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Executive Summary

Search for Common Ground Pakistan has been implementing a two-year project titled “Promotion of Dialogue for Peacebuilding through Media & Youth Mobilization in Pakistan”. The overall objective of the project is “to strengthen Pakistan’s fragile context by shifting attitudes and behaviours of the Pakistani population away from adversarial, intolerant approaches towards greater tolerance, inclusiveness and understanding among the country’s various regional, ethnic and socio-economic groups”. Being part of project’s monitoring and evaluation framework, the current review was designed to assess and review “the efficiency, effectiveness (where feasible), implementation process and the timeliness of the Project to date”. The review is expected to help the SFCG Pakistan team, its donors and partners to improve project’s implementation and also incorporate lessons in future projects. Using the mix methods approach, the review involved desk review of project documents, 3 focused group discussions with 21 participants from youth, local leaders and media, 6 semi structured interviews, 5 meetings with partners and SFCG staff and a sample survey with 106 trained persons which included 51 media personnel, 14 youth and 41 local leaders participants.

SFCG had to conduct 13 trainings with media, youth and local leaders and all training have been done. Two primary trainings were organized for presenters and producers from radios; one for private FMs with 29 participants and one for PBC with 30 participants. Selected 27 participants from two trainings were provided advance training. One primary and one advance training was conducted for print journalists which included 23 persons in primary and 22 in advance. One training was done for 19 anchor persons and hosts from TV. Five trainings were organized for local leaders wherein 100 persons participated. Two trainings, one primary and one advance, were completed for youth. Thirty youth participated in primary training whereas out of them 23 took part in advance training. For local leader SFCG had to train 125 local leaders but it could only train 100 persons. Such differences emanated from the last minute regrets by some confirmed participants. SFCG has planned additional trainings to meet the target of 125 participants for local leaders’ trainings1. Besides, these targets, SFCG also completed two baselines, developed training manuals and finalized selection of implementing partners. In addition, 13 coaching sessions were held with print journalist.

As result of the trainings and coaching session, participants reported an increase in their capacities particularly with respect to understanding peace and conflict resolution theories and strategies, and they feel more confident in working for peacebuilding. Participants from local leaders and youth trainings shared that they wanted to play their role in peacebuilding but did not have proper direction in this regard previously and the trainings have helped them in finding that direction. Participants from the media also shared that they feel an increase in their capacities and now they are more confident professionally, as they have learnt important skills related to their jobs. The participants have made efforts to make their reporting more balanced and neutral and have tried to include the voices of various related stakeholders. Some of the radio presenters have started paying more attention to social issues in their programs, and some have already conducted shows specifically designed on some key issues like violence against women, local issues related to civic amenities and peace. The participants had mixed feelings for the coaching sessions. They shared that coaching sessions provided them a very good opportunity to learn more from senior colleagues and have more detailed discussions. But at the same time, some of them shared the need to make coaching sessions more structured and focused. From discussions with participants of coaching sessions, there also arises the need to have monitoring arrangements for the coaching sessions.

Overall, SFCG’s budgetary allocations for the trainings, radio programs and TV programs are fairly reasonable and justified keeping in view inflation and national scope of the project. District dialogues are insufficiently budgeted though.

1 While this review was being conducted, SFCG conducted one such training where 15 participants participated.
The project activities were delayed due to some changes in roles and budgets of the partners at the start of the project. This was partly caused by transition within SFCG staff. Besides, inception period was not included in original project timeline, so planned activities were moved ahead to adjust inception period in the project plan. SFCG has adopted a consortium approach to this project, and is working with five partner organizations, each of which has specific roles. While being appreciative of the consortium approach, partners did share that it was not utilized effectively, and improvements in coordination and communication within the consortium were required. The partners also shared need for improving planning of the project activities.

To conclude, the project employs a positive approach of targeting a range of actors like youth, local leaders and media. It not only provides them opportunities for capacity building but also for working together through district dialogues. The trained participants and consortium have the potential to be utilized for long term advocacy and awareness raising for a sustainable peace process in Pakistan.
1. Introduction

Search for Common Ground (SFCG) is an international NGO working since 1982. SFCG works on conflict transformation with a particular focus on promoting non-adversarial approaches to dealing with conflicts. Since 2010, the organization has been working in Pakistan with media, civil society and communities. With support from the Danish Agency for International Development (DANIDA), SFCG started the “Promotion of Dialogue for Peacebuilding through Media & Youth Mobilization in Pakistan” project in 2011. The project focuses on capacity building of youth, media and local leaders for promoting peace in Pakistan. Additionally, district dialogue forums, radio talk shows and TV shows are part of the project design.

The project activities span over a period of two years starting in September 2011 and ending in 2013. This review is part of project’s monitoring and evaluation framework; it has been planned after the completion of the first year of the project. The review is designed to “assess and review the efficiency, effectiveness (where feasible) and implementation process and the timeliness of the Project to date”.

The findings of the review are intended to be used by SFCG, its partners and donors for bringing improvements in activities to be conducted during the remaining project duration as well as for designing future interventions.

1.1. Project/Programme Overview

Prominent in the global spotlight due to its role in the war on terror and ever increasing internal turbulence, Pakistan is undergoing a democratic transition and is currently at the brink of the first ever possible transfer of powers from one civil government to another. Pakistan’s 184 million population includes Muslims in the majority whereas Hindus, Sikh, Christians, and others constitute the minority. The population is also divided along ethnic lines. Poverty, unemployment, religious extremism, intolerance and the energy crisis are among major national issues. Violence has been democratized as various groups continue manifesting it in various parts of the country. The religious minorities face widespread discrimination and often they are subject to violence and human rights violations as well.

Pakistan has huge population of youth. As per the 1998 census, around 62% population falls under the age of 29, of which there around 41.81% are in the age bracket of 15 to 29, as indicated in 2009 Labour Force Survey. Though the youth could provide important human capital and contribute to the country’s development, the state and society do not have many avenues for the youth’s capacity development and they continue to live a life surrounded by a myriad of issues. In the given context, they are increasingly becoming disconnected and disillusioned by social and political realities. Aimed at lack of opportunities of growth, many youth have resorted to joining violent groups. Moreover, as documented in the British Council’s Next Generation Report, a large section of the youth has lost confidence in the state and its institutions.

In recent years, Pakistan has seen unprecedented growth in mass communication outlets. Liberalization in government policies combined with massive investment from the private sector have resulted in mushrooming of TV channels and FM radio stations. Such media outlets are playing an influential role in shaping public opinion; militant groups have also used FM radios for spreading their message and recruiting youth for their activities. While there are no two opinions about the fact that the media can play an effective role in peacebuilding and countering the propaganda of extremist groups, in Pakistan most media persons, whether they belong to TV, radio or print, don’t

---

2 http://www.cyc-net.org/features/ft-Pakistaniyouth.html, see also http://pc.gov.pk/feg/PDFs/youth.pdf
3 British Council, Pakistan: The Next Generation, Nov. 2009, pg. 15
have basic professional skills and they are also unaware of how they can effectively use the media for peace.

In this context, the project under review have been designed to address three specific problems: “(1) the increasing use of media for extremist propaganda purposes; (2) the lack of capacity of local leaders and activists to resolve local conflicts in non-adversarial ways and build consensus within their communities so as to discourage extremist attitudes; and (3) the negative relationship between the youth and the state at the district level”.

1.1.1. Project’s Overall Objective
The overall objective of the project is to “strengthen Pakistan’s fragile context by shifting attitudes and behaviours of the Pakistani population away from adversarial, intolerant approaches towards greater tolerance, inclusiveness and understanding among the country’s various regional, ethnic and socio-economic groups”

1.1.2. Objectives
- To enhance the capacity and sustainability of Pakistani media, both electronic and print, to play a proactive role in creating peace and in promoting tolerance, co-existence and non-extremists approaches;
- To enhance the capacity of Pakistani youth and local leaders to explore issues affecting them through a constructive, solutions-oriented approach that is geared towards reconciliation and conflict transformation; and
- To establish platforms/mechanisms for Pakistani youth, civil society, and local government officials to foster greater collaboration towards constructive dialogue, increased understanding of local conflict dynamics and issues of key importance to youth, thereby fostering increased moderation and tolerance across the country.

1.1.3. Key Activities
- **Media for Peace building**: SFCG has planned to conduct capacity building workshops for media persons from print, FM radios, Pakistan Broadcasting Corporation (PBC) and TV. There are primary and advance workshops for radio affiliated media persons whereas there is only one primary training workshop for anchors and hosts from TV.
- **Capacity Building of Local Leaders and Youth**: Five trainings have been planned to train 125 local leaders. In addition, one primary and one advance training has been planned for 30 youth representatives.
- **National Peacebuilding Summit of Media, Youth and Local Leaders**: The national summit aims to bring around 150 trained participants from media, youth and local leaders. The summit is geared toward developing a common vision for media reporting and peace building in Pakistan.
- **Production, Broadcasting and Publications**: SFCG has planned to produce and air 25 programs on district dialogues to be held by youth. In addition, there are 90 radio talk shows and 5 TV talk shows planned under the project.
- **Guidebooks**: The project also includes two guidebooks. One guide book is designed for radio presenters and producers whereas the second one is done for youth. Both guide books focus on peacebuilding using the common ground approach.
- **Website**: Under the project, a website has also been made. The website contains information about project, the activities and resources on peace building.
1.1.4. Key Partners
SFCG is implementing the project in partnership with five partners who have specific roles in project implementation. The partners brought together to work as a consortium are:

- **Intermedia Pakistan** is responsible for the primary training of presenters and producers from private FM radio stations. Additionally, it has also conducted the advanced training for 30 selected participants from private FMs and PBC as well as coaching sessions with FM presenters/producers.

- **Uks Research, Resource and Publication Centre on Women and Media** is responsible for the primary training with hosts and producers from PBC. In addition, it will also conduct coaching sessions with trainees from PBC.

- **Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)** is responsible for trainings of youth and local leaders and organizing district dialogue forums. The organization has also conducted one of the baselines for the project and the two day training for hosts/anchors from TV channels.

- **Pakistan Press Foundation (PPF)** is responsible for training for print journalists and editors in addition to conducting coaching sessions with them.

- **Pakistan Broadcast Corporation (PBC)** supports in the production and airing of radio programs.

In addition to these roles, all partners will work together during the district dialogue forums. SDPI will take the lead in organizing the forums whereas other partners will ensure the participation of trained media persons for discussions and press coverage. SFCG provides technical support to all partners in implementation of the project activities. The partners are responsible for ensuring that they met the targets for activities assigned to them.

1.2. Review Methodology
The review was conducted using a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection. The review team comprised of one overall lead and one enumerator for the online/phone survey. The review process started at the end of January 2013 and was completed in March 2013. The report was finalized by mid April 2013. A brief summary of process and methodology is given as under:

- **Desk Review**: The assignment started with a desk review of key project documents. These included the project proposal, budget, log frame, agreement with donor, training manuals, training reports, monitoring reports from the training, reports of coaching sessions, agreements with partners and guidebooks developed under the project. This helped in having a good understanding of the project.

- **Development of Survey instrument**: The review envisaged a survey with training participants. In this connection, two survey questionnaires were developed by the consultant. The instruments were finalized in consultation with the SFCG Pakistan team.

- **Meetings with SFCG Team**: Based on the desk review, the consultant held a meeting with the SFCG team. This included the project management and M&E staff. During the meeting, a review of project progress was done. Discussion was held on the project’s achievement, success stories and issues in implementation.

- **Meetings with Partners**: SFCG is implementing this project with the support of five partners and the consultant held meetings with the relevant staff of four partners. Meetings with PCB could not be held as their staff remained unavailable. During these meetings, discussions were held about the role of partners in the project, achievement against the targets for each
partner, successes and any issues and challenges faced. Discussion was also held on reviewing the progress of the consortium in light of the ToRs.

- **Focused Group Discussions:** Under the review, three focused group discussions were held. Two discussions were held in Karachi, one with local leaders and one with media persons trained under the project. The third discussion was held with local leaders and youth in Peshawar. Overall, 21 persons participated in these discussions; four from the media, one youth representative and 16 local leaders.

- **Semi-structured Interviews on Telephone:** Six semi structured interviews were done on telephone. The interviews focused on the participants who received support through coaching sessions. During the interviews, the process and benefit of coaching sessions were discussed.

- **Online-Phone Survey:** Under the review, a survey was conducted using structured questionnaires mostly containing closed-ended questions. The survey was setup using “Lime Survey” online.
  - **Sampling for survey:** Under the project, a total of 231 participants have been trained from the media, local leaders and youth during the first year of the project. Using the confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of ±5, a sample of 144 participants was required. However, considering that a low response rate was expected and also to minimize sample selection bias, all 231 trainees were included in the survey. Email addresses were available for 154 trainees and they were sent invitations directly through email. In addition, all trainees were called on their given phone numbers requesting them to participate in the survey either telephonically or through email. Overall, 106 trainees participated with total coverage of 45.8%. Of these 22 participants had completed the survey themselves using the online system whereas rest of the 84 participants were interviewed on telephone. There was representation from all 25 target districts as well as various strata like media, religious leaders, advocates, social workers, political leaders and youth were also covered. As indicated in Graph 1 below, the participants included 51 media persons, 14 youth and 41 local leaders. Overall, there were 14 females and 92 males (for more demographic details of the survey participants see Annex IV).

![Graph 1: Number of respondents by target groups](image)

---

4 See Annex I for Question guides for partner meetings
5 See Annex II for FGD agenda and question guide
6 See Annex III for survey questionnaire
1.2.1. Ethical Considerations
Throughout the review process, participants were given full freedom to decide whether they wished to participate in the focused group discussion and survey. They were given full information on why they are being interviewed and how their responses will be used. After having their full consent, the interviews were started. Moreover, respecting participants’ privacy, calls and email reminders were done for a maximum of three times.

In doing the analysis and presenting findings here, original identities of trainees and partners are not mentioned except for the stories mentioned in boxes in the “key findings” section. The final data of surveys to be provided to SFCG will also not include the names and locations of the participants in order to maintain confidentiality.

2. Key Findings
2.1. Effectiveness
2.1.1. Progress Against Key Targets
The project has made significant achievements in terms of achieving the key targets set for the first year as mentioned in the project proposal. Using these targets from project proposal, the main achievements under project objectives are discussed:

**Objective 1:** To enhance the capacity and sustainability of Pakistani media, both electronic and print, to play a more active role in the creating peace and in promoting tolerance co-existence and non extremists approaches

The main targets under the objective included two primary trainings for radio producers and presenters. One training was to be organized for the producers and presenters from private FM radios whereas one training was planned for producers and presenters from PBC. In addition to this, SFCG had to organize one advance training with 30 participants (15 each from both primary trainings). Apart from this one training was planned for TV anchor persons/hosts and print editors and journalists.

As indicated in the table 1 below, SFCG and its partners have achieved targets for number of trainings to be organized. Two advance and one primary training has been done for radio producers and presenters. In primary trainings 59 participants attended training against a target of 60 participants. There 29 participants in the primary training for private FM stations whereas 30 PBC presenters and producers participated on the second primary training. In the advance training, 27 participants participated against a target of 30 participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of trainings conducted</th>
<th>Number of participants in Trainings</th>
<th>Target for Participants</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Progress against Training Targets for Media
For the print journalists one five-day training was planned originally but it was split into two trainings one primary and one advance. The SFCG staff and the partner organization shared that such change was made because many journalists could not commit five days to training due work commitments; so they have to split one training into two. In first training 23 participants participated whereas there were 22 persons in the second training.

Besides, this SFCG had to develop and distribute a guidebook on Radio for Peace during the first year. Though guidebook was developed, however, its publication had been delayed and hence it could not be distributed.

**Objective 2:** To enhance the capacity of Pakistani youth and local leaders to explore issues affecting them through a constructive, solutions-oriented approach that is geared towards reconciliation and conflict transformation

Under the objective 2, the main targets set for the period under review included one primary and one advance training for youth. Besides, SFCG had to organize five trainings to train 125 local leaders. SFCG had also planned to develop and distribute a guidebook on peace building for youth. District Dialogue forums were also planned for the year one and these were to be done after completion of the trainings of youth and local leaders.

During the period under review, SFCG completed both primary and advance training for youth. There were 30 participants in primary training whereas 23 participated in the advance training for youth. For the local leaders SFCG organized five trainings and it was able to train 100 local leaders from the target district. SFCG had to train 125 local leaders, however, due to last minute regrets from the participants the target could not be completed. SFCG and its partner has planned to conduct additional trainings to complete this target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of trainings conducted</th>
<th>Number of participants in Trainings</th>
<th>Target for Participants</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Advance</td>
<td>Primary Advance</td>
<td>Primary Advance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Leaders</strong></td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>125 0</td>
<td>25 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth</strong></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>30 23</td>
<td>30 25</td>
<td>0 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Progress against Training Targets for Youth and local leaders**

SFCG has developed a guidebook on peacebuilding for youth; like guidebook for radio, this guidebook too could not be published and hence could not be distributed. The delay has been mainly due to budgetary reasons. SFCG received higher quotations for translation and publication of booklets as compared to the cost budgeted; so it had to find alternatives which might fit into the project’s budget which caused a delay.

During the first year, district dialogues forums were to be held as well. The dialogue forums were to be held by youth and local leaders based on the learnings from the trainings given to them; however as trainings were delayed; the forums could not be held during that time.

---

7 While the review was being conducted, SFCG conducted 6th training of local leaders. 15 local leaders participated in this training.
**Objective 3**: To establish platforms/mechanisms for Pakistani youth, civil society, and local government officials to foster greater collaboration towards constructive dialogue, increased understanding of local conflict dynamics and issues of key importance to youth, thereby fostering increased moderation and tolerance across the country.

Under this objective, SFCG had to design and launch a project website during the project period. The website has been developed and it is live on [http://www.pakistanpeaceinitiative.net.pk/](http://www.pakistanpeaceinitiative.net.pk/). However, it has not been formally launched as the required material is still being uploaded to it.

SFCG had to conduct coaching sessions with media trainees under this objective but they were originally planned for second year. The purposes of the sessions is to support and provide more support to trainees when they are producing programs for radio and writing articles for news papers. However, the trainees from print media started writing such articles after their primary training, so SFCG decided to support them through coaching sessions. In this connection, 13 sessions were completed.

Additionally, a national summit was planned during the period under the review but it was not held within the time period originally planned. The main reason for this delay is due to the absence of the three-month inception period within the original work plan. As the work plan did not include the inception period, some activities, like the national summit and district dialog forums appear delayed. During the inception period, the following activities were completed:

- Completion of two baseline studies
- Selection of partners
- Partners trainings on the Common Ground approach
- Inception meeting with Partners
- Development of Training Manuals

### 2.1.1.2. Main Issues and Challenges in Implementation

The main issues faced in implementation so far include security, and ensuring participation in the training. The security situation in the country particularly affected the baseline study and one of the trainings. For the baseline on youth and local leaders, SFCG had included Gilgit in its sample districts but the timing coincided with incidents of sectarian violence in Gilgit due to which access to the district was affected. This caused delay in completion of the baseline study. Similarly, SFCG’s partner had to cut one day of its training of local leaders in Karachi because of security reasons. The training was supposed to conclude on September 21 2012; however, there was a nationwide strike call on this day against the blasphemous movie ‘Innocence of Muslims’ released in the USA. Violence was expected on the day so SFCG had to cut one day of the training and complete it within four days.

The second issue was ensuring participation of trainees to meet the targets related to participants. In almost all the trainings, there were last minute regrets from some confirmed participants; due to such refusals SFCG’s implementing partners could not meet required number of participants in all the trainings as discussed before.

### 2.1.2. Indicators of Change

As a result of the activities mentioned in the preceding section, SFCG’s efforts and good work under this project have made a contribution to the overall project objectives and indicators of change. While the project is still ongoing, it is too early to talk about any ultimate change or impact and SFCG is also realistic in this regard as it did not request an extensive focus on knowing the impact of the project within the review. Nonetheless, as a result of trainings and coaching conducted

---

8 21st September 2012 was declared ‘Yaum-e-Ishq-e-Rasool’ and nationwide strike and holiday was observed.
so far, there have been some signs of change/impact. These include increased capacity and understanding about conflict resolution, increase in professional skills of the media personnel, behavioural changes, understanding of and exposure to different cultures and an urge for solving local issues. A brief discussion based on the survey is provided here:

**a. Increased Capacities in Conflict Resolution and Professional Skills**

A number of participants from the media, youth and local leaders have reported an increase in their capacities with respect to understanding conflict resolution and professional skills. Using the Likert Scale, the participants were asked about various changes they have felt in their capacities. As indicated in Table 3, 49% of the participants from youth and local leaders strongly agreed that they have an increased understanding about conflict resolution; whereas 47% just agreed to the same statement. About 3.6% of the participants chose to stay neutral and/or to disagree with this options; such participants believed that they already had a background in peacebuilding and conflict resolution so the training did not add to their existing knowledge. 38% of the participants from youth and local leaders strongly agreed, whereas 56% just agreed, that they have an increased understanding about conflict resolution strategies. The participants also reported an increase in their confidence to deal with conflicts with 41.8% strongly agreeing and 50.9% agreeing to the statement. Again, about 5% of participants stayed neutral and 1.82% disagreed and such participants again mentioned that they are already working in peacebuilding as local leaders so they had such confidence prior to the training. Around 30% of participants from local leaders also strongly agreed that their communication skills and negotiations skills have improved while 60% agreed with the same statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a better understanding of conflict resolution as compared to before</td>
<td>49.09%</td>
<td>47.27%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an understanding of conflict resolution strategies</td>
<td>38.18%</td>
<td>56.36%</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more confident in dealing with conflicts than before</td>
<td>41.82%</td>
<td>50.91%</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can communicate more effectively as compared to before the training</td>
<td>30.91%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My negotiation skills have improved</td>
<td>30.91%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more confident as a leader / youth representative</td>
<td>30.91%</td>
<td>61.82%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Local leaders and youths' capacity building responses

Supporting their choices, the participants also shared how the trainings had benefited them. A participant from the youth training shared that “before the training, I did not think that I could be a leader; but since I was given a chance to lead group work during the training, I realized that I have leadership skills and I can also become a leader”. The training targeted local leaders who were otherwise involved in conflict resolution in one way or other, they still felt that the training had increased their understanding about conflict resolution and peacebuilding. One participant remarked that it was useful to know about the stages of conflict and possible outcomes that can come from the resolution process; through this he had gotten a proper method of understanding and dealing with conflict. A number of participants also stressed that they realized
the importance of the position they hold when trying to resolve conflicts. They shared that after this training they have realized that it is highly important for them to remain neutral when they are resolving conflicts. Similarly, a female participant shared that before the training, she used to get annoyed when she saw any conflict around her, but now, since she knows exact ways of dealing with conflicts, she focuses on addressing the conflict rather than getting annoyed.

Among the local leaders, a lot of trainees are lawyers by profession and they shared that the training has helped them a lot specially in “Alternative Dispute Resolution” (ADR). The judiciary has recently started encouraging lawyers and judges to use ADR for resolving various conflicts and now civil and family matters are usually resolved through ADR. Laywers have to be part of the ADR process. A lawyer from Balochistan shared that “the conflict resolution training has helped me a lot in ADR; now I am better skilled to mediate ADR sessions”.

Similarly, participants from the media reported increased capacities and understanding about conflict resolution. In fact, for some of participants, it was the first time they were receiving proper training on not just conflict resolution but also on professional skills related to media.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have a better understanding of conflict resolution as compared to before</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I can do proper research for TV/Radio programs/writing articles as compared to before</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am more confident in hosting/producing radio / TV shows/writing articles as compared to before</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know exactly how to use media for peace building</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have better interviewing skills as compared to before.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I got familiar with non-adversarial approaches to conflict resolution</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Local leaders and youths’ capacity building responses
As depicted in Table 4, during the sample survey, 54.6% of participants strongly agreed & 45.4% agreed that their understanding about conflict resolution improved due to the trainings. Participants also reported improvements in their research skills with respect to writing reports or doing talk shows for TV/radio with around 59.8% strongly agreeing and 38.9% just agreeing to it. Similarly 54.7% of participant strongly agreed whereas 37.6% just agreed that their skills in interviewing have also improved. The participants reported that their confidence in writing content or hosting TV/radio shows has increased as a result of the trainings that they attended as they have learnt proper skills and techniques in this regard; 71.5% strongly agreed to this and 25.9% just agreed.

A participant in the survey shared that “before (the training) I did not know anything about conducting interviews; now I have a clear understanding (about interviews). I have been in this profession for 9 years; but this is first time that I have received any training”. Similarly, another participant shared that after understanding conflict theory, it was easy to report on conflicts. “(Before the training), reporting on conflicts was not easy; after attending the training, I can handle such reporting better. Similarly, I try to fulfil my responsibilities as a good human being (/Citizen) as well”.

b. Personal Behavioural & Perceptional Changes

Some of the participants reported changes on the personal level and using the knowledge from the training for resolving their personal matters at home. A youth member shared that he had some issues with his brother with respect to sharing resources at home, and they often used to have arguments in their home. However, after the training, he realized that he needs to talk to his brother and solve the issue amicably. He did so by admitting his mistakes and also settling a way for the resolution of such conflicts.

Similarly, participants in FGD at Peshawar shared that their perceptions about NGOs have changed. The participants were of the view that before the training they had negative perceptions about NGOs but now they have positive feelings toward the NGOs. A participants remarked that “we used to think that NGOs were acting on western agenda and they somehow try to change our societal values”. Another participant shared simillar opinions and added that “after the training we realized that NGOs also try to bring people together and facilitate them to transcend above differences; the training made us realize that NGOs were actually working on important cause which we as local leaders also try to propagate and support”.

“Before going into the training, I was just eager to hunt for news stories and throw them before the public without having any idea about what positive and negative consequences they can create for people. But after the training, I now have a clear vision that I must understand the situation before, especially when I am reporting on any socio-political or tribal conflict”, a participant from print media training

“After the training we realized that NGOs also try to bring people together and facilitate them to transcend above differences; the training made us realize that NGOs were actually working on important cause which we as local leaders also try to propagate and support”, said a participant during FGD at Peshawar
c. Changes in Media Programming and Contents

Some of the participants from media reported that after attending the training, they have made changes in their programs and content writing. Participants from the radio shared that they now try to include a greater focus on social issues in their programs. For example, a respondent to the survey said “Usually, I do entertainment programs but now I also include issues in certain programs sometimes. We invite politicians (and other stakeholders). Now we have a proper understanding of how to bring people to common ground”. Similarly, those who were already doing such programs shared that they have tried to make their programs more balanced and they also try to implement the common ground approach in their programs as well.

A participant in the survey shared that “Often there are strikes, so we try to include messages of peace during such events”. Another participant reported that after the training, he has done four radio programs and focused on issues of violence against women, household conflicts, high ratios of divorce and lack of girls’ enrolment in schools. A participant from Karachi shared that he regularly talks about peace in Karachi in his magazine program on PBC Karachi, and invites speakers to talk on increasing violence and the need to improve the situation.

Similarly, a participant from the print journalist’s trainings shared that before this training his reporting was not balanced and neutral, but now he has been striving to do that. Another participant in the survey shared that “Before going into the training, I was just eager to hunt for news stories and throw them before the public without having any idea about what positive and negative consequences they can create for people. But after the training, I now have a clear vision that I must understand the situation before, especially when I am reporting on any socio-political or tribal conflicts.” In a similar vein, another participant shared that “before this (training), we used to start articles but did not know where and how to end them properly; but now we know the proper way. The most important thing that we have learnt is what kind of words we have to select”. Though limited so far, these views indicate that participants from the media trainings have begun to use skills they have learnt for improving media content and they are also contributing to the objectives of this project in this connection.

At the same time a number of media persons also shared that there are practical issues due to which implementing this approach becomes an issue. Most media houses are for profit and they put commercial interest in front of them. In this connection, there are competitions on ratings and subscription. Practically speaking, the media persons have to obey their owners and hence they do not enjoy full freedom to implement what they learn in these trainings.

Moreover, the print journalist work in very unjust work conditions as mostly they are not paid by their organizations and lack resources for effective reporting. So they too face hardships in their routine jobs. So proper implementation of the Common Ground approach, while faced with a lack of resources and proper facilities, may not be feasible for them. This indicates that there is also need to do advocacy for improving the conditions in which journalists work and that will help create and/or improve the enabling environment where journalist could enjoy more freedom to implement learning from trainings like these. SFCG may also consider playing its role in such advocacy efforts.

d. Increased Understanding of and Exposure to Different Cultures

A lot of participants, particularly from the youth and media trainings, also appreciated the fact that during the trainings, they were able to meet with participants from across Pakistan. This gave them the opportunity to understand more about the different cultures, mindsets and their positions on
various aspects of life. A participant from the youth training shared that “it was good to have participants from all over the country. We were able to understand each other better and also understand the issues we face”. Similar opinions were also found among participants of the media and local leaders trainings. A participant from the local leaders trainings shared that “It was good to have participants from South Punjab; we were able to understand their opinions and views (in relation to having a separate province)”. Similarly, another participant shared that “there was a section on the Balochistan issue and I was happy to have better knowledge about Balochistan (as it helped in countering prejudice); I have now ordered more books to get an even deeper understanding about the Balochistan issue”. Such changes in views and understanding about various sections of Pakistani society could help promote peaceful coexistence in society and may ultimately contribute to overall objective of this project as well.

**Researching for Peacebuilding in Islam**

Syed Iftikhar Ali Bukhari is a lawyer and currently in his 50s. He attended the Local Leaders for Peace training in Lahore.

He shared that the training helped him understand peacebuilding and conflict resolution in a very good manner. He wants to continue this learning and also spread the message to others. In fact, he has become interested in writing a book. He shared that he is beginning to start a small research project for writing this book. His intended research focuses on providing insights about peacebuilding in Islam and linking the Common Ground approach with messages of peace that Islam gives.

### e. Awareness about Playing a Role in Resolving Conflicts

Some of the participants, especially from youth and local leaders, shared that before the training, they did not pay attention to the fact that there were small conflicts and disputes around them that they could solve; so they used to ignore them. A participant from the youth trainings shared that “I play in a football club and there were disputes every now and then; but I used to ignore them; but after the training, I have started to talk to people whenever there is conflict”. Similarly, another youth shared that “In our area, there are often conflicts among Shia and Sunni community members; I have always wanted to do something about it but never had the courage; now after the training, I have started talking to the people in our village about being more tolerant”. Another youth shared that “I saw many issues in my local area but did not know what I could do for resolving them; after the training I realized that I can talk to people and I can organize them (for resolving such issues)”. 

### f. Spreading the Message Forward

Some of the participants shared that they have tried to spread the message to others as well. Most of the participants shared that they have shared the learning from the training with others fellows. Some participants have even conducted formal sessions on what they learnt during the training. A participant shared that he is a member of the peace committee and is also connected with some youth groups and organizations; he has done three sessions among such groups and shared knowledge gained from the training. Similarly, another youth member shared that “I work with a NGO and after the training, I conducted two sessions in my organization to share what I learnt during the training”. 
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2.1.3. Monitoring

SFCG is committed to monitoring and evaluation and it is evident from the fact that a “Design, Monitoring and Evaluation” (DME) unit has been institutionalized within the organizational structure. The DME unit is responsible for all monitoring and evaluation support for the project. For this project too, team members from DME are playing their due part.

In order to have proper M&E for the project, SFCG has planned baselines, a midterm review and an end of project evaluation. Monitoring of trainings and partners is done on a regular basis for which proper checklists/instruments have been developed and used in the trainings. So far under this project, two baselines have been conducted. One baseline focused on “Youth Perceptions of the Promotion of Dialogue for Peacebuilding through Media” and has been done through the content analysis of media programs from radio and TV and a sampled survey with youth. The sampled survey under this baseline was done with 500 youth who are studying or working in the federal capital. The second baseline was done with youth and local leaders and focuses on their knowledge, perceptions and skills in peace building. The baseline was done only in five out of the 25 target districts which limits its potential for generalization. Baseline studies help in multiple ways in monitoring and evaluation. One of the potential purposes is to help setup benchmarks and indicators for project results. It seems that from this perspective, the baselines have been underutilized and the findings have not been used for reviewing the logical framework analysis (LFA) matrix or setting any benchmarks.

The Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) and Sources of Verification (SOVs) in the LFA need revisions. Some of the OVIs are placed in SOVs column. Generally speaking, there is a need to improve coherence among OVIs and objectives. There is also need of improving consistency within LFA and between LFA and project proposal especially with respect to results, indicators and outputs. As already said, since baselines have been conducted, it would be better to set indicators/benchmarks in light of the baselines where possible. The existing monitoring data does not contain an analysis of diversity that participants represent in terms of gender, religion and ethnicity. So there is need to generate such analysis and for this purpose SFCG may consider developing participants’ profiles containing their demographic information and bios. Within LFA too, there is room for including sex segregated indicators and also ensuring the same in the project’s progress reports.

---

**Friday Sermons for Common Ground**

Abdul Qayyum is Lecturer in Jamia Anwaar ul Quran and an administrator and lecturer at the Islamic University for Women in Karachi. He is also prayer leader in a local mosque. He attended the Local Leaders for Peace training in Karachi. As the prayer leader, he also delivers sermons, especially in Friday prayers. After attending the training, he delivered a series of sermons on peacebuilding and citizens’ duties in this respect. He shared that “I particularly focused on sharing the Common Ground approach with people”. He delivered about five such sermons after the training. He said that “Friday sermons are a great opportunity as a lot of people come and listen to us and I have used the opportunity to spread the message further.”
2.2. Efficiency
This section briefly presents comments on the allocated financial resources, management of the project, trainings and coaching sessions.

2.2.1. Budget Vs. Results
The geographic coverage of the project is spread over 25 districts from all of Pakistan and Azad Jammu and Kashmir. While local leaders trainings are held regionally/provincially, the trainings of youth and media bring participants from all 25 target districts to Islamabad. In each training, various experts have been invited as resource persons. So far 13 trainings have been organized and 320 people have participated overall (including participation in advanced trainings). With this perspective, the average cost of training one person is about 77,000 PKR and the total cost booked for all trainings is 24.6 million PKR. The cost may seem somewhat high on the onset but as said earlier the approach used for the trainings is resource intensive. Moreover, it is also the preferrable approach due to increasingly higher security risks in some of the target districts. So in light of the factors explained above along with ever increasing inflation, the overall allocation and use of resources seems resonable.

Moreover, the project also includes plans for the production and broadcasting of 90 radio talk shows and 5 TV talk shows. A budget of about 11.17 million PKR has been allocated. Considering that there is a huge potential target pool of listeners and viewers for these programs and there would be targeted listener clubs as well, the allocated budgets commensurate to the potential results that airing these programs may yeild.

Moreover, with respect to the District Dialogue Forums, the budget does not seem to have much provisions. Some of the participants in the survey and FGDs also complained that the budgets being provided for the District Dialogues were hardly enough to organize a proper forum. They shared that no resources were being provided for venues and the budget being given for food was also not enough to arrange decent meals and/or refreshements. So there is a need to look into possibilities of revising the budget and also making costs for such activities more realistic in the future.

The budgeted amounts for translation and printing of guidebooks are not enough as discussed before as well. Guidebook for youth are planned to be printed in five languages whereas translation of radio guidebook is planned in two languages along with printing of the same. SFCG received higher qoutations than budget it has booked.

The budget allocations for the operation costs for the project are a little over 40% of the total cost. Given recent increases in inflation, the costs seems reasonable and justified. With respect to partners, the operational, including personnel cost, are mostly about 10% their respective budgets. Overall, 7.4 million PKR have been allocated for the monitoring and evaluation of the project. This involves two baseline studies, regular monitoring visits to 13 trainings and 25 district dialogues, the midterm-evaluation and the final evaluation of the project. This allocation seems fair but could be constrained as number of activities are too much and also require extensive travel; for example the resources for this review were too limited.

2.2.2. Project Management
This section briefly discusses the overall project management of the project. In section A, brief discussion is provided on the project management by SFCG. This section is based on discussion with SFCG team and the implementing partners. Section B discusses the management and delivery of trainings and coaching sessions by SFCG’s partners. The section draws upon the survey and semi structured interviews with participants of trainings and coaching sessions.
a. Project Management by SFCG

At SFCG, overall project management is carried out by a team of two project management staff at SFCG. They are supported by the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation team especially with respect to the monitoring of activities. There are five partners who have been assigned different support roles. Activities are directly implemented by the partners with active support by the SFCG team. Currently, the SFCG team and partners were quite satisfied with the overall management of the project. However, at the start there were issues which also caused some delay in start of project activities. Most SFCG partners shared that there were some changes in roles of partners which also impacted budgets. This also caused a delay in the start in the project activities as too much time was taken up in finalization of the partner roles. The partners pointed out there were some changes in the staff at the start of project and during the initial period of the project; this was major reasons which caused changes in the partners roles and budgets. The staff changes affected proper management and communication and resulted in delay of the project activities. Most partners realized that communication and coordination issues did occur during transitions but some aspects could have been better managed; especially with respect to repeated changes in partner budgets and roles.

Under the project, SFCG planned to make a website to share more resources with media, youth and local leaders and also provide them a platform for interaction. Though the website has been made but it has not been finalize and its launch has been delayed as well.

b. Event / Activities management by partners

- **Training Management**: Generally, the participants seem happy with the way the trainings have been conducted. They gave good ratings to trainers, content and training material used in the training. As shown in Graph 2 below, 24% of the participants gave ratings of excellent whereas 49% gave ratings of very good for the content and material. There were 2% who considered the content was of poor quality. Similarly, for resource persons’ knowledge and delivery of training, 33% rated them as excellent and 35% rated it very good. 27% considered that the resource persons were good. Again, 5% of the participants gave poor ratings to the resource persons. Within logistics, the participants were generally happy with the arrangements as 27% considered them excellent, whereas 47% and 22% gave ratings of very good and good respectively.

![Graph 2: Training Ratings by Local Leaders and Youth](image-url)
Participants who rated the training material and trainers as poor and good were of the view that the trainers needed in-depth knowledge about their subject and they generally did not handle the participants well as the trainers were unable to properly answer the questions of the participants. With respect to content, some participants were of the view that there was a need to include a greater focus on national issues instead of just focusing on smaller issues/conflicts. With respect to logistics, some participants, particularly from the local leaders training, were concerned that they did not receive adequate support in transportation costs as the cost they incurred on travel was higher than the reimbursement they received. A few participants, specially from local leaders training in Punjab, also expressed the need to make travel cost reimbursements fair and shared that some participants were paid higher whereas otherwise paid less irrespective of the fact what was the actually expenditure. From within the partners, there were suggestions to make standardized budgets for trainings and per diem across the board for all partners. SFCG’s internal monitoring reports also take note of the fact that trainers need to increase their effectiveness in training delivery.

Some participants also raised concerns about the selection of participants and group formation. One participant from the local leaders trainings shared that “there was mix of juniors and seniors in the training; the seniors seemed to dominate the training discussions most of the time, so there is a need to ensure that participants are from the same level of seniority”. This, however, indicates a difference in participant’s perspectives as a mix participants provides opportunity to learn from peers as well. At the same time, it highlights the need to increase focus on addressing the learning needs and levels of various participants. Some participants also expressed concern about participants who did not seem too serious about the training. A few participants also shared concern that some participants did not belong to districts they represented in the training and highlighted the need to properly enforce selection criteria and identify participants from target district only.

Some of the participants felt that some trainers were a bit insensitive to their context when discussing some issues. For example, participants from Sindh shared that while discussing Kala-Bagh dam issue one of the trainer’s seemed to favour the proposal of constructing dam; despite the fact that most of the people in Sindh are strongly against construction of this dam and have long fought struggle to stop dam’s construction. So they suggested that trainers should be sensitive while discussing such issues and avoid taking positions.

While some of issues discussed above might be mere perceptions, they invite SFCG and its partners to give them due consideration; and see how selection processes can be further improved and also explore possibilities customizing traings to meet the varying individual needs of the participants. While SFCG already have developed a criteria for selection of the participants, there is a need to strengthening its implementation and further improving the selection process as well.
Participants from the media trainings seem quite satisfied with the trainings. Generally, no one has given the trainings ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’ ratings. As indicated in Graph 3 above, more than 40% of the participants gave ratings of ‘excellent’ for the training material and content, resource persons’ knowledge and training methods. A few participants from the media, however, did mention in the survey interviews and the FGD in Karachi that the selection of some of the trainers could have been improved by selecting some resource persons who were recognized as role models in their respective field and also had in-depth understanding of the subject. For example, a participant from the TV trainings shared that some of the trainers/resource persons who also work in the television industry were good but when we study their programs they themselves are not role models. Similarly, another participant from the radio training shared that one or two resources persons were not that good as they lacked experience in the field and could not properly clarify questions raised on sessions that such trainer delivered.

- **Coaching sessions**: With respect to coaching sessions, the participants had mixed feelings about the general management and approach adopted for the sessions. They were happy that coaching sessions were arranged for them because it provided an opportunity to sit one-on-one with a senior journalist. However, they expressed the need to make the sessions more structured and defining a proper focus as well. For example, one participant said that his session lasted only 15 minutes and there was just a general discussion on writing a feature article on a given topic. Relating to similar experiences, another participant shared that it seemed like coaching sessions were just a formality as no substantive discussion took place about discussing my work and helping to improve it. With respect to giving coaching sessions more focus, another participant shared that district based reporters work more on news reporting as compared to feature writing, whereas the coaching session was focused on feature writing; so the focus of such sessions should be set in light of the actual work that we do.

It could be seen that the participants did agree to the fact that coaching sessions have value addition for them to learn more from seniors. Yet there is a need to further define their
focus and structure. Moreover, efforts should also be made to have proper monitoring of the coaching sessions as well.

2.3. Coordination and Coherence
This section will briefly present the findings related to the working of the consortium with respect to this project. Although the original ToRs did not include a focus on coordination with and among trained participants, a number of participants raised this issue in the FGDs and the survey, so a brief discussion regarding this is also provided in this section.

2.3.1. Consortium
SFCG’s decision to adopt a consortium approach for the project’s implementation is generally appreciated by all the partners. Firstly, the project has multiple focuses so it requires diverse skill sets in implementation and its selected partners do have such skills. Secondly, the partners believe that it provides them a unique opportunity to work with each other and learn from each others’ skills and approaches as well. A partner staff member shared “we know each other by working in the sector but most of us have not worked together closely before; so to be in this consortium provides us with the opportunity to do so”. However, partners did raise concerns that the consortium approach was not fully utilized and there was considerable room for improvement to work as a proper consortium. Some of the major issues, in this regard are discussed below:

   a. Need to Make the Consortium More Active and Engaged
   All partners agreed that there was a need to make the consortium more active and engaged in the project’s planning and the implementation of activities. Since the start of the project, there have only been two formal occasions for partners to meet each other. One was during the partner capacity building workshop/inception meeting and the second was a recent partners meeting which happens to be the first dedicated consortium meeting. So the partners expressed a need to make the consortium more active and engaged in project planning and implementation. In this connexion, they suggested to have proper and regular planning and progress sharing meetings. Most partners suggested to have quarterly consortium meetings. It is evident from the budget that there are no budget allocations seperately identified in the project for consortium meetings. So in future it will be better to include budgets for consortium meetings if a similar implementation strategy is used.

   b. Lack of Proper Planning
   Most partners shared that there are certain activities where they have to work together. For example, the District Dialogue Forums; the forums are to be organized primarily by SDPI while other partners have to provide support in coordinating with the trainees from the media for coverage and support. Similarly, with respect to the radio trainings, Intermedia conducted the primary training for private FMs and Uks conducted the primary training for participants from PBC. The advanced training for 30 selected participants from the 2 primary trainings was to be done by Intermedia. Such a training also requires interaction between the two organizations on timelines and the specific approaches they adopted in the trainings so as to maintain standards across the board. So there is a need to involve partners in the proper planning for all these trainings and activities where they have to work together or there is interdependence on each other’s activities. SFCG did take initiative of having an inception meeting at the start of the project and then there was follow partner in January 2012. However, partners felt that more planning and coordination meetings were required; and SFCG needs to take lead in properly creating linkages among the partners. As already mentioned, partner suggested quarterly meetings.

SFCG have already signed contracts with partners which elaborate the roles of respective partners in the project’s implementation. There was need to further clarify their roles especially with respect to specifications of such roles in joint activities. So maximum clarifications should also be made and reiterated about the specific roles partners have to play in activities where they have to work
together. The partners also expressed concern due to lack of proper planning that often they are asked to do activities on short notices specially in connection to joint activities being done by the partners. This also highlights the need for proper and timely planning.

c. **Coordination and Communication**

The partners also expressed the need to have more coordination and communication within the consortium. Particularly, almost all partners shared that there was a need to share lessons learnt and best practices with each other. This can be regularized if there are regular meetings of the consortium and in addition to that, the partners also suggested the regularized flow of such information over e-mail.

d. **Partners’ Capacity Building on the Common Ground Approach**

The partners were happy that a workshop was conducted on the Common Ground approach and SFCG’s training manual, as it provided them a lot to learn from. However, at the same time, they shared that the workshop conducted was not long enough in duration and there remained a need for detailed training on the Common Ground approach and also sharing SFCG’s experience the world over. One of the partners also expressed the need for organizing the training of trainers for potential resource persons and developing a cadre of master trainers specializing in the Common Ground approach and SFCG’s training manuals on peacebuilding and common groupd approach.

2.3.2. **Trainees**

The participants trained under the project generally expressed a need for more coordination and communication by SFCG and its partners. They also expressed a need of developing and nurturing linkages and networking among various persons from the media, youth and local leaders trained under the project. Many participants shared that after their trainings, interviews under this review mark the first time that someone from SFCG and/or their partners have contacted them again. They appreciated this effort and asked for making such efforts a regular feature. The participants shared that if it was not possible to have physical contact, SFCG and its partners can at least regularly send various written materials and e-mails regarding our trainings and other activities.

A good number of participants have suggested creating formal networks of the trained participants. Such a network could be utilized for extensive advocacy, capacity building and awareness raising for sustainable peacebuilding in Pakistan. This suggestion does need due attention and consideration from SFCG and its partners. Both SFCG and its partner can facilitate the trained participants in forming and initial organizational development of such a network.

3. **Conclusions**

Using a holistic approach, the project focuses on media, youth and local leaders and aims to increase their capacities so that they can play a better role in peacebuilding in Pakistan. The provision of trainings to these groups have created impact though limited so far. It can seen that trainings helped in increasing their capacities in understanding conflict resolution and have also trigged personal behavioural changes and urge to work for peace. The target groups have also increasingly realized their roles in peacebuilding. While some of them were eager to play such roles, lack of capacity had held them back and after receiving trainings through this project, they feel more confident in moving forward now.

Moreover, in future programming SFCG may also consider paying more attention to addressing the structural issues that media persons face. Efforts to resolves such issues will create a more enabling environment for jouranlists to use learning from trainings and also contribute more effectively for using media for sustainable peace process process in Pakistan.
4. **Recommendations**

Based on the review’s findings, the key recommendations are provided below:

- **Planning & Monitoring**
  - LFA should be revised to improve coherence and consistency among objectives, outputs and OVI's and also improving its linkages with project proposal. Where possible, the baselines should be used for setting/improving indicators and benchmarks.
  - Efforts should be made to include sex-segregated indicators and also reflecting the same in progress reports. There is need to generate data and analysis about diversity of participants trained under project and similar initiatives in future. It will be useful to develop participants profiles with their demographic information and bio.
  - Project work plans in future should take into account inception period and adequate period should be included for completion of the inception related activities.
  - Work plans should also include targets for various activities and should not merely reflect timelines of the activities.

- **Efficiency**
  - Issues raised by a few participants with respect to unfair and/or inadequate reimbursements for travel costs need further investigation by SFCG, with a possible recontextualization of budgets in the future.
  - Possibilities of standardizing budgets for similar activities should be discussed with partners in future discussions and mutually agreed rates may be adopted.
  - Possibilities should be explored for increasing budgets for District Dialogue Forums and in the future, budgets for such activities should be allocated keeping in mind varying contexts and different aspects related to an event like venues, logistics and food etc.

- **Trainings**
  - Concerns raised on selection process for training participants need attention from SFCG and its partner(s). It highlights the need to improve the selection process and further enforce the selection criteria.
  - It will also be good to have some participants in waiting lists so as to cover targets in case some participants regret at the last minute.
  - While it is good to have a mix of participants, it is important to design the training in such a way that the participants’ varying learning needs and abilities are catered to the maximum possible level.
  - It may be good to include more rigorous trainer evaluations within trainings. This could be done by having evaluation forms for each trainer / session of the training. This will help indicate which trainers are performing well as per participants feedback.
  - As also suggested by the partners, ToTs should be conducted for the trainers and partner staff to develop a cadre of master trainers. Such a ToT may also focus on improving capacities of master trainers in dealing training participants from various cultural and learning backgrounds.

- **Coaching Sessions**
  - Generally participants have appreciated the coaching sessions and the potential value addition they have; however, there is a need to explore possibilities of properly structuring them and clarifying the purpose and process of coaching sessions to the participants and coaches.
  - Monitoring mechanism should be devised for coaching sessions like other activities.

- **Coordination and Coherence**
  - SFCG and its partners need to engage with each other more proactively and work as much closely as possible in the next one year as the success of most of the remaining activities require the partners working together with strong communication and cooperation with each other.
The Consortium approach has lot of potential for increasing the project’s effectiveness; however, there is a need to proactively engage partners into proper consortium coordination and operation by having regular planning and progress sharing meetings.

Though SFCG did conduct a planning meeting at inception of the project, such planning and review meetings should be made a regular feature.

Budgets should be included for such consortium meetings in similar initiatives in future. In current project, SFCG may look into possibilities of revising budget to include provisions for consortium meetings.

Coordination and communication should also be improved with trained participants as the project targets to keep them involved beyond the trainings as well. This can be done through social media, SMS, email and landmail. They should also be updated effectively on course of action for further activities.

Linkages should be established among the trained participants from media, youth and local leaders as soon as trainings are completed. SFCG and partners should facilitate in strengthening these linkages as the trainees from three groups are expected to work together during district dialogue forums.

Possibilities of establishing networks of trained participants should be explored as these will have great potential for promoting peace and the Common Ground approach in the long run. SFCG already has the platform of the Pakistan Peace Initiative in this regard; it just needs to formalize the network’s creation and provide support in its organizational development. This will also help in making sure that investments made on the capacity development of participants are further channeled for creating a sustainable peacebuilding process in Pakistan.
Annexures

Annex I: Partner Meeting - Question Guide

• Please share a brief introduction of your organization?
• What is the role of your organization in the implementation of the project?
• Please share progress of the activities so far? Including discussion on targets and achievements against them
• What has been the response to trainings/project activities from the participants?
• What were some of the major challenges and issues faced in project implementation?
• What do you think about the budget allocations for the project activities? Are they enough or not?
• What is your opinion about overall management and monitoring of the project?
• How is the overall coordination with SFCG Pakistan team?
• What are your insights on the way the consortium is working? What are some of the good aspects? What are the issues?
• What suggestions would you give towards improving the consortium’s working?
• Any suggestions or recommendations for bringing improvements to the project?
• Anything else you may want to say

Annex II: Focused group discussion Agenda and question guide

Agenda

• Welcome
• Introduction of all participants and facilitator
• Purpose of the discussion
• Discussion as per question guide
• Vote of thanks and Tea

Guiding Questions

• How were you all selected for the training?
• Please share your insights about the training? What did you learn during the training?
• What did you like the most about the training?
• What was the most significant contribution of the training for you, personally or professionally?
• Have you used any learning from the training in your personal/professional life?
• What would you suggest for further improvements in the training?
• How can SFCG facilitate you to further your role in peace building?
• Any suggestions or recommendations for future activities/project?
Annex III: Survey Questionnaires

Search for Common Ground, Pakistan

“Promotion of Dialogue for Peacebuilding through Media & Youth Mobilization in Pakistan”

Mid Term Review

Survey Questionnaire (Media)

Section A: Respondent Information

A1. Full Name: __________________________
A2. Gender:
   a. Male
   b. Female
A3. Age in years: _________________________
A4. District: __________________
A5. Email: _____________________________
A6. Contact number: ___________________
A7. What is your religion (optional)
   a. Muslim
   b. Christian
   c. Hindu
   d. Baha’i
   e. Sikh
   f. Others: ___________
   g. Choose not to answer
A8. What is your mother tongue
   a. Punjabi
   b. Sindhi
   c. Balochi
   d. Brahvi
   e. Pashto
   f. Seraiki
   g. Other: __________
   h. Choose not to answer
A9. Which media are you associated with:
   a. Print
   b. Radio (private/FM)
   c. Radio (government/PBC)
   d. TV
A10. Which newspaper/TV/radio are you associated with:
    a. _________________
A11. What is your role
    Editor
Journalist / new correspondent

Anchor Person / TV host

Radio presenter

Radio producer

Columnist

a. Other, please specify: __________________

Section B: Trainings & Guide books

B1. Did you receive primary training by SFCG:
   a. Yes
   b. No

B2. Did you receive advance training by SFCG:
   a. Yes
   b. No

B3. Which organization conducted the training(s) in which you participated:
   a. Intermedia Pakistan
   b. Uks Research Resource and Publication Centre on Women and Media
   c. Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)
   d. Pakistan Press Foundation (PPF)

B4. How would you rate the quality of the training(s) against the indicators specified below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contents &amp; Training Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource person’s knowledge and delivery of training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings Methods (Group work, role plays etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements: Logistics, accommodation, venue etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B5. Did you find the training(s) relevant to your work?

Highly relevant

Very much relevant

Somewhat relevant

Neither relevant nor irrelevant

Not at all relevant

Questions from Print Media only

B6. What changes do you feel in yourself after attending training
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a better understanding of conflict resolution as compared to before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do proper research for writing articles as compared to before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more confident in writing news articles as compared to before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I now have better knowledge on how to use media for peace building as compared to before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have better interviewing skills as compared to before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am now more familiar with non-adversarial approaches to conflict resolution as compared to before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions from Radio & TV presenters and producers only**

B7. To what extent did the training(s) helped you increase your skills in the following areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a better understanding of conflict resolution as compared to before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do proper research for TV/Radio programs as compared to before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more confident in hosting/producing radio / TV shows as compared to before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know exactly how to use media for peace building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have better interviewing skills as compared to before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got familiar with non-adversarial approaches to conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B8. Have the training(s) helped you improve your work?

a. Agree  
b. Strongly agree  
c. Neither agree nor disagree  
d. Disagree  
e. Strongly disagree
B9. How have the training(s) helped you in your work? Please explain with one or more specific examples

B10. Have you used the skills you learnt for conflict resolution / peacebuilding?
   a. Yes
   b. No

B11. How did you use your learning from the trainings for peace building in your work as a media person? Please explain below citing one or more specific examples.

B12. Do you know that SFCG has setup a project website to share more useful resources on peace building and conflict resolution with media, youth and local leaders?
   • Yes
   • No

Section C: Suggestions & Recommendations

C1. What kind of support can Search for Common Ground provide to Media persons to help better and further increase the media’s role in peace building in Pakistan?

C2. Any suggestions you may want to give to improve trainings programs in future?

C3. Anything else that you may want to say
Section A: Respondent Information

A12. Full Name: __________________________
A13. Gender:
   a. Male
   b. Female
A14. Age in years:
   a. ______________
A15. District: __________________
A16. Email: ____________________
A17. Contact number: ______________
A18. What is your religion (optional)
   a. Muslim
   b. Christian
   c. Hindu
   d. Baha’i
   e. Sikh
   f. Others: ___________
   g. Choose not to answer
A19. What is your mother tongue
   a. Punjabi
   b. Sindhi
   c. Balochi
   d. Brahvi
   e. Pashto
   f. Seraiki
   g. Other: ___________
   h. Choose not to answer
A20. How do you identify yourself:
   a. Local leader
   b. Youth representative
A21. What is your occupation?
   a. Student
   b. Government Servant
   c. Political worker/Leader
   d. Trade Union Leader/worker
   e. Social worker
f. Religious leader  
g. Local government representative (Nazim, Councilor etc)  
h. Other, please specify ____________________

**Section B: Trainings & Guide books**

**B12.** Did you receive a primary training on peacebuilding by SFCG/SDPI:  
   a. Yes  
   b. No

**B13.** Did you receive an advance training on peacebuilding by SFCG/SDPI:  
   a. Yes  
   b. No

**B14.** How would you rate the quality of the training(s) against the indicators specified below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contents &amp; Training Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource person’s knowledge and delivery of training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings Methods (Group work, role plays etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements: Logistics, accommodation, venue etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B15.** Did you find the training(s) relevant to your work?  
   a. Highly relevant  
   b. Very much relevant  
   c. Somewhat relevant  
   d. Neither relevant nor irrelevant  
   e. Not at all relevant

**B16.** What changes did you observe in yourself after attending this training(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a better understanding of conflict resolution as compared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an understanding of conflict resolution strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more confident in dealing with conflicts than before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can communicate more effectively as compared to before the training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My negotiation skills have improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more confident as a leader / youth representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B17. Please explain how the training(s) have helped you in your personal and professional development

B18. Did you find the training(s) useful in terms of helping you resolve local issues?
   f. Highly useful
   g. Somewhat useful
   h. Neutral
   i. Somewhat useful
   j. Not at all useful

B19. Please explain if the training has helped you as a local leader/youth representative in resolving local conflicts:

B20. How did you use your learning from the training(s) for peace building / resolving conflicts in your local area? Please cite any specific examples

B10. Do you know that SFCG has setup a project website to share more useful resources on peace building and conflict resolution with media, youth and local leaders?
   • Yes
   • No

Section C: Suggestions & Recommendations

C1. What kind of support can Search for Common Ground provide to local leaders / youth to help better and further increase their capacities for ultimate peace in Pakistan?
C2 Any suggestions you may want to give to improve trainings programs in future?


C3 Anything else that you may want to say
## Annex IV: Additional information about survey respondents

### District-wise coverage of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Youth &amp; Local Leaders</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahawalpur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charsadda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.I Khan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujrat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwadar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haripur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karachi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansehra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirpur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustang</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzafarabad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Waziristan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawalakot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahiwal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargodha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukkur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swabi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Religion of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Youth &amp; Local Leaders</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>92.73%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baha'i</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mother Tongue of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Youth &amp; Local Leaders</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.82%</td>
<td>15.69%</td>
<td>18.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>15.69%</td>
<td>17.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindhi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>15.69%</td>
<td>15.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seraiki</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>15.69%</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahvi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>4.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.91%</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>12.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professions of Local Leaders and Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professions</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government official/Employee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Worker/Leader</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union Worker/Leader</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Leader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Representative/Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Roles of Media persons who participated in survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist/Correspondents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Person/Host</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Presenter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Producer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columnist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hassan Nasir Mirabahar brings with him around 9 years of work experience in the area of human rights, democratisation and peace. He has recently completed Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (MHRD) from the University of Sydney Australia. Before joining MHRD, Hassan worked as Executive Director of Cavish Development Foundation. As the director of the Cavish, he initiated organizational development and strategic planning processes and helped in raising funds of around 1 million dollars for various projects. His work experience also includes over 2 years of experience on the rights to education and the right to political participation with Indus Resource Center in Sindh, Pakistan. Besides, he also worked with Lead Pakistan as Associate Coordinator for Project Management Unit.

Currently, Hassan works as freelance consultant providing services in areas of Monitoring and evaluation, research, training and advocacy. As consultant he has conducted evaluation of “Earthquake Response Project” of Cordaid Pakistan. Besides, he also conducted mid-term and final evaluation of “Disabled Children’s Support” Project, jointly run by IRADAH and Plan Pakistan. He has also provided consultancy services to Global Works, Adam Smith International, and Oxfam Novib’s Peace My Right Campaign.