EUROPA-UNIVERSITÄT
VIADRINA
FRANKFURT (ODER)

Band 36

Viadrina-Schriftenreihe zu Mediation und Konfliktmanagement

Matthias Ryffel

Whole system peace – exploring Large Group Intervention in peace mediation

Wolfgang Metzner Verlag

Band 36

Viadrina-Schriftenreihe zu Mediation und Konfliktmanagement

Band 36

Viadrina-Schriftenreihe zu Mediation und Konfliktmanagement

Herausgegeben von
Prof. Dr. Ulla Gläßer, LL. M.
Dipl.-Psych. Kirsten Schroeter
Dr. Felix Wendenburg, M. B. A.

Matthias Ryffel

Whole system peace – exploring Large Group Intervention in peace mediation

Wolfgang Metzner Verlag

Master-Studiengang Mediation
und Konfliktmanagement
Masterarbeit
Studiengang 2020/2021

EUROPA-UNIVERSITÄT
VIADRINA
FRANKFURT (ODER)

© Wolfgang Metzner Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 2022

Das Werk ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der Freigrenzen des Urheberrechts ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlags unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Printed in Germany
ISBN 978-3-96117-115-6 (Print)
ISBN 978-3-96117-116-3 (Online)
ISSN 2365-4155

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek
Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

Table of Contents

Preface **3**

1. Methods **5**

2. Peace Mediation **7**
2.1. Definition of Peace Mediation **7**
2.2. Those involved and affected by Peace Mediation **9**
2.3. Timing in Peace Mediation **10**
2.4. Approaches to Peace Mediation **11**

3. The Large Group Intervention approach **16**
3.1. The roots of LGI **16**
3.2. Key assumptions and characteristics of LGI **18**
3.2.1. Whole system thinking **18**
3.2.2. Self-organization and change **19**
3.2.3. Facilitation in self-organization **21**
3.2.4. Common ground orientation **22**
3.2.5. Participation **24**
3.2.6. Process-orientation **25**

4. Analysis and conclusions **28**
4.1. Spread of the LGI approach in the peace mediation field **28**
4.1.1. Conceptual references in literature **29**
4.1.2. Reference to practical application **30**
4.2. Relevance and applicability of LGI to peace mediation **32**
4.2.1. Impartial, facilitative, common ground oriented, prepared **32**
4.2.2. Complexity **36**
4.2.3. Inclusivity, participation, process-orientation, ownership **37**
4.2.4. Understanding, trust and relationship building **43**
4.3. Conditions and challenges to LGI in peace mediation **47**
4.4. Situating the LGI approach in tracks and phases **52**

5. Summary and discussion **54**

Literature **59**

Abbreviations **63**

Annex **64**

About the Author **68**

Preface

The idea of facilitative mediation is to empower parties to find their own solutions to their conflict. They, so the assumption, have the best understanding of their dispute and need procedural assistance rather than substantive help. And it is they who will ultimately have to implement any solution (Moore, 2014, p. 46).

This model simplifies reality. Mediation and dialogue facilitation in peace processes deal with systems and subsystems of a conflict playing out on multiple societal levels. At any of these levels, processes that seek to resolve, manage, or prevent conflict face enormous complexity.

How does facilitative mediation work in such complex situations? The number of people affected makes it impossible to include everyone in a conflict resolution process physically. Moreover, violence, escalation, power, and other dynamics may prevent broad inclusion.

Thus, peace practitioners face difficult challenges and choices: How can a process be designed to be effective under such constraints yet still produce solutions that account for the conflict's full complexity and receive broad enough support to contribute to a sustainable peace? How to assist the parties to conflict in understanding a situation that is so complex and help them identify the right solutions? Should one try to break complexity down and address it in its parts? Or is it possible to embrace complexity and address a conflict comprehensively?

The peace mediation field has come up with numerous approaches to answer these questions. However, relevant processes may also be found and studied beyond the field of peace mediation. When I came across reports of mediators who apply so-called Large Group Intervention methodology in the organizational context and in conflicts that involve entire communities in the public sphere in Western societies, sometimes leading participatory processes that can number in the thousands, I was perplexed. After working more than five years in peace mediation support, why had I not heard about these Large Group Interventions before? Had these mediators found something that had not been tried in the peace mediation field before?

As I will show in this thesis, Large Group Intervention (LGI) reflects the evolution of participatory approaches in organizational development. These interventions attempt to bring together large groups that reflect an organization's full complexity and enable that group to understand complexity to find solutions acceptable to everyone. The approach is inspired by systems thinking. Its fundamental as-

sumptions are that complex systems are inherently self-organizing. Thus, one cannot steer them towards a specific change – change must emerge from an interaction of the whole system. They also sought to deal with constraints of inclusion, as organizational hierarchy tends to promote exclusive decision-making.

That is how the idea for this thesis was born. It aims to study LGI regarding its potential to inform concepts and practice in the field of peace mediation. My research question is: How relevant and applicable is the LGI approach to the field of peace mediation?

In the following, I will briefly outline the research method. The second part of the thesis focuses on theory: It outlines the approach of Large Group Intervention and defines the field of peace mediation, to then assess the LGI approach against concepts of peace mediation. In the third part, I present my analysis and conclusions about the relevance and applicability of LGI to the field of peace mediation. In part four, I wrap up by summarizing and discussing my conclusions, taking a step back to put them into perspective, and looking at the potential for further research on the topic.

Matthias Ryffel, November 2021

1. Methods

This thesis is literature-based with a degree of reality contact. This means that I primarily answer my research question based on existing literature. The 'reality contact' comes through four interviews with LGI and peace practitioners, conducted throughout November and December 2020.

The thesis aims to explore the research question without intending to offer conclusive and evidence-based answers to it. Exploratory research usually studies a problem that has not been clearly defined yet. It allows tackling new issues on which little or no previous research exists while the researcher believes it may offer insights that merit discovery, seeking to generate new ideas or link ideas to create theory (Stebbins, 2011, pp. 5-8). Qualitative research aims to discover, understand and interpret a situation, phenomenon or process, or perspectives and worldviews of the people involved, seeking to describe these and inductively generate hypotheses – rather than testing existing theory (Merriam, 1998, pp. 17-21).

It is thus important to emphasize that I do not aim to assess the effectiveness of the LGI approach for the field of peace mediation. Instead, I explore whether this approach could be relevant and applicable and make sure that I ask the right questions. The literature I have relied on in describing these methods would not be suitable to perform such assessment either. It mainly consists of handbooks or reflections written by practitioners. One can assume that these practitioners tend to be biased towards the validity and efficiency of the methods and concepts they use and the values that underpin them. There is indeed very little research that empirically studies the efficiency of LGI (Worley et al., 2011), which is an essential gap that this thesis cannot fill.

The qualitative data collection involved semi-standardized interviews. This type of interview generally follows an interview guide that is devised before the interview and focuses on a core topic. While it thus provides a general structure, the semi-structured interview allows for discovery by following topical trajectories as the interview unfolds (Magaldi & Berler, 2018). Semi-structured interviews are of particular use "if you are examining uncharted territory with an unknown, but potential momentous issues and your interviewers need maximum latitude to spot useful leads and pursue them" (Adams, 2015, p. 494). This interview type suited my purpose to openly explore the interviewees' perspectives. At the same time, it allowed me to give them hints and clues about the LGI approach or the peace mediation field, as I could not count on the interviewees' familiarity with both fields of practice.

The small interview sample includes three practitioners from the field of peace mediation and one LGI practitioner. I sought to capture different perspectives that reflect the mediation field's breadth and include practitioners who work explicitly with LGI. Although diverse, this small sample is in no way representative and does not accurately reflect the relevant larger fields of practice. Consequently, the findings of this thesis are not representative.

Below is a description of the interviewees' profiles. They decided to remain anonymous due to confidentiality considerations regarding their work:

- Senior peace mediation practitioner with government affiliation who has substantial experience in accompanying track I processes.
- Senior dialogue practitioner, formerly affiliated with an international organization, for which she ran a large-scale dialogue program in Latin America.
- Senior mediation and dialogue specialist in the peace mediation field, affiliated with a regional organization.
- Independent LGI practitioner who uses the approach in large mediation and development processes in the organizational and public sphere in Switzerland.

In consultation with the interviewees, I have fully anonymized their names and specific affiliations. For concrete examples mentioned in the interviews, I have anonymized or abstracted names, dates, and places to the necessary level to ensure confidentiality. Each of the semi-structured interviews is between 1 and 1.5 hours long. They were conducted based on an interview guide (see annex 1). All interviews were conducted online through the platform 'zoom' given social-distancing requirements due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Due to time constraints, I have refrained from editing and annexing the rough transcripts that I have established. To evaluate the interviews, I relied on a thematic analysis, which identifies patterns and themes within data. It begins with data collection and continues throughout the transcribing, reading, analyzing, and interpreting (Evans, 2018, pp. 4-5). In the process of identifying the patterns, I have cross-checked the interviews against the literature review.

2. Peace Mediation

The term peace mediation is used in this thesis to describe a field rather than an instrument. In this field, third party actors usually apply mediation or related tools (e.g., dialogue facilitation) in the framework of an existing or emerging peace process, addressing different levels and segments of society.

Without aspiring to be comprehensive, I will now outline the peace mediation field's key features to set the stage for the subsequent assessment and comparison with the LGI approach, thus identifying the requirements a participatory approach like LGI needs to fulfill to be relevant to and applicable in the peace mediation field. I will do so by following a broad structure of what mediation is, who it involves, when it is done, and how it is done.

2.1. Definition of Peace Mediation

Peace mediation is not a clearly defined field. It can include a range of different actors with differing agendas, processes with different aims, and foci on different levels of society that play out at various moments in a conflict.

A narrow perspective on peace mediation may focus on official political negotiations between the main parties to a conflict. Mediation, in a simple understanding, then equals negotiations that are assisted by an impartial third party (Mason, 2007, p. 10).

Reflecting a focus on the official negotiations, the United Nations (UN) Guidance on effective mediation defines mediation as “a process, whereby a third party assists two or more parties, with their consent, to prevent, manage or resolve a conflict, by helping them develop mutually acceptable agreements” (United Nations [UN], 2012, p. 4).

Looking beyond the official negotiation tables, a range of different third-party processes may form part of the peace mediation field, and the spectrum quickly broadens beyond the concept of assisted negotiations.

One broad concept that applies to many of the other processes is that of dialogue or dialogue facilitation. Facilitation (subsequently dialogue facilitation) is relatable to mediation, in particular to facilitative mediation approaches. However, dialogue facilitation is less outcome-oriented than mediation and focuses more on enhancing mutual understanding, preparing joint action, and less on decision-making. Dialogue facilitation is complementary to mediation and applicable in other phases and on different tracks, which the official political negotiations cannot address

(Mason, 2007, pp. 4-8). Even a comprehensive peace agreement will not automatically translate into sustainable and positive peace on all levels of a society. Dialogue facilitation is thus needed on different levels.

Dialogue facilitation should not be confused with facilitation the way for instance Switzerland conceptualizes it as part of its 'good office' foreign policy. Such understanding of facilitation is closer to the idea of 'host state services'. It focuses on providing (often material) support to conflict parties and accompanying them in arranging for a negotiation process in the sense of a lighter version of mediation (Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, 2020).

Neither mediation nor dialogue are limited to a specific level of society. Just as mediation may be needed to address conflict on a local level (UN, 2020), dialogue facilitation can address the national level. For example, the so-called 'National Dialogues' aim to expand participation in political transitions beyond military and political elites. National Dialogues are processes that strive for maximum inclusivity across the tracks and full national ownership. They are broad-based participatory processes that may include large groups. They may aim for crisis prevention and management or fundamental change, such as renewal of the social contract regarding the relation between state and society, or constitutional change. National Dialogues come into play in times of deep political crisis, be this post-conflict or during political transitions. They may take place before, after, or even in parallel to a mediation process (Blunck et al., 2017, pp. 20-34).

To avoid confusion by the labels mediation, negotiation, and dialogue, it may help to think of three underlying mechanisms at play in all of these processes: Dialogue, deliberation, and decision-making. According to the practitioner handbook for democratic dialogue (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007, p. 23) one can distinguish between:

Dialogue: Brings together many voices, stories, and perspectives; makes use of shared inquiry, exploration, and discovery; encourages deep listening that fosters respect and understanding; aims for shared meaning-making and co-construction of knowledge.

Deliberation: focuses on argumentation based on reason; seeks to examine possible solutions seriously; potential tradeoffs are weighed-off; judgment is taken on an informed and reasoned basis.

Decision-Making: decisions can be made based on authority; by negotiating; based on consensus; by voting.

It helps to understand that mediation, dialogue, and negotiation processes can involve all these mechanisms, depending on their goal and framing. In peace mediation, the lines between mediation, dialogue, and negotiation are often blurry.

Analyzing a process according to the mechanisms of dialogue, deliberation, and decision-making can help to look behind the labels and see what a process is really about.

For instance, we can say that mediation is an outcome-oriented process and focuses on decision-making (based on negotiations or consensus). Yet, mediation also involves dialogue and deliberation. Interest-based mediation uses dialogue to identify the parties' diverse perspectives and interests to find mutually acceptable solutions. Other types of mediation focus more on the level of relationships and may put an even stronger emphasis on dialogue. The same is true for negotiation processes, depending on the negotiation approach chosen. While distributive negotiation focuses on decision-making through positional bargaining, integrative negotiation requires dialogue and deliberation to identify the parties' interests and produce win-win solutions (Spengler, 2003, p. 1). And while dialogue processes may focus on fostering understanding, they often go beyond the strict dialogue mechanism. As they may aim for tangible output, they will include aspects of deliberation or decision-making.

2.2. Those involved and affected by Peace Mediation

The focus on political negotiations between the main conflict parties can be broadened to the society at large in which a peace mediation process takes place. Accordingly, one can distinguish between different levels or segments of a society that an initiative addresses: Track I (officials, government, decision-makers, key representatives); Track I.5 (referring to a setting where participants take part informally and not in their official capacity, or to a mix between Track I and Track II actors); Track II (non-official but influential figures with links to decision-makers); Track III (grass-roots level and civil-society). (Mason, 2007, p. 5)

The UN Guidance for effective mediation emphasizes that mediation processes should be inclusive and consider the needs and concerns of the main conflict parties and of other relevant stakeholders and address the root causes of the conflict as well as the needs of the broader affected population – thereby increasing the legitimacy and national ownership of a process (United Nations [UN], 2012, pp. 11-13).

This understanding of inclusivity circles around the challenge of designing an inclusive peace process and thus puts great emphasis on who should be involved in a peace process at which point and in which way. Many different models of broadening participation in peace negotiations exist. Paffenholz (2014) mentions

eight models that range from the representation of stakeholders in the official negotiation process to mass action, such as demonstrations that may influence the process (p. 4).

One can challenge the focus on this type of inclusivity, criticizing the top-down perspective that depicts a peace process as a rather monolithic and hierarchically organized system, in which peace practice gravitates around the track I process. Such an understanding of peace processes may correspond with the strong influence of track-oriented thinking in the field of peace mediation. The multitrack perspective may offer an alternative. It suggests understanding a peace process as a plethora of different processes that can but need not necessarily be linked to each other (Palmiano et al., 2019, pp. 7-11). For instance, local processes may work autonomously towards sustainable peace, regardless of track I. Conscious of such a critical perspective, this thesis seeks to avoid suggesting or implicating a hierarchy when referring to the track model. None the less, it will draw on it to look at the relevance of LGI to peace practice with regards to different levels of society.

2.3. Timing in Peace Mediation

Time is another dimension that helps depict the field of peace mediation. One common model identifies three or four phases in peace mediation: pre-pre-negotiations; pre-negotiations; negotiations; implementation (Mason, 2007, p. 6). Zooming into the negotiation phase, one can further distinguish different phases of the mediation process. Common models identify five to eight different phases, usually including the beginning of mediation; the initial presentation of the conflict parties' perspectives; a deeper clarification of issues, interests, and needs; the generation and evaluation of options; and the reaching of an agreement and closure (Moore, 2014, p. 186).

Such models simplify an oftentimes messy reality: mediation processes do not usually stick to phase models. Yet the models can provide an overview and indications about an ideal order of the mediator's interventions. For this thesis, the phase model may be useful to situate where LGI methods fit in.

A different way to look at time in peace processes is to ask about the time horizon of intervention: The 'SMALL-framework' organizes the goals and activities of interventions in a fragile context according to short-, medium-, and long-term and puts a focus on the need to link these different levels. Short-term responses include reaching agreements through contextualized mediation. Medium-term responses include establishing interim peace structures for peace practitioners to

work across conflict cleavages, and long-term responses focus on using consensus to support effective and legitimate governance (Abdi & Mason, 2019, p. 13). A strength of this model is that it also allows looking at peace practice beyond a narrow phase model in fragile contexts where there is no clear peace process in place.

2.4. Approaches to Peace Mediation

In this paragraph, I will not focus on techniques but rather look at important concepts and mediation and dialogue facilitation principles.
One can distinguish between many different 'schools' of mediation (Moore, 2014, pp. 46-59). The models and concept that this thesis discusses tend to match best with process-oriented and relationship-oriented schools of mediation, but less so with substantively focused schools. The process-oriented approach (for instance, facilitative mediation) implies that mediators primarily provide process assistance and leave the mediation's substance or content to the conflict parties (Moore, 2014, pp. 46-47).

In contrast, the relationship-oriented school (for instance, transformative mediation) "focuses on procedures to improve and enhance mutual understanding, address psychological and relational issues, manage and work through emotions, improve interactions, and promote the establishment of positive and respectful relationships between or among disputing parties (Moore, 2014, p. 47). Substantively focused schools involve the mediator's substantive assessment of the issues in dispute, based on which he may also advise parties in conflict on substantial aspects (Moore, 2014, pp. 54-55). While it could be enlightening to study LGI against the full spectrum of different mediation schools and approaches, this would go beyond this thesis's scope.

The practitioners' handbook for democratic dialogue establishes five principles for dialogue that can guide action: Inclusiveness, joint ownership, learning, humanity, long-term perspective (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007, pp. 26-29).

Inclusiveness is the idea that a dialogue process should allow all those to be involved or represented in the dialogue who are part of the problem system the process seeks to address. The assumption is that a) the combined knowledge of the constituents of a problem system builds the expertise required to address everyone's problems, and b) that their sense of ownership in the problem, the process managing it, and the solution found is needed to produce (sustainable) change (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007, pp. 26-28).

Joint ownership implies the participants' commitment to contribute to change by engaging in and shaping the dialogue process. To develop such ownership, participants must feel that they discuss substantial issues that truly matter for any attempt to bring about change (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007, p. 28).

Learning means that a dialogue process requires openness from participants to listen deeply to each other to gain new insights and new perspectives, for which they need to learn to suspend certainties, assumptions, and judgment (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007, p. 29).

Humanity can be summarized as the need to create a safe space where participants can engage in genuine interaction about what truly matters, and where they can respect each other as human beings, with all their differences, and understand each other in an empathic way that reaches deeper than cognitive reasoning (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007, pp. 30-31).

Long-term perspective implies that dialogue must go beyond stopping violence and stabilizing the political situation. To find sustainable solutions to crises requires attention to underlying patterns of relationships and behavior. No 'quick fix' can achieve this – it requires time (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007, pp. 31-32).

The same handbook also mentions five challenges that dialogue processes need to address to be effective (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007, pp. 15-18):

Dealing with complexity: Dialogue processes must be capable of dealing with complexity along three dimensions. *Social complexity* means that a problem includes many different stakeholders and actors with diverse perspectives and interest, so outside experts cannot solve it. *Dynamic complexity* refers to a situation where cause and effect are not obvious because they are far apart in space and time. *Generative complexity* means that a situation is so complex that the future is unpredictable, and solutions cannot simply be generated or copied from past experiences and lessons.

Coordinate meaning: Since effective dialogue processes aim for coordinated action under a common goal, they must establish a common language as a basis. In conflict, people interpret and make sense of a situation differently based on different experiences and conceptual frameworks. Participants must be open to acknowledging the various meanings given to words to achieve shared understanding as a basis for coordinated action.

Produce innovation: Dialogues attempt to deal with problems in a new way, because other ways have not worked. They thus need to empower people to overcome the status quo and develop new solutions that are broadly supported and implemented.

Enable deliberation: If dialogue is to produce sustainable solutions, these need to build on decisions informed by an awareness of the different options and choices at hand and the trade-offs involved.

Produce sustainable results: Dialogues respond to a crisis with the ambition to go beyond producing a quick solution to the crisis. While the dialogue needs to address the current problem, it must tackle the underlying problems and, moreover, empower the people to handle these problems in the future and find sustainable solutions.

Mediation Practitioners Dirk Splinter and Ljubjana Wüstehube suggest a framework to characterize dialogue, which is broad enough to link many of the earlier mentioned dimensions and situate them against the track levels (Splinter & Wüstehube, 2020, pp. 70-72): The framework characterizes dialogue processes along four dimensions. The first dimension looks at the already introduced levels of society (tracks I-III) on which an intervention plays out. The second dimension looks at the degree to which a process aims to produce deep understanding between its participants instead of merely convincing each other of different perspectives. The third dimension captures the decision-making involved. It asks to what extent participants are involved in making decisions: Are they merely informed about others' decisions, consulted about their opinions on such decisions, invited to contribute to identifying options and solutions jointly, or even involved in consensual decision-making? The fourth and last dimension captures the dialogue's focus: Is it focused on substance (the issues at hand)? Or is it focused on identity-oriented discussions that aim for trust-building and transforming relationships, for instance, by making the personal experience of the participants a topic?

The Reflecting on Peace Practice (RPP) framework is another useful means to understand how peace initiatives differ in fostering change. It suggests a simple, two-dimensional matrix: The first dimension looks at the people addressed by an initiative, project, or program: Are these 'key people', who are critical to the resolution or the continuing of the conflict, in other words, individuals who yield special power and influence to bring about or block change? Or are these 'more people', implying a broadening of the basis for peace by mobilizing larger numbers of people and constituencies who become engaged in the process? The second dimension looks at the level of change the intervention aims for: Is it on the individual/personal level and seeks to change the skills, values, attitudes, behavior, perceptions, ideas, and relationships of individuals? Or is it on the socio-political level and aims to change institutions, norms, culture, or group- relations and behavior, to address grievances that drive conflict, or promote peaceful means of addressing

conflict? For instance, by reforming government policies, negotiating peace agreements, or addressing norms that regulate inter-group relationships. Beyond helping to clarify how a peace initiative seeks to bring change, the framework emphasizes that change, which is to contribute to comprehensive peace on all levels of a society (referred to as 'peace writ large'), needs to link these different dimensions (CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, 2015, pp. 33-42).

As an aspirational document, the United Nation's Guidance on effective mediation establishes seven fundamentals that the UN suggests should inform peace mediation initiatives:

Preparedness: This fundamental mainly speaks to the need for a structured and phased approach through which mediators strategize and plan their interventions (process design), including the necessary flexibility to account for such processes' non-linear nature and uncontrollable developments (UN, 2012, pp. 6-7). **Consent:** Peace mediation is a voluntary process, which implies that parties must consent to the process and to the mediator and can always withdraw from the process (UN, 2012, pp. 8-9).

Impartiality: A 'cornerstone' of mediation, impartiality means that the mediator needs to be able to talk to all sides and treat them fairly and in a balanced way. While the guidance includes that a mediator should not have any material interests in the outcome of the process, it distinguishes impartiality from neutrality, referring to the rucksack of values and principles that particularly UN-mediators carry and need to uphold (UN, 2012, p. 10).

Inclusivity: Mediation processes need to consider the needs and concerns of the main conflict parties and other relevant stakeholders and address the root causes of the conflict and the needs of the broader affected population, thereby increasing the legitimacy and national ownership of a process. The guidance clarifies that inclusivity does need to mean direct participation. It can also mean the establishment of mechanisms, which ensure that the process considers all perspectives. It also outlines challenges associated with inclusivity, such as the resistance of the key conflict parties to open the negotiations to others, the rising complexity of processes that include more stakeholders, and the difficulties in identifying and reaching legitimate representatives of interest groups on the various levels. Dilemmas exist around the notion of inclusivity. For instance, the mediator must balance normative considerations speaking for inclusivity with the context's reality, which often limits the space for participation. This could be because key parties push against inclusivity or because of pragmatic consideration of resource-constraints (time and funding) and manageability of complexity (UN, 2012, pp. 11-13).