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1 Introduction

Through longstanding project work in the DRC and the conduct of thorough conflict assessments and baseline studies, SFCG has in-depth knowledge of the very local level of various geographical areas. Sometimes, therefore, SFCG is asked by other actors operating in the region (i.e. the UN) to conduct a rapid conflict assessment in a current hot spot for them.

However, conflict-affected contexts, such as the DRC, are rapidly changing environments. In order to regularly check the conflict incidents in the different project areas and beyond, SFCG came up with an instrument called “conflict scan”, which, as the name suggests, intends to be a quick scan or snap shot of the changing conflict dynamics and key driving factors for conflict and peace in a given location. In addition to the existing comprehensive conflict assessments, the regularly updated scans provide the organization and its partners with the latest hyper-local information to inform project management and activities. Additionally, conflict scans are conducted in a participatory way and aim at enabling space for dialogue, building trust and understanding among different stakeholders. Furthermore, conflict scans are action research insofar that they are encouraging discussions among diverse stakeholders on how to address the identified conflicts, and based on their inputs, come up with ideas for project activities.

This document provides the methodology and guidelines for conflict scan. It is not “set in stone” but will need a reality-check by on-the-ground staff, who can adapt the process as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Scan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product/deliverable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Point in time/frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guiding Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This methodology guideline has the following objectives:

- It explains the purpose of a conflict scan and what we can expect from it;
- It provides guidance in applying the conflict scan methodology;
- It serves as an initial reflection on the standardization of the methodology for other contexts where SFCG has been conducting conflict scans.
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2 Purpose of Conflict Scan

The key determinant of any conflict analysis is its purpose. The purpose shapes the methodology used and the key analytical categories to be examined. For SFCG in the DRC, the conflict scan has several purposes:

a) It serves as a diagnostic tool for staff members for understanding the conflict context, people’s experiences and perceptions, as well as the local initiatives to prevent and resolve conflict. This understanding will allow the staff members together with the local partners and communities to design new project activities, and, if there are already ongoing activities, to check if they are still addressing the key factors of conflict and still strengthen the capacities for peace.

b) It is a peacebuilding activity in its own right. The participatory process of conducting a conflict scan provides the opportunity for dialogue, discussing sensitive issues, build trust and understanding among diverse actors, in a safe environment. Being part of the process, participants become proactive agents for change and can bring in ideas for initiatives to improving their lives. Furthermore, by feeding back the results to the participants, they have the opportunity to react and validate the findings, and thus, can influence the prioritization of findings and the arising proposed project activities.

c) As an ancillary benefit, and if they are asked to conduct a conflict scan, the findings of the conflict scan will be disseminated to other actors working in the field in order to inform them about the current conflict dynamics and changes in the area in order that they can plan their projects in a conflict sensitive manner.

3 Conflict Scan and Project Cycle

Usually, a thorough conflict analysis is conducted when a program and project strategy is defined or shortly after the financing of a project was secured.

During the project implementation phase, conflict scans (or updates of conflict scans) are conducted on a regular basis (about every 4-6 months), in order to check the conflict situation and if there are changes in the initially analysed context, which concern the project management or activities.
In the evaluation of the project, evaluators will check if the project design has been based on the findings of the conflict scans, if conflict scans have been conducted regularly, and if project activities have been adapted to potential changes in the context.

Conflict scans can also be conducted in areas where no projects have previously been implemented. This could be the case, where there has never been an analysis or where earlier conflict analyses might have indicated that project activities could not be implemented (due to security, lack of resources, etc.) or were not necessary. But over time, the context and dynamics could have changed and new incidents of conflict may have occurred. In this situation, a conflict scan became necessary. The scan is thus a stand-alone project, and would not be part of a project cycle yet.

4 Precautions and Conflict Sensitivity

Conducting conflict scans in a conflictive context can entail high risks for both researchers as well as people who participate in the interviews, FGDs and surveys. It is therefore important to be prepared and to ask: what are the risks of conducting a conflict scan in this context at this moment of time? Can we foresee the reactions and mitigate these risks in each situation? With keeping this in mind – the risks and reactions on mitigating the risks – is it still advisable to conduct a conflict scan? Or is the more advisable option to delay the data collection until we have more rapport with the people and can be sure risks will be effectively mitigated? The potential risks need to be assessed for each individual conflict scan, and can include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risque</th>
<th>Précaution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For SFCG staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of aggression by armed groups</td>
<td>Establish contacts with representatives of armed groups and communicate with them to ensure free movement in their areas of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total transparency on our objectives in conducting the conflict scan, and on its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train SFCG staff on communicating with armed groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of reprisal from the government due to having spoken to &quot;rebels&quot;</td>
<td>Communication by SFCG management (and donors) with relevant authorities to explain the reason for conducting the conflict scan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | Ensure strict confidentiality of the report where
5 Process of Conflict Scan

5.1 When to Conduct a Conflict Scan

Wherever SFCG has ongoing project activities, a conflict scan should be conducted on a quarterly basis and more often if there is a severe contextual change or whenever deemed necessary by staff members and decided in the dedicated meeting. Stand-alone conflict scans are conducted whenever deemed necessary by staff members or in case other organizations commission it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible; Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Conflict Scan Meeting</strong>: Discussion about the situation in the foreseen geographical area (conflict events and security issues) → decision about the necessity of conducting a conflict scan (or not)</td>
<td>Program staff; field and M&amp;E staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td><strong>Review of former conflict analyses and scans</strong> (if available on this geographical area) and <strong>literature review</strong>: review recent and important literature and contact other organizations → use the template «Modèle recherche de documentation»</td>
<td>SFCG researchers (program staff) &amp; field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td><strong>Prepare the mission and the research team and identify interview partners</strong></td>
<td>SFCG researchers (program staff) &amp; field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td><strong>Interviews, FGD, informal conversations, and participating in local dispute settlement mechanisms, i.e. Barzas</strong></td>
<td>SFCG researchers (program staff) &amp; field staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>days</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td><strong>communitaires, if possible</strong> Survey</td>
<td>field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enumerators (hired and trained in Goma/Bukavu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Debriefing</strong> with the entire research team upon return to the office</td>
<td>Research team with program/M&amp;E/management staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td><strong>Data Analysis Workshop and finding entry Points</strong> for project activities and/or adaptation of project activities</td>
<td>SFCG researchers (program staff) &amp; field staff (and reporters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td><strong>Write first draft of report</strong></td>
<td>SFCG researchers (program staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td><strong>Revision of report</strong></td>
<td>Management staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td><strong>Restitution and Validation</strong> of findings with partners, communities (in gatherings in the field), and external “experts”; Adjust the analysis</td>
<td>SFCG researchers (program staff) &amp; field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td><strong>Finalization of report</strong> including the executive summary** (2 pages) for other interested actors (donors, journalists, etc.) <strong>Write 2-pager for dissemination to local communities</strong></td>
<td>SFCG researchers (program staff) &amp; field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-7</td>
<td><strong>Dissemination</strong> of findings to local communities, journalists, partners in events</td>
<td>SFCG researchers (program staff) &amp; field staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge Management</strong> for SFCG</td>
<td>Program &amp; management staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 Conflict Scan Meeting

Every three months or when deemed necessary, program, field and M&E staff will organize a “Conflict Scan Meeting”. Based on news from field staff and project partners visiting the sites regularly, media and NGO reports about current incidents, rumors, etc., they will discuss the following:

- The current conflict situation in different areas (project and other areas)
- The current hot spots
- If there are conflicts that are affecting the project activities
- Time of last conflict scans in the different areas
- If there were any requests for conflict scans by other actors
- The status of security in these areas considering the precautions above: do the circumstances allow us to conduct a conflict scan?

→ It will be decided if and where a conflict scan is necessary and possible

### 5.3 Review of Former Conflict Analyses and Scans

If the decision has been taken to conduct a conflict scan, a preparatory step will be to revisit the conflict analysis, the baseline (if the scan will be conducted in a project area), and former conflict scans conducted in this area. Remind yourself about the main conflict factors, dynamics, the main
CONFLICT SCAN – METHODOLOGY

factors supporting peaceful relationships, and the involved actors, that were key at the time of the analysis. During the data collection of the new conflict scan, check if these factors have remained the same or if and how they have changed.

5.4 Literature Review

A short review of recent and important literature, documents, articles etc. (desk study) is a next step which helps to:

- Learn about other perceptions and viewpoints, by always keeping gender roles in mind
- Identify what information already exists and to avoid duplication, and to maximise the use of information: what are the experiences of organizations and actors in the context? What are the existing instruments and best practices to deal constructively with the identified conflicts/dynamics/actors?
- Find out who to interview and whether the list of questions for the interviews and FGD needs to be updated or complemented.

In order to do this, the following steps are recommended:

- Check the SFCG literature database
- Check if there are relevant and recently published books and articles on (the Northeast of) the DRC.
- Contact a few organizations (via phone or visit) that work in the area and check with them whether they recently have published reports or conducted conflict analyses to share, and find out about their current activities in peacebuilding (-> see Annex for a list of potential organisations to be contacted)
- Undertake also a google research and scan some relevant websites (-> see Annex)
- Note important issues on the template: Modèle «Notes de recherche de documentation»!

5.5 Identifying Interview Partners and Setting up a Research Team

➢ Establish a preliminary meeting list of potential interview partners. If possible, this list should be shared with partners in the field to get further suggestions.

The sample of interview partners should include as many diverse viewpoints and voices as possible, with particular attention to those groups perceived to be parties of the conflict. Ideally, representatives from the following groups/actors/stakeholders are interviewsed (also see suggestions in table below):

- Partner organizations (executive directors, program managers, field staff)
- Government officials and representatives from the local level,
- Local authorities, political leaders
- Religious leaders
- Communities from different ethnic groups
- People on the street/“average citizens”
Inclusivity-game

While sitting in a circle as a focus group, everyone receives a small sheet of paper and a pen. 1 person writes down what she wishes to do (in future) (example: work in peacebuilding/organize a dialogue/become president/...) and the person next to her writes on her small sheet why she would do it, without knowing, what “it” is, respectively what the person next to her wrote down (example: because I like to live in peace/because I want to do s.th. for my country/because I have a small daughter...). The next person writes again what she wishes to do, and the person next to her why she would do it, until everybody has written s.th. on their sheets (including facilitators, project managers, etc.).

Then, one after the other reads out loudly what she/he wrote, and a person who wrote what and the person who wrote why who sit next to each other, read it out as a “couple” (even though they don’t know from each other, what the other wrote). It is very funny to realize how the different statements somehow match (or not). The game helps greatly to re-include everybody into the group and loosen up the discussion.

- Civil society representatives (staff of NGOs, women’s groups, journalists, activists, social workers)
- Teachers
- Intellectuals
- Representatives of international organizations
- If possible, security forces, armed groups

Of these interview partners, it is important to include:

- Both women and men, as they may have different and complementary information and perspectives. different ethnic groups,
- Individuals of all relevant ages;
- People in positions of authority as well as those over whom authority is exercised;
- People from different social strata (not only elites!)

For the report, it will be important to declare these categories of people that you have the information from.

In many conflict zones, society is polarized and fragmented. Some groups may hold unpopular or “politically incorrect” views; while others are deliberately quiet and reluctant to speak. These may represent particular challenges for data collection—but should not be ignored, as they may represent important viewpoints. This problem can be approached in many different and creative ways (see box for an example by a SFCG facilitator). Also, write such difficulties down as observations.

- **Set up a research team of 3-4 persons:** what is a good mix of team members with certain expertise and knowledge of the context? Are there any reasons to deviate from the norm of a mixed-gender team? How will the composition affect the conflict dynamics? How will the team be perceived, in terms of potential biases or links with actors/parties? Are there security risks for any of the team members?
- **Establish a schedule for the interviews:** do this by consulting and checking with the interlocutors: what date and daytime does fit them best? Check news about current security in the context.
- Decide on where and with whom to conduct the survey and hire and train enumerators to go to the field and collect data with help of the iPad.
- **Inform and consult other key stakeholders** about the endeavor, in order to identify synergies and avoid duplicative efforts.
Be aware of security risks: Will you endanger people just by interviewing them? Will you endanger yourself or your team? -> A conflict scan should not be conducted if risks are too high! (see “Precautions” above).

5.6 Data Collection in the Field

For the conflict scan, a qualitative and quantitative method mix will be applied. With the literature review findings in mind, semi-structured interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) will be conducted with the identified interlocutors in the field. In addition, interviews with individuals that cannot be visited could be conducted via phone/Skype calls. A list of questions that is based on SFCG’s matrix of the “5 Ws” serves as guidance (-> see separate document). Per research team and per day, 3-4 interviews or 2 FGDs à 1-2 hours (in order to have sufficient time to build trust and discuss the issues more profoundly) should be envisaged, depending on the conditions (distance between interlocutors, security, time, etc.).

Participant observation: while conducting interviews and FGDs, the researchers and reporters join in and take care to observe the conversation, group dynamics, activities, and write down notes for reflections later on. In addition, observations of the environment and people while traveling to the interview location could provide important indices about the conflict and should be noted down and shared with team members.

Informal conversations on the market, in a shop, in the hotel, at the bus stand, etc. with random people can be an important source for learning about what is on people’s minds and therefore, should be conducted whenever possible.

Participating in Barzas communautaires (community gatherings) or other local mechanisms for dispute settlement if possible could be an alternative for FGDs to discuss the conflict context and to learn how people deal with it in the everyday.

The qualitative information will be noted down by the reporters into their note books and later typed in a table organized into questions and matching answers and sent to the SFCG staff members who will write the report.

Surveys: In order to support the qualitative answers from the interviews and FGDs, a small quantitative survey of approx. 10 questions will be conducted (-> see survey guideline). The survey should be conducted with members of „community networks“, local leaders from different villages, local journalists, and local people from different sides/ethnic groups/villages and age groups.

- Make sure that the FGDs, interviews, participatory observation, and also the survey are conducted in a “safe” environment, where people feel comfortable to speak
Be sensitive about reactions and emotions and ask differently if a question causes discomfort.

Try to gain a gender-balanced picture of the conflict situation by asking women and men about their opinion, experience, ideas and recommendations.

Facilitate a dialogue rather than an interrogation, and enable people to bring in their views, ideas, and recommendations; let them become proactive agents for change that can bring in ideas for initiatives to improving their lives.

After the data collection is completed, a debriefing with the whole research team takes place upon return to the office. This serves to discuss and exchange the conflict scan regarding the application of the methodology (what went well and went did not, and why) and content (the observations and impressions of the research and results). The points discussed should feed into the knowledge management. This should take place with the program/M&E/management staff members.

**Overview of Methodology for Conflict Scan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>No. of interviews</th>
<th>No. of FGDs</th>
<th>No. Surveys</th>
<th>No. of interlocutors per FGD/ interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program/fiel d staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview (1-2 hrs), (10 interviews, 3-4 interviews per day =&gt; approx. 3 days in total)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 program staff of SFCG, 2 rapporteurs from Goma/Bukavu, 1-2 translators if necessary (group can split up in 2 and conduct interviews/FGDs simultaneously)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD (1-2 hrs), (7 FGDs, 2 per day =&gt; approx. 3-4 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local leaders from different villages</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security forces</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members of community networks</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women associations</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approx. 8-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant observations</td>
<td>program staff of SFCG, rapporteurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random, short conversation s</td>
<td>program staff of SFCG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey approx. 5 days (in parallel to interviews and FGDs)</td>
<td>3 Enumerators Local communities from different villages (women, men, young, old); members of community networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total per conflict scan</td>
<td>1 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. No. of persons covered</td>
<td>10 7 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.7 Data Analysis**

In the data analysis process, the collected ‘raw’ data will be translated into meaningful information by verifying it, compiling and summarizing it, comparing it to other information, and identifying key findings that require action. In other words: prioritize your data! This is best done in a workshop setting. The SFCG research team and other staff members (field, program, M&E) and partners – who were not involved in data collection and can thus bring in an “outsider” view – come together in the Analysis Workshop for 1-2 days. This joint and participatory analysis process serves several purposes:

- **Building common ground**: the participants learn about each other’s understanding and viewpoints of the conflict and can reach a common understanding of it, or, in the case of differences, the points of and reasons for disagreement. A common understanding is important for writing the report, but even more for the project design later on, and the definition of a theory of change for the project.
- **Validating the collected findings** (more on this below).

**Analysis Process:**

- In the workshop, as a first step, reflect about the different analyzed conflicts, and identify themes or types of conflicts (land, governance, community, ethnic, generation, resources, etc.): which conflicts are those that are the most recurrent mentioned in the interviews, FGDs, and in the survey?
- Select 3-4 conflicts that are seen as most worrisome in the area and analyze them: Fill the collected information from the literature review and the field research into the 4-Box Analysis, which will serve as a basis for the use of the other analysis tools, that will be applied next:
### Key Actors

**Which individuals or groups in the situation are in a position to strongly influence the conflict positively? Who can decide for peace? Is it men or women?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Factors For Positive Change</th>
<th>Key Factors Against Positive Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the forces in the situation that exist now that can be built upon to promote movement towards peace/positive change? What currently connects people across conflict lines? How do people cooperate? Who exercises leadership for peace and how? (These are not things you want to exist or that you would like to see—they must be true now.)</td>
<td>What are factors that are most critical to pushing against positive change? What factors, issues or elements are causing conflict and/or dividing people, and how?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Actors**

Which individuals or groups in the situation are in a position to strongly influence the conflict negatively? Who can decide against peace? What roles do women and men play?

---

**Note:**

A key driver (factor or actor) is an element—an issue in contention or the role/behavior of certain people—without which the current situation would not exist or would be significantly different.

Key Driving Factors are those that are most critical to pushing for and against positive change. If we want to contribute to positive change, our programming must address these drivers by supporting drivers that push for change or overcoming barriers that resist it.

Key Actors are the people who can say yes or no to significant positive lasting change. Key actors are those with whose action or support change becomes possible...or whose counter-productive behavior/role currently makes positive change impossible. Key actors are often the power brokers in a given context, though their roles are not always easily visible or even widely-known, especially to outsiders.

**Caution:** key actors are not necessarily target participants of your project, such as women, youth, or religious leaders. We may be interested in engaging with those groups, but they are not always “key” in the situation.

Dynamics are the longer term trends shaping the conflict constellation and shorter term events that have an influence on the evolution of the conflict and fragility. Understanding conflict dynamics will help identify windows of opportunity, in particular through the use of scenario building, which aims to assess different possible developments and think through appropriate responses.

**Source:** CDA Training Manual “Practical Tools for Promoting Positive Change”, 2014.

- In a next step, apply the three **analysis tools** listed below and add other tools from the tool box, depending on what needs to be focused on in the certain context (factors? Actors? Long or short term trends and dynamics?) (-> see tool box with more tools, description and guidelines for each tool):
  - **Conflict and solution tree** – a tool for analyzing the factors of conflict or peace: structural/root causes (roots), the core problem/conflict factor/issue (trunk) and the effects/symptoms of the conflict (branches).
  - **Connectors & dividers analysis** – to identify the factors supporting peace and those undermining it.
  - **Actors mapping** – to place the actors in relation to the conflict and to each other, to identify the nature of relationships between them and their power position and alignments.
Additionally, compare the conflict scans of different geographical areas: are there similar conflicts, drivers, actors and dynamics in the various areas? What factors/actors have remained consistent in which zone and which have changed in which zone and why? Are there any patterns that you can recognize? Document these patterns in the report under the chapter “4. Conclusion d’Analyse”.

5.8 First Draft of Report
After the joint analysis of findings, a first draft of the report will be written by the staff member of SFCG who conducted the conflict scan (program staff) for the purpose of SFCG’s project management. The report contains the analyzed findings from the interviews and FGDs (key driving factors and actors for conflict and positive lasting change, connectors and dividers, dynamics, and actors relationships, etc., illustrated with visualizations. Identified ideas for entry points that can be easily translated into project activities, as well as a short overview of the methodology, and the interview guideline (as annexes) will also be included (-> see template of report).

In addition, for the validation and restitution of findings to the interview/FGD interlocutors, prepare 1-2 pages summary of the report in the local language with the visualizations of the analysis.

The first draft and 1-2 pagers will be revised by the management and/or other program staff.

5.9 Validation of Analysis and Restitution of Findings
After the analysis is completed and the first draft of report is written, it will need to be validated, in order to be sure that it is as accurate and correct as possible. “Accurate” and “correct” means that as many groups to the conflict as possible could agree with it, meaning, it has to include the different views. It is important to find ways of including the different and contrasting views in the analysis, because the different understandings of the conflict and reasons for conflict might be a key factor of the divergences of groups in the conflict. Otherwise, one runs the risk of fueling the conflict with the analysis.

- Organize a Validation Workshop/Meeting. The workshop should be attended by staff members (those who were involved in the analysis and others) and – if possible – 3-5 invited context “experts” are participating. These experts can be staff members of other organizations that just conducted a conflict analysis in this geographical area, academics who work on this area, journalists who know this area well, etc.
- Together, discuss the analysis, the different viewpoints, and how they can be included into the analysis as a compromise.
- After the workshop, adjust and refine the analysis (draft report) accordingly.
- Simultaneously or after, organize a validation and restitution event/hearing for the interlocutors of the interviews and FGDs (local communities, local leaders and authorities, journalists and partners):

Disseminate the 1-2 pagers of the report and present the findings (the 4 box analysis, the tree, the actors map, connectors and dividers) with help of flipcharts/power point presentation (to 10-50
persons). Take time to discuss it and note down the feedback from the audience. These restitution events will serve as:

- A dialogue among participants and with SFCG staff members, who are present and moderating the sessions
- A validation of the analysis. By feeding back the results to the local communities, they have the opportunity to react and validate the findings, and thus, can influence the prioritization of findings and the arising proposed project activities. What do they think of the analysis? Do they agree? Do they have additional inputs and ideas? What needs to be changed? The feedback of the audience should be documented and used to adjust the conflict scan.

5.10 Finding Entry Points for Project Activities

Based on the completed and validated analysis, respective peacebuilding needs and appropriate entry points for new project activities will be identified, given the mandate, capacity and interests of an institution (resources, expertise and partners) and the activities (past and present, successful or not) by other key actors.

- Organize a meeting or workshop with program and management staff (decisions need to be taken).
- Review the prioritized conflict driving factors and factors that work against positive lasting change and how they can be reduced. Check the factors and actors that work for a positive lasting change (peace factors and connectors) and how they could be strengthened. Discuss the following questions:
  a) What measures and actions could help to reduce or eliminate obstacles, resistance from actors, in particular those that are most strong? What does and can you or your organization do to positively influence these people who are reluctant to engage in conflict resolution in your area?
  b) What measures and actions could strengthen driving forces, the motivation of actors, in particular those are most important? What does and can you or your organization do to increase the motivation of these actors who support conflict resolution in your area?
- The results will be discussed in the group and written down. You can compare them with what came out in other areas, after a conflict scan was conducted. They will then be included in the report.
- Once the entry points are selected, the application of the Change Matrix (CDA)\(^1\), the development of the theory of change and other planning steps of the project cycle management will be contemplated in a different setting.

\(^1\) The Change Matrix by CDA for project design helps to identify if a project is addressing “individual/personal change” or “socio-political change”, and if it works with “more people” or “key people”. Lasting change can be achieved if change at the socio-political level is created, and if a project works with “more people” AND “key people”. Find the matrix here: http://www.cdacollaborative.org/media/90136/RPP-Change-Matrix_Plus.pdf and explanation here: http://www.cdacollaborative.org/media/94317/rpp-i-participant-training-manual.pdf.
5.11 Adapting Project Management and Activities

If the conflict scan was conducted in an area of an ongoing project, the changed factors and actors might require adaptations in the project management and project activities. These can concern the following three fields:

- **Partners/stakeholders**, i.e. change of implementing partner
- **Project/program**, i.e. adjustment of activities and project logframe or adjustment of the budget for the training of staff members
- **Organization**, i.e. implement more flexibility as a working principle

➢ Organize a meeting or workshop (could be part of analysis workshop) with program and management staff (decisions need to be taken).
➢ Jointly discuss possible project adaptations and institutional constraints (resources, donor expectations, etc.).
   → The process of identifying appropriate and relevant revisions requires creativity and a constant cross-checking with the conflict scan findings (strategies and actions must be linked to and stem from the conflict scan).

5.12 Dissemination of Findings

a) **Report for SFCG:**

After the validation process, the report needs to be revised and finalized according to the report template, and the entry points for project activities that were identified and discussed in the workshop mentioned above need to be included. Once finalized, the report should be shared with the country director, the Institutional Learning Team and the Head Offices.

b) **Feedback for local communities, local leaders and authorities, journalists and partners:**

For the local communities, local leaders and authorities, as well as journalists and partners, the validated findings could be transformed into project activities and redistributed, for example, in the following manner:

   → The findings could be illustrated with image boxes and/or could serve for a next “Mopila”-story.
   → In addition, the findings could be taken up by the theatre group to inform communities about the and to use the findings in their next play.
   → Furthermore, the findings could be disseminated as part of a radio program, in order to inform people. A call-in session could again serve as a feedback channel.

c) **For other organizations/public:**

An executive summary could be used for dissemination to other organizations or to the public.

   ➔ **Confidentiality of findings:** Be aware that the raw data is confidential! The written report is also meant to be confidential and only for internal SFCG use. The 1-2 pages summary and
the analysis visualisations for the interlocutors (local communities, leaders, journalists, and partners) and other organisations working in the field are meant to be public.

6 Updating the Conflict Scan

In order for the findings to remain updated, and instead of conducting the conflict scan from scratch in the same zones after every 4-6 months, the findings can be updated. During the conflict scan meeting, revisit the report and analysis visualizations (actors map, tree, etc.) and discuss, based on information received while working in the zone on project activities and with partners: Have there been rather small changes and thus, is an update of the “old” conflict scan sufficient, or have there been rather significant changes that ask for a new conflict scan? If you decide to conduct an update or “light” version of conflict scan, proceed as follows:

- Conduct a mini data collection by focusing on the identified driving factors and actors and how they have changed and why, and by finding out what new ones have come up, by using both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods:
  - **Quantitative**: Conduct a survey with 50 people from different villages and communities/ethnic groups. Focus on those questions that you identified as key in the previous conflict scan, and ask if the findings from the last survey are still accurate, if the situation has changed (positively or negatively) by indicating the change on a scale between 1-5.
  - **Qualitative**: In addition, conduct 7 interviews while visiting the field for other project activities (or via phone calls), in order to gain more detailed information that could support the answers from the survey. Informal conversations with security forces and local people from different sides/ethnic groups/villages, and participatory observation will further contribute to the data collection.

- Depending on the extent of change, decide to either fill in new 4 box-tables and draw new actors mappings and trees, or to revise the “old” maps/tables according to the new findings.
- Again, compare the conflict scans of different geographical areas: are there similar conflicts, drivers, actors and dynamics in the various areas? What factors/actors have remained consistent in which zone and which have changed in which zone and why? Are there any patterns that you can recognize?
- Revise the “old” report by adding/deleting changes.

We suggest to conduct a new conflict scan every 8-12 months, and updates/“light” conflict scan every 4-6 months – depending on the changes in the context.

7 Knowledge Management

For the purpose of knowledge management and sharing within the organization, this methodology, the lessons learned of working with it, and the findings of the conflict scans can be shared as suggested in the following table:
### Methodology

#### Simple and self-explaining guidelines, templates, questionnaires (provided by Swisspeace)

- LL-Template: to be filled in after every conflict analysis and conflict scan: what went well, what didn’t when using this method/guidelines/questionnaires/templates? How should they be amended?
  - Could be integrated into SFCG’s knowledge management system (i.e. into ToRs/ mission reports)

### 8 Pillars and Variables of a Conflict Scan

The philosophy of a conflict scan is flexible, yet it maintains certain key features as described above. The following table provides a clear idea of the pillars and some of the variables of a conflict scan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillars</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– To understand the evolution and dynamics of conflicts</td>
<td>– Analyze and identify conflicts between and within communities based on a geographical location</td>
<td>– Action-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– To plan or adapt program / project activities (of SFCG and partners) based on the specificities of the context and changing dynamics</td>
<td>– Provide new information</td>
<td>– Quick (1 month maximum to conduct scan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– To ensure that SFCG and / or other actors do no harm</td>
<td>– Provide a snapshot of the situation</td>
<td>– Small scope of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– To promote dialogue and reflection and reduce tensions</td>
<td>– Provide recommendations</td>
<td>– Short report (15 pages maximum without annexes including purpose, summary of methodology, context, findings and recommendations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Provide analysis of risks</td>
<td>– Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Produce a short final report</td>
<td>– Developed together with communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Communicate back to communities and other actors</td>
<td>– Targeted at actors who are implementing activities in the area and the communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | – Is repeated in response to changes in local dynamics (e.g. conflicts, installation of a mining company, new outside actors, ...)
| | | – Based on a qualitative approach |
| | | – Conducted by trained and skilled people |
9 Conflict Scan Plan

As a recap of the previous sections, a conflict scan follows the basic general plan:

• A conflict scan can be conducted for the following reasons:
  • To provide information for the design of a project or for planning project activities
  • To understand recent changes in a conflict context

• A conflict scan will study the general conflict dynamics in an area
  • You might also decide to include a focus on specific issues, like gender relations, youth dynamics, humanitarian interventions, or economic activities

• The methodology can include:
  • Qualitative methods
  • Quantitative methods
  • Participatory methods

• Field assessments can take anywhere from 1 to 2 weeks
  • The assessment can focus on a small area (a few villages), or a larger area like a province or an entire country

• The analysis process must be conducted quickly while the information remains topical
  • The final report should be light - no more than 15 pages long

• The report should be shared back with the community and presented to SFCG staff
  • The report can also be shared with any other actors who are interested, such as government, humanitarian or economic actors

• The conflict scan can be used as a basis for SFCG and the community to design peacebuilding activities together
  • Other actors can also use it to ensure that their work contributes to peacebuilding as well, and does no harm
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Annex

Resources for data collection

For the data collection, the following websites should be checked:

- African Confidential: http://africanconfidential.com/
- Peacebuilding Data: http://www.peacebuildingdata.org/research/drc
- Etc.
The following local and international CSOs, government institutions, and the media publish regular reports that contain useful information or analysis about different types of conflicts in the DRC, and should be checked for each conflict scan:

International Alert, Pax, Life and Peace Institute, African Initiative Program, Pole Institute, UNDP, UNICEF, UNHCR, OCHA, UN Habitat, MONUSCO Civil Affairs Section, Congo Leadership Initiative, Usalama Project, COOPI, Cesvi, Welthungerhilfe, Solidarités, Norwegian Refugee Council, Oxfam Quebec and GB, Première Urgence, Christian Aid, ASP, AAP (Action d’Aide Pour la Paix, aident les paysans avec des conseils et moyen financier pour demander des documents légaux de terre), PRPDE (Programme de Reconstruction et Pacification pour le Développement Economique), NRCF (Noyo de Résolution Conflits fonciers), CAFPD (Collectif des Associations Féminin de Paix et Développement, travaillent sur la résolution des conflits fonciers par dialogues, médiation, théâtre, chansons, etc.), EAD, SCC (Save Communities in Conflict), ADAPEV, ACPD, AMIDI, SABACO (Savons de Bassin du Congo), Fondation Buhini, VIJI.P.CO (Vision des Jeunes Intercommunautaires pour la Paix et la Cohabitation Pacifique), FPD, l’église 8iem CEPAC à Pinga ...

*to be completed and updated.*