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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Search for Common Ground (SFCG) is guided by the mission to “transform the way the world deals with conflict, away from adversarial approaches towards cooperative solutions” by engaging in conflict transformation. SFCG Nigeria has been in operation since 2004 with offices in Abuja, Jos, Maidugri, and Port Harcourt and is directed by the mission to “address conflict, utilizing consensus-based advocacy training, conflict resolution training, human rights monitoring and reporting, and the facilitation of dialogue processes that engage all levels of society.” With this in mind, SFCG Nigeria developed the PWA I and PWA II projects.

As background, Nigeria’s Middle Belt divides the country’s predominantly Christian south from the largely Muslim north. As one of the most diverse regions in Nigeria, the area has experienced two decades of violence rooted in longstanding grievances, religious and ethnic tensions, land disputes, and a deteriorating security sector. At the core of these tensions is a power struggle between Hausa-Fulani Muslims, the largest group in northern Nigeria often called “settlers”, and the Christian “indigene” ethnic groups. Both groups have experienced and engaged in bloody massacres and mass killings as part of a power struggle for cultural, religious, economic, and political control. As of late, the region has become increasingly fragile with the rise of extremist groups like Boko Haram.

The Plateau Will Arise! Phase II (PWA II): *Consolidating an Architecture for Peace, Tolerance and Reconciliation* is an eighteen-month continuation of the first phase of the project that works to address violence and underlying tensions in the Middle Belt. Implemented from July 3, 2015 to June 30, 2017, the second phase of the PWA project aimed to “strengthen the locally-driven peace process in Plateau State, and ensure the sustainability of the ‘Peace Architecture’ - a network of structures capable of analyzing, preventing, and responding to violent conflict within the State - established in the first phase of this program.” To do so, SFCG used the following objectives as the project Theory of Change:

*Objective 1:* To enhance the climate of peace in 10 Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Plateau and Kaduna States.

*Objective 2:* To strengthen the capacity of state and local actors to secure their communities.

*Objective 3:* To increase collaboration and outreach by Religious leaders, women and youth to sustain peace in the post-election period.

*Cross-Cutting:* To strengthen the capacity and knowledge of local civil society to implement this kind of programming.

Evaluation Objective & Scope

This final external evaluation offers a review the project Theory of Change (ToC) and all project components in an effort to measure progress toward key project indicators. The evaluation
method, objective, and final report center around three themes: effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability.

The final evaluation used primary quantitative, primary qualitative, and secondary quantitative and qualitative data to triangulate findings. Secondary qualitative and quantitative data included information from relevant project documents, industry reports, and monitoring data. Primary data was collected during key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and a survey with stakeholders in Plateau State and Kaduna State, Nigeria. Primary data collection took place from 1-14 July 2017 in Barkin Ladi, Bokkos, Lantang North, and Jos North. Stakeholders included community residents, civil society, security, government leaders, and SFCG staff.

**Evaluation Methods**

The evaluation follows a five-phase, mixed-methods methodological approach that relies heavily on participatory techniques. A total of 339 household surveys, 19 key informant interviews (KIIs), and 7 focus-group discussions (FGDs) were conducted across four LGAs – Barkin Ladi, Bokkos, Langtang North, and Jos North. Household surveys took place with one adult household member, alternating male and female respondents, from every third household. KIIs were held with lead ToT trainers and partner organization project leads. Finally, FGDs took place with lead ToT trainers and community members.

Importantly, baseline data was drawn from the final report of the PWA I project. The evaluation team did not have access to raw data from any prior phase of the PWA I project nor the PWA II project.

**Findings & Recommendations**

**Cultivating a Climate of Peace**

The PWA II project has successfully contributed to a climate of peace in target LGAs. 55.1% of men and 64.4% of women did not experience violence. Where there was violence, more men (42.2%) than women (33.3%) experienced violence as a result of conflict in their LGA. The frequency of violence was also low in PWA target communities; 52% stated violence never occurred in their community, 42% experienced only occasional violence, and only 3.3% found violence often occurred in their community.

Over half of all respondents noted great improvement in intergroup relations across all LGAs, with the greatest proportion in Bokkos at 72.3%. Of those communities that overlap from baseline to endline, namely Barkin Ladi and Bokkos, respondents saw a mean increase of 29.8% between those that reported great improvement in intergroup relations at the conclusion of PWA I (baseline) and the completion of PWA II (endline).

The security situation in all communities has also improved: 68.9% in Jos North noted great improvement, followed by Barkin Ladi (61.7%), Bokkos (53.2%), and Langtang North (43.6%).
**Shift in Attitudes**

PWA communities are confident violence can be stopped – 87.5% of household survey respondents affirmed this response – and 75.7% of those surveyed feel violence cannot be justified.

**Increase Communication & Collaboration**

The PWA II project is responsible for increased communication and information sharing. Local uptake and increased capacity of community members, local and state governments, and security services speaks to the project’s impact and sustainability beyond June 2017.

Participants found dialogue/mediation trainings and the ToT program particularly helpful in increasing the capacity of local community members to mitigate violence. Nearly all households felt intergroup relations had improved over the lifetime of the PWA II project, citing improved communication and coordination with security agents. Mutual greeting, joint football games, and faster response to calls for help were among the many examples of the improved relationship.

**Gendered Feelings of Safety**

That majority of both women (83.6%) and men (90.3%) stated that they feel safe in their community; however, when they did report feeling unsafe, women stated this twice as often as men.

**Recommendations:**

- Future projects should address safety concerns through a gendered lens, meaning activities should account for and directly target the unique safety concerns of women from project participation to activities that teach women to address gender-based violence to activities that address men’s involvement with violence against women.

**Conflict Resolution**

Local community members (1) are confident in their ability to resolve conflict, (2) note that women and youth, and disable persons to a lesser degree, are involved in decision-making at LGAs, (3) find collaboration is happening between communities and security agents, local and state government, and CSOs, and (4) are overwhelmingly “satisfied” with these collaborations.

**Participation**

Awareness is lower than desired – only one-third of respondents had heard of PWA project activities – and low participation, including listener- and viewership of media programs, causes some concern. 50.2% of households are not participating in project activities and nearly two-thirds are not engaging with the project’s media outputs. 41.5% of respondents stated they were not aware of any activities.

It should be noted that the organization feels these figures illustrate a substantial increase in engagement given previous lack thereof. The evaluation team agrees in principle but is unable to substantial this finding without comparable baseline data.
**Recommendations:**

- Include greater awareness raising around project activities in the future.

  - Our Children are Talking and The Team programs should be eliminated with greater funding applied to the Voices of Peace program instead.

**Early Warning System**

73% of KII respondents found the EWS effective. However, the effectiveness of EWS waned in direct relationship with reduced funding because engagement with the EWS requires the use of cell phones data.

**Recommendations:**

- EWS should remain a key project activity, but in future iterations of the project must include a fully funded EWS at a level that allows (1) full and consistent staff management of the EWS and (2) data allowance for EWS community leaders who are trained and responsible for managing the EWS at the local level.

**Staff Retention**

Staff retention on the PWA II project, and potentially across SFCG Nigeria, appears to be a chronic problem. The result is poor institutionalization of knowledge around both the project and the organization. Given their short tenure with SFCG, current staff do not have the capacity to recall milestones, project challenges and successes, and detailed accounting of the relationship with the donor nor partner organizations. This lack of institutional knowledge was exacerbated by contracts for PWA and PWA II project staff that expired prior to the time of final evaluation, which made consultations and FGDs with project staff nearly impossible.

**Recommendations:**

- Increase staff salaries and benefits packages, including highly prized professional development training, to market rate to attract and retain qualified candidates.

  - Extend project staff contracts at least one month beyond the conclusion of each project to enable staff support of final external evaluation.
**Monitoring & Evaluation**

The PWA I and PWA II projects were well monitored, but baseline and mid-term data were entirely inaccessible to both staff and the evaluation team. Put simply, raw datasets of baseline or mid-term data could not be found. This issue is simultaneously about high staff turn-over and poor M&E protocols and planning.

**Recommendations:**

- To conserve the evaluation budget and more efficiently use project time, the same evaluation team should be contracted for baseline and endline evaluation activities.
- Ideally this same team also consults with the project team during monitoring activities to allow for continuity across datasets. This would improve the consistency and quality of data collected throughout the project cycle.

- Baseline and mid-term data should be more consistently gathered and stored in a manner accessible and clear to external reviewers.
INTRODUCTION

Context

Nigeria’s Middle Belt, dividing the country’s predominantly Christian south from the largely Muslim north, is one of the most diverse and complex regions in Nigeria. For the past two decades, the region has been plagued by episodes of violence rooted in longstanding grievances, religious and ethnic tensions, land disputes, and a deteriorating security sector. Neighboring Plateau and Kaduna states have been affected the worst by the violence, enduring more than 10,000 deaths from inter-communal clashes since 1992, thousands of which occurred after 2010. Exacerbated by discriminatory state and local government policies, there is an acute need to rebuild trust between government authorities, the security sector, and divided religious and ethnic communities. Tensions in these states are said to emulate tensions on a national scale because of the diversity of the population and the drivers of violence.

At the core of the tensions in both states is a power struggle between Hausa-Fulani Muslims, the largest group in northern Nigeria deemed to be “settlers” in the Middle Belt, and predominantly Christian “indigene” ethnic groups. “Indigene” groups, who identify as the original inhabitants of this region, claim to feel threatened by the expansion of “settler” groups into their communities, citing a history of oppression and violence against non-Muslims in the north. In Plateau State, the Christian-majority government has responded by enacting discriminatory policies limiting opportunities for Hausa-Fulani Muslims to enter local government. In Kaduna state, there is a more stark political and ethnic divide, as Hausa-Fulani Muslims represent the majority in the northern part of the state, where non-Muslims feel they face discrimination. Christian “indigene” groups represent the majority in other parts of the state, where Muslims say they are treated poorly.

Both groups have experienced and engaged in bloody massacres and mass killings as part of a power struggle for cultural, religious, economic, and political control. This has resulted in the displacement of nearly a quarter-million people. High tensions between the security sector, government authorities, and local communities has resulted in an inability to appropriately punish crimes that contribute to widespread distrust. Ethnic tensions have also been linked to violence in the states’ rural areas, including tensions between “indigene” farmers and “settler” herders, armed rural banditry, and an aggressive military response. This has created a large population of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs).

The instability in the region has become increasingly dangerous with the rise of extremist groups. Recent activity by Boko Haram include the kidnapping of approximately 300 schoolgirls in Chibok, Borno state and deadly bombings in Abuja, Jos (162 people in May 2014) and Kaduna.

The first phase of the Plateau Will Arise! project focused exclusively on eight Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Plateau state. Cross border tensions and similar problems in neighboring Kaduna state led Search for Common Ground (SFCG) to expand the program, adding Kaura LGA in Kaduna state and Langtang North in Plateau state.
Organization Background

Founded in 1982, SFCG is guided by their mission to “transform the way the world deals with conflict, away from adversarial approaches towards cooperative solutions” by engaging in conflict transformation. Today SFCG has 59 offices around the world, 802 local partners, and 795,000 participants each year. SFCG Nigeria has been in operation since 2004 with offices in Abuja, Jos, Maidugri, and Port Harcourt. In Nigeria, SFCG is “working to address conflict, utilizing consensus-based advocacy training, conflict resolution training, human rights monitoring and reporting, and the facilitation of dialogue processes that engage all levels of society.”

Program Background

Plateau Will Arise! Phase II (PWA II): Consolidating an Architecture for Peace, Tolerance and Reconciliation is an eighteen-month continuation of the first phase of the project, implemented from July 3, 2015 to June 30, 2017. Both phases of the project were implemented by SFCG Nigeria and funded by the European Union (EU) Instrument Contributing to Stability and Peace. SFCG worked with two implementing partners to carry out project activities: Community Action for Popular Participation (CAPP) and the Jos Repertory Theatre (JRT). Other contributing partners include The Office of the Special Adviser on Peacebuilding and the Plateau Peace Practitioners Network (PPPN). PWA II was implemented in ten local government areas (LGAs) in Plateau and Kaduna States, including eight LGAs from PWA (Jos North, Jos South, Riyom, Barkin Ladi, Bokkos, Qua’an Pan, Shendam and Wase) and two additional LGAs (Langtang North and Kaura). The second phase of this project aimed to “strengthen the locally-driven peace process in Plateau State, and ensure the sustainability of the ‘Peace Architecture’ - a network of structures capable of analyzing, preventing, and responding to violent conflict within the State - established in the first phase of this program.” At its core, this project is committed to building local ownership of the peace architecture to ensure long-term, sustainable results.

Objectives: This project had the overall objective of “developing and ensuring the sustainability of an active, locally owned, and inclusive Peace Architecture in Plateau State beyond 2015,” as well as the following specific and cross-cutting objectives:

Objective 1: To enhance the climate of peace in 10 Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Plateau and Kaduna States.

Objective 2: To strengthen the capacity of state and local actors to secure their communities.

Objective 3: To increase collaboration and outreach by Religious leaders, women and youth to sustain peace in the post-election period.

Cross-Cutting: To strengthen the capacity and knowledge of local civil society to implement this kind of programming.

Target populations: Due to the far-reaching implications of community and state-level peacebuilding, the final beneficiaries for this project include all 3.5 million residents of Plateau
state and 200,000 residents of Kaura LGA in Kaduna state. This project targeted community leaders and other influential actors, ordinary residents (including children, women, youth, IDPs, persons with disabilities (PWD), men, and victims of conflict), and civil society, security, and government leaders.

**Results and activities:** Through its implementing partners, this project carried out activities in Plateau and Kaduna states to meet a unique set of results under each specified objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. To enhance the climate of peace in 10 Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Plateau and Kaduna States.</strong></td>
<td>1.1 Enhance key local actors’ knowledge of conflict transformation and initiatives to address conflict in 10 LGAs</td>
<td>1.1.1 Refresher trainings for ToT Participants and Key Stakeholders 1.1.2 Training of Trainers Workshop and Step-down Trainings in New LGAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Reinforce favorable public attitudes</td>
<td>1.2.1 Continue to air voices of Peace Radio Programme 1.2.2 Produce a comic book that will introduce the characters and storylines of the children’s radio drama. 1.2.3 Produce and air children’s radio programme Our Children are Talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Increase the number of successfully resolved conflicts</td>
<td>1.3.1 Support to locally led conflict response processes through training and facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. To strengthen the capacity of state and local actors to secure their communities.</strong></td>
<td>2.1 Increase communication and collaboration among community leaders, security actors, and local government officials on security issues</td>
<td>2.1.1 Support Community Peace &amp; Security Architecture Dialogues (CSAD) 2.1.2 Support strengthening and implementation of the Early Warning System (EWS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Enhance the ability of state government agencies with a peacebuilding or security mandate to analyze and respond to conflict threats</td>
<td>2.2.1 Offer conflict sensitivity mainstreaming training for key government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Enhance mutual understanding of situations that create conflicts and develop responses to conflict threats</td>
<td>2.3.1 Continue to support facilitation of state-level Peace Architecture Dialogue (PAD), led by the Nigerian Stability and Reconciliation Programme (NSRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. To increase collaboration and outreach by</strong></td>
<td>3.1 Enhance the ability of Religious leaders, women and youth to for inter-religious</td>
<td>3.1.1 Support inter-religious collaboration and non-adversarial advocacy training for religious, women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious leaders, women and youth to sustain peace in the post-election period.</th>
<th>collaboration and outreach for a peaceful post-election period.</th>
<th>and youth leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2 Facilitate radio roundtables to respond to post-election tensions</td>
<td>3.2 Increase awareness about constructive leadership related to the post-elections environment</td>
<td>3.2.1 Air constructive leadership-based television drama modeled after SFCG’s international program The Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2 Use a mobile cinema to bring dramas to rural areas and facilitate discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CC. To strengthen the capacity and knowledge of local civil society to implement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CC1: Enhance the organisational capacity of JRT and CAPP</th>
<th>CC1 Update the Institutional Capacity Assessments (ICA) for JRT and CAPP from Phase I; hold technical assistance workshops and quarterly meetings for finance staff, programme officers and leadership.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC2: Evaluate the project, collect and share evidence</td>
<td>CC2 Conduct a participatory evaluation to draw lessons and gauge results of the project; share results widely with project participants and partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Review of Similar Peacebuilding Programs

In an effort to better understand both the context and project activities, the evaluation team reviewed similar projects.

### Women’s Situation Room, Nigeria

The Women’s Situation Room (WSR) is a mechanism to mitigate violence before, during, and after an election period through active engagement with stakeholders, youth, and the media acting in countries where election periods are particularly rocky. The WSR is both a process of conflict mitigation and a physical room, set up to field calls from the public to act as an EWS and analyze violence across the country. Founded on the principles that women should be actively engaged in political processes and conflict mitigation/resolutions, the program establishes both a contact group of national eminent women, and a group of Eminent African women to engage stakeholders and support the physical room. The WSR was first developed by the Angie Brooks International Centre (ABIC) in Liberia during the 2011 general and presidential elections. It has since been replicated in seven other African countries after being adopted as a “best practice” by the Gender Is My Agenda Programme (GIMAP) at the African Union (AU).

The WSR was adopted in Nigeria during the 2015 general elections to help mitigate violence and increase women’s political participation for long-term sustainable peace. The Nigeria WSR was built on the foundation of the WSR strategies, including:
1. Mobilization of women and youth
2. Engagement and mobilization of youth and the media
3. Capacity building, including training of women and youth as elections observers
4. Robust media campaign
5. Advocacy and lobbying

Convened by the Nigeria Women Platform for Peaceful Elections (NWPFE) and led by the Women’s International League for Peace (WILFP), the WSR was operationalized in 10 states identified as particularly prone to electoral violence. The program supported women and youth to engage with key stakeholders, including political parties, the Independent National Electoral Commissions (INEC), security agencies, and the media, lobbying them to “conduct themselves in a more responsible manner pre, during and post elections in Nigeria.”

Relevance to PWA II: Like PWA II, the WSR built a strategy that activated the community to mitigate violence and build sustainable peace through a strategic communication plan and engagement with stakeholders, including security forces and political parties. Best practices that could be adopted for future PWA programs include:

1. Actively engaging and training women leaders, recognizing both the power of women stakeholders to influence their communities and the risk of excluding women from peacebuilding processes. For the WSR 300 all-women election monitors were deployed during the elections, and reported 5,000 incidents including reports of GBV.

2. Adopting a widespread social media campaign to spread ideas and reach new groups of people as part of their communication strategy. The WSR complimented their active engagement with the media, including radio talk shows and TV shows, with a strong social media strategy to reach young people.

3. Establishing a physical space to act as an EWS and link reports of violence to immediate action, including two rooms: (a) a call center for the public to report acts or risks of violence, and (b) a room for prominent leaders to analyze and respond. In the case of the WSR, forty youth incident reporters managed the call center took 2,748 calls from the public during the 9 days around the 2015 election. The second room was led by 8 prominent women leaders and supported by a team of analysts.

4. Active engagement with youth - including dialogues, trainings, and overall positive support - empowers the next generation of leaders to fight for peace in their country.

Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of this participatory evaluation was to collect the viewpoints of a cross-section of community residents, including both participants and non-participants to draw lessons and gauge results of the project. The final evaluation was produced and shared widely with project participants and partners, and presented during the Peace Architecture dialogues. The evaluation – with sensitive details redacted – will eventually be published on SFCG’s website and shared
with other learning networks to enhance the broader field of peacebuilding in Nigeria and the world.

**Evaluation Objectives**

This evaluation offers a review the project Theory of Change (ToC) and all components of the project to measure progress toward key indicators, as specified in the Project Monitoring Plan. Using highly participatory approaches, the evaluation centers around measuring project effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability as crucial DAC criteria. Deliverables were created with an eye toward shareability with project participants, partners and learning networks, presentation during the Peace Architecture dialogues, and publishing on SFCG’s website.

**Evaluation Scope**

This evaluation works to triangulate findings via primary quantitative, primary qualitative, and secondary quantitative and qualitative data. Secondary qualitative and quantitative data includes information from relevant project documents, industry reports, and monitoring data. Primary data was collected during key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and a survey with stakeholders in Plateau State and Kaduna State, Nigeria. Primary data collection took place from 1-14 July 2017 in Barkin Ladi, Bokkos, Lantang North, and Jos North. Stakeholders include community residents, civil society, security, and government leaders.

**Evaluation Team**

*Evaluation Team*

The evaluation team was led by Jillian J. Foster, with Molly Kellogg as research assistant and fifteen enumerators, listed below. Imaobong Akpan provided in-country support, offered substantial expertise related to context, and recruited the team of enumerators:

**Enumerators:**

- Abdullahi, Maimuna I.
- Abdulrazaq, Zainab
- Ahmadu, T. Tahiru
- Azi, Yakubu Itse
- Bashir, Salis Mahommad
- Dauda, Emmanuel
- Gam, Yakubu C.
- Jwan, Nanret Daniel
- Kwaplong, Katmaan Katherine
- Muhammad, Amina Aliyu
- Pwakim, Jacob Choji
- Sabo, Aishatu
- Shaibu, Gloria C.
- Terry, Cynthia
- Yahaya, Ali Ali
METHODOLOGY

Research Questions

Theory of Change and Design
1. How relevant is the Project Theory of Change and design to the context and area in which the project intervened?
2. How can the attribution of the project be verified? Can any causal chain of the project be identified and confirmed?

Effectiveness
1. How effective have the Early Warning System, Community Security Architecture Dialogues (CSADs) and Peace Architecture Dialogues (PADs) been in contributing to increased communication and information sharing on emerging conflict issues in communities, LGAs and the state?
2. How effective have the Project’s media programming and community engagements been at reaching the targeted demographics, and supporting the shifts in public knowledge and attitudes on conflict issues that are targeted through this project?

Relevance
1. How relevant has the project been in contributing to, or hindering:
   a. Increased intergroup confidence, reduced tensions, the gradual return of peace to the region, and by extension economic growth?
   b. Increased social cohesion within the targeted communities, reinforced informal ties, as well as deliberately created relationships aimed at bringing together multiple stakeholders for violence prevention?
   c. Increased linkages between government, civil society and security agencies, creating opportunities for a more broad-based and inclusive policy response to conflict both at the state and local levels? How sustainable are these linkages?
2. What unexpected changes, both positive and negative, has the project contributed to?

Sustainability
1. How sustainable are the Early Warning System, Community Security Architecture Dialogues (CSADs) and Peace Architecture Dialogues (PADs) supported by this Project, in communities, LGAs and the state?
2. If the project has contributed to the building of relationships and linkages between groups in targeted communities, as well as government, civil society and security agencies, how sustainable are these relationships and linkages?
Data Sources

**Primary Sources**
- Survey questionnaire responses
- KII responses
- FGD responses

**Secondary Sources**
- Background documents, provided by SFCG Nigeria
- NGR503 baseline, midterm and final evaluation reports; NGR505 baseline and midterm reports
- Review/evaluation of other similar programs

Methodology

This evaluation follows a five-phase methodology as outlined below. This methodology relies heavily on participatory, mixed-methods approaches, including a survey, FGD and KII and works to triangulate data wherever possible.

Sample

The table below outlines the sample for this final evaluation. The data collection team – which included Foster, and 15 enumerators – conducted a total of 339 household surveys, 19 key informant interviews (KII), and 7 focus-group discussions (FGD). Household surveys took place with one adult member of each household. KII took place with lead ToT trainers and SFCG and partner organization project leads. FGDs took place with lead ToT trainers and SFCG and partner organization staff members.

Enumerators were asked to survey every third household to ensure a random sample. Surveys took place with one adult member, alternating female and male respondents, from each household. Districts and villages chosen for data collection were selected because of their relative safety, ease of access given resource constraints, and close relationship to baseline data.

Importantly, baseline data was drawn from the final report of the PWA I project. The evaluation team did not have access to raw data from any phase of the PWA I project nor the PWA II project. Analysis was truncated to simple comparison rather than statistical testing as a result.

The data collection timeline is provided at the end of the methodology section.
Table 1: Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Population (people)</th>
<th>% of Sample Frame</th>
<th># HH Surveys</th>
<th># KIIs Lead ToT Trainers</th>
<th># FGDs Community Members</th>
<th># FGDs Lead ToT Trainers</th>
<th># FGD Staff/Partner Org</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barkin Ladi</td>
<td>175,267</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (one with each org)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bokkos</td>
<td>178,454</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantang North</td>
<td>140,643</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos North</td>
<td>429,300</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Evaluation Activities

In alignment with the TOR, this evaluation follows a five-phase methodology as outlined below. This methodology relies heavily on participatory, mixed-methods approaches and works to triangulate data wherever possible.

PHASE I: Background Literature & Data Review

Following initial consultation with SFCG staff, Foster and Kellogg conducted a review of all background project documents and data, including relevant scholarship, industry reports, and previously collected program data. The aims of this exploratory literature and data review was to:

- Frame the study and identify initial hypotheses around project effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability.
- Identify unforeseen variables associated with project impact.
- Explore project indicators as able to measure project effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability.

Documents and data reviewed include, but were not limited to: baseline and mid-term evaluations, monitoring data, initial project plans and donor application(s), Project Theory of Change, results-based framework, previously used data collection tools, and evaluations from similar SFCG projects implemented outside of Nigeria.

PHASE II: Tool Development

In consultation with SFCG, Foster developed a quantitative survey, two KII questionnaires, and four FGD guides for use as outlined in the sample above. Tools were validated by SFCG and the team of enumerators. Following validation, tools were modified according to initial testing results before full implementation.
The evaluation team, when considering appropriateness and relevance in the broader context of this study, chose to address both via a unique mix of indicators to illustrate the reality that appropriateness and relevance often work in concert.

**PHASE III: Data Collection**

From 1-14 July, data was collected using the following techniques:

- 30-90 minute in-depth KIIs with lead ToT trainers and SFCG and partner organization project leads.
- 45-90 minute focus group discussions held separately with (a) lead ToT trainers, (b) SFCG and partner organization staff members, and (c) those that previously participated in the Theory of Change (ToC) “interactive group session”.
- Surveys with a random and representative sample of individuals from households in communities where NGR503 and NGR505 have been implemented.

Foster endeavored to facilitate a ToC-focused FGD as a time of reflection with SFCG staff and partners but that FGD did not materialize because of staff turn-over and the obligations of other projects.

**PHASE IV: Synthesis & Writing**

Following data collection, Foster and Kellogg synthesized qualitative and quantitative data into concrete and cogent findings, compiling these findings into a draft report for review by the SFCG team. Emphasis was placed on visualization of data and triangulation of findings across data sources. Feedback provided by SFCG was integrated into the final report and presentation.

**PHASE V: Final Presentation**

Foster will present findings to SFCG and key stakeholders using PowerPoint slides and notes. The presentation will include discussion and visuals detailing (1) evaluation overview, (2) methodology, and (3) main findings. Upon SFCG’s request, Foster will present findings at peace architecture dialogues. Foster will also be available for continued consultation, at no additional cost, for 14 calendar days.
Evaluation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET DATES (2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHASE I: Background Literature &amp; Data Review</td>
<td>1-25 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE II: Tool Development</td>
<td>25-28 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCG reviews draft tools</td>
<td>29 June – 1 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE III: Data Collection</td>
<td>1-14 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE IV: Synthesis &amp; Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>14 July – 14 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft final report</td>
<td>15-31 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCG review draft report</td>
<td>1-10 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report finalized with feedback integrated</td>
<td>11-15 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE V: Final Presentation</td>
<td>16-20 September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethical Considerations

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluation team, under Foster’s leadership, considered the following ethical standards imperative to our work:

- Guarantee the safety of respondents and the research team.
- Apply protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of respondents.
- Select and train the research team on ethical issues.
- Ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas and applicable SFCG policies such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and youth.
- Store securely the collected information.

The research team also respected the following ethical principles:

- Comprehensive and systematic inquiry: The consultant conducted systematic, data-based inquiries. She communicated her methods and approaches accurately and in sufficient detail to allow others to understand, interpret and critique her work. She made clear the limitations of the review and its results.
- Competence: Consultant possessed the abilities and skills and experience appropriate to undertake the tasks and practiced within the limits of her professional training and competence.
- Honesty and integrity: The consultant was transparent with the contractor about: any conflict of interest, any change made in the negotiated project plan and the reasons
why those changes were made, any risk that certain procedures or activities produce misleading review information.

- Respect for people: The consultant respected the security, dignity and self-worth of respondents, program participants. The consultant was sensitive to and respected differences amongst participants in culture, religion, gender, disability, age and ethnicity.

**Limitations**

The sensitive nature of this evaluation and the security situation in Nigeria presented limitations for this evaluation. The methodology was modified in country as needed and reflected in its final form here. The following limitations may have affected the process and findings from this evaluation:

1. **Sample Bias – Not representative of entire population.** Given that this study only sampled communities where the PWA project was implemented, there is an inherent inability to (1) contrast with a control population and (2) provide causal analysis of changes. Because of resource constraints, an expansion of the evaluation to include greater representativeness within the population was not possible.

2. **Lack of institutional knowledge.** There is a history of high staff turn-over at SFCG Nigeria. As a result, institutional knowledge around this project was severely lacking. Current staff simply did not have the capacity to recall milestones, project challenges and successes, and detailed accounting of the relationship with the donor nor partner organizations. Further exacerbating the situation, contracts for all PWA and PWA II project staff had expired by the time of evaluation which meant consultations and FGDs with project staff was all but impossible.

3. **Inadequate baseline data.** The PWA II project was clearly monitored, but full baseline data was inaccessible. Instead, the evaluation team made due by drawing baseline data from the final report of the PWA project. The evaluation team did not have access to raw data from any phase of the PWA project nor the PWA II project. As a result, final analysis was reduced to only comparison of figures rather than full statistical testing.
FINDINGS

The following section provides an overview of the key findings from the evaluation using four subsections: theory of change and design, effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability. Analysis within each subsection seeks to answer the key research questions listed above. Being conscious to not overwhelm the reader, a full list of research questions has not been provided again; rather, they remain detailed only in the methodology section. Every effort was made to answer all guiding question, but gaps remain given the limitations of this study and lack of a raw baseline data with which this evaluation team was not involved in collecting.

Of keen interest to the evaluation team are indicators that speak to behavior and attitudinal changes. The evaluation was designed with this in mind, which meant tools were carefully developed to build on those used previously. The sample population was also chosen to mimic that chosen at baseline. Data collection techniques were intentionally designed and skillfully planned to enable the greatest possible triangulation of findings.

Demographics

For the final evaluation, endline data was gathered from households randomly selected at an interval of every third home. One adult – alternately a man and a woman – was chosen to complete a survey at each household of the four LGAs surveyed; namely Barkin Ladi, Jos North, Langtang North, and Bokkos. The evaluation team was not involved with the gathering of baseline data, though that data has been analyzed where possible. A total of 339 household surveys, 19 KIIs with ToT participants, and 7 FGDs with community members were completed during the endline. Table 2 provides further details about the endline household survey sample population.

Table 2: Demographic Summary, Endline Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51+</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent is Head of HH</strong></td>
<td>28.8 (% of women)</td>
<td>69.9 (% of men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary complete</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary complete</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical school</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic studies</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary studies</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary degree or greater</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith leader</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local laborer/NGO/Private sector</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public servant</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security services</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HH Size (mean)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH Size (mean)</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent is disabled</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other member of HH is disabled</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The endline sample included a nearly equal proportion of male and female respondents. The majority of women (31.4%) completed secondary school and the majority of men (35.5%) completed some tertiary studies. Though a smaller proportion of the sample population, 2.5% more of the women’s sample received no schooling as compared to the men’s sample population. The majority of the baseline sample (40.2%) also completed secondary school.

The Tarok, Berom, and Hausa tribes are most represented in the endline sample population at 14.8%, 13.9%, and 13.0% respectively. The “other” category visualized here includes, but is not limited to, the following tribes: Afizere, Anaguta, Angas, Borno, Bwall, Challa, Chibok, Egon, Gade, Igala, Kanam, Kanuri, Miango, Owan, Puma, and Pyem.

Relatedly, the sample population includes mostly Christians, with approximately one third of the sample being Muslim and only 1.1% of only men practicing traditional religion(s).
Survey respondents were asked about their experiences with violence over the most recent two years, or the final phase of the PWA II project. Specifically, respondents were asked, “Have you experienced violence as a result of conflict in your LGA in the past two years?”. Disaggregation by sex offers interesting insights into experiences with violence in PWA II target communities. First, the majority of men (55.1%) and women (64.6%) did not experience violence, which is a finding in support of an impactful PWA II project. Second, and possibly most helpful for developing the next iteration of the PWA project, more men (42.2%) than women (33.3%) have experienced violence as a result of conflict in their LGA.

**Theory of Change & Design**

Following a conflict mapping exercise and theory of change (ToC) interactive group session, SFCG designed PWA II as an expansion of the PWA project. The ToC for PWA II extends the objectives of PWA and builds on the same activities from the first phase of the project. Unfortunately, the PWA II theory of change was not visualized during the interactive group session, but the project’s three objectives and three targets have been clearly outlined as follows:

**PWA Theory of Change**

**Objectives:** (cross-cutting) To strengthen the capacity and knowledge of local civil society to implement this kind of programming.

*Objective 1:* To enhance the climate of peace in 10 LGAs in Plateau and Kaduna States;

*Objective 2:* To strengthen the capacity of state and local actors to secure their communities;

*Objective 3:* To increase collaboration and outreach by Religious leaders, women and youth to sustain peace in the post-election period.
Targets:

1. Community leaders and other influential actors in divided communities: Equip them with tools to lead in peacebuilding/conflict transformations.

2. Ordinary residents (children, women, youth, IDPs, PWDs, men, victims of conflict): Engaged in program design, identification of leaders through community activities/media programming.

3. Civil society, security and government leaders: Training, capacity building to respond to conflict, dialogue facilitation with government; improve relationship with security forces (which Boko Haram takes advantage of).

To better understand project relevance and work to identify the casual chain of the PWA II project, each objective is first examined independently below. This is followed by a discussion of the relevance of the project ToC. Before beginning, it is important to note that the distinction between appropriateness and relevance is often misunderstood. Appropriateness refers the degree to which an intervention was implemented in a manner conducive to and honoring of socio-cultural norms. If the intervention did challenge socio-cultural norms, appropriateness speaks to implementation that results in no harm to participants. One might think of the “do no harm” policies many NGOs and researchers follow when designing and implementing projects. In contrast to doing harm, an appropriate intervention would instead carefully adapt to context specific needs, would be highly participatory, and would encourage community ownership and engagement. Relevance, on the other hand, points to an intervention’s ability to address community-identified needs and to align activities with furthering the purpose of the intervention.

Thinking about appropriateness and relevance in the broader context of this study, the evaluation team chose to address both via a unique mix of indicators, understanding that appropriateness and relevance often work in concert. This section and those that follow build on one another to illuminate (1) the relevance and appropriateness of the project design and implementation, (2) the effect of the project, and (3) the sustainability of that effect.

Objective 1: To enhance the climate of peace in 10 LGAs in Plateau and Kaduna States

The PWA II project was largely concerned with cultivating a climate of peace, as opposed to conflict, in the target LGAs. Respondents at baseline and endline were asked about intergroup relations, and at endline respondents were asked an additional series of questions about the “security situation” in their communities.

Using the final evaluation of the PWA I project as a baseline, the majority of respondents stated that intergroup relations had improved somewhat during the PWA I project. Closely behind that majority, 27% in Barkin Ladi, 25% in Jos South, 34% in Shendam, and 43% in Bokkos felt that intergroup relations had greatly improved during the first phase of the PWA project. At endline, the vast majority of households surveyed reported that intergroup relations had improved greatly “over the last 2 years”. Over half of all respondents noted great improvement across all LGAs
sampled, with the greatest proportion in Bokkos at 72.3%. Of those communities included in both baseline and endline, namely Barkin Ladi and Bokkos, respondents saw a mean increase of 29.8% between those that reported great improvement in intergroup relations at the conclusion of PWA I project (baseline) and the completion of PWA II project (endline).
Asked about security in their communities, respondents at endline also reported great improvement over the most recent two years. In Jos North, 68.9% noted great improvement, followed by Barkin Ladi (61.7%), Bokkos (53.2%), and Langtang North (43.6%). Interestingly, in Langtang North a nearly equal number of respondents stated that community security had only somewhat improved (45.5%) as opposed to improved greatly (43.6%).

Communities targeted by the PWA II project have clearly experienced improvements in both intergroup relations and community security. Beyond these points, a climate of peace is also about feelings of personal safety and the frequency of violence, both of which are highly gendered topics.

That majority of both female (83.6%) and male (90.3%) survey respondents stated that their community feels safe. That said, when they did report feeling unsafe, women stated this twice as often as men. An unsurprising finding given global gender-based violence trends that illuminate women’s physical insecurity.

Households across communities noted low levels of violence; 52% stated violence never occurred in their community, 42% experienced only occasional violence, and only 3.3% found violence often occurred in their community.

From intergroup relations, to general security, to feelings of safety and the frequency of violence, households in PWA II target communities have benefited from a climate of peace.
Objective 2: To strengthen the capacity of state and local actors to secure their communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barkin Ladi</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos North</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langtang North</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bokkos</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ability of local and state actors to secure communities begins first with the ability to resolve conflict between local community members.

Respondents were asked, “Do you think people in your community are better able to resolve conflict than they were two years ago?” Though the evaluation team does not have baseline data in this area, the endline figures are clear. All respondents affirmed that members of their LGA are better able to resolve conflict. Disaggregated by LGA, the highest percentage of these positive results come from Bokkos (85.1%) and Langtang North (82.1%).

Communities feel confident in their abilities at the local level. The following sub-section explores the link between local and state actors, understanding that collaboration is critical in efforts to (1) resolve existing conflict and (2) cultivate a lasting climate of peace.

Objective 3: To increase collaboration and outreach by Religious leaders, women and youth to sustain peace in the post-election period.

Women, youth, and those with disabilities were more involved in decision-making at each the LGA. Across communities, 27.7% of respondents stated that women are “very involved”, 38.6% found youth “very involved”, and 9.4% found those with disabilities “very involved”.

Looking at how communities collaborate with security agents, local and state government, and civil society organizations (CSOs) illuminates the interaction of decision-making power and the ability to resolve conflict. Promisingly, most respondents at endline noted that there was collaboration between their community and security agents (82.7%), local government (69.2%), state government (55.2%), and CSOs (63.7%).

Satisfaction with this collaboration was also high. While not the highest, at “very satisfied”, the largest number of respondents in each of the four LGAs surveyed expressed satisfaction with these collaborative relationships. The greatest percent of respondents satisfied with their community’s collaboration with security agents was in Bokkos (61.9%). Similarly, Barkin Ladi (67.9%) was most “satisfied” with local government collaboration, Bokkos (58.1%) with state government, and Langtang North (51.2%) with CSOs.
Table 3: Satisfaction with Collaborative Relationships, Endline Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barkin Ladi</td>
<td>Jos North</td>
<td>Langtang North</td>
<td>Bokkos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community + Security Agents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly satisfied</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community + Local Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly satisfied</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community + State Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly satisfied</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of Civil Society Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly satisfied</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between Objective 2 and Objective 3, the evaluation team finds that local community members from PWA II LGAs (1) are confident in their ability to resolve conflict, (2) note that women and youth, and disable persons to a lesser degree, are involved in decision-making, (3) find collaboration is happening between communities and security agents, local and state government, and CSOs, and (4) are overwhelmingly “satisfied” with these collaborations, which is both positive and leaves room for growth to “very satisfied”.

**Relevance of Theory of Change**

Evaluating the PWA II ToC is about appropriateness – the degree to which the project was implemented in a manner conducive to and honoring of socio-cultural norms – and relevance – the project’s ability to address community-identified needs and to align activities with furthering the purpose of the intervention. To measure appropriateness and relevance, the evaluation team began with the ToC objectives above and now builds into overall PWA project awareness and participation.

Before participating in project activities, one must first know about those activities. 37.2% of respondents had heard of the PWA project at some point during the life cycle of the project. Unfortunately, 50.2% stated that they did not participate in project activities. It should be noted that 40.4% of respondents elected to not answer the survey question asking about their
participation in PWA project activities. In other words, participation could be higher, but there appears to be hesitation in identifying oneself as a project participant.

Of those that did participate, the majority (40.5%) attended SFCG organized training programs, followed closely by participation with the Early Warning System (EWS; 27.0%), and the mobile cinema (16.2%). These figures closely but not exactly mirror those found at baseline where 40% participated in conflict resolution, 37.2% in Peace Architecture Dialogues (PADs), and 35.9% in SFCG training programs.

Similar to overall participation, listener- and viewership rates for the PWA II project’s media activities were quite low at endline. As illustrated in Table 4, 52% and 74.7% never listened to the Voices of Peace and Our Children are Talking radio programs respectively, and 79.1% never watched The Team television drama. Encouragingly, those that did listen or watch these media programs found the content resonated with their concerns. Over 98% of respondents that listened to Voices of Peace agreed or strongly agreed that the topics covered in the program are in line with their “daily concerns for peace”. Nearly 95% of all respondents that watched The Team agreed or strongly agreed that the topics covered in the program are in line with the “concerns we face in Plateau State”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Media Results, Endline Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voices of Peace (listenership)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our Children are Talking (listenership)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Team (viewership)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“*The topics covered by the 'Voices of Peace' program are in line with my daily concerns for peace*”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“*The topics covered by ‘The Team’ are in line with the concerns we face in Plateau State*”
There is a clear gap occurring around participation. Awareness is lower than desired – only one-third of respondents had heard of PWA project activities – and low participation, including listener- and viewership of media programs, causes some concern. Over half the surveyed households are not participating in the project generally and nearly two-thirds are not engaging with the project’s media outputs.

When asked why they had not participated in peacebuilding activities, 41.5% stated they were not aware of any activities. Adjustment in this area is crucial. The evaluation team suggests future projects include greater awareness raising around project activities. Additionally, the Our Children are Talking and The Team programs should be eliminated with greater funding applied to the Voices of Peace program instead.

SFCG feels these figures illustrate a substantial increase in engagement given previous lack thereof. The evaluation team agrees in principle but is unable to substantial this finding without comparable baseline data.

**Effectiveness**

Program effectiveness is simultaneously about meeting output targets and reaching intended outcomes. Outcomes, largely centering on behavior changes in the case of the PWA II project, are more complex to measure. This section bridges outcome and output indicators in an effort to illustrate the interconnected nature of this work. The evaluation team understands it is at once important that the intervention was delivered as planned and that the design and implementation of the intervention were aligned in such a way to meet intended outcomes.

As is evident from the Table 5 below, most activities were delivered at or exceeding target. The only exceptions being the comic books, EWS bulletins, and the production and airing of the Our Children are Talking program. Highlighted in dark purple below, the comic books and EWS bulletins did not occur. Staff and partners noted that the Our Children are Talking program did not air as planned because of unexpected funding delays. From discussions with staff and partners, there was a lack of funding across the life cycle of the project for these activities, which directly affected the impact of these activities. The EWS in particular was effective but only so when funding allowed for consistent staff management of the program and participation from community members.

Participants in KII and FGDs noted that the EWS was useful in communicating with security forces as a means of conflict prevention. One participant noted, “I have used the early warning system and dialogue to control crowd in my community and at work during union activities.” Another participant stated that “I sent a text message using the early warning signs to the security forces” but noted that “dialogue” was the most useful skill learned for conflict resolution at the
community level. Overall, 73% of KII respondents found the EWS effective.

What started as a noteworthy project activity, the effectiveness of EWS waned in direct relationship with funding, which was not allocated for full staff support throughout the project life cycle. This is largely because engagement with the EWS requires the use of cell phones data. Any lasting impact of the EWS is due to local uptake of this project activity, which was unfunded during the final months of the PWA II project. It is suggested that the EWS remain a key project activity given that staff and program participants both found the EWS effective, but in future iterations of the project the EWS should be fully funded at a level that allows (1) consistent staff management of the EWS and (2) data allowance for EWS community leaders who are trained and responsible for managing the EWS at the local level.

Table 5: PWA II Project Outputs, activities as of May 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>% of target completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start-up and Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline study in new LGAs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II launch workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement of MoUs and capacity building plans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: To improve the climate of peace in 10 LGAs in Plateau and Kaduna States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresher training for ToT participants and key stakeholders</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToT step-down trainings in new LGAs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Voices of Peace” production and broadcast (segments)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>180%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of comic books (# of comic books)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and airing of children’s radio program “Our Children Are Talking” (episodes aired)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to locally led conflict response processes (# of processes)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>140%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2: To strengthen the role of the state and local actors to provide security for population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community security architecture dialogues</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early warning system (# bulletins produced and distributed per month)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict mainstreaming workshop for key government officials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace architecture dialogues</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3: To increase collaboration between religious, women, and youth leaders to ensure a peaceful post 2015 election period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for Religious, Women and Youth Leaders on inter-religious collaboration and non-adversarial advocacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media roundtables on managing post-election ethnic and religious tension</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airing of The Team film series</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Cinema and Facilitated Discussions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CC: To strengthen the capacity and knowledge of local civil society to implement this kind of programming</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional capacity assessments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final participatory evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Increasing communication and information sharing**

Over the course of interviews and discussions conducted for this evaluation, 94% of KII respondents increased communication and/or information sharing within or between target populations, including civil society, government, and/or security sector. Participants cited dialogue and mediation as the most important skills they learned from SFCG activities and the most useful in resolving conflict in their communities. The EWS and ToT trainings were major factors in this increased communication and information sharing.

Moreover, the improvement of intergroup relations enabled greater communication and information sharing. At endline, 65.5% of households surveyed for this evaluation reported that intergroup relations had “improved a lot”. Dialogue featured high as a contributing factor to improved intergroup relations at both baseline and endline. At endline 19.9% of respondents noted that dialogue was key to improving intergroup relations. This was closely followed by the involvement of youth (18.3%) in peacebuilding.

**Shifts in public knowledge and attitudes on conflict issues**

Survey responses present a hopeful tone. Asked if conflict or violence could be stopped, 87.5% stated “yes”. Asked if the actions of those involved in violence could be justified, 75.7% stated “no”. Though baseline data is not available to assess changes in this area, endline responses show that households in PWA II target communities believe that violence is not justified and that it can be stopped. This connotes a degree of self-activation in that if violence can be stopped, perhaps one should stop it. Respondents were asked about the causes of violence and the methods for stopping violence. Ethnicity (20.7%), poverty (18.5%), politics (16.8%), and indigene/settlership disputes (15.0%) were most commonly noted as causes of violence.

In alignment with project objectives and activities, respondents noted first that dialogue or mediation is a useful technique for stopping violence. Dialogue was mentioned in this way by 36.3% of all survey respondents. Religious intervention was the second method, noted by 25.7% or respondents, most commonly found to mitigate violence.

Most striking, 100% of KII respondents, who were also ToT participants, and at least one ToT participant from each of the seven FGDs referenced increased knowledge of conflict issues – including causes of conflict, types of conflict, emerging conflict issues and mechanisms for conflict resolution – citing the ToT trainings as the most useful activity enabling this knowledge generation. Participants noted that PWA II activities taught them to recognize early warning signs and respond to conflict using techniques such as mediation and dialogue.
Participants also said that the PWA II activities helped them understand and improve interreligious relationships, referring to this trend a total of 27 times. One participant recalled that the ToT training “increased my knowledge and has made me receptive to [relating] better with Muslim groups.”

In all, the PWA II project met almost all outputs, except the comic books, EWS bulletins, and the Our Children are Talking program. These few instances of underperformance can be accounted for by gaps in funding. Though chronically underfunded, the EWS was found particularly effective by participants. The evaluation team suggests repositioning the EWS in future projects to allow funding for this activity at a level that allows (1) full and consistent staff management of the EWS and (2) data allowance for EWS community leaders who are trained and responsible for managing the EWS at the local level.

Qualitative and quantitative data suggest the PWA II project is responsible for increased communication and information sharing, and positive shifts in public attitudes. Respondents are confident violence can be stopped – 87.5% affirmed this response – and 75.7% feel violence cannot be justified. Participants found dialogue/mediation trainings and the ToT program particularly helpful in increasing the capacity of local community members to mitigate violence.

Relevance

Building from the evidence provided above, this section works to assess the PWA II project’s contribution to intergroup confidence, reduced tensions, social cohesion, and increased linkages between communities and government, civil society and security agencies. The section concludes with a look at unexpected findings.

Intergroup confidence and reduced tensions

“During KIIs, 73% of respondents expressed that intergroup tensions had reduced on a community, state, or local level. When asked “do you think the ToT trainings helped improved the climate of peace in your community?” one respondent stated “yes it did. The conflict has really reduced.” Another participant responded “yes, we are able to harmonize both religions.” A number of respondents noted that they now felt safe to travel places they previously felt were unsafe, or “no-go areas”.

During a focus group discussion in Jos North participants said that the biggest change their community had seen over the last two years is “acceptance of one another, between Christians
and Muslims,” “freedom of movement from one area to another,” and the development of “cordial relationships and peace.”

Quantitative data mirrors these results, with 96.8% of surveyed households noting that intergroup relations had improved, either “somewhat” or “a lot”. Communities, religious leaders, and security agents were identified as those most responsible for this improvement. As outlined in the sections above, community members also feel the overall security in each community has improved over the last two years. In Jos North, 68.9% noted the security situation in their community had seen great improvement, followed by Barkin Ladi (61.7%), Bokkos (53.2%), and Langtang North (43.6%).

With an eye toward the future, survey respondents were asked how intergroup relations might continue to improve and tensions further reduce. Table 6 outlines the top four responses.

Table 6: How to Continue Improving Intergroup Relations, Endline Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build capacity of security services to deal with conflict</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build capacity in the local communities to deal with conflict</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased cooperation between communities and government agencies (police and local government)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased dialogue at local level</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social cohesion

According to KIIIs and FGDs, the PWA II project supported greater social cohesion. Indeed, 79.0% of KII respondents and one or more participant in 100% of FGDs affirmed this result. As evidence, references were made to improved intergroup relations/linkages within targeted communities, including civil society, government, and security. Many respondents noted that the project was particularly effective at improving communication and coordination with security agents.

Moreover, during fieldwork, the evaluation team found that ToT leaders in Bokkos had voluntarily continued peace dialogues after the conclusion of the project. These ToT leaders found their work on the project so meaningful individually and for their communities, they chose to lead project activities on their own. This clear example of local ownership demonstrates the depth of project relevance and effectiveness. Local leaders, outside of funding sources, organically carrying forward project activities is also a sign of project sustainability.

Increased linkages

On 16 occasions in qualitative data, the security sector was referenced as a party to and participant in increased social cohesion. One respondent expressed how PWA II activities improved the overall climate between the security sector and the community, stating, “We now have a good

“Before the trainings, I saw them [security] as enemies. We now report issues to them.”

- ToT KII Participant, Bokkos
relationship with the security. They have changed for good because they are also better informed now and the area is peaceful.” Another ToT participant from Bokkos cited the ToT trainings as transformational in improving relations with the security sector, explaining, “Before the trainings, I saw them [security] as enemies. We now report issues to them.”

References to relationships with the government were less frequent (42% of KII respondents) and less positive. While a number of participants did express some positive feelings, noting increased dialogue and community meetings with the government, the majority of responses during KII and FGDs were not as positive as those referenced for security. In some cases, participants noted that relations with government still need to be improved, or complained that government was unable to provide financial support to its citizens, a possible area for increased tension in the future.

Survey respondents were also asked about improvements in the relationship between their community and (1) security agents and (2) the government. Table 7 outlines these responses. Both relations with security agent and the government show a great deal of improvement across religions. Muslims, however, expressed greater improvement in their relationship with security agents (63.1%) and the government (40.2%) than Christians.

**Table 7: Relations between Communities and Security/Government by Religion, Endline Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Christian</th>
<th>% Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community + Security Agents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved a lot</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved somewhat</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsened somewhat</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Worsened a lot</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community + Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved a lot</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved somewhat</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsened somewhat</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Worsened a lot</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveyed households provided the following examples of improved relations with security agents:
- More security agents in community
- Faster response time to distress calls
- Security agents playing football with local community members
- Mutual greetings
- Better coordination between local community members and security agents
- Increased youth involvement in security services
- Community members are more free to approach security agents and offer complaints
**Unexpected outcomes**

Unexpectedly, many participants were concerned about issues related to youth and drug abuse. 42% of KII respondents and FGD participants were concerned about youth in their community. Issues of drug use and abuse were cited as a community concern 13 times, representing 21% of KII respondents and 71% of FGDs. Respondents noted that dialogue and mediation were the most useful tools to engage with youth and talk to their children about drug use. In several cases, participants noted youth as one of their main target groups during step-down trainings.

---

"There should be enlightenment of youths on drug abuse to know the effects."

- ToT Participant, Barkin Ladi

---

Respondents stated that drug issues and issues of youth are priority concerns in their communities and should be more thoroughly addressed by future iterations of the PWA project. “The issue of drugs activities, that is one of the biggest challenges” one respondent shared when asked what priority issues need to be addressed relating to peace, reconciliation, and security in the community. Another respondent identified “youth that are into drug addiction” as actors with the potential to provoke conflict in the community.

These responses about drug abuse and youth involvement suggest that future programs should address these issues more directly and ensure the ToT trainings cater to the unique needs of youth in Nigeria’s Middle Belt region.

In all, intergroup tensions have reduced in PWA II target communities. Participants in KII and FGDs noted increased mobility because of reduced tensions and greater social cohesion. Nearly all households felt intergroup relations had improved over the lifetime of the PWA II project, citing improved communication and coordination with security agents as a major factor in improved intergroup relations. Community members found their relationships with security agents and the government had improved, but that improvement was more greatly felt with security agents. Mutual greeting, joint football games, and faster response to calls for help were among the many examples of the improved relationship with security agents.

**Sustainability**

While sustainability is difficult to measure at this point, this assessment identified responses referring to the stated, inferred, or proven transfer of programs, projects, or knowledge to the local community as an indicator for local sustainability. Since respondents rarely referred directly to the EWS and PADs in their responses, it is difficult to infer how sustainable those programs are; however, in numerous cases, respondents gave examples of ways they had applied...
the skills they learned in trainings to real-life scenarios outside of PWA II activities which illustrates local uptake and application of skills and transfer of knowledge.

A number of participants stated that they use the skills they learned from PWA trainings daily, in their homes and communities. Nearly all of the ToT participants interviewed led step-down trainings. During this assessment, 100% of KII respondents and at least one participant from each focus group discussion made statements that displayed the local transfer of programs, projects, and activities to the wider community. One participant explained how she has incorporated new found skills into everyday life: “In 2015 when it was close to election time all women in Bisichi came together and bring out a way to have a peaceful election. The Bisichi Primary School was closed but we had training by SFCG. We were able to call the teachers and made them come back.”

The PWA II project has seen local uptake and increased capacity of community members, local and state governments, and security services, all of which speaks to the project’s sustainability beyond June 2017. That said, without funding, the EWS and peace dialogues, even when led by those trained in ToT workshops, will slowly wane and eventually become non-existent unless funding is renewed and the project adjusted according to the feedback given here by the evaluation team.
CONCLUSIONS

After careful study and rigorous analysis of all data and background documents, the evaluation team concludes the following about the PWA II project:

Cultivating a Climate of Peace
The PWA II project has successfully cultivated a climate of peace in target LGAs. 55.1% of men and 64.4% of women did not experience violence. Where there was violence, more men (42.2%) than women (33.3%) experienced violence as a result of conflict in their LGA. The frequency of violence was also low in PWA target communities; 52% stated violence never occurred in their community, 42% experienced only occasional violence, and only 3.3% found violence often occurred in their community.

Over half of all respondents noted great improvement in intergroup relations across all LGAs, with the greatest proportion in Bokkos at 72.3%. Of those communities that overlap from baseline to endline, namely Barkin Ladi and Bokkos, respondents saw a mean increase of 29.8% between those that reported great improvement in intergroup relations at the conclusion of PWA I (baseline) and the completion of PWA II (endline).

The security situation in all communities has also improved; 68.9% in Jos North noted great improvement, followed by Barkin Ladi (61.7%), Bokkos (53.2%), and Langtang North (43.6%).

Shift in Attitudes
PWA communities are confident violence can be stopped – 87.5% of household survey respondents affirmed this response – and 75.7% of those surveyed feel violence cannot be justified.

Increase Communication & Collaboration
The PWA II project is responsible for increased communication and information sharing. Local uptake and increased capacity of community members, local and state governments, and security services speaks to the project’s impact and sustainability beyond June 2017.

Participants found dialogue/mediation trainings and the ToT program particularly helpful in increasing the capacity of local community members to mitigate violence. Nearly all households felt intergroup relations had improved over the lifetime of the PWA II project, citing improved communication and coordination with security agents. Mutual greeting, joint football games, and faster response to calls for help were among the many examples of the improved relationship.
Gendered Feelings of Safety
That majority of both women (83.6%) and men (90.3%) stated that they feel safe in their community; however, when they did report feeling unsafe, women stated this twice as often as men.

Recommendations:
Future projects should address safety concerns through a gendered lens, meaning activities should account for and directly target the unique safety concerns of women from project participation to activities that teach women to address gender-based violence to activities that address men’s involvement with violence against women.

Conflict Resolution
Local community members (1) are confident in their ability to resolve conflict, (2) note that women and youth, and disable persons to a lesser degree, are involved in decision-making at LGAs, (3) find collaboration is happening between communities and security agents, local and state government, and CSOs, and (4) are overwhelmingly “satisfied” with these collaborations.

Participation
Awareness is lower than desired – only one-third of respondents had heard of PWA project activities – and low participation, including listener- and viewership of media programs, causes some concern. 50.2% of households are not participating in project activities and nearly two-thirds are not engaging with the project’s media outputs. 41.5% of respondents stated they were not aware of any activities.

SFCG believes these figures illustrate a substantial increase in engagement given previous lack thereof. The evaluation team agrees in principle but is unable to substantial this finding without comparable baseline data.

Recommendations:
- Include greater awareness raising around project activities in the future.

- Our Children are Talking and The Team programs should be eliminated with greater funding applied to the Voices of Peace program instead.
**Early Warning System**

73% of KII respondents found the EWS effective. However, the effectiveness of EWS waned in direct relationship with reduced funding because engagement with the EWS requires the use of cell phones data.

**Recommendations:**

- EWS should remain a key project activity, but in future iterations of the project must include a fully funded EWS at a level that allows (1) full and consistent staff management of the EWS and (2) data allowance for EWS community leaders who are trained and responsible for managing the EWS at the local level.

**Staff Retention**

Staff retention on the PWA II project, and potentially across SFCG Nigeria, appears to be a chronic problem. The result is poor institutionalization of knowledge around both the project and the organization. Given their short tenure with SFCG, current staff do not have the capacity to recall milestones, project challenges and successes, and detailed accounting of the relationship with the donor nor partner organizations. This lack of institutional knowledge was exacerbated by contracts for PWA and PWA II project staff that expired prior to the time of final evaluation, which made consultations and FGDs with project staff nearly impossible.

**Recommendations:**

- Increase staff salaries and benefits packages, including highly prized professional development training, to market rate to attract and retain qualified candidates.

- Extend project staff contracts at least one month beyond the conclusion of each project to enable staff support of final external evaluation.
Monitoring & Evaluation
The PWA I and PWA II projects were well monitored, but baseline and mid-term data were entirely inaccessible to both staff and the evaluation team. Put simply, raw datasets of baseline or mid-term data could not be found. This issue is simultaneously about high staff turn-over and poor M&E protocols and planning.

Recommendations:
- To conserve the evaluation budget and more efficiently use project time, the same evaluation team should be contracted for baseline and endline evaluation activities.
- Ideally this same team also consults with the project team during monitoring activities to allow for continuity across datasets. This would improve the consistency and quality of data collected throughout the project cycle.

- Baseline and mid-term data should be more consistently gathered and stored in a manner accessible and clear to external reviewers.
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Final Evaluation

*Plateau will Arise (PWA)! Phase II: Consolidating an Architecture for Peace, Tolerance and Reconciliation in Plateau and Kaduna State*

1. CONTEXT

**About Search for Common Ground**

Search for Common Ground (SFCG) is an international non-profit organization that promotes peaceful resolution of conflict. With headquarters in Washington DC and in Brussels, SFCG’s mission is to transform how individuals, organizations, and governments deal with conflict away from adversarial approaches and toward cooperative solutions. SFCG seeks to help conflicting parties understand their differences and act on their commonalities. With a total of approximately 800 staff worldwide, SFCG implements projects in 49 countries, with permanent offices in over 35, including in Asia, Europe, the Middle East, the United States and Africa.

**About the Project**

*Goal and Objectives*

The Plateau Will Arise (PWA)! Phase II: *Consolidating an Architecture for Peace, Tolerance and Reconciliation* Project is funded by the European Union. It has the objective of “developing and ensuring the sustainability of an active, locally owned, and inclusive Peace Architecture in Plateau State beyond 2015”. Implementation of the project started on 2 July 2015 and the project will be terminating on January 2, 2017.

The specific objectives of the project are:

- To improve the climate of peace in 10 Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Plateau and Kaduna State
- To strengthen the capacity of states and local actors to secure their communities
- To increase collaboration and outreach by religious, women and youth leaders to reduce post-election tension;
- To strengthen the capacity and knowledge of local civil society to implement this kind of programming (Cross Cutting Objective)

The target stakeholder groups for the project include:

- Community residents including children, youth, men, women, PWD, IDPs and conflict victims;
- Community leaders and other influential actors, who can either positively or negatively impact the potential for mediation and future conflict prevention;
- Civil society, security and Government Leaders who were targeted both for capacity building, as well as for activities aimed to bring them together.
A cross section of these stakeholders, inclusive of participants and non-participants of the project, will be engaged in this evaluation to draw lessons and gauge results of the project.

2. EVALUATION

Evaluation Questions

The study will primarily evaluate the Project Theory of Change (TOC). It will also evaluate components of the Project, inclusive of the community and media engagements, and respond to key project indicators as specified in the Project Monitoring Plan. This evaluation will be participatory, centering around three DAC criteria — effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the project.

Evaluation questions will include:

A. Theory of Change and Design
   1. How relevant is the Project Theory of Change and design to the context and area in which the project intervened?
   2. How can the attribution of the project be verified? Can any causal chain of the project be identified and confirmed?

B. Effectiveness
   1. How effective have the Early Warning System, Community Security Architecture Dialogues (CSADs) and Peace Architecture Dialogues (PADs) been in contributing to increased communication and information sharing on emerging conflict issues in communities, LGAs and the state?
   2. How effective have the Project’s media programming and community engagements been at reaching the targeted demographics, and supporting the shifts in public knowledge and attitudes on conflict issues that are targeted through this project?

C. Relevance
   3. How relevant has the project been in contributing to, or hindering:
      a. Increased intergroup confidence, reduced tensions, the gradual return of peace to the region, and by extension economic growth?
      b. Increased social cohesion within the targeted communities, reinforced informal ties, as well as deliberately created relationships aimed at bringing together multiple stakeholders for violence prevention?
      c. Increased linkages between government, civil society and security agencies, creating opportunities for a more broad-based and inclusive policy response to conflict both at the state and local levels? How sustainable are these linkages?
   4. What unexpected changes, both positive and negative, has the project contributed to?
D. Sustainability
1. How sustainable are the Early Warning System, Community Security Architecture Dialogues (CSADs) and Peace Architecture Dialogues (PADs) supported by this Project, in communities, LGAs and the state?
2. If the project has contributed to the building of relationships and linkages between groups in targeted communities, as well as government, civil society and security agencies, how sustainable are these relationships and linkages?

Findings from this evaluation will be shared widely with project participants and partners, and presented during the Peace Architecture dialogues. The evaluation – with sensitive details redacted – will eventually be published on SFCG’s website and shared with other learning networks in order to enhance the broader field of peace-building in Nigeria and the world.

Methodology
The final evaluation will adopt a mixed approach methodology, comprising of both qualitative and quantitative methods. In addition to an in-depth desk review of project documents and other supporting documents, the evaluation will utilize focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and a survey. The evaluation will target community residents, inclusive of communities in which the project was implemented, and those in which the project was not implemented. It will also target civil society, security and government leaders within Plateau State and Kaura Local Government Area of Kaduna State.

Deliverables
The final evaluation deliverables are:
- An inception report detailing the proposed method, study matrix, data collection tools and work plan. It is to be approved by SFCG before starting data collection.
- Draft report for review by SFCG staff and other stakeholders.
- Final Report (maximum 30 pages, excluding appendices), consisting of but not excluded to: Executive Summary, Methodology, Findings and Analysis, Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations. The report should be structured according to the evaluation questions.
- Appendices, including data collection tools and list of interviewees.
- A power point presentation of the report.

3. REQUIREMENTS AND APPLICATION PROCESS

Requirements
The ideal candidate and/or team will have the following:
- More than 5 years of experience in evaluations with international organizations;
- Graduate degree in Conflict Studies, Human Rights, Social Work or other relevant degree;
- Experience in peacebuilding, conflict resolution and human rights;
- Experience in international development, prior work experience in North Central Nigeria;
- Experience with mixed methods;
- Strong analytical skills;
• Excellent written communication and report writing skills in English;
• Ability to communicate fluently in Hausa;
• Ability to be flexible with time and work schedule

**Logistical Support**
SFCG will provide the following logistical support to the consultant;
• Transmission of background materials (project proposal, meeting notes, etc.);
• Availability of meeting room in Jos;
• Use of SFCG printers;
• Meeting arrangements with stakeholders and beneficiaries if requested by the consultant;
• Support of a SFCG Field Officer for introductions to key stakeholders and equivalent.

**Timeframe**
The evaluation will take place during January – February 2017, and the final deliverables are due end of February, 2017.

**The consultant is required to respect the following Ethical Principles:**

• **Comprehensive and systematic inquiry:** Consultant should make the most of the existing information and full range of stakeholders available at the time of the review. Consultant should conduct systematic, data-based inquiries. He or she should communicate his or her methods and approaches accurately and in sufficient detail to allow others to understand, interpret and critique his or her work. He or she should make clear the limitations of the review and its results.

• **Competence:** Consultant should possess the abilities and skills and experience appropriate to undertake the tasks proposed and should practice within the limits of his or her professional training and competence.

• **Honesty and integrity:** Consultant should be transparent with the contractor/constituent about: any conflict of interest, any change made in the negotiated project plan and the reasons why those changes were made, any risk that certain procedures or activities produce misleading review information.

• **Respect for people:** Consultant respect the security, dignity and self-worth of respondents, program participants. Consultant has the responsibility to be sensitive to and respect differences amongst participants in culture, religion, gender, disability, age and ethnicity.

In addition, the consultant will respect SFCG’s evaluations standards, to be found in SFCG’s evaluation guidelines: [http://www.sfcg.org/programmes/ilt/dme_guidelines.html](http://www.sfcg.org/programmes/ilt/dme_guidelines.html)
**Applications**

Interested candidates are invited to send an application through our Application System, no later than **23 December, 2016**. The title of the application should be: “**Final Evaluation of (PWA)!Phase II**” and the application should hold four attachments:

- 1 technical offer detailing the methodology, timeframe and size of the evaluation team proposed (max 4 pages);
- 1 biography of the evaluator/ evaluation team demonstrating relevant experience/ knowledge (max 10 pages);
- 1 financial offer (Excel) detailing the costs of the budget;
- 2 references of organizations who can verify the quality of the consultant’s work.

Preference will be given to applicants who include at least an executive summary or abstract of a similar work conducted.