



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Developing Scenarios for Indonesia's Future: Chemonics International Task Order Report

Indonesia Scenario Development

Contract Number
PCE-I-00-97-00039-00
Task Order: 805

June 19, 1999

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Chemonics International Inc.

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background and Introduction	i
SECTION I DEVELOPING SCENARIOS FOR INDONESIA’S FUTURE: RESULTS OF THE BOGOR WORKSHOP	I-1
A. Summary of Dialogue Concepts and Rules	I-1
B. Summary of Issues Facing Indonesia	I-1
C. Draft Implementation Plan Developed with the Indonesian Steering Committee	I-2
D. Dialogue and Scenario Development Schematic Flow Diagram	I-6
SECTION II INDONESIA: A PATH OF STRATEGIC CONVERGENCE	II-1
A. Models vs. Scenarios	II-1
B. Developing Workable Scenarios	II-3
SECTION III DIALOGUE AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN INDONESIA	III-1
A. Understanding the Dynamics of Conflict	III-1
B. Addressing Modern Conflicts	III-2
C. Interactive Conflict Resolution: Methods of Achieving Results	III-4
ANNEX A: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND AGENDA FOR BOGOR WORKSHOP	A-1

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

Developing Scenarios for Indonesia's Future: Chemonics International Task Order Report

A. Formation of the Indonesian Steering Committee

Indonesia is in the midst of a highly complex economic, social, and political crisis that threatens the foundations of major institutions. The challenges confronting this nation are unparalleled in Indonesia's history, and each has the potential to undermine the fabric of its society. Yet there is also unprecedented opportunity to reassess the problems of the past and rethink the future to create even greater opportunities for Indonesian citizens.

A1. Objectives of Scenario Development

By facilitating a series of activities aimed at developing scenarios, including a series of regional and national dialogues, the steering committee intends to promote the expression and analysis of the pressing issues facing Indonesia. The committee plans to use the scenarios developed through these dialogues to identify opportunities and prepare a future for Indonesia by developing national and regional consensus around key issues and an agenda for reform. In particular, this process is intended to achieve the following objectives:

- Create a better understanding of the economic, social, and political challenges facing Indonesia, the legacy of past policies and institutions, and their implications for the nation's future
- Develop a consensus on urgent issues and concerns
- Identify approaches to resolve current problems and create an agenda for genuine political, social, and economic reform
- Identify a framework and plan for creating and strengthening a reform agenda that has broad-based acceptance across Indonesia

A2. Dialogue and Scenario-Development Project Activities

The dialogue and scenario-development project was created to achieve the above-mentioned objectives. Preliminary activities have begun and are described below in the order in which they were implemented.

Establish a steering committee. A steering committee comprising approximately 30 individuals was formed to supervise and provide direction for the entire dialogue and scenario-development process. This steering committee includes representatives from various elements of Indonesian society: business, political parties, NGOs, government, academia, ethnic minorities, mass organizations, and women's groups.

Hold initial steering committee workshop. Once the steering committee was established and members had achieved a common understanding of the project process, the committee decided to

convene in Bogor on 10-12 May to launch the project and to secure commitment and ideas from all members regarding project implementation.

The venue for this conference was the Novotel Bogor Estate, and participants included members of the steering committee plus facilitators and representatives from project organizing institutions.

The objectives of the steering committee workshop were to:

- Present and gain an understanding of the dialogue and scenario-development process
- Review this process and carry out simulated activities for implementation
- Develop an implementation plan and schedule for next steps under the project

B. Introduction

From 10-24 May, Chemonics International Inc. carried out a task order for USAID/Indonesia through the Legal and Institutional Reform Indefinite Quantity Contract, Contract No. PCE-I-00-97-00039-00. The project, Task Order #805, was entitled “Assistance to Working Group Specialists for Problem Solving and Model Development, and Work Plan for a National Dialogue.”

To carry out this project, Chemonics provided three specialists to facilitate and participate in a series of meetings and workshops in Bogor and Jakarta during the week of 10-17 May. Following this assistance, the specialists spent an additional week collating the results of these meetings into deliverables submitted to USAID and the Indonesian Steering Committee and its core working group.

This Final Task Order Report summarizes the activities of the Chemonics team and the Indonesian Steering Committee and presents the requested deliverables, based on the results of this collaboration.

B1. Chemonics Project Team

Chemonics International provided a team of three specialists to carry out this LIR IQC task order. These individuals were as follows:

- Eileen Borris, dialogue and reconciliation specialist
- David Trickett, dialogue and reconciliation specialist
- Jonathan Simon, project development and work planning specialist

B2. Meetings and Itinerary

During the course of the task order, the Chemonics team met with project counterparts, in addition to the main project workshop held in Bogor. These meetings are detailed below:

8-9 May

Meetings with USAID/Indonesia project COTR. Workshop planning and project background.

10-12 May

Dialogue and Scenario Building Planning Workshop in Bogor. Results of this workshop are presented in the subsections below. A list of participants and a workshop agenda is attached as

Annex A.

13 May

Meeting with USAID/Indonesia project COTR. Collation of workshop results and planning next steps for the national dialogue process.

14 May

Presentation to Lemhannas (National Resilience Institute). Presentation of the dialogue and scenario development process and its relation to the military's role in Indonesian society. Discussion.

Presentation to USAID/Indonesia. Presentation of the dialogue and scenario development process and the results of the Bogor and Lemhannas meetings to USAID staff. Discussion.

Meeting with steering committee, Komnasham. Follow-up to the Bogor workshop and planning of next activities.

Meeting with USAID project COTR. Discussion of project results and planning of deliverables and next steps.

15 May-present

Departure of U.S.-based specialists and completion of project deliverables and reports.

B3. Results of the Bogor Workshop

As the centerpiece of the task order, a three-day workshop was held at the Novotel Bogor resort from 10-12 May. Led by the steering committee and facilitated by the Chemonics team, the workshop introduced the concepts and procedures for national dialogue and scenario development in Indonesia. A list of participants and workshop agenda are presented in Annex A of this report.

In addition to the presentation, discussion, and simulation of a process of national dialogue and scenario development for Indonesia, several distinct products resulted from the Bogor workshop. These included:

- Summary of dialogue concepts and rules
- Summary of issues facing Indonesia
- General Work Plan developed by the steering committee and working group for the dialogue and scenario-development process

For these items, the Chemonics team facilitated discussions and was given the task by the steering committee to collate workshop results and present the completed products to the committee following the end of the workshop. The presentation of each product comprises Section I of this report.

B4. Other Project Deliverables

In addition to the results and products from the Bogor workshop, the Chemonics team was requested by USAID and the steering committee to provide written summaries of dialogue, reconciliation, and scenario-development issues relevant to the Indonesian context, as well as examples of dialogue and scenario development processes in other countries.

These summaries, written by Dr. Trickett and Dr. Borris, are presented in Sections II and III of this report.

SECTION I

Developing Scenarios for Indonesia's Future: Results of the Bogor Workshop

A. Summary of Dialogue Concepts and Rules

The notes in this document summarize the agenda, issues, and plans discussed at the Bogor Workshop, and are presented here for consideration by the steering committee. Annex A contains the list of participants and complete agenda for the workshop.

A1. Steps for Holding a Dialogue

Following are steps to be taken to carry out a dialogue process.

- Determine participants. Whom to invite? Whom not to invite?
- Dialogue purpose. What are the objectives of the process? Be as clear as possible.
- Establish safety and confidence among participants. Consider events to break the ice.
- Establish rules of confidentiality.
- Set other ground rules and guidelines for dialogue. (See examples below.)
- Put forth introductory questions to participants, based on dialogue objectives.
- Hold the dialogue.
- Put forth closing questions to participants, based on dialogue objectives.
- Wrap up. Schedule next meeting or dialogue, specify next steps, etc.

Sample ground rules and guidelines for dialogue include the following:

- No personal attacks
- No interruptions.
- Facilitator to act as referee
- Time limits for participant speakers
- Ability to pass on responses or issues
- Use of "I" statements

B. Summary of Issues Facing Indonesia

B1. Envisioning Indonesia's Future: Issues Raised by the Workshop

At the workshop, participants discussed the major issues facing Indonesia in its period of political, economic, and social transition. When asked to state what aspects of life they would like to see in the new Indonesia, they responded with numerous items covering political, economic, social, and ethnic/religious issues. These items were then grouped into five general categories, as shown below.

B2. Workshop Discussion: What do Participants Want to See in Indonesia's Future?

Category	Desired Situation
Justice and Human Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Resolved past human rights violations · Clarified historical record, including dark episodes · Positive relationship between business and human rights · Freedom of religion · A non-violent society · Economic equality · Freedom from fear · A sense of justice for the people · An end to discrimination · Tolerance of other viewpoints
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No KKN* · National integration instead of disintegration · Resolution of social conflicts · Public credibility for the government
Democratic Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Fixed and operating legal system · Clarified role of the military · Clarified role of religion in politics · Genuine participatory democracy · Constitutional democracy · A politically aware population whose votes count
A Normal Life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Absence of fundamentalism · Freedom and ability to live a normal life
Sustainable Future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A humane society with no poverty · A clear definition of modernity for Indonesia · Environmentally sustainable development

* KKN – Kolusi, Korupsi dan Nepotisme (“Collusion, Corruption and Nepotism”)

C. Draft Implementation Plan Developed with the Indonesian Steering Committee

The Draft Implementation Plan summarized in this document was developed by the steering committee Core Group following the conclusion of the Workshop on scenario development, held in Bogor on 10-12 May 1999. What follows are recommendations developed during the collaborative process which took place during the workshop in Bogor, which the Chemonics team helped to facilitate.

C1. Carry Out Pre-Regional Dialogue Activities

Following the steering committee Workshop, the first major implementation activity will be regional dialogue meetings in several locations around Indonesia. To introduce the concept of dialogue to stakeholders in each region and create ownership among them of the process, several pre-dialogue interventions are necessary. These are described below.

- *Selection of regional dialogue locations.*
Based on considerations of the social, economic, and political conditions and history in each part of Indonesia, the steering committee will select locations for regional dialogues under the project.
- *Selection and discussions with contact representatives in each region.*
To begin the socialization of the dialogue and scenario development process in each location, the steering committee will identify and begin discussions with “contact representatives” in each region. Representatives will be social, economic or political leaders with whom one or more steering committee members have established relationships, and who can serve as go-betweens for the committee and regional stakeholders during the introduction and execution of the dialogue and scenario development process.
- *Socialization of the dialogue and scenario development process to contact representatives and their constituent stakeholders.*
The steering committee will explain and develop each region’s dialogue and scenario development plan, using contact representatives as point people. These representatives will then pass on the information to their stakeholder groups to solicit their input and gain their acceptance.
- *Training of regional dialogue facilitators.*
Selected steering committee members and hired facilitators will hold sessions with all regional facilitators to train them in the dialogue and scenario development process and prepare them to carry out regional dialogue meetings. Training will include brief simulations of dialogue and scenario development exercises.
- *Scheduling of regional dialogues.*
Following sufficient socialization and training, the steering committee and contact representatives will select participants and set a schedule for regional dialogue meetings.
- *Communications strategy.*
Before and after regional dialogues are held, media statements and press conferences will be planned to explain the purpose of dialogue meetings to the public, and to place each activity within the context of the overall scenario development process.

Objectives of these preregional dialogue activities include:

- Preparation of a one-page outline of the dialogue and scenario development process to present to regional representatives.

- Socialization of the dialogue and scenario development process among regional stakeholders.
- Selection of participants and scheduling of regional dialogue meetings.
- Acceptance of and commitment by participants to carry out regional dialogues to achieve the goals presented in the activity, as described below.

C2. Carry Out Regional Dialogues

Regional dialogue meetings in each selected location will last two to three days and will generally follow the format adopted by the steering committee during the Bogor workshop.

Participants will include mostly local social, political, and economic leaders. There will also be selected participants from the steering committee and technical resource persons, based on acceptance by regional leaders. In addition, two facilitators (one local and one national) will lead the dialogues, and a small team of rapporteurs will take part in the proceedings and produce an archive to be used for future compilation and synthesis. In total, regional dialogue meetings will involve about 30 individuals.

Objectives of regional dialogue meetings are as follows:

- Introduce and begin the process of dialogue and scenario development.
- Elicit responses from participants about the challenges facing society, and their priorities and visions for the future of their region and Indonesia.
- Secure commitment from regional leaders and their constituent populations to participate in the national dialogue and scenario-development process.

C3. Compile and Synthesize Regional Dialogue Results

At the completion of each regional dialogue meeting, the facilitators, rapporteurs, resource persons, and selected core participants will compile the results and present them back to the participants for confirmation.

All compiled results from regional meetings will then be synthesized by a small group, in order to aid agenda development for the national dialogue meeting. In addition, compiled results from each regional meeting will be shared with other regions to help spread the concept of a national dialogue and to inform people around the country of what their fellow citizens are feeling about the future of Indonesia.

Compilation and synthesis of regional dialogue results will be carried out by a small group made up of rapporteurs, technical resource persons, selected participants of the regional meetings, and steering committee members.

C4. Carry Out National Dialogue and Scenario Development

Following the completion of dialogue compilation and synthesis, the steering committee will schedule and organize a national dialogue and scenario development workshop in the Jakarta area. Participants will include steering committee members, regional dialogue participants, and additional invitees to be determined.

The meeting will take place over three days and will include 50-60 participants, who will be broken into smaller working groups over the course of the workshop.

The national dialogue meeting will follow the same format as the regional meetings, with the added goal of developing scenarios for Indonesia's future. The meeting will seek to achieve the following objectives:

- Elicit responses from participants about the challenges facing society, and their priorities and visions for the future of Indonesia
- Develop identifiable scenarios for Indonesia's future
- Secure commitment of participants to take the next step toward communicating scenarios and creating an agenda for reform to help bring about the desired future
- Secure the commitment of stakeholders to develop and implement the Action Plan for Reform, based on technical and political capability

C5. Compile and Publicize Dialogue and Scenario Results

At the completion of the national dialogue meeting, facilitators, rapporteurs, resource persons, and selected core participants will compile the results and present them back to the participants for confirmation.

All compiled results from the national meeting will then be synthesized by a small group, in order to aid the development of a national Action Plan for Reform. This synthesis will include developing identifiable and named scenarios that will form the core of the project's communications campaign.

Compilation and synthesis of national dialogue results will be carried out by a small group made up of rapporteurs, technical resource persons, selected participants of the regional meetings, and steering committee members.

Communications tasks will include the following:

- Send result compilation and synthesis back to regions for confirmation and ratification.
- Present result synthesis to the President as a precursor to the development of an Action Plan for Reform.
- Develop a clear strategy for dissemination of information about developed scenarios and the Action Plan for Reform, to be presented to the Indonesian people.

- Creation and publicity of project ‘trigger points’—watershed events or accomplishments that can be used to generate and maintain momentum, awareness, and public support for project.

Objectives of the communication campaign will include:

- Regional ratification of national dialogue results and developed scenarios.
- Presidential acknowledgment of dialogue results and developed scenarios, and of the next step to develop an Action Plan for Reform.
- A detailed strategy for spreading national dialogue results nationwide.
- Identified awareness trigger points and associated communications and publicity plans.

C6. Carry Out Follow-Up Steering Committee and National Dialogue Meetings

The two main tasks under this activity are development of an action plan for reform, and implementation of follow-up national workshops.

Action plan for reform.

Following the national dialogue and scenario development meeting, and the finalization of developed scenarios, the steering committee will meet and begin the process of developing an Action Plan for Reform that will be adopted by Indonesia’s agencies and institutions to achieve desired outcomes over the next three years.

The basic process taken will be that of strategic planning (including Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats [SWOT] analysis), with the goal being clarification of Indonesia’s desired future. Steps will include the following:

- Using technical resource persons as needed, shape the Action Plan for Reform based on dialogue and scenario development results.
- Create a time line for development and initial implementation of the Action Plan for Reform, including benchmarks and required resources.
- Establish a capacity for monitoring, evaluation, and adjustment of Action Plan development and implementation, including objective indicators.

Follow-up national meetings.

To reaffirm project processes and spur the acceptance of the national Action Plan for Reform, the steering committee will hold follow-up national workshops, beginning 6 months after the initial national dialogue meeting. Tasks to be carried out before and during the first follow-up workshop include the following:

- Determine the format, participants, and objectives of follow-up workshops.

Continue strategic planning and SWOT analysis of the Action Plan for Reform.

- Issue a call to action to all participants and their constituent stakeholder groups regarding Action Plan implementation.
- Develop and carry out a plan to expand the national network of groups engaging in Action Plan implementation.

D. Dialogue and Scenario Development Schematic Flow Diagram

The illustration on the following page presents a tentative schematic flow of the scenario development process for Indonesia. This diagram represents a plan for implementation by the steering committee and other counterparts of the Indonesia dialogue and scenario development process.

The steering committee will develop a work plan to implement this process following internal deliberations. This scenario-development process should take place over approximately 24 months, covering the period leading up to and following the June 1999 election. The committee will review this work plan every six months, making adjustments as necessary based on interim results and discussions with interested parties.

SECTION II

Indonesia: A Path of Strategic Convergence

(Notes from Presentation in Indonesia by David Trickett, May 1999)

These comments complement the formal report, “Developing Scenarios for Indonesia’s Future: Draft Implementation Plan for a National Dialogue and Scenario Development Project,” which was revised and submitted in Indonesia. That report details steps to be taken to ensure the success of the project, which a variety of constituent groups envisioned and supported. A steering group connected with the Indonesian National Commission on Human Rights coalesced these groups.

The challenge is momentous: to help catalyze a nation to have a constructive dialogue that can result in positive and viable scenarios for its future. In this case, leaders from across the social sectors — the business world, government and politics (including the military), and NGOs — have recognized the challenge as significant. This is partly because of the unique and dynamic features present in Indonesia: among them, hundreds of language groups and dialects; dozens of political parties that actually represent many more nuanced positions on the political spectrum; hundreds of religious affiliations (and five official religions); and the physical nature of the nation — thousands of islands and their peoples somehow linked together as Indonesia.

Our objective was clear, if not also demanding: to help identify and shape the path ahead (and help discern *which* path, from among numerous competing options, might be most sustainable); to help formulate some practical steps so the constituent groups could continue to spearhead the dialogue process on the path they choose; and help secure commitment among relevant constituent groups to implement their proposals.

As one who engages in formal and informal dialogues in a wide variety of contexts where peace and reconciliation are sought as outcomes, and helps organizations and societies develop scenarios for their futures, I was one of a team of two technical specialists providing insight and strategic counsel to Indonesia.

Going into the week of on-site meetings, we realized it may take several years before this technical assistance has been effectively translated indigenously. We confirmed this judgment at the end of our time in Indonesia and sought to identify when a next visit could occur to move the process forward via the capable local leaders with whom we met.

Meeting in Bogor prior to Jakarta, we began an interactive process of dialogue that was preceded by original inputs from our team.

A. Models vs. Scenarios

Elements of society act on sets of assumptions that may have historic warrant for some validity, and most of us are trapped by these assumptions. We cannot get from the present and all its psychic, political, economic, and otherwise social baggage to a fresh future unless we somehow free ourselves from the disjunctive assumptions that entrap us in highly conflictive situations.

Many of us seek to move to the future by using models, econometric projections, extrapolations from statistical trends, and other tools. These means, however helpful and measurable, hide all

kinds of unassessed ideological commitments that can obstruct reconciliation and dialogue. How do we learn about our relative blindness? It is by first realizing that what counts is a far bigger category than what can be enumerated. We must attempt to bring qualitative evaluation into our mix, and dialogue with scenario development does just that.

Modeling often fails. It does this because it almost never connects deeply with the affective aspect of human experience, the heart. Models aim for the mind. But societies and communities do not work primarily from the mind; they are creatures of heart and passion. It is only by tapping the rich matrix of social and intellectual capital — namely, the dreams, aspirations, and fears of people in various ecological niches in any given context (a corporation, a government, a military, an NGO environment, a nation state) — that the technical expertise of modeling can be most effectively deployed to serve a sustainable future path for that context.

Scenarios, on the other hand, are quite distinctively different from models. They do tend to engage the creative, intuitive, the qualitative, and largely intangible dimensions of our experience. When properly developed, scenarios do not ask the fairly traditional questions of what's the best, worst, or most likely outcome of any given set of circumstances. They actually elicit narrative strains, or deeply complex stories, that point to alternative futures and enable further dialogue to elucidate details from those story lines that can lead to action plans. Scenarios are really mental maps: whereas a metaphor to describe modeling could be an engineering paradigm, that of scenario work is more an image of organic gardening.

I am often called into situations where modeling has failed. Whether in governmental, societal, corporate, or NGO instances, many of us who have been fortunate enough to receive an education have been tutored in the ways of tangible measurement and analysis. Our expertise tends to come at the expense of synthesis. I've been able to develop a series of mental mapping exercises, organizational and societal social- and values-audit interventions, and strategies for dialogue and scenario development. All can help those of us who value expertise to learn afresh the positive value of discerning the voices of those who are not like us — others who are required for the sustainability of any organization or society. The intuitive, humble-yet-powerful technique of using dialogue and scenario development is perhaps the best mode of intervention I know to find a viable future for the complex set of entities that comprise Indonesia.

Scenario work in the context of dialogue allows viable options to emerge. It does not impose a required script or text concerning how the process is to develop. It does operate with certain guidelines (such as ensuring that safe space is found, that confidence is assured for those who are participants, and ad hominem political and ideological — including religious — bickering is left at the door), but its aim is to draw forth a shared set of values and commitments that allow for the formulation of a shared vocabulary to name current challenges and chart a path forward.

Where this process usually meets with criticism is in its inherently a-logical method (it is important to note that it is not illogical). Ambiguity is essentially a part of dialogue and scenario work — just as is honesty in facing any complex social circumstance such as how to address human rights abuses, the role of a military force in a renewed civil society, and other issues.

Perhaps taking a lesson from old maps will help. If one looks at maps produced 500 years ago, it doesn't take too much effort to notice that the cartographic accuracy is not brilliant. But cartographic accuracy is the concern of a modeler. A scenario developer is much more concerned with the function of a map — namely, to help people get from one place to another. Precisely

because in a time of exploration, no one knows the precise parameters of the known world (such as was clearly the case five centuries back), they do their best to chart what they know — but realize that those making any journey cannot rely ultimately upon the validity of any map. So it is with scenarios: they are our maps to help us get from the present to the future. We do not know all aspects of the figurative terrain in our society or in the wider world; yet we must plunge forward. We must have working maps that help us move, and such are scenarios that are developed through the use of dialogue.

B. Developing Workable Scenarios

What do you do to develop a workable scenario? Several steps of practical use are:

- Ensure the right people are engaged in the process. Usually when any reform or transformation effort is begun, those in the initial stages of moving it forward are only a small percentage of those needed for the process to work. Yet they don't always know who else is going to be essential. Step one is this: discern who is needed and for what purposes. Undertake a relatively familiar process of strategizing about mission focus, what functions and skills are needed to accomplish the mission, and who—from beyond the circle of acquaintance any of the initial group of leaders — needs to be added.
- Use a specific form of dialogue (the kind we have begun to nurture with the Bogor and Jakarta groups) to begin establishing a baseline of trust and mutual accountability. We believe this is one of several areas where additional technical assistance will be of genuine and significant value to the Indonesian team we are privileged to serve, because it is required that this process be facilitated by a person experienced in dialogue as a mode of social transformation and who is an unaffected third party.
- Determine the pressing concerns of all parties. Rather than being an obstacle to the scenario-development work that can lead to a new and sustainable future for Indonesia, this is a critical factor which can enable success. This applies even more pointedly to situations such as those in East Timor and Aceh, not to mention the military as they seek to determine a new and creative role in civil society.
- With continued third-party facilitation (part of the value we add), begin a focused process of asking key scenario-foundation queries:
 - What assumptions ground the pressing concerns that have been expressed?
 - How can the group assembled begin to assess the validity of those assumptions?
 - What perceptions are linked closely to the deeply held assumptions?

Usually, important issues of trust and distrust, memories of abuse and mistreatment, and injustices that can actually be catalogued, surface. In this instance — perhaps quite different from other such occasions where potentially (or actually) violent differences are voiced — each participant is nudged to speak about what is fundamentally at stake in any specific pained memory. What eventually emerges is a new shared sense of mutual violation and mistreatment, and that allows a foundation to form that can be very strong. Without losing face, all parties come to see that each has been hindered by certain forms of blindness that have allowed them to live disconnected from one another, and they also recognize that a future of peace and wellbeing

will require from each of them a new civility toward one another and their own kin. This is usually a breakthrough insight, and is the preliminary stage of what can become a gripping and powerful process of reconciliation.

- With facilitation from a third party used to expressions of violent ambiguity, the process moves to a specific set of queries seeking to determine the key driving forces in a given organization or society. It is essential that the facilitators can easily and freely “connect the dots” from among the varied and often-conflicting expressions articulated by members of any scenario-dialogue group. Again, several questions should be asked:
- What are the principal social forces affecting our situation? In Indonesia, especially critical issues to be addressed include the role of a national language, education, the migration of peoples, human rights abuses and attempts to redress them, the role of civil society NGO organizations in the future of the nation, and religious diversity with its multiple expressions.
- What are the critical technological forces that are likely to drive our society as it moves into the future?
- Which environmental factors must be added to our deliberation about our common future?
- Which economic forces should we take account of?
- Which political realities are essential to add to our developing map of the future?

Lists are developed for each of these categories, and the group meeting to have dialogue about them must evaluate the relative significance of each. A priority order is to be set. It is vital that no one’s contribution be left out of the initial list, although the mind of the group in setting its sense of priority will not likely include each person’s whole list in the final, most essential items when the process is finished.

The group then must ask several more probing questions:

- What are the largely “predetermined” factors which we must not lose sight of as we draw a map to the future? Issues such as demographic projections and other factors of which we can be reasonably certain come into play here.
- What are the vital uncertainties about which we must be concerned? This is generally quite tricky for most groups, for it asks them to do the equivalent of looking around a corner. Here, though, matters such as popular opinion on major social issues (in Indonesia, matters of human abuse could possibly top the list) are vital to tap and discern as best anyone can do.

When all these queries and the group’s answers to them are evaluated, several plot lines emerge, quite like in a novel. These are the warp and woof of scenarios, and anywhere from two to four of them can be developed into possible alternative future story lines. They serve as tools for reflection, deliberation, decision-making, and subsequent strategic and tactical-action planning for implementation. Each story will likely place a relatively different emphasis on assumptions that are deemed important, as well as on the implications of those assumptions and the key indicators to be evaluated if a specific story is made the map for the future.

These steps fit into a larger process. What has been described here are the practical steps that many relevant groups in local and regional contexts must take, using external facilitation, prior to a synthesis of these stories in a national dialogue. Some flexibility needs to be shown in each local context, and yet the same kinds of process and outcomes are important if they are all to be woven together into a story for a nation's future.

People need to be educated in the ways and means of dialogue and scenario development, and a teamwork approach — using external guidance coupled with local leadership — is an important aspect of the working plan to ensure success. Only by these means can a strategic dialogue be engendered which the people of Indonesia can view as more than “just another project coming from Java.” It must be positioned as a process that genuinely seeks to transform the very nature of civic participation in the future of Indonesia. Whereas decision making and leadership systems have been quite closed, the future must become much more open. The process of dialogue and scenario development points in that hopeful direction.

A communications strategy accompanies this plan for dialogue and scenario development. Communications is not merely a vehicle to be used in disseminating findings or outcomes of the dialogue and scenario work; it is at the core of the dialogue work itself. Positioning the whole enterprise in the context of a “manifesto for the nation” is part of what we discussed both in Bogor and in Jakarta.

A significant aspect of this positioning strategy (details of which are yet to be worked out with the Indonesian leadership team) is to address institutional resistance to change that gets in the way of societal transformation plans. Those who see such a dialogue and scenario-development process as a threat to their position and value in society must be led to discern that only by adopting a new map of interdependence — the kind of map that necessarily forms when this dialogue and scenario-development protocol is followed — can what they care most deeply about, even their long-term security in a dynamic and sometimes violent society, be assured. They need to be led to see what is of value to them as well as to others. This is not by any means an impossible task; indeed, it will call forth from those dedicated to dialogue and scenario work for national renewal their best strategic persuasiveness and most powerful, compelling maps for the future.

SECTION III

Dialogue and Conflict Resolution in Indonesia

(Notes from Presentation in Indonesia by Eileen Borris, May 1999)

A. Understanding the Dynamics of Conflict

Many of the world's intense and intractable conflicts occur between different ethnic groups within the same country. These conflicts often have the following characteristics:

- They are initiated by disadvantaged groups to gain what they see as justice and equity.
- They unleash a spiral of violence that debilitates everyone.
- Eventually everyone loses, and calls for social change are lost.
- What results is a continuous parade of tragedies in countries ranging from Lebanon and Sri Lanka to Northern Ireland and the former Yugoslavia, to name a few.

The underlying question is whether methods of conflict resolution might be developed that would allow parties an earlier opportunity to meet their needs and resolve differences in a less costly and more efficient manner. What can we do to help us move toward peace, justice, and a reasonable quality of life for people?

We can begin to develop a common security as an alternative to deterrence. Common security is based on the realization that the nations of the world can achieve political and economic security only through a commitment to joint survival, rather than individually attempting to achieve security through military strength.

The nature of conflict has been changing. We now deal with social conflicts that seem unresolvable. The sources of these conflicts are not only concerned with economics and power, but also with the denial of basic human needs such as:

- Security
- Identity
- Social recognition of identity
- Effective participation in civil society

In addition, social conflicts involve enduring features of:

- Economic underdevelopment
- Structural inequality
- Unintegrated social and political systems

What becomes important in social conflict is the identity group (ethnic, racial, religious), for it is through the identity group that the human needs are expressed in social, and often political, terms.

These kinds of conflicts arise when identity groups perceive they are oppressed and victimized through a denial of recognition, security, equity, and political participation. We often think of such conflicts as deep-rooted — not based on negotiable interests and positions but on

underlying needs that cannot be compromised.

Such conflicts occur in any relationship where inequality exists and basic needs for identity and participation are frustrated. But the most conspicuous are violent conflicts between communities or nations over the preservation of culture and values. These situations are not subject to negotiated or coerced settlements, and such attempts will only prolong and exacerbate the situation.

B. Addressing Modern Conflicts

Because the nature of conflict has changed dramatically in the past 50 years, much of the world's machinery for managing conflict is inappropriate and not very effective.

Deep-rooted conflicts cannot be contained or suppressed in the long term, but can be prevented or resolved only by satisfying basic needs through conflict-resolution processes that emphasize effective and constructive face-to-face interaction among representatives of the parties in conflict.

These methods involve small-group, problem-solving discussions, facilitated by an impartial third party, between unofficial representatives of identity groups or states engaged in destructive conflict.

In a broader sense, these methodologies can be defined as facilitated face-to-face communication, training, education, or consultation that promotes collaborative conflict analysis and problem solving among conflicted parties in a manner that addresses basic human needs and promotes the building of peace, justice, and equality.

Characteristics of modern conflict resolution include the following:

- Constructive analysis and creative problem solving between parties in conflict can be most satisfactorily implemented through the assistance of a skilled third party.
- A focus on relationship issues such as misperceptions and unmet basic needs can help resolve conflict through mutually acceptable solutions developed through joint interactions.
- Through joint interactions, attitudinal change is possible by the generation of innovative, mutually agreeable solutions to the conflict and to improvements in the wider relationships between the parties.
- In this regard, conflict resolution is not a time-limited outcome, but a complex process of de-escalation and reconciliation that develops over time to the point where a new mechanism exists in the relationship to allow for the constructive settlement of conflicts.

Exhibit 1 on the following page shows the position of Interactive Conflict Resolution in the conceptual domain of approaches to peace. We explain this approach, its methods, and results in Section C.

The traditional approach to peace emphasizes state-to-state interaction such as collective security and deterrence, diplomacy and negotiation, and strategic management and arms control. This

relies on armaments, particularly nuclear weapons to maintain deterrence and facilitate negotiations on arms control. Track one diplomacy focuses on government-to-government interactions only. Peacemaking represents attempts to transcend incompatibilities that impede human progress. It is typically operationalized through traditional diplomatic activities such as peace treaties and UN diplomatic efforts. Peacekeeping involves the intervention of a third party to keep the warring parties apart and maintain an absence of direct violence.



The political systems approach emphasizes conflict resolution methods to reduce tension, build trust, and promote cooperative security. Unlike track one diplomacy, which consists of formal interactions, track two diplomacy involves informal, unofficial forms of interactions between members of adversarial parties. Track two diplomacy involves professionals and nongovernmental agencies who practice conflict resolution and whose work focuses on analysis, prevention, and resolution of international conflicts. Tracks three to nine, otherwise known as multitrack diplomacy, are defined by the people or channels involved in the interactions (e.g., business people, private citizens, peace activists, the religious community, philanthropic foundations, etc.) with the assertion that each can work in its unique way to foster peaceful relations between adversaries.

Some conflict-resolution terms include:

Peace building, which refers to the attempts to create a structure of peace in equity and justice. It often refers to efforts for improving the relationship between adversaries toward:

- Greater trust and cooperation
- More accurate perceptions and attitudes

- A more positive climate
- A stronger political will to deal constructively with their differences

Peacemaking represents attempts to transcend incompatibilities that impede human progress. It is typically operationalized through traditional diplomatic activities (such as peace treaties and UN diplomatic efforts.)

Transnationalism refers to a host of interactive activities outside a state-to-state interaction that involve various non-governmental actors in developing peaceful political relationships.

Peace through cooperation emphasizes conflict-resolution methods to reduce tension, build trust, and promote cooperative security.

C. Interactive Conflict Resolution: Methods of Achieving Results

C1. What Do We Mean by Dialogue?

Dialogue is an interchange and discussion of ideas. Dialogue provides the opportunity for us to learn about one another — about our concerns, thoughts, hopes, and fears. It is a forum where members can feel safe, respected, and which fosters true communication and opportunity for answering “questions of curiosity.” The purpose of the dialogue or problem-solving workshop is not only to hear each other, but also to:

- Transcend barriers of fear, hatred, and prejudice
- Change perceptions
- Improve relationships
- Foster peaceful resolution of different conflicts

The typical problem-solving workshop contains these elements.

- First and most important is to establish a safe environment for developing a working trust that enables perspectives to be challenged without conflict escalation and entrenchment. This may begin with a get-acquainted activity — sometimes a dinner together to build familiarity.
- The participants clearly communicate their expectations before the dialogue/workshop begins.
- Collaborative development of ground rules and guidelines takes place.
- Facilitators discuss their role with the participants.
- The groups begin to define the situation from each side’s perspective.
- Participants develop an understanding and empathy of each other’s hopes, fears, constraints, and needs so each can consider and incorporate the other’s perspective into their concept of the conflict.
- The facilitators provide options to the participants for proceeding in a way that:

- Redefines the conflict
- Supports more information gathering
- Helps the participants engage in creative problem solving leading to new creative solutions.

- The facilitators carefully pose a series of questions designed to encourage openness and authenticity among participants and to explore any “gray areas” or uncertainties in their belief.

The final phase involves identifying useful themes for further discussion and inviting reflections on the process of closing comments from participants. The closing comments generally contrast the productivity of the dialogue session with the futility of adversarial debate, and follow-up contacts with participants generally indicate the experience to be personally enriching and eye-opening in regard to the genuine concerns of the other side.

C2. The Importance of Learning: Adopting the Right Attitude

The overall purposes of dialogue, problem solving, and problem analysis are:

- The opportunity to experience ourselves as a learning community
- A learning experience, which means growth, change, and creativity – qualities that tend to be missing in a conflict-habituated system.
- Learning together, so individuals can keep their minds open to continuous discovery of:
 - New insights
 - Feelings
 - Ideas
 - Perceptions
 - Skills
 - Attitudes
 - Behavior
- Instead of being focused on each other, people are focused on what they are learning and become partners in a common journey.

When we are truly in dialogue with one another, the adversarial walls begin to come down.

The potential for learning and even team building increases. When we can create that kind of atmosphere, three important aspects begin to emerge:

- We think more insightfully
- We begin to develop “operational trust,” where we become more conscious of each other and begin to act in ways that complement each other’s actions
- We share what we learn with larger communities

This works because in dialogue:

- There is free and creative exploration of complex and subtle issues
- We listen to each other more deeply
- We suspend our own views
- We become aware of our defensive routines (the habitual ways of interacting which protects us and also prevents us from learning, i.e. smoothing over differences)
- The group becomes open to the flow of a larger intelligence

The other purposes of dialogue are to:

- Go beyond any one individual understanding
- Allow members to gain insights that could not be achieved individually
- Create a new kind of perspective based on a common meaning
- Explore difficult issues from many points of view
- Allow individuals to suspend their assumptions, communicate their assumptions freely, and become observers of their own thinking

C3. Conditions for Effective Dialogue

Three basic conditions are necessary for dialogue.

- All participants must suspend their assumptions. This means being aware of our assumptions and examining them. This cannot be done:
 - If we are defending our opinions
 - If we are unaware of our assumptions
 - If we are unaware that our views are based on our assumptions
- All participants must regard each other as colleagues in a mutual quest for deeper insight and clarity. Thinking of each other as colleagues contributes toward interacting as colleagues because:
 - This sets a positive tone and offsets the vulnerability that dialogue brings
 - In dialogue people feel as if they are building something new together with a deeper understanding
 - As the dialogue develops, team members will find this feeling of friendship developing

toward others whom they do not have much in common

- There must be a facilitator who holds the context of dialogue. The facilitator carries out the basic duties of being a good process facilitator. These functions include:
 - Helping people maintain ownership of the process and the outcomes
 - The facilitator’s understanding the dialogue process to keep the flow of development moving

C4. What Is Scenario Building?

Scenario building is a tool for ordering how we think about alternative futures. Scenarios resemble a set of stories built around carefully constructed plots. They describe different, though equally plausible, futures by recognizing hidden forces that are present and acting in the world today. It helps people uncover their own biases and assumptions to “re-perceive” the future. Characteristics and steps of scenario building include:

- The process is highly interactive.
- It isolates a decision that needs to be made.
- It challenges the mental maps — images and assumptions — that shape one’s perceptions. They determine how we make sense of our world and how we take action and what we choose to see in the world.
- We challenge our mental maps by gathering information.
- Then we begin the process by agreeing on the issue that we want to address. This involves identifying the driving forces (social, technological, environmental, economic, and political). These include:
 - Social dynamics — demographics, values, lifestyles, etc.
 - Economic issues — international trade, structure of industry, etc.
 - Political/electoral issues — who will be the next president, etc.
 - Technological issues — what are the latest advances here and around the world and how will that affect us?
- We look at the critical uncertainties facing the country, i.e., what is unpredictable; and we look at the predetermined elements, i.e., what is inevitable.

These factors are then prioritized according to importance. Next, the group returns to the list of driving forces. These dynamics become “characters” in the stories that are to be developed. Three or four carefully constructed plots are developed, and each should represent a plausible alternative future.

Reasons for using scenarios include:

- They are powerful planning tools
- They present alternative images of the future
- They have the power to break old stereotypes
- Using scenarios is rehearsing the future and recognizing warning signs to avoid surprises, adapt, and act effectively
- Decisions that have been pre-tested against a range of what fate may offer are more likely to stand the test of time, produce robust and resilient strategies, and be open to possible alternatives
- The result of scenario planning is not only a more accurate picture of tomorrow, but also a way of making better decisions today

C5. Learning from Mont Fleur

A scenario-building process called Mont Fleur took place in South Africa in 1991-1992. In the midst of deep conflict, it brought people together from different organizations to think creatively about the future of their country.

The purpose of Mont Fleur was to stimulate debate on how to shape the next 10 years in South Africa. The project brought together 22 prominent South Africans to develop a set of stories about what might happen in their country over the 10-year period from 1992-2002.

The scenario team met three times in a series of three-day workshops. After considering many possible stories, the participants agreed on four scenarios that they believed to be plausible and relevant.

- *Ostrich*. A negotiated settlement is not achieved concerning the crisis in South Africa, and the country's government continues to be non-representative.
- *Lame Duck*. A settlement is achieved but the transition to a new dispensation is slow and indecisive.
- *Icarus*. Transition is rapid but the new government unwisely pursues unsustainable, populist economic policies.
- *Flight of the Flamingo*. The government policies are sustainable and the country takes a path of inclusive growth and democracy.

The group developed each of these stories into a brief logical narrative. A 14-page report was distributed as an insert in a national newspaper. Team members also produced a 30-minute video that included cartoons and team members' presentations. The team then presented and discussed the scenarios with more than 50 groups including political parties, companies, academics, trade unions, and civic organizations.

Mont Fleur did not resolve the crisis in South Africa. The project along with other, interactive conflict-resolution processes contributed to the establishment of a common vocabulary and mutual understanding.

The participants did not agree upon a concrete solution to the country's problems. They reached a consensus on some aspects of how South Africa "worked." More specifically, they agreed that, given the prevailing circumstances, certain strongly advocated solutions could not work including:

- Armed revolution, continued minority rule (Ostrich)
- Tightly circumscribed majority rule (Lame Duck)
- Socialism (Icarus)

As a result of this elimination process, the broad outline of a feasible and desirable outcome emerged. The process was a dialogue through which participants found areas of shared

understanding and agreement, several of which were relevant to the formal negotiations that were occurring simultaneously.

The Mont Fleur process only focused on the future of South Africa, and relayed very important messages to South Africans, as follows:

Ostrich. Non-negotiated resolution of the crisis would not be sustainable. The National Party (NP) government and the business community wished to believe that a deal with their allies, instead of a negotiation with their opponents, could be sufficient. NP leader F.W. de Klerk was quoted as saying, "I am not an Ostrich."

Lame Duck. A weak coalition could not deliver results and therefore could not last. This was important because the nature, composition, and rules governing the Government of National Unity (GNU) were a central issue in the pre-election negotiation. The NP wanted the GNU to operate subject to vetoes and other restrictions, and the ANC wanted unfettered "winner takes all" rules. The Lame Duck scenario explored the boundaries in a GNU between compromise and incapacitation.

Icarus. This warned of the dangers of a new government implementing populist economic policy. The message was very challenging to the left, which had assumed the government money could be used to eradicate poverty quickly. The business community that was worried about Icarus policies found the team's articulation reassuring. The fiscal conservatism of the GNU was one of the important surprises of the post-election period.

Flight of the Flamingo. The team believed in the potential for a positive outcome. In a country in the midst of turbulence and uncertainty, a credible and optimistic story makes a strong impact.

One participant said, "We mapped, in very broad terms, the outline of a successful outcome, which is now being filled in. We captured the way forward of those committed to finding a way forward."

The project produced these results because:

- *The scenario process is logical.* There is no place in the core of a scenario conversation for positions or values. Instead, the discussion is about facts, logic, and convincing your fellow team member that the story you are putting forward is plausible.
- *The process is open and informal.* Building scenarios can be creative because the process is “only” about telling stories. This allows people to discuss almost anything, even taboo subjects.
- *The process is inclusive and holistic.* A story about the future has to be able to encompass all aspects of the world; social, political, economic, cultural, ecological, etc. Moreover, the process of telling several stories encourages people to listen to multiple perspectives. In discussing a fundamentally unpredictable future, there is no single truth, and this accords respect for the point of view of all participants and allows everyone to see more of the world.
- *The process elicits choices.* A premise of scenario thinking is that the future is not predetermined and cannot be predicted, which means that the choices we make can influence what happens. In a situation where people feel swept along by overwhelming, inevitable currents, this is an empowering world view. During its transition, South Africa was haunted by apocalyptic vision: the scenario stories helped people rationally think through their options.
- *The process is constructive.* A scenario conversation turns the attention of a group away from the past and present toward the future. It shifts from looking for the solution to exploring different possibilities, and from separate interests of the parties to their common ground.

Conditions necessary for a successful scenario effort include:

- *Timing.* This is the most important element. The public leaders must be ready to talk about the future.
- How the process is led:
 - Credibility.* The people who convene and lead the project must be broadly respected. They must be seen as advocates of the process and not of any particular position or outcome.
 - Informality and reflectiveness.* The power of scenario work comes from its status as an exercise in reflection and imagination, which is not directly linked to action. Therefore, although it is possible to proceed from constructing scenarios to creating a vision and then planning action, these processes must be carefully insulated from one another.
 - Inclusiveness.* The value of these projects is that they build common ground among different perspectives and parties. It is important to be as inclusive as possible. The Mont Fleur project was unfortunately diminished by its failure to include the Inkatha Freedom Party, which has been an important dissenter in South African politics.

- The teams need to be:
 - Respected*: Composed of leaders who are influential in their own communities or constituencies.
 - Open-minded*: In particular, not fundamentalist and able to listen and work with others.
 - Representative*: All the important perspectives on the issues at hand must be included. Any stakeholder must be able to see their point of view represented by someone on the team.

C6. Lessons From Cyprus

The ethnic conflict in Cyprus also benefitted from a scenario building process that took place in the mid-1990s. This conflict's characteristics were:

- It was considered an “intractable conflict”
- It is fueled by Cyprus's location at the crossroads of Europe and the Middle East
- British ruled Cyprus from the late 1800s until 1960, when an independent Republic of Cyprus was established as a single, ethnically mixed, bicomunal state, set up as a partnership between the Turkish-speaking Muslim community, which was approximately 20 percent of the population, and the Greek-speaking Orthodox Christian community, which is approximately 80 percent.
- In 1964, ethnic violence erupted and the UN intervened to stop hostilities.
- Turkish Cypriots withdrew into enclaves which encompassed 3 percent of the territory of Cyprus.
- In 1974, intervention by Turkish troops following a Greek-instigated coup against President Makarios of Cyprus led to the geographical and communal division of the island.
- The result of this war displaced hundreds of thousands of individuals from the two communities and almost completely severed communication links between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

Although little progress has been made in political negotiation to end the conflict, there has been increased activity in recent years to introduce alternative conflict-resolution approaches to citizen groups and government officials.

- A group of 32 individuals — 16 Greek and 16 Turks — met for a series of problem-solving and design workshops over a nine-month period, from October 1994 to June of 1995.
- Groups met in the evenings on a weekly basis and occasionally on weekends.

- In the beginning, groups met separately in each community because the political situation did not permit bicomunal meetings.

The primary objectives were to:

- Help the group develop a thoughtful design for their peace-building efforts and to build stronger teamwork for carrying out this design
- The facilitated design sessions provided an opportunity for participants to experience and receive preliminary training in a specific problem-solving and design process

To accomplish these purposes, the group's work progressed through three design phases: Phase 1, definition of the situation (problematic) surrounding peace-building efforts in Cyprus; phase 2, development of a collective vision for peace-building efforts in Cyprus; and phase 3, creation of an integrated set of activities for peace-building in Cyprus.

The situation in Cyprus is emotionally laden due to the historical circumstances and the struggles over resources. This affected the process as follows:

- Such situations require a systematic approach that is capable of helping participants' progress through the maze of both content and relational difficulties that confront them.
- Participants must be able to explore critical issues in depth and learn to work together productively.
- Work must be done to help participants *create* together a new sense of understanding about the current situation and to build a strong basis for a common future together.

Such a process requires:

“Relational Empathy” (Reframe the event) — Unless participants in such conflicts can construct together a new framework for interpreting the events surrounding the conflict, they are likely to either remain trapped in incompatible views of the past and future, or else they will find themselves forced by circumstances into making unsatisfactory compromises that may lead to an eventual breakdown of agreement.

“Interactive Management” — a system of problem solving and design. It is a useful way to help groups deal with complex issues.

The interactive management system helps parties design group products that integrate contributions from individuals with diverse views, backgrounds, and perspectives.

In interactive management, a group of participants who are knowledgeable of the situation is engaged in:

- Collectively developing a thorough understanding of the current state of affairs
- Establishing a clear basis for thinking about the future

- Producing a framework for effective action

The conditions of the interactive management approach of group problem solving require:

- A group of knowledgeable participants who represent the variety of perspectives that are relevant for dealing with the situation
- A trained facilitation team that is able to guide the group through the problem solving and planning process
- Understanding and using the process of consensus
- Setting up an appropriate physical environment

In *Phase 1, Identifying and Structuring Obstacles to Peace-building Efforts in Cyprus*, participants developed a deeper understanding of the system of problems affecting peace-building efforts in Cyprus by:

- Recognizing the obstacles to the peace-building efforts
- Exploring subsets of obstacles from participants' lists and the interrelationships among these problem statements

The process allowed the participants to produce a structure that showed the group's consensus on how the more important barriers negatively impact one another.

In *Phase 2, Developing a Vision Statement for Peace-building Efforts*, they used the structure of obstacles as a foundation, then focused on developing a vision statement that could guide the work of the group in the future. The following objectives were established:

- To identify the goals that should guide the group's peace-building efforts in Cyprus
- To develop a "vision statement" showing the supportive relationships among selected goals

Here the participants engaged in proposing characteristics of the desired future. The questions used were:

- "What are desired goals for our peace-building efforts during the next decade?"
- "In designing the future for peace-building efforts in Cyprus, would the accomplishment of goal A significantly support the accomplishment of goal B?" This question examines the positive influence that goals can have on one another.

In *Phase 3, Identifying and Structuring Options for Peace-building Activities*, the objectives were to:

- Identify options for accomplishing the goals of peace-building efforts in Cyprus
- Develop an alternative “options profile” of selected activities and recommendations that could be implemented during the next 12 months
- Formulate specific plans for the implementation of actions and recommendations
- Build the group into a strong force for bringing about change in Cyprus

The questions that resulted were:

- “What are proposed options for accomplishing the goals from the vision statement?”
- “Does Option A share significant elements in common with Option B?”
- “Will choices made from one category influence choices made in another category?”

This set of options serves as the basis for the next step of the design process, in which participants were engaged in making choices.

Participants suggested items for consideration and discussed these items by explaining their rationales for favoring their implementation. The participants were asked to consider the following criteria for selecting options:

- The option is feasible given the resource constraints
- Responsibility for implementation of the option can be assigned to a specific person or group
- The option will have an impact on the overall system of obstacles
- The option will provide support for the vision statement

The items selected through this systematic discussion were viewed as a collaborative action agenda for peace-building activities.

As a final step in the design process, and as a first step in the implementation of the options, the group organized a gathering to which they invited more than 100 individuals with an interest in becoming involved in peace-building activities. This very successful event resulted in the formation of themes around each of the 15 projects to work with the designated project leaders in the implementation of each activity.

The products that resulted from the group work by the conflict-resolution trainers represent tangible accomplishments that will shape the direction of peace-building efforts in Cyprus for many years to come.

Several specific products were produced. The most important were:

- *Problem schematic*: a graphical structure depicting the group's view of the current situation confronting peace builders in Cyprus
- *Vision statement*: a representation of the group's view of the desirable future
- *Collaborative action agenda*: a plan of activities for accomplishing the aims of the group

Projects that were part of the collaborative action agenda were organized according to four categories:

- Variety of workshops
- Organizing cultural and social programs
- Holding public presentations and discussions on peace issues
- Building stronger bridges with officials

Significant features of the group's products were:

- A realization of the importance of structuring a problem schematic. This schematic is important for two reasons:
 - It incorporates a variety of perspectives into an overall understanding of the situation.
 - It prevents premature focus on solutions by gaining a deeper understanding of how problems relate to one another, and sets the stage for a more creative approach to finding solutions.
- The vision statement served two primary purposes:
 - It provided direction and guidance for the group and helped the group construct a clear image of the future
 - It helped participants understand and accept individual and community differences in aims and objectives

ANNEX A

List of Participants and Agenda for Bogor Workshop

Workshop Participants, 10-12 May, Novotel Bogor Estate

Marzuki Darusman, Komnasham
H.S. Dillon, Komnasham
Asmara Nababan, Komnasham
Mansour Fakih, facilitator
Binny Buchori, INFID
Sugeng Bahagijo, INFID
Dedy Prasetyo, Indonesia Masa Depan/INFID
Agum Gumelar, Lemhannas
Jend. Panjaitan, Abri
Bambang Yudhoyono, Abri Sospol
Emil Salim, Universitas Indonesia
Frans Hendra Winarta, Winarta & Associates
James Castle, Castle Group business consultants
Emmy Hafild, Walhi
Muhammad Hikam, LIPI
Mochtar Buchori, Jakarta Post
Saparinah Sadli, Women's Solidarity Forum
Felia Salim, Jakarta Stock Exchange/CSIS
Rainer Adam, Friedrich Naumann Stiftung
Mary Zurbruchen, Ford Foundation
Dennis Wendel, USAID/Indonesia
Eileen Borris, Chemonics International
David Trickett, Chemonics International
Jonathan Simon, Chemonics International

**Agenda: Workshop on National Dialogue and Scenario Development
for Indonesia
10-12 May 1999**

10 May

- 12:00-13:30 Registration and lunch.
- 13:30-14:00 Opening speech.
Introduction and welcome to the workshop. Introduction of agenda
and presenters.
H.S. Dillon, Komnasham.
- 14:00-15:30 Presentation: Model Building, Reconciliation, and Dialogue.
Eileen Borris.
- 15:30-15:45 Coffee break
- 15:45-17:30 Presentation: Dialogue and Scenario Development.
David Trickett.
- 17:30-18:30 Discussion.
- 18:30-19:30 Dinner and break.
- 19:30-20:30 Presentation: Summary of Indonesia's Most Pressing Issues and
Challenges.
M. Hikam.
- 20:30-22:00 Discussion of dialogue and scenario-building processes. Planning
of workshop Agenda for Day 2.

11 May

- 7:30-8:30 Breakfast
- 8:30-10:00 Presentation: Details of What Constitutes a Process of Dialogue
and National Reconciliation.
Eileen Borris and David Trickett.
- 10:00-10:30 Coffee break.
- 10:30-13:30 Discussions. Dialogue process, scenario development, and conflict
resolution.
All participants and facilitators.
- 13:30-14:00 Lunch.

14:00-16:00	Discussions. Dialogue process, scenario development, and conflict resolution. All participants and facilitators.
16:00-18:00	Simulation of a Dialogue Process: Envisioning a Desired Future for Indonesia. All participants and facilitators.
18:00-19:00	Dinner.
19:00-21:00	Presentation and Discussion: Steps in the Scenario-Development Process. All participants and facilitators.
<i>12 May</i>	
7:30-8:30	Breakfast.
8:30-10:30	Discussion: Summarizing workshop issues and processes. All participants and facilitators.
10:30-12:00	Finalizing and collating results. Development of a draft implementation plan for the dialogue and scenario-development process. Working group and facilitators.
12:00-12:15	Closing and wrap-up.
12:15-1:00	Lunch and return to Jakarta.