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1. Executive Summary
The Tomorrow is a New Day (TND), Phase II project was funded by the European Union (EU) and implemented in twelve communities in four states in the Delta Region over a two-year period by SFCG and five implementing partners. It was awarded a budget of EUR 5,000,000. The overall objective of this project was to scale up past successes recorded under phase one to sustain them and to ensure long-term stability and functioning peace architecture in the Niger Delta Region. The project was to run for a total of 24 months and had four\(^1\) key objectives and its main beneficiaries were community leaders, youth and women leaders.

1.1. Objectives of the Evaluation
The main objectives of the final evaluation are to assess the two DAC criteria: 1) the project’s effectiveness, and will focus on the accountability aspect, i.e. to find out whether the project has been implemented as intended and whether it has achieved the expected results, and 2) assess the quality of partnerships of the implementing partners. It shall focus on the same objectives as the mid-term evaluation with the aim of providing enriched results.

The evaluation focuses on Objective 1, 2 and the cross-cutting objective.

- TND II Objective 1: Culture of non-violence in the region is enhanced through a collective, inclusive vision of reintegration and increased local capacities;
- TND II Objective 2: Increased participation of community members in ensuring a peaceful and credible 2015 electoral process in targeted regions and;
- TND II Cross-cutting objective: Capacity and knowledge to implement this kind of programming is reinforced.

The results of the final evaluation are to inform both the project and the donor about the overall performance of the project, to identify lessons learned and to make recommendations for future similar projects.

1.1.2. Evaluation Methodology
The Terms of Reference, matrix and tools were designed by Jessica Sjolander, the Design, Monitoring & Evaluation Africa Specialist, with the Nigerian team providing feedback. The data collection team was made up of a total of 7 SFCG staff drawn from the Jos and Port Harcourt office.

In July 2016, the team of 7 went from state to state starting from Ogu community in Rivers State, Ogbia in Bayelsa Stata, Koko in Delta State and rounded up in Osu in Abia state. In each state the team of 7 split into groups of 3 or 2 depending on the category of interview to be conducted and the time of the interview. Daily debrief and planning sessions were held with the team.

A qualitative method approach was adopted in order to gather mainly qualitative data. An online survey for the partners was also included which included both qualitative and some quantitative data. The evaluation carried out an exhaustive literature review, 12 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), 27 Key Informant Interviews as well as Site Visits. Taking into account the qualitative nature of the data, the evaluation team has also drawn on from data extracted from the mid-term evaluation. Effectiveness as one of OECD/DAC criteria for evaluation was explored to measure the extent to

\(^1\) Objective 1: Culture of non-violence in the region is enhanced through a collective, inclusive vision of reintegration and increased local capacities; Objective 2: Increased participation of community members in ensuring a peaceful and credible 2015 electoral process in targeted regions; Objective 3: Enhanced collaboration and communication between authorities and communities to increase level of security in targeted communities and; Objective 4: Improved local decision-making through enhanced involvement of women in community governance and public affairs
which the aid activity provoked or likely provoked the intended changes and whether it reached its intended objectives, in a well-timed manner. The FGD and KII tools were designed to be participatory and gather relevant information according to the key evaluative themes, however this was not able to be triangulated with quantitative data. The surveys were distributed to the partners and a total of seven partners provided their feedback.

In the final evaluation a one-day training with the team took place, where the team used role play to pre-test the tools and be sure everyone clearly understood the tools and the objective of the evaluation as all team members were involved in previous evaluations and familiar with the process. In order to maintain confidentiality, only the titles of the KII participants were noted, and therefore no names are mentioned in this report.

A total of 12 FGDs and 27 KII s were held in the four communities. The evaluation consulted with community leaders, youths, women, CDCs, representatives of LPCs and IRCs; training participants, media viewers, electoral process participants, staff of SFCG and IPs. This evaluation was carried out in Ogu, Amairi- Osusu in Abia State, Ogbia in Bayelsa State, and Koko in Delta State.

1.2. Key Findings

1.2.1. Effectiveness of the Project

During the collection of data in July 2016, it was noted that the status of conflict remains at the same levels as at the mid-term evaluation, especially in places such as Omoku, Ogbia and Ogu. Subsequent to the mid-term evaluation which took place from late September to October 2015, very few activities have taken place. To this end, while, there is strong evidence to suggest that the activities carried out prior to the mid-term evaluation were effective in reducing conflict and maintaining peace through the various skills training provided to the local leaders and community members, improvement beyond this date was not found. Nonetheless, it should be duly noted that the participants in the activities under TND II continue to use the tools they acquired under the project and these continue to have an important and positive impact on curtailing the level of conflict at the community level where they received trainings.

A major factor in the effectiveness of TND II and this lasting impact is displayed through one of its main achievements which has enabled the trust and confidence in the local communities and other key actors and allowing the recipients to understand the importance of dialogue prior to resorting to violence. Nonetheless, this confidence did not extend to some of the security forces and government under TND II, and this still impacts on the security in certain areas. The Local Project Committees (LPCs) are regarded as a particularly important mechanism by the local communities and some external stakeholders and there is consensus that these structures have facilitated collaboration and helped develop more coherent responses to peace-building, conflict management and electoral process at the local level.

If we examine the activities foreseen for the project, unfortunately many of the activities were either partially achieved or not achieved at all. Under Objective One, which had three key results, under Result One 43% of the activities were achieved, 43% partially achieved and 14% not achieved at all; under Result Two, both activities were achieved, so it achieved 100% performance according to the

---

2 With a total of 97 participants
3 The final report was issued in January 2016
Despite this poor performance in reaching indicators as expressed in the project's log frame, and some activities not taking place due to the shortage of funds, the general consensus concludes that the project was effective and had a positive impact on promoting a culture of non-violence and an increased participation of community members in ensuring a peaceful and credible 2015 electoral process in the targeted regions.

All of the persons consulted in both the focus groups and in the key informant interviews did state that the project had helped them understand the advantages of using dialogue over violence. Many of the respondents noted that this has not only had a positive effect on the community, ensuring that issues are now solved without conflict, but has had a spill over effect on how they conduct themselves with their own families.

Another important factor in the effectiveness of TND II and one of its foremost achievements is the high level of trust gained from the local people. The all-inclusive community-driven LPCs are vital structures in the peace process and their good level of acceptance by the local people themselves is the key factor in the effectiveness of TND II. An added factor in TND II effectiveness is that the LPCs provide an avenue for community people and groups including marginalized ones to participate in the decision making process as well as the fact that the LPCs and Information Resource Centres (IRCs) are central in promoting collaboration between the communities and external actors. Also, electoral activities undertaken by the project to prevent electoral violence around the 2015 elections was principally effective and contributed to an enhanced peaceful atmosphere before, during and after the general elections in the communities. Nonetheless, while there is little room for doubt that the project contributed to understanding of and a desire for peaceful elections, 2015 was one of the most peaceful elections in the history of democratic elections in Nigeria. So while the project would have contributed to more knowledge on the importance of peaceful elections it is unsure whether the peaceful elections could be directly attributed to the activities conducted under the project. Furthermore, it is unlikely that the project contributed to an increase in participation in the electoral process. While reliable statistics are not available to prove this, many of the comments indicated that the beneficiaries of the trainings did not vote more in the
**last elections as compared to the previous elections, which took place prior to the project taking place.**

With reference to the quality of partnerships of the implementing partners, as reiterated in the mid-term evaluation, an improved organizational capacity of implementing partners is one place where the TND II has scored a major breakthrough. The trainings for staff of SFCG and the five Implementing Partners were elaborate enough to cover a wide range of activities targeted at helping over 2,000 community leaders and members strengthened their individual and collective conflict resolution skills. Specific areas of capacity building included hands-on skills training on mediation and dialogue, conflict transformation, transformational leadership, communication and M&E. The different Training of Trainers and follow-up activities greatly improved field officers’ and organizational capacities to effectively deliver on the project in the four states. There is absolutely no doubt, that as well as the project achieving a number of its key objectives, it also built capacity within partners to address conflict and related issues.

The key recommendations are as follows:

1. To regain the trust and confidence of the communities, implementing partners will have to conduct field visits to ensure that their possible needs are looked into, new bridges will need to be built;

2. However a new extension/project will need the assurances of a stronger financial system to be in place at SFCG to ensure regular cash flow to the implementing teams of SFCG and to the partners, avoiding the latest to lose face before the communities;

3. While this particular evaluation took place a few months after the closure of the project, and it is evident that a non-violent approach is embedded into community practice, follow up activities need to be ensured. These need to be practical and to find ways of connecting different communities with others to ensure that the project has a spill over effect on key communities. These should not only include capacity building tools but possible micro grants so that the beneficiaries can put the tools to good use.

4. A new project should concentrate its efforts on promoting more female and youth participation in community decision-making process as well as at local governmental level.

5. A new project should examine the needs of the security and ex militants and design components of the project to ensure their full participation in a future project.

6. A more comprehensive monitoring and evaluation programme should follow a future programme, to ensure that key activities are conducted and that the project is able to follow the same trajectory as envisaged in the original log frame. Local context as well as possible political, economic and social factors should feed into the regular monitoring to the project to ensure its effectiveness and possible changes that are required.

7. A more robust internal and external communication system needs to be put in place at SFCG and between SFCG and the partners and target beneficiaries, especially with regards to any activities not being able to be implemented. While town hall meetings are important to call should changes in the project occur, it is equally important to ensure that all relevant persons are communicated to with regards to any changes, which will impact on the effectiveness or the impact of the project.
2.0. Programme Background

2.1.1. About Search for Common Ground
Search for Common Ground (SFCG) is an international non-profit organization operating in over 40 countries whose mission is to transform the way the world deals with conflict away from adversarial approaches toward cooperative solutions. Its headquarters are in Washington D.C., USA and in Brussels, Belgium with offices in 34 countries around the world. SFCG began working in Nigeria in 2004 to encourage understanding across ethnic and religious lines. It facilitates inclusive dialogue and collaborative decision-making on vital issues like accountability, corruption, transparency, and peaceful conflict resolution. To do this, SFCG works with media, academic, government, and local partners.

2.1.2. About the 'Tomorrow is a New Day Phase II Project’
The first phase of the project, "Tomorrow is a New Day: Supporting Community-Level Conflict Resolution and Reintegration of Ex-Militants to Promote Stability in the Niger Delta" (TND I), aimed to support community conflict resolution and reconciliation in seven “trend-setting communities”, to leverage changes in these communities to influence conflict dynamics across the Niger Delta and to facilitate access to information and dialogue inclusive of marginalized and alternative voices in the region.

The seven trend setting communities under TND I are Okrika, Ogu and Kpor (Rivers State), Oporoza and Koko (Delta State), Amassoma and Kaiama (Bayelsa State) while under TND II, five new communities were added, which are Ogbia (Bayelsa State), Uzere (Delta State), Omoku (Rivers State), Azumini and Amairi-Ususu (Abia State). Those communities have been selected on the basis of their diversity in several key aspects including the size of the communities, the conflict history and legacy, the number of ex-militants in the area and the relationship between these and the communities and between the security forces and the communities.

The second phase of the project Tomorrow is a New Day, Phase II: Building a Peace Architecture in the Niger Delta for 2015 and Beyond (TND II) started in April 2014. It was implemented by SFCG in partnership with 5 Implementing Partners (IPs): namely Centre for Environment, Human Rights and Development (CEHRD), Community Initiative for Enhanced Peace and Development (CIEPD), Citizens Direct Network (CDN), Leadership Institute for Transformation and Empowerment - Africa (LITE-Africa) and Institute for Media and Society (IMESO). In its second phase, the project’s initial budget was Euro 5,000,000 however only about half of that amount was actually engaged by SFCG by the project closure.

The project ended on 4th April 2016, however many of the planned activities subsequent to the mid-
term evaluation did not take place due to the lack of available funds. While the first half of the project yielded good results, the project faced numerous challenges during the second year with regards to the timely implementation of activities largely because of internal controls that resulted in cash flow issues. This was as a result of an audit that was carried out previously on SFCG at an earlier phase of the project, which resulted in a large amount of disallowances. To mitigate this from happening, SFCG endeavored to improve its internal control systems and therefore had to prevent the cash flow.

Prior to the foreseen end of the project, SFCG requested a six-month no-cost extension in order to allow the project enough time to implement a number of the remaining activities. However, SFCG failed to convince the European Union of the importance of extending the project further, hence SFCG and the EU were unable to reach a mutual agreement and the request was not granted. To this end, the project was closed on 4th April 2016: while that was foreseen by the original contract, the SFCG team had remained hopeful until the last day that an extension would be granted and that activities could continue. Given the long negotiations and the break in activities, this meant a number of activities were unable to be implemented and the project came to a foreseen yet unplanned halt, to the dismay of many of the project’s recipients. Recipients were advised of the closure of the project during the second quarter of 2016, through SFCG who conducted small “town hall” type meetings with the key project stakeholders in the targeted communities in all four states. Nonetheless, many of the participants of the FGDs and KILs were hugely disappointed at the flow of communication surrounding this decision, and some stated, that they simply no longer saw the implementers anymore.

2.1.3 Project Goal and Objectives

This 2nd phase of the project was born out of the successes of the 1st phase that run in 2010-2012. The main goal of this Two-year project, which commenced in April 2014 and culminated in April 2016, was to work with partners at the community-level, local authorities, and at the state level to support locally driven conflict transformation, reduce tensions among youth, support the electoral process and establish strong linkages for local community decision-making and problem-solving. This is supported by four specific programming objectives and cross-cutting objectives:

1) Sustaining a culture of non-violence and peace;
2) Increased participation of community members in electoral process;
3) Enhanced involvement of women into local decision making, community governance and public affairs;
4) Enhanced collaboration between authorities and communities for security;
5) Capacity and knowledge needed for implementation reinforced.

While the project has four key objectives4, only the first two objectives are under scrutiny in this final evaluation as well as the one relating to capacity and knowledge of the partners to implement the project.

2.1.4 Expected Outcomes/Results

The main expected results of the TND II Project are (i) community leaders and key stakeholders are trained and engaged in conflict transformation programming; (ii) increased acceptance of non-violent methods for conflict resolution within target areas; (iii) citizens have increased awareness of their rights and obligations related to elections environment; coalitions of stakeholders, including business, non-state actors, local, state and federal authorities are developed to achieve regional peace; enhanced collaboration between communities and security units for early warning and

4 These include Objective One – Culture of Non Violence, Objective Two – Democratic Participation, Objective Three – Coalitions for Security and Objective Four – Women’s Participation.
response to violence; women leaders play an enhanced role in public decision-making and peace initiatives. A summary of TND II Project objectives, outputs and activities is provided in Annex I.

2.1.5. SFCG Approach and Project Groups
To achieve TND II’s overall goal and specific objectives results thus creating positive changes, SFCG implemented a multi-layer programme of activities working with local communities and partners at the community-level, local authorities, civil society and government stakeholders at the state-level to support locally-driven conflict transformation, reduce tensions, support the electoral process and establish strong linkages for community decision-making and problem-solving in partnership with the five IPs. SFCG’s approach focused primarily upon three key groups namely community leaders (traditional and religious leaders, security actors, and other respected local stakeholders, youths (amnesty participants and non-participants, etc.) and women leaders including mothers of ex-militants.

3. Conflict Analysis in the 4 Target Communities

3.1. About the Conflict in Koko Community
Despite the fact that normalcy has returned to the community a number of years ago - the collaborative efforts of the Delta State Government, community leaders, youths, women and other key actors, the crisis between the Ijaws and Itsekiris that rendered many dead, several others homeless and properties destroyed as a result of the burnings that took place then - still remains unforgettable in the minds of the people of Koko community because they suffered the most. The main victims of that crisis and restlessness were the youths including ex-militants.
It was noted that the rate of youth unemployment is very high and in 2015, a crisis situation was averted when the local contractors working within the locality refused to engage some youths from both Koko and the neighbouring Ijaw communities. Youths from both Koko and their neighbours used to serve as blockages before, but today, they hardly block oil workers. The almost non-inclusion of youths and freedom fighters is beginning to prompt them to hinder the decision making process in Koko. Even though youths have dropped arms, some criminal activities are ongoing and this is mostly oil pipe vandalism and illegal bunkering, a situation that creates conflict between them and the security forces.

3.2. About the Conflict in Ogbia Town
Due to a number of disputes a few years ago, the leadership of Ogbia is still temporary as a substantive body is yet to be reconstituted. This situation continues to generate conflict, tension, disagreements and hostility amongst various groups in the town. It was explained that the major sources of conflict in Ogbia which still exist are land ownership, tussle for power and chieftaincy titles. Serious efforts have been made by concerned persons and stakeholders to resolve all conflicts but not much has been achieved because aggrieved chiefs and other actors are not willing to change. Furthermore, the relationship between the community and chiefs is poor and this constantly causes misunderstandings.

3.3. About the Conflict in Ogu Community
At the moment, the relationship existing amongst the various groups in Ogu is good though not without skirmishes here and there particularly when youths and women are excluded when it comes to land and employment issues according to some community youths during a focus group discussion. Ogu is generally peaceful with people living in peace and unity according to one respondent. The relationship between the youths and chiefs is even worse. The chiefs tend to listen to more prominent personalities than the generality of the people, a situation that is breeding one
form of conflict or another. In any case, things are more positive with little disagreements due to the quality of community leadership in place that ensure people come together on how best to move Ogu forward.

3.4. About the Conflict in Amairi-Osusu Community

For the last two years or so, the people of Amairi-Osusu community are having more peace and coexistence than before. According to one source, this is so because most family members practice and preach peace at greater level far more than before as a result of the skills and knowledge they gained from SFCG trainings on peacebuilding. The high rate of kidnapping and other criminal deeds that was taking place between 2008 and 2010 has since reduced to its barest minimum due to the efforts of the Abia State Government, the Amnesty Programme and the security agencies. The land conflict between Amairi Osusu and their neighbouring communities in Akwa Ibom State that led to the destruction of properties is still lingering on even though there is relative calm for now. The prime minister stressed that the conflict resulting from chieftaincy titles between two chiefs that led to the division of Amairi Osusu into two autonomous communities namely Amairi-Osusu and Osusu-Abala still stands as it has not been put to final rest. The level of electoral violence has reduced drastically when compared to what were obtainable years back due to the gains from the project intervention – peace talks, town hall meeting, media programmes, etc. Most uneducated persons, women in particular, now and then feel intimidated. These women feel that the literate ones get more attention than them, a situation that does not augur well even though this has not led to any serious form of conflict or disagreements amongst them. Like in Azumini, majority of the youths of Osusu are also unemployed, a situation that is likely to breed severe conflict in no distant time. The unavailability of basic social amenities in the community such as potable water, electricity, hospital, road, market angers the people a lot. The good thing is that there is no conflict yet between the community and government. For now, it is worthy to note that the level of occurrence of conflict is on the decline as cases of disputes and conflict is very low in Amairi Osusu community.

4.0. TND II Final Evaluation Methodology

4.1. Mixed Methodology

For the purpose of this final evaluation, a mainly qualitative approach was used with one small online survey, which provided both quantitative and qualitative data. The evaluation carried out an exhaustive literature review, 27 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), 27 Key Informant Interviews as well as Site Visits. Taking into account the qualitative nature of the data, the evaluation team has also drawn on from data extracted from the mid-term evaluation. Effectiveness as one of OECD/DAC criteria for evaluation was explored to measure the extent to which the aid activity provoked or likely provoked the intended changes and whether it reached its intended objectives, in a well-timed manner. The FGD and KII tools were designed to be participatory and gather relevant information according to the key evaluative themes, however this could not be triangulated with quantitative data. The surveys were distributed to the partners and a total of seven partners provided their feedback.

In the final evaluation a one-day training with the team took place, where the team used role play to pre-test the tools and be sure everyone clearly understood the tools and the objective of the evaluation as all team members were involved in previous evaluations and familiar with the process. In order to maintain confidentiality, only the titles of the KII participants were noted, and therefore no names are mentioned in this report.
A total of 12 FGDs and 27 KIIIs were held in the four communities. The evaluation consulted with community leaders, youths, women, CDCs, representatives of LPCs and IRCs; training participants, media viewers, electoral process participants, staff of SFCG and IPs. This evaluation was carried out in Ogu, Amairi-Osusu in Abia State, Ogbia in Bayelsa State, and Koko in Delta State.

4.2. Objectives of the Final Evaluation
The overall objective of the final evaluation is to assess the project’s effectiveness, in order to examine whether the project has been implemented as intended and whether it has achieved the expected results. Furthermore, the evaluation assesses the quality of partnerships of the implementing partners. Given the short lapse of time since the mid-term evaluation, and the relative inactivity in the last months of the project, the report will also draw on some of the results from the mid-term evaluation.

The results of the final evaluation are to inform both the project and the donor about the overall performance of the project, to identify lessons learned and to make recommendations for future similar projects.

The evaluation will focus on Objective One and Two and the cross-cutting objectives:

- **Objective 1**: Culture of non-violence in the region is enhanced through a collective inclusive vision of reintegration and increased local capacities
- **Objective 2**: Increased participation of community members in ensuring a peaceful and credible 2015 electoral process in targeted regions
- **Cross-cutting Objective**: Capacity and knowledge to implement this kind of programming is reinforced

The evaluation addresses the following four questions:

**Effectiveness:**

1. Has the project contributed to an enhanced culture of non-violence in the target communities?
2. Has the project resulted in an increase in people’s knowledge, skills and use of non-violent methods for conflict resolution?
3. Do community members, including marginalized groups, have increased knowledge about elections and was their participation in the 2015 election higher?

**Partnerships:**

4. Have implementing partners and SFCG staff achieved enhanced knowledge and capacity?

4.3. The Evaluation Team and Roles Played
The TOR, matrix and tools were designed by Jessica Sjolander the Design, Monitoring & Evaluation Africa Specialist, with the Nigerian team providing feedback.
For data collection the team was made up of a total of 7 SFCG staff drawn from the Jos and Port Harcourt office. They are

---

5 With a total of 97 participants
The team of 7 went from state to state starting from Ogu community in Rivers State, Ogbia in Bayelsa Stata, Koko in Delta State and rounded up in Osu in Abia state. In each state the team of 7 split into groups of 3 or 2 depending on the category of interview to be conducted and the time of the interview.

Daily debrief and planning sessions were held with the team.

5.0. Challenges and Limitations of the Evaluation

This particular evaluation has encountered a number of challenges. The first of which, is that many of foreseen activities for the last year of the project did not take place due a loss in funds and a number of internal issues, to this end, much of the information gathered during the mid-term evaluation is also valid today. Furthermore, due to a number of situations, the final evaluation suffered a delay due to the fact that the lead evaluator fell ill, and thus an external consultant had to analyse the data without actually visiting the country. Furthermore, unfortunately during the course of the year, the project manager passed away, which meant that information, was more difficult to attain. Nevertheless, it is felt that all of these challenges have been surpassed, and sufficient information, combining information already collected under the mid-term evaluation has contributed to this final report.

6.0. Project Objectives and Key Findings

The evaluation will look at the first two objectives of the project:
**TND II Objective 1:** “Culture of non-violence in the region is enhanced through a collective, inclusive vision of reintegration and increased local capacities”

Objective One had three key results, these included the following:

Result 1.1. Community Leaders and Key Stakeholders are trained and engaged in Conflict Transformation Programming
Result 1.2. Increased acceptance of non-violent methods for conflict resolution within target areas
Result 1.3. Increased positive engagement and mutual acceptance for militant and non-militant youth.

Box 1: Objective One

**TND II Objective 2:** “Increased participation of community members in ensuring a peaceful and credible 2015 electoral process in targeted regions”

Objective Two had one key result:

Result 2.1. Citizens have increased awareness of rights and obligations of citizens related to the elections environment.

Box 2: Objective Two

6.1. Question One – Has the project contributed to an enhanced culture of non-violence in the target communities?

The activities under the three results “helped us to solve our problems amicably” The trainings were considered to be “eye opener to the whole community; it taught us the best practices of conflict resolution.”

Focus Group from Osusu

Objective One aimed to enhance the culture of non-violence in the region through a collective, and inclusive vision of reintegration and increased local capacities. As the following section will illustrate, the three results reached the majority of their targets and indicators, and where they did not completely achieve their targets, it would appear that the impact on the communities is undeniably positive. Furthermore, as will be demonstrated below through data from the surveys from the mid-term evaluation and the interviews carried out in July and August 2016 with a variety of stakeholders, there is absolutely no doubt that there is a direct correlation between the project, and the improved culture of non-violence - there is definitely a “before” and “after” the implementation of the project.

Under this particular objective, result one had seven different activities, which were programmed, this also included the establishment of Project Management Bodies (Project Implementation Group Meetings (PIG) and Project Advisory Group (PAG) and Coordinating Bodies (Field Officers Forum (FOF) and Local Project Committee Experience Sharing Network (LPCEN). While the majority of the activities were implemented the project management bodies and coordinating bodies did not take place as often as anticipated. In the main, there was not necessarily a general consensus that due to the meetings taking place less frequently, the project was impacted upon, however, one person in the focal groups did mention the “meetings was not regular in order to talk about what to do.” Nonetheless, almost all of
those consulted expressed a disappointment about the project ending so promptly and that funds dried up so that many of the foreseen activities did not take place. This is particularly pertinent for the sustainability of the project and means that a number of weaknesses still persist.

Figure 1: Percentage of meetings taking place during the implementation of the project.

If we look towards the first result 1.1. under Objective One – “community leaders and key stakeholders are trained and engaged in conflict transformation programming, we can see that a total of 4011 6 (males accounting for 55%) were reached. Nonetheless, many of the activities under objective one, consisted in organizational meetings and therefore indicators pointed towards how many meetings should take place rather than how many persons should be reached. As can be seen in figure one, on average - only 44% of the meetings took place.

Figure 2: Number of completed activities under Result One – Objective One

6 2,189 males and 1,822 females
Figure Two demonstrates the targets foreseen for each activity under Objective One and to what degree the targets were reached, as can be noted by the graph above activities under 1.1.3. were not achieved as foreseen (see Figure One above)

Despite the fact that a number of activities didn’t take place and under activity 1.1.7, only a small number of consultations took place in Baylesa State, consultations with the key respondents and focus groups demonstrated a positive trend indicating that the project contributed to an enhanced culture of non-violence in the target communities.

The tables below illustrate each of the key activities under each result under its respective Objective. As one will note in the tables, the activities under each result are examined to see if the overall target as highlighted in the performance matrix. The table will outline conclusions as to whether these particular targets were achieved at the activity level. In order to assess whether they have been achieved or not, the evaluation does not only look at the indicators according to whether targets were met (see figures one and two above), but by also examining the project’ documents and the key respondent interviews as well as the focus groups and analysing the information and data emanating from the mid-term evaluation. It should be noted, that many of the “Objectively variables indicators of achievement” under the performance matrix relate to quantitative information, thereby in certain cases, targets could have been reached, but the outcome was not necessarily that desired, or vice-versa, whereby quantitative targets were not necessarily achieved or ascertained, yet the desired result was obtained. Nonetheless, the evaluation will derive its final conclusions with regards to each individual result and not activity, and to this end, while activities under a certain result may have not all been achieved, but a result may have deemed to have been achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1: “Culture of non-violence in the region is enhanced through a collective, inclusive vision of reintegration and increased local capacities”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 1: Result 1.1. Community Leaders and Key Stakeholders are trained and engaged in Conflict Transformation Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.1.1. Phase II Launch Meeting, Capacity Building Session and community introduction sessions Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.1.2. Conduct a participatory Baseline Assessment in new communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.1.3. Expansion and Continuance of Project Management Bodies (PIG and PAG) and establishment of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
additional coordinating bodies (FOF and LPCEN) | Improved synergy effects across key stakeholders in the Niger Delta to enhance development. TND II best practices are adopted and replicated by ParticipatingGovt. and oil companies. Sustainability of peace-building efforts of TND II after the project close out.

Consistency of programme implementation quality in all TND II states. Enhanced capacity and collaboration of co-applicants to implement peace programs at the community level with or without SFCG.

A wider adoption of best practices generated within the communities engaged in the project, strengthening ownership but also encouraging a consistency in the quality of the programming across the different communities

Activity 1.1.4. Setting up and training of LPCs | Enhanced local ownership of the project. Facilitated reintegration and reconciliation of marginalised group. An alignment of LPC into local community leadership structure to enhance local sustainability of project results

Achieved

Activity 1.1.5. Training LPC members in mediation and dialogue facilitation | Active role in locally-led alternative dispute resolution (ADR). Forestall and resolve community conflicts especially through formal systems such as early warning and rapid response.

Partially Achieved

Activity 1.1.6. Conflict Transformation Trainings of Staff and Follow-up within Communities | Community members are able to cite real world instances at least three months after the project where they adopted non-reactive nor conflict driven methods to resolve community conflicts. Ex-militants become peace ambassadors through re-orientation. overall peace and stability established in communities/region

Partially Achieved

Activity 1.1.7. Network building exchanges between communities | Improved LPCs sense of ownership and participation in project and community activities. LPCs become agents of social change by freely sharing positive models of engaging security and other actors from one community to another, encouraging community members to adopt peaceful resolution of conflicts and show signs of project sustainability

Not Achieved

Table 1: Results of Objective One – Result One

This particular activity is deemed to have been achieved. The project was launched over six days with a media conference and capacity building sessions across all 12 communities. 496 males and 297 females attended. The overall objective of this particular activity was to obtain a “buy in” of the project and for the different stakeholders to pledge their support and understand the project’s expectations around community participation. The project got off to a good start, however towards the end of the project due to the lack of funds, many projects which were meant to complement the trainings were not held, and general frustration was created in this regard, as many persons wanted
to put into practice what they had learnt but were unable to start relevant projects without additional funding.

6.2. Activity 1.1.2. Conduct a Participatory Baseline Assessment in new communities.
By January 2015, a baseline survey was conducted and published. The baseline assessment consisted of a total of 750 survey respondents (419 Males, 331 Females); 193 (88 Male, 105 Females) participated in 20 organized Focus Group Discussions; 23 (17 Males, 6 Females) participants in the Key Informant Interviews. The baseline survey looked at the following themes:

- Community Decision Making, including the Participation of Marginalized Groups, Particularly Women's Role in Decision Making
- Attitudes and Behaviours towards Elections
- Conflict Dynamics and Conflict Sensitivities of the Community, and their Effects on the Population
- Reintegration of Ex-Militants with the Community
- Social Cohesion, Reconciliation and Problem Solving Collaboration and Communication between Authorities and Communities to Increase Level of Security

While baseline figures were collected and similar figures were also collected for the mid-term evaluation, the final evaluation does not necessarily examine some of these themes in detail. This is particularly relevant to the reintegration of Ex-militants within the community and community decision-making. Although these subjects were touched upon, quantitative data is not available. Nonetheless this particular activity is achieved.

6.3. Activity 1.1.3. Expansion and continuance of Project Management Bodies (PIG and PAG) and establishment of additional Coordinating Bodies (FOF and LPCEN)
Activity 1.1.3. is broken into four sub activities (see Annex I for full details). Unfortunately, none of the four sub activities under 1.1.3 achieved the full target. Under the first sub group, 50% of targeted meetings were achieved: these included six PIG meetings held - 58 Males, 28 Females (86 total participants). These meetings allowed the Project management structure to be put in place. Operational decisions were taken. It is unclear as to whether half of the meetings did not take place impacted on the Project. Nonetheless, some beneficiaries did complain about the lack of meetings and many more cited the fact that little communication was given when the Project was no longer active. Had more meetings taken place, the communication flow may have been stronger.

Under the second sub activity, as above, only 50% of the target was achieved: Two of the PAG’s were conducted with an outreach to 42 Males, 13 Females (55 total participants). This particular activity represented a platform for exchange for high-level stakeholders in place. Options to improve synergies between actions of different actors in the Niger Delta identified. Government and oil companies are informed of and committed to replicate projects’ best practices. Stakeholders are informed of the processes launched and perspectives opened and are committed to support further peace-building activities.

The third sub activity was similar in that it only reached 50% of its overall target – four FOF were conducted with 37 males and 15 females (52 total staff of SFCG and partners) cumulatively across all intervals/meeting. Activities were consistent over the target communities in the four States. The
performance of the project was increased through the sharing of best practices between SFCG and co-applicants.

The final sub activity only reached 25% of its target with only one LPCEN out of four taking place. This reached 29 males and 10 females (39 participants in all). The objective of these meetings was to inspire the sharing of best practices between LPCs in order to increase the performance of the activities.

6.4. Activity 1.1.4. Setting up and Training of LPCs
This target was completely achieved whereby 10 LPC members from the 12 communities were trained (69 males, 47 females) reaching a total of 116 LPC members. This allowed the local project structure to be put in place and the trainings enabled the LPC members to increase their skills to lead participatory decision-making processes to address local conflicts and to engage with government officials. These trainings proved invaluable to the participants and gave them the confidence and the “know how” to ensure non-violent solutions to conflict prone problems.

6.5. Activity 1.1.5. Training LPC members in mediation and dialogue facilitation
This particular activity reached its target whereby 10 LPC members were trained from each of the 12 communities (69 Males and 48 Females) totalling 117 LPC members. This enabled the members to facilitate dialogue and mediate local conflict within their own communities. In both the focus groups and key informant interviews, 100% of the persons consulted now advocated for non-violent solutions and promoted mediation and dialogue amongst those affected by conflict. Nonetheless, it is still unclear as to whether the early system works and more would need to be done in order to instil this system into the local culture in order to ensure that it works.

6.6. Activity 1.1.6. Conflict Transformation Trainings of Staff and Follow-Up within Communities
A total of 2153 (1042 and 1111 Females) were trained across all communities. In the consultations during the final evaluation, all those spoken to were able to recall examples of when they have promoted dialogue over violent solutions. The effect impacted across the board, including men, women and youth, furthermore many of the participants of the interviews cited their own personal stories, on how they had changed their own behaviour towards their spouse and children in order to avoid conflict. In some instances, it was reported to have even contributed to lessening domestic violence in the home, whereby the husband due to the training he had, has stopped hitting his wife as he learned that this was wrong in the trainings he had received.

6.7. Activity 1.1.7. Network Building Exchanges between Communities
Unfortunately, this activity did not take place.

While the evaluation deems that three of the activities are achieved and the other three are only partially achieved, and one is not achieved at all, the evaluation concludes that the overall result of community leaders and key stakeholders being trained and engaged in conflict transformation is deemed to be achieved. The evaluation reaches this conclusion as all persons interviewed were able to recognize the value of the training and all were correctly able to identify what it means to conduct conflict transformation by peaceful means.

Attitude towards non-violence and stability
If we examine the information gathered during the mid-term evaluation the survey revealed that over 65% of the respondents felt that their attitude towards conflict resolution as an individual in the first year of the project had improved while nearly 15% felt it has got worse. While such a survey was not necessarily conducted for the final evaluation, all respondents who took part in both the focus groups and key informant interviews in the final evaluation declared that they have taken part in conflict resolution activities and advocated these as the best practice in situations of conflict.

The cases which were highlighted in the mid-term evaluation survey whereby they felt that it had gotten worse, was attributed to not enough security especially by the police, lack of community togetherness/unity and disaffected youth. Such incidences in the final evaluation pointed to on-going conflicts and still weak militant and police structures, which sometimes de-balanced the situation, however it did not deter individuals from using peaceful methods for conflict resolution. Respondents, both from the mid-term evaluation and the final evaluation, who felt the situation had improved, attributed this mainly to TND II activities and the media messages (The Team and video screenings).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Koko</th>
<th>Uzere</th>
<th>Ogbia</th>
<th>Omoku</th>
<th>Ogu</th>
<th>Azumini</th>
<th>Osusu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>66.14%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got worse</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result Two which aimed to increase acceptance of non-violent methods for conflict resolution within target areas used two activities. These included a “constructive leadership themed television programming “The Team” produced and aired to enhance a peaceful electoral process and a second activity which involved a team video-dialogue mobile screenings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1: “Culture of non-violence in the region is enhanced through a collective, inclusive vision of reintegration and increased local capacities”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 1: Result 1.2. Increased acceptance of non-violent methods for conflict resolution within target areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.2.1. Constructive leadership-themed television programming “The Team” produced and aired to enhance a peaceful electoral process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 1.2.2. Team video-dialogue mobile screenings
Willingness of youths and leadership structures to model alternative approaches to conflict and sustain a peaceful environment before, during and after the elections in the TND II communities of operation
Achieved

Table 3: Overall Results of Objective One – Result 1.2

6.8. Activity 1.2.1. Constructive Leadership-themed Television Programming “The Team” produced and aired to enhance a peaceful electoral process
The target of 13 episodes, to be aired on two national TV channels was achieved. In all 13 episodes were aired across five local TV stations across the four states. An average of 2.5 to 5 million viewers were reached across the Niger Delta region. The episodes included information about non-violent methods to solve conflicts and information on how to guide discussions about conflict resolution available. While not everyone surveyed in October 2015 and those interviewed under the final evaluation had not all heard of the media programmes, those who had said that they had stated that they “really helped” in building increased awareness of positive leadership skills and practices.

6.9. Activity 1.2.1. Team Video-Discourse Mobile Screenings
240 dialogues was the target, however only 69% of this was achieved. This resulted in 166 dialogues in 11 communities. A total of 6,373 (3,042 Males and 3,331 Females) were sensitised to the production.

During the Mid-Term Evaluation, the survey asked if in any way the SFCG organised media programme influenced or changed community people. The results demonstrated a low level of viewership of the TV TEAM Programme. This was also confirmed in the final evaluation during the interviews where only a small proportion of the respondents said that they had actually seen the programme. Nonetheless, no quantitative data was collected during the final evaluation. In the survey conducted in the mid-term evaluation, for instance, less than 22% of respondents stated that they had heard of the SFCG organised TV programme called “The Team”, which was aired over the local TV Stations earlier this year because they were informed by the project teams. 76.8% stated that they had not heard about the TV programme with the highest percentage being recorded in Omoku (88%). For those who are (21.7%) aware of the programme, they mostly believed that the programme changed or influenced them greatly.

Table 4: Respondents that have heard about SFCG organised TV Team series under the mid-term evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Option</th>
<th>Overall Response</th>
<th>Koko</th>
<th>Uzere</th>
<th>Ogbia</th>
<th>Omoku</th>
<th>Ogu</th>
<th>Azumini</th>
<th>Osusu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure/</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Source: TV stations coverage note
8 Omoku in Rivers State excluded
Quantitative data collected during the mid-term evaluation, revealed that 15% of persons noted that they watch this TV programme frequently at the time aired and 13% occasionally. Some respondents never got to watch the programme due to the absence of electricity in the communities. While 33% recommended for the continuation of the TV series as designed, others (47%) felt it should be continued but more tailored to local demands and issues. On how the TV programme can be improved upon or made more effective, a number of interesting comments were made focusing mainly on the need to have the programmes in specific local languages. Others suggested that the TV programmes should be aired more frequently and should be on more local and cabled stations and be more available in remote rural communities especially where conflicts are prone. Over 55% stated that they participated in the SFCG organized mobile cinema/video dialogue called “The Team” that was screened in their community early in the year. No such data was collected for the final evaluation.

Respondents that have heard about the TV Team series

As can be noted from the above table, although not all the targets were reached under the second activity and not a large percentage of persons had knowledge of the media programmes, both activities were deemed to be fully achieved, which resulted in the evaluation team concluding that result 1.2. was achieved.
This is illustrated both in the conclusions derived in the mid-term evaluation and in the numerous consultations undertaken in the final evaluation. It is a foregone conclusion that one of the key successes of the TND II project is the training of community structures to resolve conflicts using non-violent mechanisms. As was noted in the mid-term evaluation this was achieved by using the LPCs drawn from the local leadership structures in each of the target communities across the four states. This led to increased dialogue between community stakeholders and between communities and external stakeholders. As has been reiterated in this report, many of the beneficiaries have used the methods learnt to resolve domestic conflicts as well as applying their acquired skills at the community level. Many of those who cited incidences both professional and personal where they had achieved a resolution of a conflict through dialogue and mediation attributed these skill sets to the project.

Under the mid-term evaluation, over 85% of participants agreed that they have personally experienced a changed in attitude weeks after the training. In the subsequent final evaluation, every person spoken to attributed their change to the project and all the respondents involved in the final evaluation considered "non-violence methods" to be a way to resolve conflicts in their community. Not a single person stated that a "violent solution" should ever take precedent over a peaceful one. Community people are seeing advocacy and mediation as not only being an alternative but a time-tested tool for resolving conflict. The expected change is not just short term but long term if lasting peace architecture for the Niger Delta is built and sustained.

| Objective 1: “Culture of non-violence in the region is enhanced through a collective, inclusive vision of reintegration and increased local capacities” |
|---|---|---|
| **Result 1.3. Increased positive engagement and mutual acceptance for militant and non-militant youth.** |
| **Activity** | **Targets** | **Achieved/Partially Achieved/Not achieved** |
| Activity 1.3.1. Advanced Advocacy training for militant and non-militant youth | Three months after the training, participants are able to articulate and analyse their needs, interests, how to achieve them and advocate for them appropriately. Resulting to at least a 20% increase in youth engagements in community decision making process. | Achieved |
| Activity 1.3.2. Development of action plan and support of youth-led collaborative actions and advocacy projects including militant and non-militant youth. | Advocacy needs highlighted to reach 50% implementation by the end of the project. Resulting to at least a 20% increase in youth engagements in community decision-making process especially the consultation of the youth during town hall meetings. | Not Achieved |
| Activity 1.3.3. IRC’s develop and lead youth media productions to highlight and encourage positive youth role models | More Niger Delta youths especially those attuned to the radio begin to imbibe positive values and models that strengthen peace building without glorifying conflict such as youth success, leadership and peace-making. IRC staffs can independently develop content highlighting positive roles of youth by making productions documenting the | Not achieved |

“Empathy is one thing we have developed for each other. This has made it easy to always choose non-violence.”

**Focus Group from Delta State**

“Non-violent method is the best approach for settling conflict. When people talk and express their demand or grievances, it is far better than engaging in violent conflict”

**Man From Ogbia**

"Empathy is one thing we have developed for each other. This has made it easy to always choose non-violence.”

**Focus Group from Delta State**

“Non-violent method is the best approach for settling conflict. When people talk and express their demand or grievances, it is far better than engaging in violent conflict”

**Man From Ogbia**
accomplishments and aspirations of male and female youth.

IRCs can independently develop their own context-specific productions/jingles to promote peace and sustain SFCG’s approach even after the life of the project. SFCG led approach on conflict management gains a wider reach amongst youths in the Niger Delta region apart from the TND II communities of operation. Young persons are willing to become peace ambassadors as opposed to being militants.

| Activity 1.3.4. Regional broadcast of the top IRC local productions on major channels. | SFCG led approach on conflict management gains a wider reach in the Niger Delta region apart from the TND II communities of operation. A snowball effect of electoral peace is felt in the region before, during and after the elections | Not achieved |

Table 5 Achievement of the Result 1.3 under objective one

6.10. Activity 1.3.1. Advanced Advocacy Training for Militant and Non-Militant Youth
The overall target of conducting 24 trainings was achieved and was subsequently conducted across 12 communities amounting to a total of 716 (398 male and 318 female) youths being trained on advocacy. The overall purpose of the training was that Youths and ex-militants understood Common Ground Advocacy approach and are able to analyse their needs and interests, and identify advocacy priorities.

6.11. Activity 1.3.2. Development of Action Plan and Support of Youth-Led collaborative actions and advocacy projects including militant and non-militant youth
Only half of the target was achieved. 12 follow on meetings were held but no other formal training was conducted. Due to the lack of funds micro grants were not disbursed and advocacy plans were put on hold.

6.11. Activity 1.3.3. IRC’s develop and lead youth media productions to highlight to encourage positive youth role models
67% of the overall target was achieved. One training and a refresher training was conducted for a total of 85 Information Resource Centers (IRC) volunteer and staff (53 males and 32 females. IRC volunteers and staff enhanced their skills in their respective domains (journalism, management and technical production). Six productions commenced but were not completed.
6.12. Activity 1.3.4. Regional Broadcast of the too IRC local productions on major channels.
Four programmes were to be broadcast but no production was aired. The Mid-term evaluation results show that only about 49% have heard of the SFCG/EU-funded IRCs in their community and nearly 38% have visited there for site visit and get information. On how the IRCs can be improved, over 60% of respondents suggested that the center should be upgraded with appropriate equipment and information gathering materials/tools. Operators of the IRCs should be provided further training on relevant areas of broadcasting and productions. From viewing and participating in the media programmes, it can be concluded that respondents have learned how to act and relate with one another working as one with a team spirit. It had exposed them to living in peace with other persons and protecting each other while making them to understand that they need one another, tolerate and accommodate others. Also, the programmes have made them to be more aware and informed on peace building and non-violent activities. From the comments made by the respondents, it is very obvious that SFCG programming is contributing to improvements of relationships within and outside of the seven target communities in the 4 states. However, only a small minority of respondents has been exposed to SFCG’s The Team.

Out of all the results under examination in this evaluation, the achievement of this particular result was the weakest. Three out of the four activities were not achieved and the first activity was only partially achieved.

In order to ascertain the real achievements of this particular result, both the mid-term evaluation or the final evaluation perhaps did not design sufficient tools to extract the full extent as the attainment of this particular result. While it is highly unlikely that the result was actually achieved given that many of the activities were either not carried out or simply did not reach their targets, a thorough analysis about inclusion and reintegration needs to be undertaken in the future as the final evaluation interviews reveal that many of the ex-militants are integrated adequately. Obtaining accurate information is not only pertinent as the information to date is somewhat lacking, but the issue of youth militants and women in the decision making process is vital but due to cultural challenges, conflict and the history of Nigeria, more emphasis is needed to ensure that these three groups are targeted in any future projects.

The information that has been extracted from both the mid-term and final evaluation confirms the importance of the inclusive and active participation of various categories of groups including women, youths and ex-militants in the process of planning, decision making, leadership and development related activities. It is particularly important that ex-militants are accepted and fully reintegrated into communities as this will give them a sense of belonging and encourage them to contribute effectively to community decision-making processes, which invariably could avert conflict in the area. The survey conducted under the mid-term evaluation revealed a large majority of respondents (88%) stating that there is a need for inclusion/reintegration between the various groups in their community in order to give everybody a sense of belonging and to sustain the prevailing peaceful atmosphere.

For those who felt so noted that all existing groups including women, ex-militants and youths should be included/reintegrated in the process. They further stated that such groups or persons should be reintegrated mainly into the community planning and decision making process, community leadership, community development activities and recreation. Over 74% noted that the view of their community on inclusion and reintegration had changed over the first year of implementation of the project. A key issue relating to community cohesion, inclusion and reintegration is the levels of trust and the quality of groups’ relationships within the communities.
Generally, the results indicate that there has been positive change in community peoples’ views regarding the inclusion and reintegration process for ex-agitators and other marginalised groups including women and youths. This is an improvement from the results of the baseline assessment. It is clear that there has been a significant shift in perceptions of community people over the first year of TND II implementation. There is a high level of willingness in the seven communities, particularly in Koko, Ogbia, Omoku and Ogugu communities to continue to identity with ex-agitators for there to be sustained peace and stability. Also, over 60% of respondents noted that ex-agitators, women and youths can play a positive role in the community if they are fully accepted and integrated as well as if given the opportunity.

Nonetheless, under the final evaluation, although quantitative information was not collected, and despite many of the activities not being carried out, many of the respondents noted that ex-militants had been accepted and reintegrated into the community, with only one person noting in the focus groups that they had not been accepted “but we are making progress”.

**6.13. QUESTION TWO – HAS THE PROJECT RESULTED IN AN INCREASE IN PEOPLE’S KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND USE OF NON-VIOLENT METHODS FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION?**

To this end, in order to answer this question, the data shows that all of the key beneficiaries of the project who were interviewed claimed an increase in their knowledge and skills of non-violent methods for conflict resolution.

Both in the mid-term evaluation as well as the final evaluation, KII and FGD persons consulted who are not either LPC or IRC members but community heads, leaders, women, youth, ex-militants, heads of vigilante groups, etc. highlighted the skills and knowledge they have acquired through the SFCG organised training programmes. Many of them shared typical examples in which they have been able to apply these skills in real life situations and to good results. They all admitted that these trainings and other related village events were very effective and enhanced their capacities to deal with conflict and leadership issues with less stress. The KII and FGD participants also pointed to the benefits cross learning of joint training where there is a mix of traditional rulers, committee leaders, men and women, youths and women leaders, ordinary community members, marginalised persons, ex-militants, natives and non-natives; representatives of NGOs (such as National Council for Women Society in Koko), market women, teachers, traders and the unemployed.
6.14. QUESTION THREE – DO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, INCLUDING MARGINALISED GROUPS, HAVE INCREASED KNOWLEDGE ABOUT ELECTIONS AND WAS THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE 2015 ELECTION HIGHER?

Under TND II, the second objective “Increased participation of community members in ensuring a peaceful and credible 2015 electoral process in targeted regions” had one overall result – “citizens have increased awareness of rights and obligations of citizens related to the election environment” with three key activities. (see Annex I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Two: “Increased participation of community members in ensuring a peaceful and credible 2015 electoral process in targeted regions”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 2.1. Citizens have increased awareness of rights and obligations of citizens related to the elections environment.</th>
<th>Achieved/Partially Achieved/Not achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.1. Support local awareness and participation of marginalised groups for peace and conflict transformation through the electoral process</td>
<td>Maximum involvement of communities to promote local ownership in electoral process (especially election monitoring and observation) and mitigation of electoral violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.2. Civic education rallies and Town Hall meetings on issues related to the 2015 elections, including violence prevention</td>
<td>An effective conflict-resolution mechanism is functional in the community and people know how to seek peaceful redress when dissatisfied. Evaluations should be able to ascertain that citizens have satisfactorily adopted a peaceful approach to resolving conflict away from adversarial approaches during the elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.3. Phone-based voter education ringtone developed &amp; rolled-out</td>
<td>SFCG led approach on conflict management gains a wider reach in the Niger Delta region apart from the TND II communities of operation. A snowball effect of electoral peace is felt in the region before, during and after the elections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Achievement of the results 2.1 under objective Two


75% of the target achieved whereby 11 (8 males and 3 females) SFCG staff and local community representatives functioned as Election traditional observers across 9 communities (excluding Oporoza, Kaiama & Amairi- Osusu). These workshops allowed for potential synergies between this initiative and electoral activities to be identified and explored with competent authorities and actors. The ultimate goal was for residents of the targeted and surrounding communities would benefit from non-violent elections campaigning.
6.15. Activity 2.2. Civic Education rallies and Town Hall meetings on issues related to the 2015 elections, including violence prevention

45% of the target was achieved with 8,110 participants (4,246 Males, 3,864 Females) attending 65 Town hall meetings at intervals across the 12 communities. These meetings allowed the community members to have increased knowledge about the electoral process and procedures and to be made aware of potential election related violence. The ultimate goal was for communities leaders and community members, including women, security forces, electoral officials and local candidates, to commit to address election related conflicts and have established conflict resolution mechanisms.

6.16. Activity 2.3. Phone-based voter education ringtone developed and rolled out.

This activity did not place and the targets were not achieved.

While none of the three activities were deemed to be achieved, and only two of them considered to be partially achieved, the evaluation concludes that the result was in fact achieved. Elections in Nigeria have had a long history of violence and 2015 was no exception where almost 160 people died during the election period. Despite this, all respondents cited peaceful elections in their areas and many suggested that this was a change from the past.

In order to ascertain the answer to the third evaluation question, a total of 279 Key Informants were interviewed (see annexes V and VI) in the four regions and 97 persons took part in the focus groups in the four regions (see annexes III and IV). Four key questions were asked of the focus groups and five questions of the key informants.10

"With the training, we now know that we have the right to vote and we should vote only once and go home, the training boosted our knowledge on the electoral system."

Key Informant from Koko State

"The impact created by the project, we witnesses something that has never happened before in this community. In the past, one day prior or on election day, you would see people running – women didn't come out to vote. But this time, women voted and even waited for the votes to be collated.

Focus Group in Amairi

Emanating from the answers both from the focus groups and the key informant interviews, there was a general consensus that the recipients of the training sessions and those who had seen the mobile screenings had gained a further understanding of the electoral environment and had learned that elections were not a “do or die affair.” While it is unsure how much information the recipients received on the elections themselves, it was pertinent, that as a result of the training, they learnt that the elections were about “choice and not violence” and that voting was “their responsibility – because your vote counts and only your vote can make it change.”

As a result of exposure to the project the understanding of “the rules of the game”, and enhanced awareness was created amongst the potential voters and they were able to cast their vote without the fear of ballot boxes being snatched. Furthermore, the project did not only influence the level of awareness, but much of the tools created advocated against electoral violence which had a profound influence over the participants and the elections themselves.

7 Seven in Koko, seven in Ogbia, seven in Ogu and six in Osusu.
10 All questions were more or less the same, except whereby the key informants had an added question “Did you participate in training on the electoral process? If so, did it give you increased knowledge on rights and obligations in elections?"
Out of all of those questioned, all persons stated that the project contributed to a more peaceful election process. Only one respondent said that while it did not influence the process overall it certainly influenced the direct recipients of the project. A respondent from Ogbia stated that it "contributed to a more peaceful election process, empowered the community members to understand the importance of peaceful election". Another person stated that the mobile screening "helped to reduce conflict in the community and people were made to understand that violence doesn’t solve problems.

"When you educate a man, you change his thinking and approach. Knowledge about election violence has improved "it has made us see that election is not a do or die affair. “we did not experience election violence of any sort in our community because of the knowledge we gained from the project.”

To this end, while it is not clear as to what information respondents received on the electoral process itself, there was a definite change in attitude about participation and the overall peacefulness of the elections. While respondents mainly attributed their individual knowledge on the electoral environment to the project, and that there were more peaceful elections, it is really difficult to ascertain whether peaceful elections were as a result of the training itself. In some instances, in Abai state for example, it was stated that Youths were warned during the election not to cause violence, they should vote and go home and they all complied and that helped a lot. Formerly, the youths use the election period to cause violence, but during the last election they didn't so I can say it achieved a lot.”

The town hall meetings on civic education and peaceful elections also witnessed another milestone in the 7 target communities. Community people were granted the rare opportunity of meeting with INEC and other security agencies in the build up to the general elections. Collaborations with other stakeholders in these communities led to active citizen reporting and mandate protection during the elections. Although, as reiterated above, the peaceful elections may not be totally attributable to TND intervention – it did play a key role in bringing issues to the fore where relevant authorities were granted the platform to engage citizens at the local level. The stakeholder engagements brought about increased awareness on the duties and rights of citizens around the elections. Through IRC productions of peace jingles, magazine programmes on peaceful elections, potential conflict attitudes during the elections were reduced. The handbills and flyers were most useful as they were widely distributed easily.

"For the first time in Koko, even the losers in the elections did not take the law into their hands”

"The program really contributed to nonviolence during the election "Before the election, so many people predicted violence but your program really contributed to nonviolence during the election"

Nonetheless the correlation between the respondents’ willingness to vote and the projects contribution is harder to prove. Almost all respondents under both the focus groups and the key informant interviews stated that they always voted, including in the last elections, and therefore it is unclear as to whether respondents voted more as a direct result of the project. Notwithstanding, many persons commented that in some places, more women turned out, as women were not afraid to go out as they believed that the elections would be peaceful. “Women really came out because of the program, they were called out of their houses to participate this time unlike previously where they
are left in the house as housewives. They both participated greatly." However, this was not the case in all the regions where people were interviewed.

6.16. PARTNERSHIPS – HAVE IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS AND SFCG ENHANCED KNOWLEDGE AND CAPACITY?

As reiterated in the mid-term evaluation, an improved organizational capacity of implementing partners is one place where the TND II has scored a major breakthrough. The trainings for staff of SFCG and the five Implementing Partners were elaborate enough to cover a wide range of activities targeted at helping over 2,000 community leaders and members strengthen their individual and collective conflict resolution skills. Specific areas of capacity building included hands-on skills training on mediation and dialogue, conflict transformation, transformational leadership, communication and M&E. The different Training of Trainers and follow-up activities greatly improved field officers’ and organizational capacities to effectively deliver on the project in the four states. There is absolutely no doubt, the project built capacity within partners to address conflict and related issues.

According to the partners the main strengths of the project was its ability to identify key actors across the different communities who have the power to influence or make decision. While the Amnesty project of the federal government focussed on the ex-militants, the project was able to pull together those who had suffered the effect of militancy in there locality including a sizeable percentage of the ex-militant together. It promoted real reintegration. The fact that the project also built upon the success of the first TND was also considered a key strength.

While the project implementer did find the project to be strong, the lack of funding and the numerous problems that the project suffered in the last year of its implementation weakened the reputation of the organisations and many of the activities as has been demonstrated above were not achieved. This meant that the project was sometimes unable to create a continuous platform whether all those trained in the different skills i.e. conflict transformation, mediation and dialogue facilitation or transformational leadership were unable to meet. This was further compounded by the lack of funds which signified that many of the micro grants which were to be offered to sustain activities were not awarded and this had a significant impact on the sustainability and the reputation of the project as well as enabling different actors to continue using their skills in key issues relevant to their areas of responsibility.

With regards to key skills gained under the project, the IPS were able to gain more honed skilled in the following areas (1) Conflict transformation training (2) Advanced conflict transformation training (3) Common ground advocacy training (4) Advanced common ground advocacy training (5) Data collection and data entry training. Furthermore, the SFCG compliance team were keen on ensuring that the project was implemented according to specification. In doing this, the implementing partners stated that they were able to learn and strengthen its financial capability through the Finance officers’ forum together with the on-job coaching by SFCG finance team. It further improved their facilitation skills, improved financial control processes and compliance with donor requirement. To this end, as well as contributing positively to the communities the project served, the project also enabled them to enhance their knowledge and acquire a number of new skills.

7.0. Conclusions

The evaluation has been asked to answer four key questions. As this report has illustrated the project has suffered some important set-backs and challenges with its cash flow and its ability to finalize a number of activities. To this end, only 37.5% of the activities reached their targets and 31.25% were
not achieved and 31.25% were only partially achieved. Nonetheless, the evaluation deems that the majority of the results/outcomes were actually achieved prior to the project losing funds to carry on with its activities, despite many of the activities not fulfilling their full quota.

With regards to the first question, as to whether the project has contributed to an enhanced culture of non-violence in the target communities, the answer is an overwhelming yes. All of the respondents to the final evaluation highlighted the positive elements of the project and how the project had directly affected their knowledge and skills and understanding for a peaceful environment via mediation and dialogue as opposed to resorting to violence. It has not only become an alternative to conflict resolution, but is considered the best tool to use when dealing with any type of conflict within the community and in the family.

In answer to the second question, the project has also resulted in an increase in people’s knowledge, skills and use of non-violent for conflict resolution. Furthermore, while there is no doubt that people gained knowledge, the beneficiaries of the project has actually recognized the usefulness of these skills and put them into practice, and recognize and use to their full extent what they had learned. This is very rare, that training will actually lead to a change in behaviour which not only impacts on the individual but at the community level as well. The project’s success in this area should be commended, and similar practices attached to other regions.

The third question is more ambiguous as the project also coincided with a number of peaceful deals in the area of elections, and therefore although trainings were undertaken and the respondents of the FGDs and the KIIIs did attribute their renewed confidence and knowledge of the election environment to the project, it is very difficult to ascertain if there were other influential factors outside of the project. Furthermore, while many of the respondents stated that elections were no longer a “do and die” affair and many advocated for peaceful elections, which resulted in more confidence in participating in the process, nobody stated that they had voted because of the actual project. Most of the participants stated that they “always voted”, so it is very difficult to ascertain the correlation of the project and a possible increase in participation in the 2015 elections.

The final question, as to whether the implementing partners and SPCG staff achieved enhanced knowledge and capacity - this is irrefutable, and all the partners agreed that working together was one of the strengths of the project. Nonetheless, the damage done to the reputation of each of the organizations and the disappointment expressed at the financial and communication problems in the last year of the project need to be repaired. Notwithstanding, many of the respondents continued to want training and support both financial and technical for the future and many understood the problems of the project, however many did not comprehend why many of the promises were broken and certain activities could not be implemented. To this end, communication in the event of such circumstances would need to be monitored in such an event in the future.

7.1. Recommendations

The following are set of strong recommendations as suggested by the communities themselves, project partners and the evaluation team in moving forward for a possible extension of the project or similar project in the same or similar areas:

1. To regain the trust and confidence of the communities, implementing partners will have to conduct field visits to ensure that their possible needs are looked into, new bridges will need to be built;
2. However a new extension/project will need the assurances of a stronger financial system to be in place at SFCG to ensure regular cash flow to the implementing teams of SFCG and to the partners, avoiding the latest to lose face before the communities;

3. While this particular evaluation took place a few months after the closure of the project, and it is evident that a non-violent approach is embedded into community practice, follow up activities need to be ensured. These need to be practical and to find ways of connecting different communities with others to ensure that the project has a spill over effect on key communities.

4. A new project should concentrate its efforts on promoting more female and youth participation in community decision making process as well as at government level.

5. A new project should examine the needs of the security and ex militants and design components of the project to ensure their full participation in the project.

6. A more comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system should follow a future programme, to ensure that key activities are conducted and that the project is able to follow the same trajectory as envisaged in the original log frame. Local context as well as possible political, economic and social factors should feed into the regular monitoring to the project to ensure its effectiveness.

7. Baseline data should be collected in order to ascertain the situation after the TND II project, such information can feed into a new possible project ensuring that key needs are identified and addressed.

8. A more robust internal and external communication system needs to be put in place, especially with regards to any activities not being able to be implemented. While town hall meetings were important to call to inform partners and beneficiaries of the project termination; should changes in the project occur, it is equally important to ensure that all relevant persons are communicated to with regards to any changes which will impact on the effectiveness or the impact of the project.

9. SFCG and Partners should build on the gains and lessons learned in the first part of TND II and strengthen the areas of weaknesses. In a new project, there should be less concentration on capacity building because there is general community apathy about these types of activities even though participants expressed their happiness with the training and town hall events. The solidarity events in phase one of TND were key achievements and connected well with the people, which led to community cohesiveness. Hence, they should be continued under a new phase especially in the new communities. Community people got disappointed when they were told that solidarity events are not part of TND II. In the concluding part of TND II and with the possibility of extension, *the implementation of community-driven, community-led well prioritised tangible solidarity projects such as walkways, public toilets, markets, water projects, farming programmes, etc. will go a long way in rekindling people's hope and confidence in the SFCG and the EU and will give more value for money in the long term.*

10. Government at all levels has the responsibility to the people and TND II should therefore secure the buy-in of relevant government institutions and other stakeholders on the project so that more peacebuilding successes can be recorded before closeout. State and local
governments in particular need to contribute to the success of the project in the four states. Government stands to redeem its 'lost image', 'lost trust' from their active engagement and participation on the project. **There has to deliberate efforts by SFCG for a closer working relationship with activities targeting state and local government as well as top community leadership.** In addition, there should be stronger synergy with high level stakeholders in the four states.

11. There should be continuous and consistent engagement with community leaders and members as a new project is developed. Community mobilisation should not be left to LPCs alone. SFCG and IP field staff should be more involved to ensure effective participation. They should also be more involved in creating further awareness of TND II and the selection of participants to have a fair distribution during activities not leaving this process for the LPCs alone. What all this means is that **the choice of the LPCs as the sole body responsible for mobilisation of community beneficiaries should be reviewed to engage other local stakeholders.**

12. The existing synergies between SFCG and partners and even between the five partners should be further strengthened. There should be improved two-way communication and feedbacks. **Opportunity should be created for project partners to be more involved in the media programme design and implementation** to give them a sense of belonging in the partnership arrangement and for them to be more connected with the people.

13. Although the Information and Resource Centres (IRC) have been equipped and the volunteers have undergone several trainings, IMESO recommends that more advanced and specific trainings on the use/maintenance of IRC equipment. **Income generation and marketing should be conducted for the Volunteers, to ensure the sustainability of the Centres.**

14. Many of the equipment supplied and installed in the IRCs have had complaints from the installation stage. This has led to the non-achievement of the “income generating” objective of the TND Project for the IRCs. In addressing this major challenge, **there is a need to carry out a total overhauling of the IRC equipment, to enable the IRCs to self-sustain themselves.** There is the need to facilitate the IRCs in getting to partner with established radio stations in readiness for full broadcast once they are formally registered as community radio stations.

15. There is sometimes a high risk of floods taking place in certain times of the year. **Measures need to be put in place to address the needs of project community members when it thus occur, possible option include provision of relief materials including food, water, drugs and medicines.** This should be in collaboration with government, private sector, local and international humanitarian support organisations.

16. For communities like Omoku still at risk of violence, SFCG and the IPs should **redouble efforts at creating awareness, education and training on the peace process for the youths** and enlighten them on the need to drop arms and imbibe nonviolent ways of resolving conflicts.
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### 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF ASSIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme title:</th>
<th>European funded <em>Building a Peace Architecture in the Niger Delta for 2015 and Beyond</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Partner Organization</td>
<td>Search for Common Ground (SFCG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>The Centre for Environment, Human Rights and Development (CEHRD), the Community Initiative for Enhanced Peace and Development (CIEPD), the Citizens Direct Network (CDN), the Leadership Institute for Transformation and Empowerment – Africa (LITE-Africa) formerly known as NIDPRODEV and the Institute for Media and Society (IMESO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage: region, countries:</td>
<td>12 communities in 4 states of Niger Delta, Nigeria: Omoku, Okrika, Ogu and Kpor (Rivers State), Uzere, Opobo and Koko (Delta State), Ogbia, Amassoma and Kaiama (Bayelsa State) and Amairi-Osusu and Azumini (Abia State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>2nd April 2014 to 1st April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Head</td>
<td>Mr. Chika Emeh (Project Manager), Port Harcourt, SFCG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Context

About Search for Common Ground
Search for Common Ground (SFCG) is international non-profit organization whose mission is to transform the way the world deals with conflict away from adversarial approaches toward cooperative solutions. Our headquarters are in Washington D.C., United States and in Brussels, Belgian and we have offices in 34 countries around the world.

We began working in Nigeria in 2004 to encourage understanding across ethnic and religious lines in Nigeria. We facilitate inclusive dialogue and collaborative decision-making on important issues such as accountability, corruption, transparency, and peaceful conflict resolution. To do this, we work with media, academic, government, and local partners. Today, our Nigerian-led team includes more than 30 staff members working out of offices in Abuja, Jos, Maiduguri and Port Harcourt.

*Tomorrow is a New Day, Phase II: Building a Peace Architecture in the Niger Delta for 2015 and Beyond* is the second phase of a 18 months period project that took place from January 2012 to June 2013. The first phase of the project, “*Tomorrow is a New Day: Supporting Community-Level Conflict Resolution and Reintegration of Ex-Militants to Promote Stability in the Niger Delta*” (TND I), aimed to support community conflict resolution and reconciliation in 7 “trend-setting communities”, to leverage changes in these communities to influence conflict dynamics across the Delta region and to facilitate access to information and dialogue inclusive of marginalized and alternative voices in the Niger Delta.

3.0 About the TND II project
Funded by the European Union, the project *Tomorrow is a New Day, Phase II: Building a Peace Architecture in the Niger Delta for 2015 and Beyond* (TND II) is implemented by Search For Common Ground in partnership with four local partners.

SFCG works with partners at the community-level, local authorities, and at the state-level to support locally-driven conflict transformation, reduce tensions among youth, support the electoral process and establish strong linkages for local community decision-making and problem-solving. The project is supported by four specific programming objectives, as well as a cross-cutting (CC) objective:

- **Objective 1**: Culture of non-violence in the region is enhanced through a collective, inclusive vision of reintegration and increased local capacities;
- **Objective 2**: Increased participation of community members in ensuring a peaceful and credible 2015 electoral process in targeted regions;
- **Objective 3**: Enhanced collaboration and communication between authorities and communities to increase level of security in targeted communities;
- **Objective 4**: Improved local decision-making through enhanced involvement of women in community governance and public affairs;
- **Cross-Cutting**: Capacity and knowledge to implement this kind of programming is reinforced.

In achieving these objectives, SFCG has implemented a series of multimedia, capacity-building,
and community based activities, drawing on both Nigerian technical expertise, as well as SFCG’s track record of working effectively in conflict and post-conflict situations around the world. We worked closely with credible implementing partners in each of the targeted states, as well as a series of community structures in order to leverage existing capacities and promote sustainability.

The expected results and activities of the projects are the following:

**Results Contributing to Objective 1 (Culture of Non Violence)**

- **Res. 1.1** Community leaders and key stakeholders are trained and engaged in conflict transformation programming
  - Act. 1.1.1. Phase II Launch Meeting, Capacity Building session, and community introduction sessions Act.
  - Act. 1.1.2. Conduct a participatory Baseline Assessment in new communities
  - Act 1.1.3. Expansion and Continuance of Project Management Bodies (PIG and PAG) and Establishment of Additional Coordinating Bodies (FOF and LPCEN)
  - Act. 1.1.4. Setting up and training of LPCs
  - Act. 1.1.5 Training LPC members in mediation and dialogue facilitation
  - Act. 1.1.6. Conflict Transformation Trainings of Staff and Follow-up within Communities
  - Act 1.1.7. Network-building exchanges between communities

- **Res. 1.2** Increased acceptance of non-violent methods for conflict resolution within target areas
  - Act. 1.2.1. Constructive leadership-themed television programming “The Team” produced and aired to enhance a peaceful electoral process
  - Act. 1.2.2. “Mobile Cinema” video-dialogue series on constructive leadership in targeted areas

- **Res. 1.3** Increased positive engagement and mutual acceptance for militant and non-militant youth
  - Act. 1.3.1. Advanced Advocacy training for militant and non-militant youth
  - Act. 1.3.2. Youth-led collaborative actions and advocacy projects are developed and supported including militant and non-militant youth
  - Act. 1.3.3. IRCs develop and lead youth media productions to highlight and encourage positive youth role models
  - Act. 1.3.4. Regional broadcast of the top IRC local productions on major channels

**Results Contributing to Objective 2 (Democratic Participation)**

- **Res. 2.1** Citizens have increased awareness of rights and obligations of citizens related to the elections environment.
  - Act. 2.1.1. Support local awareness and participation of marginalised groups for peace and conflict transformation through the electoral process
• Act. 2.1.2. Town-hall meetings and civic education rallies are organised on issues related to the 2015 elections including violence prevention
• Act. 2.1.3. Development and roll-out of phone-based voter education ringtone.

Results contributing to Objective 3 (Coalitions for Security)

• Res. 3.1 Coalitions of stakeholders, including business, non-state actors, local, state and federal authorities are developed to achieve regional peace
  • Act. 3.1.1. High-level Conflict-sensitive communications and Leadership training for LGA Leaders and Chairmen
  • Act. 3.1.2. Participatory theatre campaigns on local governance and decision-making
  • Act. 3.1.3. Regular Peace Architecture Dialogues convened by NSAs including, government, business, oil companies and civil society

• Res. 3.2 Enhanced collaboration between communities and security units for Early Warning and Response to violence
  • Act. 3.2.1. Strategy development and training for Security Forces
  • Act. 3.2.2. Follow-up activities with security forces
  • Act. 3.2.3. Establishment of state-level networks of CSOs and Government Officials on the Voluntary Principles

Results contributing to Objective 4 (Women’s Participation)

• Res. 4.1 Women leaders play an enhanced role in public decision-making and peace initiatives
  • Act. 4.1.1. Common Ground Advocacy Advanced trainings for women
  • Act. 4.1.2. Follow-on support to women-identified advocacy initiatives

• Res. 4.2 Women play an enhanced role in facilitating the reintegration of ex-militants
  • Act. 4.2.1. Constitution of community Mother’s Groups of mothers of ex-militants to support their reintegration
  • Act. 4.2.2. Training of MG members in trauma healing and psychosocial support
  • Act. 4.2.3. Regular support meetings of MGs, including information sharing and outreach activities to other mothers

Cross-Cutting Results

• Res. CC1: Program Implementing Partners have increased organisational capacity
  • Act. CC1.1. Institutional Capacity Assessments, Capacity Building Plan and TA Workshop for Co-Applicants
  • Act. CC1.2. Provide targeted technical assistance to build co-applicants’ organizational
The first phase of the project was implemented in seven trend-setting communities in three Niger Delta states: Okrika, Ogu and Kpor (Rivers State), Oporoza and Koko (Delta State), Amassoma and Kaima (Bayelsa State). In the second phase, five new communities were added: Ogbia (Bayelsa State), Oleh (Delta State), Omoku (Rivers State), Azumili (Abia State), and Osusu/Okpuala Ngwa (Abia State). Those communities have been selected on the basis of their diversity in several key aspects including the size of the communities, the conflict history and legacy, the number of ex-militants in the area and the relationship between these and the communities and between the security forces and the communities.

Within these communities three different target groups have been selected in order to address the deep-seated grievances and insecurities that have disempowered communities and local residents. SFCG worked with partners at the community-level, local authorities, and at the state-level to support locally-driven conflict transformation, reduce tensions among youth, support the electoral process and establish strong linkages for local community decision-making and problem-solving. SFCG’s approach focuses primarily upon three key groups of individuals within each of the target communities:

- Community leaders: including local authorities, civil society, traditional leaders, local security actors, religious leaders and other respected local stakeholders. These leaders will form Local Project Committees (where similar structures do not already exist), working jointly with women and youth. We will train these leaders in order to strengthen their contribution to the process of encouraging social inclusion, reconciliation, and non-violent conflict resolution.

- Youth: including male and female youth, Amnesty participants as well as non-participants. Non-participants will include both civilian youth, as well as militants who did not participate in the Amnesty process. We will aim to both help youth play a more active role in community decision-making, as well as focus on encouraging entrepreneurship, non-violence, and strengthened connections between Amnesty and non-Amnesty youth.

- Women leaders: who we will target at the community level in order to enhance their voice and role in promoting social inclusion. We will also work with mothers of ex-militants within the targeted communities, in order to address issues linked to their sustainable reintegration within the household and help them get psychosocial support as needed.
4. Objectives of the evaluation

The way that SFCG conducts evaluations is grounded on the guiding principles of our work: being participatory, culturally sensitive, building capacity and valuing local knowledge and approaches. SFCG Nigeria will apply this approach to the TDN II final evaluation, which will be carried out in consultation with key relevant stakeholders, including local partners and, where appropriate, community groups or key civil society individuals.

The evaluation evaluates two DAC criteria: 1) the project’s **effectiveness**, and will focus on the accountability aspect, i.e. to find out whether the project has been implemented as intended and whether it has achieved the expected results, and 2) assess the quality of **partnerships** of the implementing partners. It shall focus on the same objectives as the mid-term evaluation with the aim of providing enriched results.

The evaluation focuses on Objective 1, 2 and the cross-cutting objective:

- **Objective 1**: Culture of non-violence in the region is enhanced through a collective inclusive vision of reintegration and increased local capacities (FGD, KIIIs: security (vigilante/ police: frequency in violence reporting), community leader, youth leader, women leaders...)

- **Objective 2**: Increased participation of community members in ensuring a peaceful and credible 2015 electoral process in targeted regions (FGDs)

- **Cross-cutting Objective**: Capacity and knowledge to implement this kind of programming is reinforced (KIIIs partners 4 partners and media partner, staff SFCG)

5.0 Evaluation questions

**Effectiveness:**

1. Has the project contributed an enhanced culture of non-violence in the target communities?

2. Has the project resulted in an increase in people’s knowledge, skills and use of non-violent methods for conflict resolution?

3. Do community members, including marginalized groups, have increased knowledge about elections and was their participation in the 2015 election higher?

**Partnerships:**

4. Have implementing partners and SFCG staff achieved enhanced knowledge and capacity?

6.0 Methodology

6.1 Qualitative Methodology

SFCG used qualitative methodologies and data is collected through a literature review, focus group discussions (FGD), key informant interviews (KII) and an on-line survey. Data collection tools are designed and adapted to each target group. Tools include:

- Focus group discussions (Semi open-ended questions)
6.2 Geographic scope of the Evaluation

Four out of twelve project sites are evaluated: Osusu in Abia, Ogu in Rivers, Ogbia in Bayelsa and Koko in Delta.

- **FGDs:** There are three FGDs in each project site consisting of women, men and youth (both sexes) from the community that were involved in the project. There is a total of approx. 12 FGDs.

- **KIlIs:** There are 6-7 KIlIs in each project site with community leaders, youth leaders, women leaders, security officers (vigilante or police) non-violent youth, and local government officials. There will also be additional participants, i.e. the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) and the Project Advisory Group (PAG). There is a total of approx. 25 KIlIs.
  - Koko (Additional respondents e.g. BOT Chairman/ IRC Chairman; Ex-freedom fighter Leader)
  - Ogbia (Additional respondents e.g. CDC Chairman, LPC Chairman)
  - Ogu (Additional respondents e.g. Ex-Militant, Election Observe)
  - Amairi-Osusu

- **On-line Survey:** An on-line survey will target SFCG current and previous staff, as well as for implementing partners. It is estimated to target 6-7 SFCG staff (Field Officers and Project Manager) and Executive Directors and Field Officers from the five implementing partners. In total approximately 17 respondents (depending on the response rate)

6.3. Process done by SFCG

In order to collect the data there is are the following stages: preparatory stage, the stage of data collection and analysis stage.

6.3.1. Phase 1: Preparatory stage

- **Document Review:** Key documents are: project proposal, logical framework, the project Phase 2 baseline and mid-term evaluation reports, EU evaluation report of Phase 1, final evaluation report, monthly and quarterly activity reports for phase, Attendance sheets, Pre-Post test scores and Mid-term Evaluation Phase 2.

  Evaluation matrix and data collection tools development: An evaluation matrix is produced which gives an overview of the evaluation.

- **Recruitment and training of data collectors:** Data collectors were identified by SFCG. The DME Coordinator led and supervised the process.
  - 2 interviewers/ facilitators of FGD;
6.3.2. Phase 2: Data collection

- FGDs gathered homogeneous group of 8 to 10 people (minimum 6) and used semi-open ended guides. FGDs held with female participants were facilitated by a female member of the team and the equivalent for men.
- KIIIs were conducted in each of the identified communities targeting key participants of TND II activities and community influencers. An interview guide with semi-open ended questions was used.
- On-line Survey: The survey was designed to collect data from SFCG staff and implementing partners.

7.0 Consultancy tasks

7.1 Phase 3: Data analysis
Data analysis is the task of the Consultant. The collected data from FGDs, KIIIS and the on-line survey is to be analyzed. Findings from the mid-term evaluation are to be considered and compared.

7.2 Phase 4: Report Writing
Report writing is the task of the Consultant following standard requirements of the EU for final evaluation reports. Relevant results from the mid-term evaluation is to be incorporated into the final report.

8.0. Expected Deliverables
Expected deliverables include:
- Analysis documents;
- A draft report by 30 Sep
- A final evaluation report after comment from the donor (max 35 pages)

9.0. SFCG collaboration and support

The DM&E Assistant in Nigeria is the in-country focal point. There shall be an initial Skype call to discuss the evaluation process so far and solve any issues the Consultant may have. The DM&E Assistant is available on and ad-hoc basis to clarify questions about the data collection and other steps in the process that was managed by SFCG.
The DM&E Specialist have the oversight of the work. There is an initial discussion about the evaluation methodology, tools, as well as the steps of analysis and report writing. The DM&E Specialist shall review the data analysis part before report writing starts. There is also a review of the draft report before it is sent to the donor.

10.0 Ethical Considerations
The survey will take consideration of the rights of participants in line with the ethical codes and guidelines of research. Participant will be asked to provide their consent and made aware that their identities would not be revealed. Cultural rights will be respected; minors below 18 years of age would not be assessed while collected data would be protected for confidentiality all through the data management process.

11.0 Approval of deliverables
The deliverables will be reviewed and approved by the Project Manager, Country Director and by SFCG’s Institutional Learning Team (ILT).

12.0 Tentative timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action and deliverable</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Sep</td>
<td>Introduction Call</td>
<td>Consultant, DM&amp;E Specialist and DM&amp;E Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Sep</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 26 Sep</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Sep</td>
<td>Review of Analysis part</td>
<td>DM&amp;E Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 – 30 Sep</td>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep</td>
<td>Review of draft report</td>
<td>DM&amp;E Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 30 Sep</td>
<td>Adjustments as required by the donor</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2. Annex II – Summary of TND II Project Objectives, Outputs and Activities

Goal: Long-term stability and Peace in the Niger Delta

SO 1: Sustaining a culture of non-violence and peace
  Res. 1.1 Community leaders and key stakeholders trained & engaged in conflict transformation programming
    Act. 1.1.1 Phase II Launch, CB & Intro. conducted
    Act. 1.1.2 Baseline survey
    Act. 1.1.3 Coordinating bodies in place & effective
    Act. 1.1.4 LPCs set-up & trained
    Act. 1.1.5 LPCs trained in mediation &
    Act. 1.1.6 C&T TOT & step down conducted
    Act. 1.1.7 Network-building exchanges organised by comm.
  Res. 1.2 Increased acceptance of non-violent methods for conflict resolution
    Act. 1.2.1 The Team series aired &
    Act. 1.2.2 Team video-dialogue mobile
  Res. 1.3 Increased positive engagement of militants & non-militant youths
    Act. 1.3.1 Advocacy trainings for youths conducted
    Act. 1.3.2 Advocacy projects by youths
    Act. 1.3.3 Youth-led media productions
  Res. 2.1 Citizens have increased awareness of rights and obligations concerning elections
    Act. 2.1.1 Marginalised groups’ supported to participate in electoral process
    Act. 2.1.2 Town hall meetings & civic education rallies organised
    Act. 2.1.3 Phone-based voter education ringtone developed & rolled-out
  Res. 2.2 Coastal communities sustainable non-violent conflict resolution mechanisms
    Act. 2.2.1 Advocacy trainings conducted
    Act. 2.2.2 Participatory theatre
    Act. 2.2.3 State-level networks of CSOs & Govt. Officials
  Res. 3.1 Coalitions of stakeholders at all levels are developed to achieve regional peace
    Act. 3.1.1 LGA Leaders and Chairmen trained on leadership
    Act. 3.1.2 Participatory theatre
    Act. 3.1.3 Regular Peace Dialogues convened by NSAs
  Res. 3.2 Enhanced collaboration for Early Warning and Response to violence
    Act. 3.2.1 Strategy development and training of Security Forces
    Act. 3.2.2 Women advocacy initiatives
    Act. 3.2.3 State-level networks of CSOs & Govt. Officials

SO 2: Increased Participation of community members in electoral process
  Res. 1.1 Community leaders and key stakeholders trained & engaged in conflict transformation programming
  Res. 1.2 Increased acceptance of non-violent methods for conflict resolution
  Res. 1.3 Increased positive engagement of militants & non-militant youths
  Res. 2.1 Citizens have increased awareness of rights and obligations concerning elections

SO 3: Enhanced collaboration between authorities and communities for security
  Res. 3.1 Coalitions of stakeholders at all levels are developed to achieve regional peace
  Res. 3.2 Enhanced collaboration for Early Warning and Response to violence

SO 4: Enhanced involvement of women into local decision making, community governance and public affairs
  Res. 4.1 Women leaders play an enhanced role in public decision-making and peace initiatives
  Res. 4.2 Women play an enhanced role in facilitating the reintegration of ex-militants

CC: Capacity and Knowledge needed for implementation reinforced
  Res. CC1: Program IPs have increased organisation capacity
  Res. CC2: Successes and best practices of project activities shared regionally

Act. CC.1.1 Capacity Building workshop conducted for
  CC.1.2 Technical assistance provided to co-applicants
  CC.1.3 QA & learning clinics established

Act. CC2.1 The TND Program results are rigorously documented
  Act. CC2.2 TND II experiences documented by media
### 8.3. Annex III – Composition of the FGDs in the Four Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Community</th>
<th>No. of FGDs</th>
<th>Category of People Consulted</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koko</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Men group reps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women group reps.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youths group reps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogbia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Men group reps</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women group reps.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youths group reps</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osusu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Men group reps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women group reps.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth groups reps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Men group reps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women group reps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youths group reps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4. Annex IV – Focus Group Discussions Guide

Final Evaluation for 'Tomorrow is a New Day, Phase II'

Focus Group Discussion Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of FGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Note Taker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-10 (minimum 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(women/men/youth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start and end time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Introduction, confidentiality and informed consent

My name is ....... and I work with Search for Common Ground (SFCG), a Non-Governmental Organization. We are doing a study of a peacebuilding project in your community called 'Tomorrow is a New Day, Phase II' that finished some time ago.

We are doing a review to find out how the project progressed and what you thought about it. The findings will be used to help SFCG and our partners to learn how to implement such a project in an enhanced way and adapt our activities to better fit the communities’ needs going forward. We also talk to other groups of people in other LGAs about the same topics so that we can get different views and opinions.

The information that we will collect is anonymous, and we will not write your names at any time. This discussion should take approximately 1.5 hours. You are not under any compulsion to participate and there will be no consequences if you decide not to participate. I will however be very grateful if you decide to participate.
Please don’t be shy, but share your opinions and perspectives freely! Also, if you decide to participate, you may decide not to answer to some specific questions, and you may decide to leave the discussion at any moment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree to participate in this group discussion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. Introduction**

*First of all I would like you to talk about the project in general and what you think about it.*

1. What do you think were the main strengths and weaknesses of the project *'Tomorrow is a New Day, Phase II'*?
   
   Answers:
   
   Interesting quote:

2. Do you think that the project was useful for you and your community?
   *Why? Why not?*
   
   Answers:
   
   Interesting quote:

**B. Effectiveness: Enhanced culture of non-violence**

*I would like to hear what you think about some of the activities and the results of those activities.*

3. Do you think that the project activities were useful to improve the situation of stability and peace in your communities? *How?*
   
   Answers:
   
   Interesting quote:

4. Do you consider that non-violence methods is a way to resolve conflicts in your community? *Why? Why not?*
   
   Answers:
   
   Interesting quote:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Interesting quote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you think that there an increased or decreased acceptance of non-violent methods for solving conflict in your community as compared to before the project? Examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Effectiveness: Increase in knowledge, skills and use of non-violent methods</td>
<td>Now I would like to hear what you think about people’s knowledge, skills and use of non-violent methods for conflict resolution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did you get any increased knowledge through the project? If so, in which area(s)?</td>
<td>Answers: Yes, in business, computer knowledge, advocacy, mediation, transformational leadership and conflict management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Can you give any examples of conflict solutions in your community via non-violence methods?</td>
<td>Answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How would you describe the community’s relationships with the security officers (police, vigilantes?) Has it changed since the project started?</td>
<td>Answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To what extent have ex-militants been accepted and reintegrated into your community?</td>
<td>Answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Effectiveness: Participation in the 2015 election process</td>
<td>I would like to understand what your views are regarding community participation in the 2015 elections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Did SFCG media programs (TV and Mobile Screening) on the electoral process contribute to non-violent elections? Why? Why not?</td>
<td>Answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answers: 

Interesting quote: 

12. Do you think that the project contributed to a more peaceful election process? Why? Why not? Examples

Answers: 

Interesting quote: 

13. Did women and men participate in the elections to the same extent? Why? Why not?

Answers: 

Interesting quote: 

**Closure:**

14. What are your main **concerns** for the future stability and peace in your community?

Answers: 

Interesting quote: 

**THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!**
### 8.5 Annex V – Number of KII's Facilitated in.xxx Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Community</th>
<th>No. of KII's</th>
<th>Category of People Interviewed</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koko</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>• Female Secretary of Woman leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ex-Militant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Police</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Youth</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unknown Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogbia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>• INEC Official</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LPC Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community leader</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Youth Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Security</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LG Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osusu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>• LGA Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Non Violent Youth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Women leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Youth leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Security</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>• Security</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Militant Chief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Youth Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• School Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LGA Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unknown Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Woman Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.6 Annex VI – Key Informant Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information. Please fill out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/ profile:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Note Taker:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start &amp; End time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction and the purpose of the interview:**

- Give your name and title and explain that you would like to find out about her/his view and experience of the project "*Tomorrow is a New Day, Phase II*" for the Final Evaluation.
- There are no right or wrong answers and it is your specific opinions that I would like to understand.
- The answers you give are **completely private**, and no-one will know that the answers were given by you.
- If you do not understand a question, please just ask me and I will help to explain it better.
- Are you happy to start? It will take approximately **45 min**.
- If yes, please [sign the Consent Form](#). If no, please thank the person and let her/him leave.
**A. Introduction**

*First of all I would like you to talk about the project in general and what you think about it.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. What do you think were the main strengths and weaknesses of the project?</th>
<th>Answer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you think that the project was useful for you and your community? Why? Why not?</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Effectiveness: Enhanced culture of non-violence**

*I would like to hear what you think about some of the activities and the results of those activities.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Which are the main causes of conflict and violence in your community?</th>
<th>Answer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. To the best of your knowledge, what activities were implemented under TND II? When?</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you think that these activities were useful to improve the situation of stability and peace in your communities? How?</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How useful are non-violence methods to resolve conflicts, on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'Not Useful at All' and 5 'Extremely Useful. Why?</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 (Pls mark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you think that there an increased or decreased acceptance of non-violent methods for solving conflict in your community as compared to before the project? Examples</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Effectiveness: Increase in knowledge, skills and use of non-violent methods

*Now I would like to hear what you think about people’s knowledge, skills and use of non-violent methods for conflict resolution.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Did your participation in the project lead to increased knowledge for yourself? If so, in which area(s)?</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did your participation in the project lead to increased knowledge of non-violent methods for conflict resolution?</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Can you give any example of you being involved in solving a conflict using non-violence methods? Example.</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How would you describe the community’s relationships with the security officers (police, vigilantes?) Has it changed since the project started?</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How would you describe your community’s relationships with local governments officials? Has it changed since the project started?</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To what extent have ex-militants been accepted and reintegrated into your community?</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Effectiveness: Participation in the 2015 election process

*I would like to understand what your views are regarding community participation in the 2015 elections.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Did you participate in training on the electoral process? If so, did it give you increased knowledge on rights and obligations in elections? Examples</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Did SFCG media programmes (TV and Mobile Screening) on the electoral process contribute to non-violent elections? Why? Why not?
   Answer:

16. Did you vote? Do you always vote?
   Answer:

17. Do you consider that the project contributed to a more peaceful election process in 2015? Examples
   Answer:

18. Do you think that women and men participate in the elections to the same extent? Why? Why not?
   Answer:

E. Closure:

19. What are your main concerns for the future stability and peace in your community?
   Answer:

20. Is there anything else you would like to share?
   Answer:

**THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!**