THE STOPLIGHT ANALYSIS:

A SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION OF INTERNATIONAL PEACEBUILDING

PARTNERSHIP READINESS

Co-authored and presented by Nuria Ségolène List

Nuria S. List
Research Assistant at IPI
Master's Student at the Carter School,
GMU

Dr. Charles E. Davidson
Assistant Research Professor at
GMU's Carter School
& President of IPI

Rémy Nsengiyumva
Director of African
Operations IPI

Autesserre, S. (2021). *The frontlines of peace: An insider's guide to changing the world*. Oxford University Press.

Hellmüller, S.(2014). *International and Local Actors in Peacebuilding: Why Don't They Cooperate?* Swisspeace.

Allen, S.H. (2022). Interactive Peacemaking: A People-Centered Approach (1st ed.). Routledge.

Anderson, M. B., Olsen, L. (2003). *Confronting war: Critical lessons for peace practitioners*. The Collaborative for Development Action Reflecting on Peace Practice Project, Cambridge, MA.

Discontinue

Consider with Alterations

Proceed

Stoplight Analysis of Partnering Organisation Readiness

Colour	Local Organisation	Project Characteristics	Outside Partnering Organisation
Red	Not Locally/Regionally Staffed Unethical behavior/lack of Integrity Self-centered interests. Discontinued by local government Lack of clear vision/focus Lack of neutrality (political, ethnic, or religious) Opportunistic (mission shifting, hasty funding) Poor financial management	Lack of trustworthy connections Lack of adherence to "do no harm" principle Prioritization of short-term outputs over long-term impact No path for local process adoption Lack of key partners/plans to operate in isolation Intractable Intolerance Inter-Country/Geopolitical Conflicts Lack of synergy with existing efforts	Undue Danger Lack of visa accessibility Lack of risk assessment Political/social restrictions
Yellow	Recently incorporated Primarily religious in nature Lack of national registration Limited work history in conflict resolution Political ties Single-person team / lack of well-structured team Weak communication channels with stakeholders Largely Under Tasked Team Lack of Physical Address	Lack of local governance structures Dependence on external "experts" Unclear plan to hand off process to local stakeholders "Unripe" Conflict Situation Lack of local language abilities	Limited knowledge of conflict context No regional coordinator Inefficient communication channels Long-term reliance on external funding Lack of methodological connectivity
Green	Community-based organization Clear peace-oriented mission Neutral position regarding parties in conflict Observance of universal human rights principles Willingness to invest own resources In line with UN Sustainable Development Goals History of peace initiatives/conflict work	Genuine partnership/collaboration Local ownership of project Clearly defined and tangible end state Inclusive/engage community Adaptability/flexibility to respond to local context Low fiscal entry point Actively involve women in processes Involves partners with history in conflict resolution/peacebuilding Immediate Fiscal Growth Potential Locally Conceived Processes Can be Released Entirely by Outsiders Doesn't "Pay for Peace"	Local expert coordinator Funds readily available Well-defined budget/ transparent resource allocation Budget aligns with project objectives Written plan/roadmap Locally-led M&E strategy

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Safety

Infrastructure

Conflict situation readiness

Existence & flexibility in funds

PREPAREDNESS

No government registration

Recent incorporation

Conflict situation readiness

Context-specific expertise & connections

TRANSPARENCY

Ulterior motivation

Potential for corruption

Undisclosed political/religious/ethnic ties & agendas

SUSTAINABILITY

Inclusiveness & teamwork

Locally conceived, implemented & monitored

Another Risk Assessment Tool?

Thank you for your attention.

https://innovationsinpeacebuilding.org