



## **Implementation: Success and Failure**

Peace agreements are often poorly implemented; however, what we understand to be successful implementation of a peace agreement, or a good outcome from a peace process has received relatively little attention. Is it that the commitments to action in the peace agreement are honoured, or that substantive outcomes are delivered? Is the main indicator of success a reduction of deaths in conflict, or should other development conditions change? In this theme we aim to contribute to how we understand implementation by 1) conceptualizing and measuring peace and failure; and 2) exploring processes of implementation and inclusive implementation.

In this theme we explore how we understand success and failure of peace processes, and how we might ‘measure’ them. Our research here considers how we might understand ‘success and failure’ of peace agreements: in terms of whether the parties implemented their commitments, whether violent conflict ended, or more ‘positive peace’ outcomes such as improvement in development statistics? We also consider how we might understand and measure whether a peace agreement sets out an ‘inclusive’ framework or not – in terms of what groups and issues are included?

This is an experimental strand of work comprising three different components. First, conceptualizing different ways of understanding and measuring success and failure. Second, correlating peace agreement commitments, and in particular those relating to inclusion with outcomes such as deaths in conflict and other development data, using the Peace Agreement Database (PA-X), the University of Denver International Futures (IF), and the expertise in Africa of consortium partner ISS. Finally, considering through case studies how people living through peace processes understand and experience success and failure. This crosscutting research approach explores methodological pathways to understand the relationship between peace negotiations and political settlements, based on both quantitative and qualitative comparative work.

### ***Research Questions:***

- What are the different ways we can define and measure peace agreement ‘success’ or ‘failure’?
- How could we measure the commitments made in peace agreements with outcomes across a range negative and positive peace indicators?
- Can we factor in some assessment of what role different forms of inclusion played?
- To what extent do different ways of defining and measuring ‘success’ tell even or uneven stories as to whether a process has been successful?

- What do measuring attempts tell us about the ‘variable geometry’ of how governance, conflict, political bargaining, and development goals interact with each other?
- In what ways are quantitative indicators themselves and attempts to measure success a global governance tool which risks supplanting local understandings of what success would look like?

***Projects:***

- [Experimental Measurement](#)
- [Amnesty Database](#)
- [Peace Agreements Database \(PA-X\)](#)

***Suggested Key Publications:***

Molloy, S. (2018). *Assessing and Influencing Progress in Peace Processes Workshop Report* (PSRP Report). Edinburgh: Global Justice Academy, University of Edinburgh.

Verweijen, J. (2016). *Stable Instability: Political Settlements and Armed Groups in the Congo*. London: Rift Valley Institute.

Schünemann, J., & Lucey, A. (2015). *Success and Failure of Political Settlements: Defining and Measuring Transformation* (PSRP Working Paper No. 2). Edinburgh: Global Justice Academy, University of Edinburgh.