Annex 2 – Report 600 – Learning Issues

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1 Organisation (Lead)** | **38 Research Question(s)** | **39 Theory of Change** | **40 Baseline Study** | **41 Impact Study** | **42 Learning Questions Working Group** |
| Save the Children NL | Within this project there been no specific research questions been formulated. | Save the Children has developed a theory of change in 2009, to ensure interventions are conducted from a joint vision, mission and value. This theory has also been applied to this project | A baseline study is planned in both Afghanistan and Pakistan | Besides the M&E protocol there is no specific study planned in the project to measure the impact. An external evaluation will be carried out in both countries. | We don’t have any particular questions at the moment for the working group. These might arise throughout the implementation of the project. Furthermore we are looking forward towards the exchange of information between the various partners in the working group. From our side we can also contribute with information from other projects that are currently being implemented in both countries. |
| SPARK | Action research component has been incorporated in ABC programme. This action research will help us in the short-term to identify partners, and programme intervention priorities, and more on the long term, answer effectiveness questions relating to MSME support and job creation, and job creation and stability. | We have developed a global results chain for the programme logic that will be validated and adapted in the programme inception phase, to be finalized in approx 2 months | We will conduct a baseline study, and are willing to share it . | The project does not involve an impact study (covering issues of attribution) but is interested in doing so. | Generally: how to develop and implement effective M&E systems (incl. baselines and evaluation approaches, data collection tool development) in conflict-affected environments for programmes that aim to create jobs and improve food security. And then on possible comparative evaluation, joint learning on: what are links between increased MSME development and job creation and food security? what are links between improved employment situation of youth and increased stability. |
| Cordaid | Yes, given that the project relies on an approach (performance based financing) that has not yet been tried in the justice sector on this scale, several questions as to the appropriateness and effectiveness of the intervention have been formulated (relating to the effects on judicial independence and on intrinsic motivations of justice sector personnel). | Yes, a theory of change will be developed as part of the inception phase of the project. | Yes, a baseline study will be conducted. | Yes, an impact study will be conducted. | Do improved public services reinforce the social contract between state and society (legitimacy in return for services) Objective of the working group could be to increase the evidence base on this subject. |
| Save the Children NL | N/A | Save the Children has developed a theory of change in 2009, to ensure interventions are conducted from a joint vision, mission and value. This theory has been applied to this project. | Will be conducted | Besides the M&E protocol no specific impact study has been planned. | Pre-conflict, traditional justice systems were in place in target communities. Is there, post conflict, an added value to revive a traditional justice system in a disrupted society, considering amongst others that people are relocated and distrust is present due to new heterogenic communities, and how would ‘we’ go about this? |
| ZOA | 1. Cross border approach addressing cross border conflicts: what are the opportunities and limitations? 2. The role of local/traditional conflict mitigation mechanisms: opportunities and limitations 3. Is economic development contributing to peace? 4. How can we effectively contribute to increased trust and cooperation and how to monitor improvement? | ZOA wants to promote human security by: - Improving access to livelihood resources and services - Strengthening governance - Strengthen capacity to handle and prevent conflict in the communities | We are in the process of conducting; possibility of sharing can be considered. | A specific impact study is not foreseen, impact M&E will be part of the regular programme M&E | 1. What is a good method to measure the presence/ absence of human security (are our indicators the best?) 2. Resource based conflicts: how to address shortage and unequal distribution of water and land in order to reduce conflicts? What are good practices? 3. The role of local/traditional conflict mitigation mechanisms: opportunities and limitations 4. Is economic development contributing to peace? 5. How can we effectively contribute to increased trust and cooperation and how to monitor improvement? |
| ZOA | 1. Cross border approach addressing cross border conflicts: what are the opportunities and limitations? 2. Resource based conflicts: how to address shortage and unequal distribution of water and land in order to reduce conflicts? What are good practices? 3. The role of local/traditional conflict mitigation mechanisms: opportunities and limitations 4. Is economic development contributing to peace? 5. How can we effectively contribute to increased trust and cooperation and how to monitor improvement? | ZOA wants to work towards improved human security by: - Strengthen the peace building capacity of peace builders and communities - Addressing livelihood challenges (diversification, access to water) - Strengthen cross border access to markets and basic services | We are in the process of conducting; possibility of sharing also depends on confidentiality. | A specific impact study is not foreseen, impact M&E will be part of the regular programme M&E | 1. What is a good method to measure the presence/ absence of human security (are our indicators the best?) 2. Resource based conflicts: how to address shortage and unequal distribution of water and land in order to reduce conflicts? What are good practices? 3. The role of local/traditional conflict mitigation mechanisms: opportunities and limitations 4. Is economic development contributing to peace? 5. How can we effectively contribute to increased trust and cooperation and how to monitor improvement? |
| Saferworld | 1. What evidence does our in-country programming provide about promoting community security in conflict-affected and fragile contexts? How do we marshal that evidence to inform international policy debate and practice among donors, NGOs and national governments and security providers?2. How can specific community security interventions support and feed-into wider national peacebuilding and security sector reform efforts, including national strategies, processes, policies or laws? [Plus three more, ML] | We believe that to address insecurity, prevent conflict and establish the conditions necessary for socio-economic development to take root, developing the capacity of institutions at all levels of society must go hand-in-hand with enhancing citizens’ capacity to hold their governments to account for their responsibilities. By further developing our community-based conflict prevention and security approach in target countries, and by piloting a more coherent approach to peacebuilding in South Sudan, Yemen and Bangladesh which aligns different sectors and interventions behind a shared analysis of how to address conflict and fragility, this project will provide national and international actors with some of the evidence of best practice and lessons they require to reduce insecurity and provide a more stable environment for development and economic activity to increase. | A central aspect of our programme is an Empowerment Approach to Evidence gathering and Evaluation. This has, at its core, a commitment to involving the communities and partners that we work with in determining how to measure the change that the programme brings about. Across the three countries we are developing a Community Security Index, with four ‘domains’ of change which we will be seeking to measure: relationships and behavior change; governance and accountability; conflict and security; and socio-economic well-being. | he Index outlined above will form the basis of yearly assessments, which will allow the programme to track and analyse what level of change can be detected in the four domains identified. These will provide significant layers of data and evidence for use in any impact study to be conducted during the four years. We will at the same time track policy language by key actors, programmes from key investment actors, and use our Policy and Advocacy Criteria and Matrix of assessment to identify the contribution Saferworld and its partners are making to the changes identified. | 3. Increasingly over recent years, Saferworld has demonstrated its ability to impact on the lives of ordinary people living in fragile and conflict-affected states and territories. Nevertheless, our experience of how change occurs in places affected by complex conflict systems – and our analysis of the role that we can play – has led us to ask how we can work at the right level of intensity and scale to make a lasting difference. Depending on the context, this may entail extending and deepening our field level work (e.g. South Sudan), connecting approaches at local level with sub-national, and national level reform processes, or working in new types of partnerships (such as introducing community security approaches through rural development programmes in Bangladesh). We would like to hear about how other organisations are developing and implementing strategies to maximise their impact?4. How are organisations addressing issues of legitimacy and representation when working with communities? What challenges are organisations’ facing in this regard? [plus 3 more, ML] |
| ZOA | 1. The role of local/traditional conflict mitigation mechanisms: opportunities and limitations 2. Is economic development contributing to peace? 3. How can we effectively contribute to increased trust and cooperation and how to monitor improvement? 4. Resource based conflicts: how to address shortage or unequal distribution of water and land/livelihoods as causes of conflict? | ZOA wants to contribute to improved human security by addressing water and land related conflicts through: increased trust and cooperation among and within various groups; reduction in conflict over land and water (by improving management and physical productivity of land and water resources) and increased utilization of alternative livelihoods resources and formal & non formal education systems. | Did you conduct, or are you planning to conduct, a baseline study, and if so, would you be willing to share it? We are in the process of conducting; possibility of sharing can be considered. | Does the project involve an impact study (covering issues of attribution) and if so, what are its main features? A specific impact study is not foreseen, impact M&E will be part of the regular programme M&E | 1. What is a good method to measure the presence/ absence of human security (are our indicators the best?) 2. Resource based conflicts: how to address shortage and unequal distribution of water and land in order to reduce conflicts? What are good practices? 3. The role of local/traditional conflict mitigation mechanisms: opportunities and limitations 4. Is economic development contributing to peace? 5. How can we effectively contribute to increased trust and cooperation and how to monitor improvement? |
| ZOA | 1. The role of local/traditional conflict mitigation mechanisms: opportunities and limitations 2. Is economic development contributing to peace? 3. How can we effectively contribute to increased trust and cooperation and how to monitor improvement? 4. Resource based conflicts: how to address shortage or unequal distribution of water and land/livelihoods as causes of conflict? | Many conflicts are due to cattle movements. Improving access to water not only for cattle keepers but also for cattle will limit movements of semi-pastoralists and therefore will mitigate conflict. | Did you conduct, or are you planning to conduct, a baseline study, and if so, would you be willing to share it? We are in the process of conducting; possibility of sharing also depends on confidentiality. | Does the project involve an impact study (covering issues of attribution) and if so, what are its main features? A specific impact study is not foreseen, impact M&E will be part of the regular programme M&E | 1. What is a good method to measure the presence/ absence of human security (are our indicators the best?) 2. Resource based conflicts: how to address shortage and unequal distribution of water and land in order to reduce conflicts? What are good practices? 3. The role of local/traditional conflict mitigation mechanisms: opportunities and limitations 4. Is economic development contributing to peace? 5. How can we effectively contribute to increased trust and cooperation and how to monitor improvement? |
| Search for Common Ground | This planning meeting is scheduled for Feb 15th ? [ML] | The broad theory of change is that if government, civil society, and citizens are better informed, more open to discussion and collaboration, and are working together on common issues of concern, solutions to these sensitive problems will be more practical, realistic, and durable. | For the Great Lakes, it is planned for the February-April time period | There will be a final evaluation, but looking at results against the intended outcomes, not at the impact level. | NA [ML] |
| CARE Nederland | We want to test the underlying theories of change and assumption which underpin our programme. For example: (1) if local capacities for peace are strengthened, then communities become more resilient against destabilization from inside or outside factors/actors, and these communities will be more peaceful; or: (2) if governments provides better access to and quality of services, and does so in a participatory, transparent and accountable way, they will enjoy higher legitimacy among the population, which in turn contributes to peace and stability; or (3) if women/young have more secure livelihoods and/or have positive expectations of their livelihoods in the near future, this will create a peace dividend to eliminate the breeding ground for violent conflict Just measuring progress / achievement of the project against indicators will not sufficiently provide answers to these questions. Therefore we would like to to additional research into such assumptions. We have reserved some (limited) funding for such research, but it would be great if we could collaborate with participants in the Knowledge Platform Security&Rule of Law as well as direct some of the resources of the platform to such research. | We do not have an explicit theory of change, but throughout the proposal and our thinking you will find an implicit theory of change, including many sub-theories of change with assumptions about cause and effect relationships. For example as I wrote above: (now I am making the implicit a bit more explicit) (1) if local capacities for peace are strengthened, then communities become more resilient against destabilization from inside or outside factors/actors, and these communities will be more peaceful; or: (2) if governments provides better access to and quality of services, and does so in a participatory, transparent and accountable way, they will enjoy higher legitimacy among the population, which in turn contributes to peace and stability; or (3) if women/young have more secure livelihoods and/or have positive expectations of their livelihoods in the near future, this will create a peace dividend to eliminate the breeding ground for violent conflict. And of course: 1+2+3 contribute to peace and stability.    We are indeed planning to make the theory of change implicit still this year. | Baseline study is almost finished and when ready we are willing to share. | 1) A mid-term evaluation half-way the project: The mid term evaluation will determine whether the project is on track and make recommendations to sustain/scale-up successes while addressing areas of improvement. The evaluation will measure the relevance of the project, the effectiveness and efficacy of activities and means as well as the methodology of activity implementation. The mid-term evaluation will establish the status of each indicator half-way through the implementation of the programme. Data will be triangulated by using a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. The quantitative section will focus on outcomes and outputs indicators to measure the progress made halfway through the project, while the qualitative section will focus on the project strategy for the implementation of activities, partnership and sustainability. The qualitative evaluation will also analyze the key lessons learned, recommendations for corrective action, and changes witnessed in the lives of the impact population. We are planning a mid-term and final evaluation 2) At the end of the project, a final evaluation will be carried out. This final evaluation will independently assess the actual level of success achieved against each of the output and outcome indicators using different tools and methods including qualitative and quantitative methods, most significant changes as well as life stories. The final evaluation will also document lessons learned and provide recommendations on how to use generated findings and knowledge in programme development and improvement of existing interventions.   Besides this, as explained above, we would like to do some research about the underlying assumptions and theories of change of our programme. In this research, attribution should certainly feature. We would like to collaborate with the Working Group Reconstruction Tender and the Knowledge Platform Security and Rule of Law on this. | As should be clear from questions above, we would like to investigate some of the theories of change and assumptions which underpin our (CAREs + other reconstruction grant recipients) programmes. I am sure that although there is diversity among grants, there is also a lot of overlap. Especially where there is this overlap is present AND where it coincides with theories/assumptions of important policies such as the Dutch Government Fragile States policy and the Busan New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, it becomes interesting to do joint research and formulate joint learning questions. Then our joint learning/research can inform policy making of donor governments and governments of fragile states alike.    We should jointly map the questions. Some examples could be:  A) Does the assumption hold true that if local capacities for peace are strengthened, then communities become more resilient against destabilization from inside or outside factors/actors, and these communities will be more peaceful;  B) Does the assumption hold true that if governments provides better access to and quality of services, and does so in a participatory, transparent and accountable way, they will enjoy higher legitimacy among the population, which in turn contributes to peace and stability;  C) Does the assumption hold true that if women/young have more secure livelihoods and/or have positive expectations of their livelihoods in the near future, this will create a peace dividend to eliminate the breeding ground for violent conflict. |
| CARE Nederland | We want to test the underlying theories of change and assumption which underpin our programme. For example: (1) if local capacities for peace are strengthened, then communities become more resilient against destabilization from inside or outside factors/actors, and these communities will be more peaceful; or: (2) if governments provides better access to and quality of services, and does so in a participatory, transparent and accountable way, they will enjoy higher legitimacy among the population, which in turn contributes to peace and stability; or (3) if women/young have more secure livelihoods and/or have positive expectations of their livelihoods in the near future, this will create a peace dividend to eliminate the breeding ground for violent conflict Just measuring progress / achievement of the project against indicators will not sufficiently provide answers to these questions. Therefore we would like to to additional research into such assumptions. We have reserved some (limited) funding for such research, but it would be great if we could collaborate with participants in the Knowledge Platform Security & Rule of Law as well as direct some of the resources of the platform to such research. | \* An action research will be carried out in Afghanistan to identify the skills/vocational training based on analysis of demand and supply locally. \* CARE Nederland will formulate research questions to learn more about participatory community-based development in fragile and ethnically and societal fractured contexts. The programme deals with different societal cleavages (age in Yemen; gender in Afghanistan and Somalia), which gives even more breadth to our understanding and can further improve our programming even beyond these three countries.  \* CARE Nederland will gather evidence for national and international level-advocacy on key issues that affect these societies and our beneficiaries: governance models that improve long-term stability; structural improvement of women’s rights; negotiating the youth bubbles in traditional societies; creating peace dividend in conflict-sensitive way.  We do not have an explicit theory of change, but throughout the proposal and our thinking you will find an implicit theory of change, including many sub-theories of change with assumptions about cause and effect relationships. For example as I wrote above: (now I am making the implicit a bit more explicit) (1) if local capacities for peace are strengthened, then communities become more resilient against destabilization from inside or outside factors/actors, and these communities will be more peaceful; or: (2) if governments provides better access to and quality of services, and does so in a participatory, transparent and accountable way, they will enjoy higher legitimacy among the population, which in turn contributes to peace and stability; or (3) if women/young have more secure livelihoods and/or have positive expectations of their livelihoods in the near future, this will create a peace dividend to eliminate the breeding ground for violent conflict. And of course: 1+2+3 contribute to peace and stability.    We are indeed planning to make the theory of change implicit still this year. | Baseline study is almost finished and when ready we are willing to share. | 1) A mid-term evaluation half-way the project: The mid term evaluation will determine whether the project is on track and make recommendations to sustain/scale-up successes while addressing areas of improvement. The evaluation will measure the relevance of the project, the effectiveness and efficacy of activities and means as well as the methodology of activity implementation. The mid-term evaluation will establish the status of each indicator half-way through the implementation of the programme. Data will be triangulated by using a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. The quantitative section will focus on outcomes and outputs indicators to measure the progress made halfway through the project, while the qualitative section will focus on the project strategy for the implementation of activities, partnership and sustainability. The qualitative evaluation will also analyze the key lessons learned, recommendations for corrective action, and changes witnessed in the lives of the impact population. We are planning a mid-term and final evaluation 2) At the end of the project, a final evaluation will be carried out. This final evaluation will independently assess the actual level of success achieved against each of the output and outcome indicators using different tools and methods including qualitative and quantitative methods, most significant changes as well as life stories. The final evaluation will also document lessons learned and provide recommendations on how to use generated findings and knowledge in programme development and improvement of existing interventions.   Besides this, as explained above, we would like to do some research about the underlying assumptions and theories of change of our programme. In this research, attribution should certainly feature. We would like to collaborate with the Working Group Reconstruction Tender and the Knowledge Platform Security and Rule of Law on this. | As should be clear from questions above, we would like to investigate some of the theories of change and assumptions which underpin our (CAREs + other reconstruction grant recipients) programmes. I am sure that although there is diversity among grants, there is also a lot of overlap. Especially where there is this overlap is present AND where it coincides with theories/assumptions of important policies such as the Dutch Government Fragile States policy and the Busan New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, it becomes interesting to do joint research and formulate joint learning questions. Then our joint learning/research can inform policy making of donor governments and governments of fragile states alike.    We should jointly map the questions. Some examples could be:  A) Does the assumption hold true that if local capacities for peace are strengthened, then communities become more resilient against destabilization from inside or outside factors/actors, and these communities will be more peaceful;  B) Does the assumption hold true that if governments provides better access to and quality of services, and does so in a participatory, transparent and accountable way, they will enjoy higher legitimacy among the population, which in turn contributes to peace and stability;  C) Does the assumption hold true that if women/youth have more secure livelihoods and/or have positive expectations of their livelihoods in the near future, this will create a peace dividend to eliminate the breeding ground for violent conflict. D) Does the assumption hold true, in conservative Muslim countries, that if we engage religious and traditional leaders on women’s rights that this will help improve women’s in those societies? E) Does the assumption hold true that if youth have improved access to local and regional level governance processes that this will lead greater stability at the national level? |
| Oxfam Novib | To be defined | Not defined | To be conducted | To be conducted | Not yet known |
| Stichting Interkerkelijke Organisatie voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking ICCO | Not specified | There is no explicit Theory of Change formulated for this program. However the proposal is based on the assumption that reconstruction and enhancing safety needs be based on the joined and coordinated efforts of different kind of actors, including economic actors. | Baseline assessments and diagnostics activities are part of the proposal. | The phasing of the program consists of 4 phases: Phase 1 : Analysis, mapping and planning Phase 2: Implementation Phase 3 : Impact Assessment Phase 4: Consolidation and replication   Phase 3: Impact Assessment. Each phase of the program provides valuable information on a host of insecurities. Together with our counterparts and in close cooperation with the target groups, an impact assessment will be based (and –if necessary- corrective action formulated) on the following questions:  o Are we doing the right thing as opposed to whether or not we are doing things right?  o Does the program alleviate identified threats while at the same time avoiding negative externalities?  o Deriving lessons learned from failures and successes and improving the program. | How to work in a programmatic way towards reconstruction, overcoming sectorial barriers and logics, leading towards more integrated multiactor approaches. How to assess and further improve the role of civil society organizations in reconstruction programs. |
| SOMO - Centre for research on Multinational Corporations www.somo.nl | Under Outcome 3, a major activity is “Research on economic dimensions of the conflict in each target country/region and the relationships between public and private sector, incl. trade and investment agreements and tax policies”. Specific research proposals for the 5 target countries will be formulated to be carried out by SOMO and its local partners. We will also carry out specific company case studies. | Our theory of change is that the foreign private sector can play an important role in the reconstruction of fragile states by generating income and sustaining livelihoods as long as they operate in line with national laws and international guidelines for corporate accountability, and as long as they operate in a conflict-sensitive way. A key concept used to guide our programme is Corporate Security Responsibility, which is a relatively new concept focusing on corporate governance contributions to peace and security in zones of conflict. To ensure that companies are contributing to peace and security instead of aggravating conflict by their presence, our programme will strengthen civil society and government capacity to monitor foreign companies’ activities and to empower communities to stand up for their rights and improve their livelihoods in relation to private sector development. | No baseline study, but we are preparing a state-of-the-art paper on the role of multinational corporations in conflict-affected countries. This paper is expected to be published by the end of 2013. | An external evaluation, in which Southern partners will be closely involved, will be conducted halfway the programme and at the end of the programme. The results of the evaluation, including recommendations and lessons learned, will be communicated with the partners and the ministry of Foreign Affairs. This will include an impact assessment. | How can other programmes under the Reconstruction Fund benefit from the work of our programme, specifically by building a knowledge base on the role of the foreign private sector in conflict-affected countries? |
| Oxfam Novib | N/A | Following Kenya workshop, we in collaboration with counterparts organized Conflict Analysis workshop in January 2013 with Dr Cordula Reimann and we are in process to compile reports and develop strategy and theory of change | The project has plan to develop position papers on ICESCR, ICCPR, UNSCR 1325 and democratization of public policies that will work as baseline study. | Project include evaluation component | Create linkages with Dutch and other international initiatives for peace and basic rights? |
| Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR), Cape Town, South Africa | To be determined | CCR will seek to develop a theory of change at the inception phase of the project. | A needs assessment was conducted in January 2013. | N/A | Possibility of sharing ways to strengthen M&E systems, methods, and tools (especially regarding smart indicators). |
| GPPAC (Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict) | While no specific research questions have been formulated, learning is integrated into GPPAC’s PM&E system. | GPPAC's theory of change is based on the following (nb: this was not developed for the project, but informs all of GPPAC's work): a) If CSOs active in conflict prevention and peacebuilding join forces through strong regional and global networks, this will increase the capacity of civil society to contribute effectively to preventing violent conflicts b) If the linkages and collaboration can be improved between civil society networks and the UN, RIGOs and state actors, a shift from reaction to prevention is possible. | N/A | GPPAC’s PME system utilizes outcome mapping methodology, which focuses on contribution of GPPAC towards outcomes and eventual impact on societal changes. Outcomes of the project are defined as behavioural changes of targeted actors. | There are different projects focusing on the same geographical areas: how can the working group contribute to ensuring there is good coherence and avoid duplication? |
| Netherlands Institute of Multiparty Democracy (NIMD) | No research questions have been formulated yet. The programme partners aim to learn about political party - civil society dialogue in polarized settings with emerging conflicts around clashing interests attached to use of natural resources. No decision has yet been made as to how this learning process will be streamlined. | The underlying idea of the porgramme is that increased interaction and communication between civil society and political actors will allow for the depolarization of emerging conflicts around environmental threats through the development of consensus and improved policy. Further work on the Theory of Change underpinning the programme will take place, as both the NIMD and Cordaid are working on this topic in insititutional terms, while the mapping studies performed in the framework of the programme provide additional input for the qualification of the Theory of Change of the programme itself. The combination of these different element will contribute in the future to visualize the assumptions and strengthen our Theory of Change. | We are currently conducting mapping studies, and are willing to share these products once finalized. | Not contemplated explicitly thus far. Issue for discussion. | We are particularly interested in two issues: 1) the relationships between political parties and diverse civil society actors in conflict sensitive settings and the dilemmas and trade-offs involved in working on the improvement and the accountability of such relationships. 2) the natural resource component of conflict, and the ways in which internal and external pressure on these rsources help shpae civil-political relations on different levels. |
| Hivos (Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| AWEPA |  |  |  |  |  |
| VNG International | To what extent does short term socio-economic investment in community development projects lead to peace dividend? | Direct socio-economic investment in community development projects lead to peace dividend | Conducted | N/A | N/A |
| Oxfam Novib | N/A | The project areas have been selected based on the kind and level of conflicts at play. Root causes as identified during the conflict analysis differ from area to area with economic and governance based triggers (cattle raiding, tensions over land between cattle herders, land disputes because of undefined inter-community boundaries, yet to be demarcated boundarie between bomas/payams/counties). The programme aims to re activate or establish Peace Committees on Payam level in the targeted areas which are supposed to play a proactive role in identifying, monitoring and mediating conflicts in the area. The payam peace committee will comprise of major stakeholders For setting good mechanisms of conflict resolution, the involvement of women and youth in these are crucial. Women because they are acknowledged as peace actors and youth are often involved in conflicts. Women and youth groups are trained in management & Conflict negotiation skills with the result of increasing the participation of them in the proceedings in the Peace committees.   The programme has two other components: (1) a food security component and 2) Provision of access to water & hygiene promotion. An improved livelihood situation and more access to water will reduce tensions in the programme either directly or indirectly.  The food security component is to secure livelihoods of households and to raise income of fishermen and livestock holders. The farmer households will benefit from distribution of improved seeds, training in low cost agricultural and vegetable cultivation techniques and practicing these in demo plots. In the adaptation of new techniques, farmer groups play an encouraging role towards farmers.  Strengthening of fisher cooperatives is pivotal in increasing the income of fishermen. A sound cooperative with a (paying) membership should play mentoring role in introducing new techniques, be able to obtain loans from government and establish direct links with clients for getting better prices for their sales, thereby bypassing middlemen. The second component consists of drilling boreholes; this as to relieve pressure from existing water points, to reduce time spent (from women and children thereby increasing their safety) on fetching water. Together, with the Hygiene promotion programme the overall health status of the population is to be improved. In order to sustain the functioning of the water points, water management committees are to be established (including a team of trained pump mechanics) which are trusted with maintenance of the points (either by the mechanics or proactive contacting the county line department).    Both the wash and food security component are to be linked to the functional county departments (water/agricultural/fisheries/veterinary department. Those departments are to be trained in new techniques on agriculture and fisheries techniques and to sustain technical input towards communities. . The water department will be provided with spare parts as to repair broken water points swiftly. | Available for the area concerned | To be conducted | To be defined |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oxfam GB | 1. Action research Process involving regional and federal government officials to analyse the value of ecosystem based approach to natural resource management and land use planning  2. Impact assessment studies on cross border coordination and animal health interventions and on diversification of livelihood  3. Documentation of good practice case studies for program activities  4. Analysis of appropriate capacity development for hybrid institutions or customary institutions to be developed with regional and federal government  5. Policy focused research to identify key constraints faced by the communities  6. Develop community of practices consisting of CMDRM Communities, civil society and local government | The Project aims/Impact expected to contribute: Conditions enabling human security for vulnerable pastoralists and agro pastoralists communities in the border areas of Ethiopia and Somaliland are created  Outcomes  1. Communities are more resilient to disasters  2. conflict over natural resource reduce in frequency and severity  3. Communities, Specialy women and Youth, have increased voice in decision making at all levels  4. Cross border Issues affecting Ethiopia and Somaliland pastorlists and agro pastoralists are raised at national and regional platforms  5.  Strategies to be used for the delivery of the project  • Understand traditional decision making structures  • Building capacity of Drought/natural resource management committees  • Building capacity of community groups and CSOs especially women and youth  • Identify/Promote alternative livelihood mechanisms  • Engage with government at various levels  • Engage with regional bodies for X-Border Policy issues  • Oxfam will use conflict sensitive approach to ensure we are not exacerbating tensions or causes of conflict through our action  Project Priorities  • Improve human security  • contribute to legitimate government  • Achieve peace dividend- Build resilience to drought and support sustainable livelihood to improve living conditions as well as tackle causes of conflict  • Women will be specifically targeted as key actors for development  • Strengthening women leadership and participation through holistic approach  • Institutionalisation of CMDRM Models in to the government system  • | Baseline is done but difficult to past here. Suggest to send in a separate doc |  |  |