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Introduction

From February 16-21, 2015, the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace and Justice (IPJ), along with its local partners in the Philippines, the Mindanao Peoples Caucus (MPC) and Bawgbug, hosted the first regional dialogue following the IPJ’s November 2014 conference on “Defying Extremism: Gendered Responses to Religious Violence.”

The dialogue included 19 international participants from 10 countries (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Burma, Kenya, the U.S. and Canada) and 31 delegates from the Philippines — religious leaders, policymakers, civil society representatives and peacebuilders.

The five-day gathering was the first in a global series of dialogues to be held in Asia, Europe, Africa and the Middle East/North Africa (MENA) region over the next two years. The purpose is to bring together individuals from diverse sectors to learn their perspectives on violent extremism: its roots and motivations, how to temper its appeal to young men and women, and how to deal with its impact on some of the most affected communities in the world.

Context — Philippines

The Philippines is home to several armed groups fighting the government, most based on the large southern island of Mindanao and the Sulu archipelago off the island’s southwest coast. The population of Mindanao is composed of indigenous people, Moros (Muslims) and Christians who moved there from the northern Philippines before and since the country gained its independence in 1946.

Some of the armed groups have been classified as terrorist or extremist groups by the U.S. and international community, others have been engaging in political processes for self-determination (though at times have engaged in violent acts that could be considered terrorism), while still others have arisen in response to the armed conflicts.

The Philippines is ranked ninth on the most recent Global Terrorism Index, produced by the Institute for Economics & Peace, which wrote, “Terrorism in the Philippines is intrinsically tied with nationalist and separatist claims by people living in provinces in southern Philippines. However, terrorism is spread across the country.”

A primary focus of discussion during the dialogue was the movement for the self-determination of the Moro people in Mindanao. This has taken various forms since the 1960s, including the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF), Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF), the Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG) and Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Fighters (BIFF). There are also Christian militias, such as

---

1 The IPJ is part of the Kroc School of Peace Studies at the University of San Diego. MPC is a grassroots network of indigenous peoples, Moro and Christian communities and leaders that works to strengthen the participation of the “tri-peoples” in the peace process in Mindanao. Bawgbug is a human rights organization in Mindanao and the Sulu archipelago. IPJ Woman PeaceMaker Mary Ann Arnado is legal counsel and spokesperson for MPC, and Woman PeaceMaker Bae Liza Llesis Saway is a co-chair of the MPC Council.

the Ilaga (or “Rats”), that formed during the conflict in response to the Moro rebel groups and also used extreme methods in what they say was the defense of their communities.

Some sources of radicalization and violent extremism in the Muslim community of the Philippines draw on valid grievances with “historical, cultural, social, economic, political and religious dimensions” that have led to the discrimination and marginalization of the Moros. These grievances form the basis for the struggle for self-determination that has lasted decades.

In November 2013, after many years of negotiations, the MILF and the government signed a peace agreement contingent upon the passage of the Bangsamoro Basic Law (BBL), which is being drafted and still must pass the Philippine Congress, and will be the basis for how the territory will be governed.\(^3\)

While the MILF is in the process of decommissioning its weapons and transitioning to a full political body, and groups like the Ilaga have largely ceased violent activity, BIFF, ASG and elements of the MNLF continue to operate in Mindanao and the Sulu archipelago.\(^5\)

### Recent Incidents

Two major violent incidents in the Philippines colored much of the dialogue, and reinforced the timeliness and importance of the issue of extremism.

In September 2013 in Zamboanga — a port city in southern Mindanao that is known as the gateway to the Sulu archipelago — a faction of the MNLF attacked the city and security personnel of the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) and Philippine National Police (PNP) responded, leading to a 21-day conflict that displaced over 120,000 people. Many were killed and thousands of homes were destroyed.

To date, there are over 32,000 displaced people, including thousands still living in the city’s main grandstand (sports complex).\(^6\) The status of the displaced people, humanitarian services and relocation proposals remain under serious contention by the city government and human rights groups.

Two weeks prior to the dialogue, on January 25, an armed encounter between the PNP and the MILF and BIFF killed over 70 people including civilians, and displaced over 6,000.\(^7\) The PNP’s elite Special Action Force entered a MILF camp in the municipality of Mamasapano in central Mindanao, upon reports that two wanted terrorists were living in the camp. Due to a lack of coordination between the MILF and the government — as parties to the peace agreement — and the resulting

---

\(^3\) Lingga, Abhoud Syed L. *Factors that Trigger Radicalization of Muslim Community in the Philippines.* Paper presented during regional conference on “The Radicalization of Muslim Communities in Southeast Asia,” Dec. 1-2, 2006. Lingga was a keynote speaker and delegate to the Asia Regional Dialogue on Defying Extremism.

\(^4\) The new Bangsamoro territory encompasses only certain areas of Mindanao, mainly portions of central Mindanao and the Sulu archipelago.

\(^5\) The MNLF signed a peace agreement with the government in 1996 but it was never fully implemented.

\(^6\) [http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/OCHAPhilippines%20Humanitarian%20BulletinNo2%20%28February%202015%29%20FINAL.pdf](http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/OCHAPhilippines%20Humanitarian%20BulletinNo2%20%28February%202015%29%20FINAL.pdf)

\(^7\) [http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/OCHAPhilippines%20Humanitarian%20BulletinNo2%20%28February%202015%29%20FINAL.pdf](http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/OCHAPhilippines%20Humanitarian%20BulletinNo2%20%28February%202015%29%20FINAL.pdf)
loss of life (including 44 PNP forces), the incident landed a significant blow to the peace process. The passage of the BBL was placed on hold by Congress, and a number of politicians called for its rejection — some even suggesting that President Benigno Aquino III be impeached for what the police termed the “misencounter” in Mamasapano.

Participants

The core participants, more than 50, brought to the dialogue a diverse array of experiences and perspectives on the topic of extremism. They were from various sectors, including gender, policy, security, government, civil society and peacebuilding, and all had been affected by extremism in different ways. Some had lost family members to extremist groups. Some were from religious or ethnic minority groups that had been displaced and/or targeted by the state or state-supported religious groups. Some were from communities often supportive of the violent tactics of some groups. Some were former fighters. Two participants (one Christian humanitarian worker, one Muslim professor and former fighter with the MNLF) previously had been abducted and held captive by the ASG.

Core participants also reflected vast religious diversity, with those from Christian, Islamic, Buddhist and indigenous traditions, as well as those who identified with no faith. There was also great diversity within religious tradition: among the Muslim women, some were ardent feminists who interpret the Qur’an quite differently from the more conservative women who were present. There was a Catholic nun who has been arguing for the rights of the Moros for decades, and a hermit priest who joined the dialogue on the last day in Manila. MPC itself is governed by several religious and indigenous leaders from the “tri-peoples” of Mindanao.

After an opening gathering in Manila, the core participants were divided into two groups, with each traveling to a separate field visit: one to Cotabato in central Mindanao and one to Zamboanga. The delegations met with various groups of stakeholders on the issue, including local government officials, security forces, the media, youth, women activists, human rights defenders, religious leaders, internally displaced persons (IDPs), and others. These additional perspectives — from more than 500 people combined who engaged in the meetings in both locations — were brought into and informed much of the delegates’ discussions and the findings of the dialogue.

Activities

The five-day regional dialogue started and ended in Manila, with the field visits on days two and three. In the capital, the group heard from keynote speakers and worked in small groups to discuss the context and major issues that the region is experiencing as a result of violent extremism. Approaches to dialogue and preventing extremism were presented by several participants. Upon the delegations’ return from the field visits, a press conference related key findings to the media, and recommendations and next steps were formulated in small working groups.8

8 See Appendix I for the agenda, including a list of activities, speakers and field visits. Speakers at the press conference were dialogue participants: Jennifer Freeman, IPJ; Rehana Hashmi, IPJ Woman PeaceMaker from Pakistan; Sister Maria Arnold Noel of the Free Cocol Tulawie Movement; Agakhan Sharief of the Bangsamoro National Movement for Peace and Development; and Dautan Magon of United Youth for Peace and Development. There was widespread media coverage, including by CNN Philippines.
The visits to Cotabato and Zamboanga were the centerpiece of the regional dialogue, and allowed the core participants to interview and interact with a diverse array of groups. In Cotabato, the group met with:

- current and former members of the Ilaga, a Christian extremist group, which included “barangay captains,” or leaders of local villages;\(^9\)
- Moro youth leaders;
- the governor of Cotabato Province and other provincial officials, city mayors, security forces, religious leaders, civil society representatives and the media;
- members of the Central Committee of the MILF, including the vice chairman, and the ulama, or religious scholars, connected to the MILF; and
- Moro women leaders, including former combatants affiliated with the MILF and MNLF.

The delegation to Zamboanga held meetings with:

- the city’s Peace and Order Council;
- IDPs living in the grandstand, including women and mothers;
- youth from the Muslim Students Association, University Student Council, and Campus Ministry of Western Mindanao State University;
- ulama from the Mahad Moro Islamic Institute;
- Hijabin, a Muslim women’s group advocating for the right to wear hijab in colleges and universities; and
- the Asia Foundation and ZABIDA, the Zamboanga-Basilan Integrated Development Alliance, on security reform.

---

\(^9\) A barangay is the smallest unit of government in the Philippines.
Key Findings

Resistance to definitions of extremisms

“Radical is a relative term, understood differently by different people. In today’s climate, defining [a] radical Muslim depends more on the political position of the person making the judgment.”

Among the Muslim participants from the Philippines and elsewhere in the region, the term “extremism” was considered a political and highly contested term. For example, Muslim women and girls in Mindanao and Papua, Indonesia had similar experiences of being called extremists (or terrorists) if they insisted on their right to wear the hijab in certain public spaces, such as schools.

Participants were highly sensitive to the use of the terms “violent extremism,” “countering violent extremism,” “radical” and “radicalization,” recognizing their use by the U.S. and other governments as security terms related to counter-terrorism, counter-insurgency or political anti-opposition measures.

One assertion heard repeatedly was that the term “violent extremism” should be applied both to state and non-state actors. In the Philippine context, some participants felt that the government’s development, land ownership and security policies in Mindanao were tantamount to violent extremism against the Muslim minority.

In Sri Lanka and Burma, the assertion of Buddhist nationalism and state-condoned extremist groups like Bodu Bala Sena and 969 are likewise seen as state or state-supported extremism against religious and ethnic minorities. In the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, the state’s policies toward religious minorities, including Christians, are equally problematic. U.S. military invasions and bombing campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan, the ongoing use of drones in Pakistan and Yemen, and Israel’s assault on Gaza in the summer of 2014 were examples of state violence considered indiscriminate and disproportionate, thus “extreme,” targeting predominantly Muslims in those regions.

On the first day of the dialogue, keynote speaker Basil Fernando of the Asian Human Rights Commission gave examples from South Africa, Cambodia and his native Sri Lanka of violent extremism being practiced not only by non-state actors but also by states:

“When states deviate from legitimate means of social control through democratic processes and resort to excessive and, therefore, illegitimate use of violence, they often create the conditions for violent response. Therefore, when discussing extremism, it is necessary to emphasize the duties of the state to ensure democratic space for achievement of change.”

Reforming legal systems for effective prevention of violent extremism

Numerous examples were given of ways in which communities, civil society and other actors were seeking to redress just grievances and prevent violent extremism through education, vocational or economic opportunities, mediation between conflicting groups, and engagement from religious or

cultural leaders. However, Fernando emphasized that the only long-term, sustainable method of prevention is through a strong and transparent legal system:

“It is the duty of the state to ensure functional legal mechanisms, which people could utilize to seek redress for their grievances. In this regard, particularly in developing countries, states often fail to provide for genuinely functional legal mechanisms for redressing grievance and enabling meaningful change. Unfortunately, civil society activism in developing countries has not been able to intervene adequately to improve the legal systems in order that the avenues can remain open for redress and change through lawful non-violent means. In this regard, the democratic movements themselves need to critically consider whether they have discharged their obligations in order to ensure that all the peoples have legal avenues open to them to deal with their problems within a democratic framework.”

The responsibility therefore falls both to states and democratic civil society movements to push for robust and transparent democratic and legal institutions, to give those with just grievances trustworthy and accessible alternatives for redress and justice.

**Translating sympathies for violence to mobilization for peace**

The process of strengthening and reforming democratic and legal systems can be lengthy, and oftentimes disconnected from the cultures of violence being fostered in communities by extremist groups and ongoing injustices. Therefore, peacebuilding initiatives and leadership are needed at the local level to transform those who are sympathetic to violence as a means of conflict resolution, to become agents of peace.

The dialogue brought together participants who spanned a wide spectrum of sympathy for violence — from pacifists and peacemakers to former or current fighters. With more than 500 individuals engaged throughout the dialogue, conversations often centered on the fervent desires of minority, marginalized and/or targeted communities to have their grievances — whether real or perceived — heard and understood.

For example, the Cotabato group met with current and former Ilaga militia members, who arrived heavily armed, and articulated feeling “harassed” by local Muslim groups. They said no one was listening to them and were suspicious of and felt disconnected from the peace process.

Likewise, Muslims in Zamboanga said they were being shut out of dialogues with the city government — the work they were doing to provide health and human services to the internally displaced people in the grandstand continually maligned as having radical or subversive aims, and Muslim leaders often being associated with terrorists.11

For many of the participants, having their grievances heard was both a necessary precursor to them being redressed, and was valuable in and of itself. The opportunity to be heard and the possibility of their concerns being conveyed — to the media, to policymakers in the Philippines and to an international body — seemed to reignite the spark of hope in the individuals and groups the delegations met. Its counterweight, despair, was associated with the hardened mentality of those considering or mobilizing for violence. Meeting more than 50 Moro youth leaders in Cotabato, the

---

11 These are the perceptions articulated during field visit discussions, not endorsed statements. It was beyond the purview of the regional dialogue to conduct a fact-finding mission.
delegates heard individuals vacillate between the hope of peace through the negotiated settlement of the MILF and the government, and the fear that the peace agreement was about to fail. Many young men in Cotabato and Zamboanga expressed that if the peace agreement fails and the IDP situation is not rectified, their only recourse would be a return to violence. 12

**Violence prevention through education**

A unique and intriguing approach to the prevention of violent extremism was shared by two participants: Agakan Sharief and his wife, Dr. Sofia Ampuan-Sharief. They established the Khadijah Mohammad Islamic Academy, a group of schools that offer a range of formal education, vocational training, a preschool, an Arabic school, a nursery and orphanage, and a Qur’an Memorization Center. With the exception of the Qur’an Memorization Center, the schools are open to girls and boys.

The academy provides full or partial scholarships to children and orphans of Muslim rebel fighters, including the MILF, MNLF, BIFF and ASG. The Shariefs explained that they were providing education to a deeply underserved population: the children of fighters who were otherwise at significant risk of recruitment to extremist groups. They felt strongly that providing education that respected and acknowledged the children’s religious and cultural beliefs as Moros would counter the disenfranchisement, poverty and attraction to violence they felt in society and the Philippine state education system.

Mr. Sharief said, “We tell [the children of Abu Sayyaf fighters], we know you and [your community] are fighters. We know what you are fighting for. But you must respect the Qur’an. God says you shall not kill women. You shall not kill children or civilians.”

The schools represent a local approach to countering violent extremism that uses religious education to reach extreme groups, and those at risk of joining them. It is a local and religiously couched example of a similar method used by the organization Geneva Call, which educates armed, non-state actors on international humanitarian law and protecting civilians in conflict.

While elements of this approach are controversial, they invite deeper inquiry and consideration of the strengths and weaknesses in localized and nuanced contexts.

**Value of comparative studies**

An explicit intention of the IPJ and its co-convening organizations in conceiving of the “Defying Extremism” conference and regional dialogues was to expand the scope of analysis beyond the predominant global focus on Islamic extremist movements. The initial conference highlighted groups that espouse violence and hatred from a range of religions (for example, Buddhist nationalist movements in Burma and Sri Lanka, Christian extremists in the Philippines and Uganda, and Christian identity movements that are affiliated with white supremacist movements in the U.S.).

In the Philippines, it was similarly valuable to have points of comparison not just among religions, 12

---

12 However, as mentioned later under the heading “Value of comparative studies,” the MILF stated during the meeting with the delegation that if the agreement fails, they would like to take their grievances to the United Nations rather than return to war.
but also between the political and power ambitions of other religious or self-determination movements, criminal elements and state actors.

For example, during a meeting in Cotabato with the Central Committee of the MILF, IPJ Woman PeaceMaker Shreen Saroor from Sri Lanka compared the international support the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) received after agreeing to a ceasefire in 2002. When the LTTE — which was fighting for Tamil autonomy from the Sinhalese government — violated that agreement, Saroor cautioned, the international community withdrew their support and the Sri Lankan government eventually annihilated the movement in a military victory. The MILF vice chairman replied that if the current peace agreement fails, the next step would be to approach the United Nations to realize its goal of self-determination.

**A different approach to gender and countering violent extremism**

Integrating a gender perspective into the politics and practicalities of countering violent extremism is both imperative and fraught with complex considerations related to (among others): the use or manipulation of women’s peacebuilding activities for security operations; the risk of essentializing the roles of men simply as fighters and women as mothers or caregivers, and concurrently the lack of analysis of the diversity of women’s roles in supporting and participating in violent extremism; and increasing the vulnerability of already endangered women human rights defenders because of inadequate support or short-term partnerships.

There are challenges to ensuring all perspectives — from women and men, boys and girls — are shared and valued equally on the topic of extremism and its effects. Articulating a conversation or activity as “gendered” or highlighting women's roles and experiences often dissuades men from participating. The local host for the regional dialogue therefore took a different approach than the conference in San Diego, opting to omit the word “gender” from the original title and instead used “Defying Extremism Asia Regional Dialogue: Civil Society Voices; Discourse and Action for Peace.”

Of the 50 core participants, there were 25 women and 26 men. Of the men, 11 were self-described conservative religious leaders who initially seemed to segregate themselves from the rest of the group. When three indigenous women leaders invited the group to dance during the welcome dinner, one man commented that it was not respectful of his religious beliefs. By the end of the dialogue, however, several of those religious leaders expressed their appreciation to and newfound camaraderie with the women delegates from the region. As one gentleman posted on Facebook following the dialogue:
The community consultations during the field visits provided a rare platform for women and men of diverse ages (from teenagers to those in their late 70s) to discuss issues together. In certain restricted or particularly hierarchical spaces — such as the MILF Central Committee, the Ulama Council, and in the nearly exclusively male and heavily militarized Ilaga — this was a significant accomplishment.

Outcomes

On the final day of the dialogue in Manila, delegates worked in sub-regional groups to discuss three topics:

1) Next steps to move forward their ideas on specific findings from the dialogue and how they might collaborate on a sub-regional level;

2) Key findings from the dialogue that they recommended the IPJ discuss during its participation in the U.N. Commission on the Status of Women the following month;¹³ and

3) Suggestions for the organizers and participants of subsequent regional dialogues in Europe, Africa and the MENA region.

Each of the groups recommended that the regional dialogue be followed by sub-regional or even strictly local grassroots dialogues. The IPJ and its co-convening organizations have indicated a willingness to partner on these subsequent meetings when invited, but also encouraged the development of direct collaboration and institutional partnerships among those gathered, without necessarily the participation of external actors. Collaborations have already begun between local groups in the Philippines, and planning has started for a sub-regional dialogue to be held in South Asia, in partnership with the Women’s Regional Network.¹⁴

¹³ See Appendix II.
¹⁴ The Women’s Regional Network is composed of women from Afghanistan, India and Pakistan who work “within and beyond borders to ensure the enshrinement and protection of human rights, sustainable development and women’s full
In addition, a publication series will be disseminated with the findings from the November conference and the subsequent regional and sub-regional dialogues. Case studies will be identified, and opportunities for community submissions will allow a greater diversity of voices from the grassroots to be shared with policymakers and decision makers at the national, regional and international levels.

One outcome of the dialogue was the establishment of a Facebook group to facilitate long-term feedback on the relationships built and the evolution of the ideas and approaches discussed in the Philippines. It currently has 41 members, with photos and updates on topics related to the dialogue, including the Philippine peace process, interfaith peacebuilding efforts in Pakistan and Myanmar, and recent events in the Middle East.

Continued engagement with the core participants and the communities in Cotabato and Zamboanga is anticipated. As one participant, Glocelito C. Jayma, an attorney, wrote following the dialogue:

“As a result of the experience I had, I am intending to establish continuing contacts with fellow participants. I intend to initiate further dialogue and talks on peace and reconciliation among the participants, invite other actors in the grassroots who are involved in real conflict, not only in Mindanao but also in Asia. Locally, among the target participants I intend to invite are local government officials in conflict areas, members of the women sector leaders of the Christian, Moro and Indigenous peoples and, hopefully, leaders of combatants from the MILF and Ilaga as well as other armed groups.”

Conclusion and Next Steps

The diversity of the participants convened throughout the dialogue allowed for rich, rare and challenging discussions on issues of extremism. A gender perspective was incorporated into these spaces, not simply because women participated in the dialogue, but because the women leaders identified and challenged the power dynamics inherent in violent extremist groups and ideologies. Crucially, they also pointed out the power dynamics at play in the various approaches to countering violent extremism, whether from the peacebuilding, human rights, policy, legal or security sectors. Even in the short duration of the dialogue, the gender balance of the discussions allowed for new narratives to be articulated and considered.

The dialogue provided the space and opportunity for the IPJ and delegates to:

• distill and disseminate the unique learning that comes from convening such diverse multi-sector actors;
• document a range of innovative approaches being used at the local and regional levels;
• form collaborations and partnerships across sectors, including among traditionally unlikely allies (for example, women peacebuilders and men religious leaders).

participation in equitable growth to ensure a more peaceful and just world.” Members of its advisory board and executive board participated in the November conference and part of the Asia Regional Dialogue. Please see www.womensregionalnetwork.org
Future dialogues, while building on the learning and findings from the Asia Regional Dialogue, will be designed based on the specific regional context. Each will have its own format and convene a different combination of individuals with various expertise and experience in differing sectors. In this way, each of these gatherings will produce its own set of insights and approaches, and a gendered, nuanced and context-specific analysis of how to undermine violent groups, prevent recruitment and foster peaceful societies.

To learn more, participate or support this work, please contact:

Jennifer Freeman, MA, at jenfreeman@sandiego.edu or (619) 260-7569  
Senior Program Officer for Women, Peace and Security  
Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace and Justice  
Kroc School of Peace Studies  
University of San Diego  
http://peace.sandiego.edu
Appendix I – Agenda

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 15 – MANILA
Mimosa Room, 2nd Floor, Lotus Garden Hotel

5:00 – 7:00 p.m. WELCOME DINNER All Participants

Ecumenical Prayer Bae Liza Llesis Saway
Pastor Reu Montecillo
Sister Maria Arnold Noel
Agakhan Sharieff
Dishani Jayaweera

Welcome Mary Ann Arnado
Spokesperson, Mindanao Peoples Caucus

Introductions Jennifer Freeman
Senior Program Officer, Joan B. Kroc Institute
for Peace and Justice

Dinner

Entertainment

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16 – MANILA
Mimosa Room, 2nd Floor, Lotus Garden Hotel

8:30 – 9:00 a.m. REGISTRATION All Participants and Special Guests

9:00 – 11:00 a.m. FORMAL OPENING Dee Aker
9:00 – 9:10 a.m. Opening Remarks Director, Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace
and Justice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Description</th>
<th>Speaker/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:10 – 9:20</td>
<td>Welcome Remarks</td>
<td>Representative Office of the Presidential Adviser for the Peace Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20 – 9:35</td>
<td>Introduction of Keynote</td>
<td>Jennifer Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Program Officer for Women, Peace and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace and Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:35 – 10:00</td>
<td>Keynote Address</td>
<td>Basil Fernando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director, Asia Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15</td>
<td>Q&amp;A Session</td>
<td>Mary Ann Arnado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spokesperson, Mindanao Peoples Caucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 10:30</td>
<td>Closing Remarks</td>
<td>Mary Ann Arnado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>COFFEE BREAK</td>
<td>All Participants, Special Guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m. –</td>
<td>ICE BREAKER</td>
<td>All Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m. –</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>All Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 1:20</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION OF NEW DELEGATES</td>
<td>Jennifer Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.m.</td>
<td>OVERVIEW OF AFTERNOON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20 – 1:40</td>
<td>BREAKOUT SESSIONS BY AREA</td>
<td>All participants: Introductions, discuss context of area and major issues they are working on, elect spokesperson for group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Basilan, Sulu, Tawi-Tawi, Zamboanga
- Cotabato, Central Mindanao
- Manila
- Indonesia, Malaysia
- Sri Lanka, Burma
- Thailand, India
- Pakistan
- U.S., Kenya
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:40 – 2:05 p.m.</td>
<td>REPORT BACK FROM SESSIONS</td>
<td>Sri Lanka, Burma, Thailand, India, Pakistan, U.S., Kenya, Indonesia, Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:05 – 2:20 p.m.</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20 – 2:35 p.m.</td>
<td>REPORT BACK CONTINUED ...</td>
<td>Basilan, Sulu, Tawi-Tawi, Zamboanga, Cotabato, Central Mindanao, Manila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35 – 4:20 p.m.</td>
<td>APPROACHES TO DIALOGUE</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services, Father Bert Layson, OMI, Sisters in Islam, Aliah Ali, Youth Mobilization, Wai Wai Nu, Mothers Schools, Women Without Borders, Archana Kapoor, Tanenbaum Peacemakers in Action Network, Dishani Jayaweera and Father Jacky Manuputty, Mindanao Peoples Caucus/BAWBUG, Warina Jukuy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20 – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>FIELD VISIT BREAKOUT SESSIONS</td>
<td>See Participant List, Ice breaker and review schedule for field visits, team leaders, security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 – 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>DINNER</td>
<td>All participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 – 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>TEAM LEADERS’ MEETING</td>
<td>Team leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TUESDAY to THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17-19 – FIELD VISITS (see separate itineraries, below)

Tuesday 6:00 – 6:25 a.m. BREAKFAST Hotel See Participant List
       6:30 a.m. DEPART FOR AIRPORT
       PROMPTLY FLY TO COTABATO
       9:15 – 11:00 a.m.

Tuesday 7:30 – 8:00 a.m. FULL BREAKFAST (lunch
       8:15 a.m. will be light) Hotel See Participant List
       PROMPTLY DEPART FOR AIRPORT
       11:05 a.m. – FLY TO ZAMBOANGA
       12:45 p.m.

Thursday 7:45 – 9:25 a.m. FLY TO MANILA FROM
Thursday 11:40 a.m. – 1:20 ZAMBOANGA
       p.m. FLY TO MANILA FROM
       COTABATO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19 – MANILA
Mimosa Room, 2nd Floor, Lotus Garden Hotel

3:00 – 5:00 p.m. PLENARY: REPORTS FROM All participants
   FIELD VISITS

5:00 – 7:00 p.m. DINNER All participants

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 20 – MANILA
Mimosa Room, 2nd Floor, Lotus Garden Hotel

9:00 – 9:30 a.m. OPENING REMARKS and OVERVIEW OF Jennifer Freeman
   DAY

9:30 – 11:30 a.m. REGIONAL DIALOGUE GROUP
   DISCUSSIONS: Issues,
Opportunities, Next Steps

South Asia: Sri Lanka, India, Pakistan
Southeast Asia: Thailand, Indonesia, Burma, Malaysia, Philippines (5 representatives)
Southeast Asia: Philippines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m. –</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS</td>
<td>Mary Ann Arnado and Jennifer Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>PREPARATION FOR PRESS CONFERENCE:</td>
<td>Carlo Abdul Malik Cleofe, BAWGBUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talking points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>PRESS CONFERENCE</td>
<td>All participants and media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light Refreshments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>FAREWELL DINNER</td>
<td>All participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COTABATO FIELD VISIT – TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17

9:15 a.m.       ARRIVAL, CHECK-IN AT ALNOR HOTEL

TRAVEL TO ALEOSAN, NORTH COTABATO
Approximately 1.5 hours
Packed lunch

1:30 – 3:30 p.m. MEETING IN BARANGAY BAGOLIBAS
(with Ilaga)
In coordination with Board Member Loreto Cabaya

3:30 p.m.       TRAVEL TO COTABATO CITY

5 p.m.          DINNER AND FORUM WITH MORO YOUTH LEADERS
“Youth Perspectives and Issues on Religious Extremism”
At KFI Training Center

COTABATO FIELD VISIT – WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18

7:00 a.m.       TRAVEL TO AMAS, NORTH COTABATO
Approximately 2 hours

9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. INTERFAITH/ECUMENICAL FORUM ON RELIGIOUS EXTREMISM
Governor of Cotabato, Provincial Officials, Religious and Multi-Sectoral Leaders

12 – 2:00 p.m.  LUNCH

2:00 – 4:30 p.m. DEPART FOR CAMP DARAPANAN – MAIN ADMINISTRATIVE CAMP OF THE MORO ISLAMIC LIBERATION FRONT (MILF)
Meeting with members of the Central Committee of the MILF and the Ulama
Women advised to wear veil.

4:30 p.m.       TRAVEL TO COTABATO CITY

COTABATO FIELD VISIT – FEBRUARY 19

7:30 – 10:00 a.m.  BREAKFAST MEETING WITH MORO WOMEN
At Alnor Hotel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>DEPART FOR AIRPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40 a.m.</td>
<td>FLY TO MANILA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ZAMBOANGA FIELD VISIT – FEBRUARY 17

12:45  ARRIVAL
p.m.  Packed Lunch in Transit

1:30 – 4 p.m.  MEETING WITH CITY PEACE AND ORDER COUNCIL
Venue: City Hall Conference Room

In coordination with JoJo Abdusalam, adviser of the City mayor for Muslim affairs, and Father Bert Alejo, mayor’s religious adviser, City Peace and Order Council is composed of multi-stakeholders who are committed to working for peace in the city. This CPOC is chaired by the city mayor and members from the private sector, business sector, religious sector and indigenous peoples’ representative. Representative from the military and PNP sit on the council.

5 – 6:30 p.m.  MEETING WITH IDP WOMEN/MOTHERS
Venue: Grandstand where thousands of IDPs are still staying more than a year after the siege of Zamboanga. The IDPs are divided into 4 zones

Around 25 mothers from the 4 zones will meet our group.

ZAMBOANGA FIELD VISIT – FEBRUARY 18

8:30  MEETING WITH YOUTH LEADERS
– 11:30 a.m.
Venue: Western Mindanao State University College of Law

Youth composed of Muslim Students Association of Western Mindanao State University, one of the biggest academic institutions in the region; University Students Council; and Campus Ministry, which represents the non-Muslim organization.

LUNCH

1:30 – 4 p.m.  MEETING WITH THE ULAMA
Venue: Mahad Moro Islamic Institute

ULAMA will be composed of faculty of Mahad Moro Islamic Institute, the largest Islamic school in the city. Mahad Moro assigns the khatib for Friday sermons.
HIJABIN is a women’s group advocating for the right to wear hijab in the different universities and colleges.

4 – 6:30 p.m. **FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION:** Civil society initiative on security sector reform toward what works in internal security in complex areas (Sulu archipelago) to highlight critical constructive engagement with the Armed Forces of the Philippines, in particular

Organizers: ZABIDA – Father Calvo, Dr. Grace Rebellos, Espie Hupida

---

**ZAMBOANGA FIELD VISIT – FEBRUARY 19**

6:00 a.m. DEPART FOR AIRPORT

7:45 a.m. FLIGHT TO MANILA
APPENDIX II: RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE
U.N. COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Asia Regional Recommendations:

1. In accordance with the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), U.N. Security Council Resolution 1325 and related resolutions on women, peace and security, women must be meaningfully included as equal partners in national and international decision-making bodies. Capacity building of women and men must be expanded to promote gender awareness and inclusion in legal, security and parliamentary decision-making bodies.

2. Domestic laws should be reviewed. States should be pressured by U.N. bodies to bring their domestic laws in line with international laws on human rights. In particular, domestic laws should be reviewed to identify those that oppress ethnic, gender or religious minorities.

3. National and international legal mechanisms that protect internally displaced persons (IDPs) need to be strengthened and accessibility facilitated for those populations.

4. In order to prevent violent extremism, human security related budgets (including for education, health and development) should be maintained and increased. The United Nations should track member states that are reducing these budgets and lobby them to maintain and increase these vital resources to build more prosperous, peaceful societies.

5. In U.N. agencies’ and member states’ efforts to counter violent extremism, engagement and accountability must be focused on both state and armed non-state actors, and include violent ideologies affiliated with multiple religions.

In Relation to the Philippines:

1. Recognizing that a failure to implement the Comprehensive Agreement on the Bangsamoro could signal a return to war, the international community should support the expedient passage of a robust Bangsamoro Basic Law as a crucial step to redress grievances and prevent the draw of violent ideologies.

2. The delegation calls on the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, and U.N. Special Rapporteurs on Internally Displaced Persons; the Promotion of Truth, Justice, Reparation and Guarantees of Non-Recurrence; and Protecting Human Rights while Countering Terrorism to investigate the conditions and long-term rehabilitation prospects for the internally displaced populations, specifically the rights of women and children in Zamboanga.


4. The United Nations or its agencies should allot funding and resources to bridge social divides between Mindanao and Luzon (Manila), with special attention to women and children in poverty.

5. Security sector reform (SSR) has been ongoing, but can be strengthened and deepened through direct dialogue between former combatants from both sides. SSR must be gender-sensitive, context-relevant and geared toward best practices in the region.
6. Agencies such as UNICEF, UNDP and UN Women should engage with vulnerable populations in Mindanao, and with IDPs in Zamboanga and Cotabato in particular, to prevent women, girls and boys from falling prey to human trafficking and prostitution.

7. Enforce transitional justice and ensure accountability for state and non-state violence.

8. Ensure the full implementation and monitoring of the Philippine National Action Plan on U.N. Security Council Resolution 1325 and related resolutions throughout the implementation of the Mindanao peace process. Furthermore, the plan should be extended beyond 2016 and explicitly include women’s participation in preventing as well as addressing future security situations.
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