fund  
World Bank/IMF

**May**

9-13, New York

Open-ended Meeting of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons

UN

TBC Abuja, Nigeria

Regional Conference on Armed Violence

Norway, UNDP

30 May – 04 June, Istanbul

4<sup>th</sup> UN Conference on the Least Developed Countries

31 May – 2 June, Stockholm

ABCDE 2010 conference: Development Challenges in a Post-Crisis World

World Bank/Swedish government

**June**

20-24, Geneva

MBT Intersessionals

UN

27-30, Geneva

CCM Intersessionals

UN

Late June/early July, Geneva

Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters / 56<sup>th</sup> session

UN

**July**

11-15, New York

ATT 3<sup>rd</sup> Preparatory Committee meeting

UN

**September**

6-7, Cape Town

5<sup>th</sup> Milestones in a Global Campaign for Violence Prevention

Western Cape Provincial Government Department of Health

7-9, New York

4<sup>th</sup> Conference of States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

UN

12-16, Beirut (TBC due to political situation)

2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of States Parties to CCM

UN

24-26, Washington D.C

Annual Meetings of the World Bank Group and the International Monetary Fund

WB/IMF

**October**

TBC, New York

First Committee (disarmament) of 66th UN General Assembly in New York, USA  
UN

30 – 01 November, Geneva

2<sup>nd</sup> Ministerial Review Conference of the Geneva Declaration on AV and Development  
GD Secretariat

**November**

14-25, Geneva

Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons  
Fourth Review Conference

28 November – 02 December, Cambodia

11<sup>th</sup> MSP Mine Ban Treaty

29 November – 01 December, Busan, Korea

Fourth high-level forum on Aid Effectiveness: to assess 2010 targets and commitments of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action  
Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD-DAC, OECD)

**December**

(...)