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Executive Summary

“Engaging Youth and Community Leaders to Prevent Mass Atrocities in the Central African Republic” was implemented by Search for Common Ground (Search) in collaboration with the Fondation J’ai rêvé, Don Bosco and with the financial support of the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations (CSO) of the US Department of State. The project started on September 23, 2016 and ended on December 31, 2017. It was implemented in the city of Bangui, particularly targeting risk areas, namely PK5, Miskine Yakite and Fatima.

The overall objective of this project was to prevent high-risk atrocities between Muslims and Christians in the PK5 and its surroundings.

In order to achieve this goal, Search had proposed specific objectives:

1) Youth in the neighborhood of PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine are deterred from participating in atrocities;
2) Targeted youth from PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine resist political manipulation to commit violence;
3) Alternative livelihood activities for at-risk youth are promoted, diverting them away from political manipulation and violence.

After the project ended in December 2017, Search conducted a final evaluation, with the two-fold aim of drawing the lessons of the project and reporting the results and the change to key stakeholders.

The main objectives of this evaluation were to:

1. Analyze the context and its changes during the project duration and analyze the relevance of the project (activities and targets) in relation to this context;
2. Analyze the project along the following evaluation criteria: effectiveness (including the collection of project indicators), impact (expected and unexpected) and sustainability of activities;
3. Draw lessons and recommendations so as to define an appropriate intervention approach for future programs.

Methodology

The evaluation is based on criteria defined by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the evaluation questions specified in the terms of reference (ToR in Annex).

Data collection was carried out in the target areas of the project, namely PK5, Miskine Yakite and Fatima. The data was collected by Search staff and enumerators recruited by Search. For the qualitative data collection, the evaluation team interviewed 39 people via focus groups and individual interviews, including Search staff members, local authorities, implementing partners, youth and community leaders, and other participants of the project activities. For the collection of quantitative data, the team surveyed 450 people, 62% of which were youth (people under 35 years) and 47% were women.

Limitations

Several factors have limited the data collection for this study:

1. Some of the Search project staff members no longer worked with the organization, which made it impossible for the enumerators to consult them. These key project staff members included the Program Director, the Program Associate, and the Media Coordinator;
2. Due to security issues in the targeted zones, movements in some areas were restricted and the data collection team was not able to interview participants from these targeted zones;

3. The absence of a reference baseline study constituted a limitation for measuring progress over time and assessing the project’s impact. On the other hand, the first conflict scan provided some raw data, which was used for comparison purposes;

4. Some activities were still ongoing while the final evaluation was conducted, making it impossible to include results of those in the evaluation.

**Key Findings**

1. **Relevance**

By working with young people, the project targeted the most vulnerable population which is both actor and victim of the conflict. Throughout the project implementation period, a context and conflict analysis was developed and updated, and a particular emphasis was put on integrating its key results into the project strategy. The project proposal, developed in 2016, analyzed the fragile situation of the country, highlighting the impact of political manipulation and ethno-religious conflict. The final evaluation confirms that the project target areas were very fragile, and that political manipulation was very present.

The project proposal identified key stakeholders, highlighting the role of young people as both victims and perpetrators of frequent violence and as key actors in conflict mediation. The responses obtained to our survey confirmed this view and added that it is unemployed youth that commit most of the violent incidents.

The project did not have a baseline study, however during the first conflict scan, a mini survey was conducted to provide baseline data. Overall, the results of the conflict scan allowed the project to redirect some of the activities in order to do no harm and to ensure that the project remained sensitive to the evolution of conflict dynamics; however, not all of the recommendations from the scans were taken into account.

2. **Effectiveness**

The overall number of respondents who believes that violence is necessary to resolve conflicts has declined, although the project did not achieve the expected target. Some of the respondents suggested that the project has contributed to this change in two ways: by organizing activities that aimed to reach out to the whole community, and by mobilizing and improving the skills of youth, and engaging them in constructive activities.

By the end of the project, the number of people able to resist manipulation has increased. The project has contributed to this change by creating dialogue between young people and authorities, enabling them to discuss the conflict in their community and share their grievances in a non-violent and constructive way. As such, the project facilitated six community meetings involving community leaders, authorities and members of the community, including young people. The project also contributed to this aspect through its media activities, namely through SMS and radio spots, the feedback of which has shown very positive attitudes towards non-violence.

The results show that young people have become less supportive of groups that advocate violence. The baseline data from 2016 showed that almost the totality of young people was more or less supportive of armed groups, while by the end of the project less than 2 out of 10 youth members stated the same. In addition, these young people have grown to be peace mediators. The project has contributed to this change by providing training in conflict transformation, which allowed youth to strengthen their capacities in the Common Ground approach and mediation. The project also enabled 59 youths to start their own business, and in the final evaluation, 77% of young people have reported having access to economic opportunities. These economic activities are essential in providing alternatives to violence, and as such largely contribute to achieving the overall goal of the project.
3. Impact

In terms of the prevention of mass atrocities, the project has had a limited impact in the implementation area, Bangui; this is also due to the sudden change of events and conflict dynamics in and around the capital.

The project followed a participatory approach and has strived to bring together Christians and Muslims, and men and women. The organization of meetings between ex-combatants of armed groups and young leaders was also highlighted as an innovative aspect that has strengthened the project's impact. The dialogue between youth and authorities has been strengthened by giving the opportunity to these stakeholders to come together to discuss pending issues. The young people and the representatives of the communities have had the chance to express their point of view to the authorities and some solutions were shared. On the other hand, there is no proof that the youth groups have followed up on the recommendations of these exchanges, limiting somewhat the impact. Ensuring an adequate follow-up would be essential for any future intervention in this field.

As for supporting the peace process, the project has had a limited impact. On the one hand, it has contributed to greater participation of the target communities in peacebuilding activities. However, the lack of direct involvement of religious leaders and other influential actors, such as the National Youth Council (CNJCA) and SCRCA (Civil Society Platform), limited the impact and questioned the sustainability of the results.

4. Sustainability

While the sustainability of the project is limited, the expectation is that trained youth participants will continue to pursue peacebuilding activities through their organizations. As such, their work will ensure continuity in their communities, where they will be able to apply their knowledge and skills on conflict transformation and mediation.

On the other hand, at the community level the project impact may dissipate in the absence of any follow-up peacebuilding activities which engage divided communities and awareness raising about the risks of violence. For example, keeping up the SMS communication encouraging non-violent behavior between young people would ensure that the message of peace is still disseminated.

Key Recommendations

Based on these findings, the evaluation team makes the following recommendations:

- Reach out to and involve all the key peace-building and community reconciliation actors, including community and religious leaders, as well as youth structures like the National Youth Council (CNJ) or the Central African Civil Society Platform (SCRCA);
- Ensure better follow-up and monitoring of project activities at the community level by involving participants and local partners in monitoring processes and building their capacities;
- Encourage collaboration between youth, religious leaders, administrative authorities, activists of civil society and other local actors, so they can continue to jointly implement peacebuilding activities;
- Ensure that the recommendations formulated during the meetings receive adequate follow-up, by equipping the participating civil societies and CNJCA (National Youth Platform) members with the right tools to be able to take a lead on the follow up, by channeling recommendations to higher authorities, and by advocating for their inclusion in the National Action Plan;
- Ensure project’s sustainability by involving local actors in the design and implementation, linking existing youth initiatives to the CNJCA, developing an exit strategy in a timely manner, and organizing quarterly meetings with all project stakeholders to ensure a mutual understanding of the project goals;
- Scale-out certain project activities to areas outside of Bangui to expand the project’s impact.
1. Background Information

"Engaging Youth and Community Leaders to Prevent Mass Atrocities in Central African Republic" was implemented by Search for Common Ground (Search) in collaboration with the Fondation J’ai rêvé, Don Bosco and with the financial support of the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations (CSO) of the US Department of State. The project started on September 23, 2016 and ended on December 31, 2017. It was implemented in the city of Bangui, particularly targeting risk areas, namely PK5, Miskine Yakite and Fatima.

Project Overview

The overall objective of this project was to prevent high-risk atrocities between Muslims and Christians in the PK5 and its surroundings.

In order to achieve this goal, SFCG proposed three specific objectives:

1) Youth in the neighborhood of PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine are deterred from participating in atrocities;
2) Targeted youth from PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine resist political manipulation to commit violence;
3) Alternative livelihood activities for at-risk youth are promoted, diverting them away from political manipulation and violence.

To help these specific objectives, the project aimed to achieve the following outcomes:

- Expected result 1.1: Youth, community leaders and communities in general have better access to inspirational and positive messages on preventing violence and promoting peace;
- Expected Result 1.2: Young people and communities humanize people from other neighborhoods and resist manipulation that encourages violence and hate speech;
- Expected Result 1.3: Trust and collaboration is increased in target communities;
- Expected result 2.1: Young people and key community leaders have the opportunity to share their fears, their concerns and their expectations with the local authorities; and the mechanisms leading to an escalation of violence are identified within communities.
- Expected result 2.2: Young people have more space to engage with community leaders and policy makers on key issues and inclusive communication channels open up to break the cycle of marginalization and exclusion leading to political manipulation and the violent expression of grievances.
- Expected result 3.1: Young people see an increase in their knowledge and skills in developing livelihoods.
- Expected result 3.2: Young people have more access to economic opportunities and are aware of alternatives to violence based on their community-level needs.
- Cross-cutting Result: The attitude of youth towards the "other" (youth of different religious affiliations) is positively transformed.

In the project framework the following activities have been implemented:

- Activities to help deter young people of PK5, Yakite, Fatima and Miskine from participating in atrocities: conflict analysis, community solidarity activities, SMS campaign and radio spots.
- Activities to help the targeted youth PK5, Yakite Fatima Miskine resist political manipulation: training of young people and community leaders in conflict transformation, mediation, leadership and advocacy, and monitoring youth activities and community meetings (town hall meetings).
Activities to help divert young people from violence and manipulation through providing alternative livelihood activities: youth entrepreneurship education and professional training as well as joint economic initiatives.

The main targets were youth from PK5, Yakite, Miskine and Fatima (with a particular emphasis on those who have left armed groups), civil society organizations (CSOs) and the general population in the PK5 neighborhoods, Miskine, Fatima and Yakite and their surroundings, who were reached through public solidarity events and media programs.

**Theory of Change**

The project was based on four theories of change related to the dynamics of conflicts in the CAR. According to the main theory of change, if Central African youth have the means to resist political manipulation and get to know the “other”, and if leaders support social cohesion efforts and peaceful conflict resolution, then young people will be less likely to participate in atrocities against “other” communities.

In addition to the main theory of change of the project, the following underlying theories support the logic of this project:

1: If young people and leaders are working more effectively together, then they will respond better to the security challenges they face and they will jointly improve social cohesion.

2: If young people and leaders learn to accept and trust each other, then they will use their capacities in a more efficient way and will develop effective coping strategies.

3: If young people and leaders build their capacity to communicate with each other and with external actors, then they will collect, manage and share security-related information, minimizing its negative impact.

4: If stakeholders improve their coordination and communities are widely informed, then there will be an improvement in protection of, and assistance provided to communities.
2. Methodology

The evaluation followed the criteria defined by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and was structured along the evaluation questions specified in the terms of reference (ToR, attached in the Annexes).

2.1. Objectives

The main objectives of this evaluation were the following:

1. Analyze the context and its changes during the project duration and analyze the relevance of the project (activities and targets) in relation to this context;
2. Analyze the project along the following evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness (including the collection of project indicators), impact (expected and unexpected) and sustainability of activities;
3. Draw lessons and recommendations of this project so as to define an intervention approach for future programs.

2.2. Data Collection

The evaluation used both qualitative and quantitative data gathered in Bangui and particularly in the areas of PK5, Miskine Yakite and Fatima. The data was collected by the Search evaluation team, as well as by enumerators hired by Search.

The data was collected in a conflict-sensitive way, that is by taking into account the safety of respondents and respecting the confidentiality of their responses. The interviews were held in safe spaces chosen by the respondents, and the focus group discussions were held in secure rooms so as to protect the respondents. The consent of each respondent was a preliminary step before the survey, and we communicated to each participant that he/she could withdraw his consent and leave if he/she felt that the situation was hostile or if he/she felt uncomfortable during the survey. A five-day training was organized for the enumerators on data collection and moderation techniques and on notetaking, so as to facilitate the documenting of the discussions and interviews.

The qualitative data was collected through individual interviews with key stakeholders and focus group discussions (FGD) with communities and key informant interviews (KII) with the direct beneficiaries of the project. The toolkit serving to lead the qualitative data collection can be found in the Annexes.

The table below shows the number of participants for the FGDs and KIIs per location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KII / FGD</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Search staff (Coordinator of Community and Media Activities and Field-based Focal Points)</td>
<td>Bangui</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>Fatima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yakite</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PK5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miskine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Bangui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Youth and community leaders</td>
<td>Bangui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Other beneficiaries of the activities</td>
<td>Bangui</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total KII:</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total FGD:</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants in KII and FGD were identified by Search following the criteria listed above.

In order to gather data for the indicators of the project, a quantitative survey was also conducted (see the survey in the Annexes). The sample for this study was based on the probabilistic method to facilitate the use of estimation method / comparison and statistical analysis all are based on probability theory. For this study, we used the stratified sample system, meaning that the fraction selection differs depending on certain characteristics of the population. We stratify to allow all categories of the population that interest us be represented in sufficient numbers (law of large numbers). In our case, the target neighborhoods (PK5, Fatima, and Yakite Miskine) are our stratum.

Determining the sample size
To determine the sample size, we used the online software Raosoft or Sample Size Calculator. Raosoft is a statistical software used for determining a sample size using the law of large numbers.

For the size of our sample, we have used the following parameters: an error margin of 5% for a 95% confidence level. The three districts (3rd, 5th and 6th) account for a total 450830 people. Taking into account the information listed above, we calculated with a sample of 384 people. So as to ensure equal distribution, we surveyed 431 people (around 100 per district).

To identify households and ensure geographical representation, the project sites have been divided into areas composed of different neighborhoods. In each area the enumerators selected households randomly, interviewing only adults (18 years or above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (Final Survey (2017))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatima</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakite</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miskine</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The disaggregation of data by religious affiliation shows that Muslims made up about 30% of respondents and non-Muslims comprised around 70%. This percentage difference is due to the geographical targeting of the project, but it also reflects the composition of the Central African population. Out of the four neighborhoods of the project, Muslims form the majority population in the PK5 area. In the other three areas, namely Fatima, Miskine and Yakite, Muslims are a minority with a very low presence in Fatima and Miskine. According to the latest General Census of Population and Housing (RGPH3) of 2003, the Central African Republic has a monotheistic, and predominantly Christian population with more than half of the population (51.4%) identifying as Protestant, 29% as Catholic and 10% as Muslim.
The collection tools were developed in French and were based on the questionnaire used to collect the baseline data during the conflict scan. New questions were added to examine in more detail the impact of the project. These were then translated into the local language, Sango, during the training of the enumerators.

Nine enumerators were recruited and trained for this study. The enumerators were directly supervised by officials of the survey: Search’s Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator and a Project Consultant recruited for this purpose.

2.3. Data Entry

Search’s Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator and the consultant were responsible for the data entry and the statistical analysis of raw data. The quantitative data entry was performed using CSPro, a processing software for surveys and censuses. The data was then exported to SPSS to produce tables and graphs. The qualitative data was written down on paper at the time of focus group discussions and key informant interviews. Qualitative data had a two-fold purpose: On the one hand it served to support the figures of the quantitative data, by collecting concrete examples, testimonials and quotes. On the other hand, it provided information on certain points that the survey could not touch upon. The analysis of the data was done by disaggregating respondents by category so as to visualize the trends to the given questions.

2.4. Analysis and Quality Assurance

Search’s Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator was responsible for the data analysis and the writing of the study in French. The quality of the evaluation report was assured by Search’s Institutional Learning Team (ILT).

For this evaluation, all precautions have been taken to ensure data quality. First, the tools have been translated into Sango and the enumerators were trained through role-playing methods to use the same formulation when conducting the surveys and interviews. The enumerators were also trained in moderation techniques for FGDs and KIs and in notetaking. The Consultant was present in the field constantly to monitor and supervise the quality and integrity of the data collection. Finally, the collected data was analyzed and reviewed in order to identify errors and oversights. A debriefing meeting of 5-10 minutes was held each morning before the field visit to share information on abnormalities.

For each evaluation question, the answers were examined and the results triangulated.

2.5. Limitations

Several factors have limited the access of evaluators to data for this study:

- Some of the Search project staff members no longer worked within the organization, which made it impossible for the enumerators to consult them for this evaluation. These key project staff members include the Program Director, the Program Associate, and the Media Coordinator.
- Due to restricted movement caused by general insecurity, enumerators reported not having been able to interview all participants since they were unable to get safe access to the locations of the some project activities.
The absence of a baseline study in the proper sense is an obstacle to the comparison of data from the beginning of the project and the understanding of their evolution in time. On the other hand, the first conflict scan provides some reference raw data that was used for comparison purposes.

Some activities have been implemented or were ongoing after the start of the final assessment and therefore it was not possible to include them in the evaluation. These activities were delayed due to the security situation following the temporary evacuation of expatriate staff from the country.
3. Findings

This section presents the main results of the evaluation. It is structured around the evaluation criteria and follows the evaluation questions as developed during the planning phase of the evaluation (see attached in the Annexes). The analysis is based on the project indicators which are integrated into the different evaluation questions in the matrix.

3.1. Relevance

Throughout the project implementation period, a context and conflict analysis was developed and a particular emphasis was put on the key results obtained from the various monitoring studies. The project proposal, developed in 2016, analyzed the fragile situation of the country, highlighting the impact of political manipulation and ethno-religious conflict as well as the impact of the low human development indicator of the Central African Republic.

The proposal emphasizes that, while the intensity of conflict in Bangui reduced significantly compared to 2013, the context remains volatile, with violent conflicts that can escalate from one moment to the next, particularly around the enclave of PK5. The presence of self-defense groups in the areas surrounding PK5 creates tension, hatred and mistrust between the Christian and Muslim communities.

Two conflict scans have been conducted in 2016 and 2017. They provided vital information for the orientation of the project. The analysis took particular care in respecting the Do No Harm principle, involving participants without harming the community or the local authorities. With the help of the conflict scans, we avoided relying solely on the recommendations of traditional leaders, as this could have created a conflict between them and the communities and were able to take into consideration the recommendations of both parties when identifying participants.

The respondents found that the project was adapted to the local context and has helped to bring together Muslim and Christian communities around a common activity and a common interest. For example, the football match allowed different groups of youth of both communities to come together and get to know each other.

"This project has enabled us to have a dialogue between us (Christians and Muslims)" (a youth participant of a FGD, on 21 December 2017).

Almost all respondents of the FGDs and KIIIs really appreciated the element of working with youth in high-risk areas. From their perspective, the youth are both perpetrators and victims of communal disturbances. Accordingly, the information from the conflict scans show that young people are the main actors in violent conflicts in their community. Our findings state that the unemployed youth (often under the influence of drugs) have a higher probability of committing crimes, such as theft. So it is very important to target them through these programs, empower them with non-violent methods, and provide them with alternative livelihoods that will in turn enable them to positively influence their peers in their communities.

"Even the Christian and Muslim youth who were part of the armed groups were engaged in the activities" (youth participant of a FGD, December 22, 2017).

"The project has managed to bring together the Seleka and anti-Balaka in a training." (KII with an implementing partner of the project, December 22, 2017).

The two conflict scans also enabled the project team to follow the evolution of the conflict dynamics and the context. While understanding the conflict on a macro level, the conflict scans also managed to reveal secondary conflicts, such as poor access to services or urban management conflicts, conflicts over access to economic resources, domestic conflicts, conflicts related to religious discrimination, conflicts linked to power structures and ethnic conflicts. These secondary, social conflicts were addressed later on through radio spots, town hall meetings, and reconciliation and solidarity activities (for example garbage-, water- and electricity management).
Another system in place to adapt to the volatile environment was to discuss with the young participants the choice of themes and implementation areas. For example, in the reported cases of violence, the project was able to readjust the messages of the spots and SMSs to help restore calm.

Although respondents confirmed the relevance of the project in the areas of intervention, they also emphasized its limits: pointing out that no religious leader has been included and that the project intervention areas remained limited. In fact, as religious leaders remain at the heart of the communities, they have an important role to play in promoting peace and reconciliation, which is why both the conflict scans and the survey respondents pointed out the importance of involving them directly in the project implementation.

According to the partners (J’ai rêvé Foundation and Don Bosco), although the project did not directly involve religious leaders, it is still very relevant, especially with regards to the youth involvement in its implementation. For them, the fact that the project is youth-oriented and addresses community leaders is already an insurance that it is building on two important pillars of society. As young people are both perpetrators and victims of the conflict, it is important to involve them in program implementation. Furthermore, community leaders are among the most influential actors in the eyes of youth, making them possible agents of peace.

**SMS tools and radio:** The SMS and radio spots have played a key role in raising public awareness. First, themes were chosen through a workshop with youth and local leaders who identified the most sensitive issues that communication activities would focus on. By participating in the workshop, participants were able to identify high priority challenges in their community, thus ensuring that radio spots would be relevant to the context.

*"I'm a district manager, I've been in a training with Search in December. I was well informed about the management of rumors; now I think the best way to communicate is through these radio messages, where the young people themselves and us, the authorities will lead the people to a behavioral change". (Testimony from one of the participants of the workshops helping to identify the themes of the radio spots).*

**Capacity reinforcement trainings:** During the project, eight trainings were held, including four on conflict transformation and four more on entrepreneurship (AGR). These trainings brought together young people from different communities, teaching them how to work together. Table 4 gives an overview of how participants of these trainings have assessed the relevance of the topics covered in these workshops to their local context: Over 83% of them found it relevant. This proportion exceeds 90% in PK5 and Miskine, which are the two most conflict-affected zones.

One of the project team members explained that:

*"... these trainings were emotional. Young Muslims and Christians held hands and cried together".*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Perception of the relevance to the local context of the capacity reinforcement trainings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The trainings are relevant to the present situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the project, the main target group was the population of the four districts of Bangui (Fatima Yakite, Miskine and PK5) and particularly young people and community leaders. While some
respondents regretted the geographical limits of this project, many confirmed that it targeted the most conflict-affected areas. As the targeted young people have had a significant influence on the conflict, it was crucial to reach out to them to be able to start working for the return of peace in the CAR.

Because of this, throughout the project we strived to include young people not only as direct participants of the project, but also as key partners in the implementation. This remains a very effective way to build community relations, as the involved youth are both victims and actors in the conflict. In addition, they have the potential to transmit the Common Ground message to their peers, thus reinforcing the efforts of peacebuilding at the community level. We have also strived to include former members of armed groups among the young participants, as this is a very effective way to educate other young people and encourage them to avoid violence in all its forms.

Almost all respondents have recognized the success of the project in including youth combatants and ex-combatants. One of the journalists working for Search explained that:

“The project was well adapted to the context and well prepared: among the youth with whom we worked, there were groups of young people who took up arms, and it really wasn’t easy with them, but after the training, they changed, and even the most violent have become mediators.”

3.2. Effectiveness

3.2.1. Extent of Achievement of Project Objectives

Due to the insecure context, the continuation of atrocities and the presence of armed groups in the project implementation area, the project has not fully achieved all of its goals and expected results: some indicators and targets have only been partly met as some activities were not implemented or were only partially carried out. As such, three of the seven objective indicators and four of the nine performance indicators have not reached the target level. The following section presents the progress made towards the achievement of the four objectives set.

Specific Objective 1: Youth in the neighborhood of PK5, Yakite, Fatima and Miskine are deterred from participating in atrocities

As part of this objective, the project had the following three expected results:

1. Youth, community leaders and communities in general have more access to inspirational and positive messages of preventing of violence and promoting peace;
2. Young people and communities humanize people from other neighborhoods and resist manipulation that encourages violence and hate speech;
3. Trust and collaboration is increased in targeted communities.

According to the key project stakeholders and participants, the implemented activities of this project have been successful in reaching out to a significant number of people from all layers of society. The media played a very important role in raising awareness in all communities on non-violence and peace. As we can see in Graph 1, approximately 99% of respondents said that they had listened to the radio messages of non-violence (73.1% very often and 25.4% often).

Graph 1: Proportion of respondents who received SMS or listened to radio emissions on conflict transformation and peace promotion (Baseline, compared to final evaluation, in %)
Some of the young people and project leaders have emphasized that they really enjoyed the SMS-sharing initiative. They added that the SMSs have greatly helped them raise awareness and share ideas with their families and friends. Because of this, they regretted the end of the program, as they said that they will not have credit (telephone airtime) to continue this activity. For example, on March 3, 2017 we received the following SMS feedback:

"I want to share this SMS with others but I have no phone credit." (Feedback received March 3, 2017).

To assess the impact of these messages, and of our activities, we asked survey respondents whether they believed that violence was necessary to resolve conflicts. As shown in Graph 2, the percentage of respondents who responded affirmatively was 15% for the baseline study, against 12% for the final study. This shows a 3% improvement. Here, our final target was only partly achieved. As we have pointed out before, this was due to disruptions in the security context, which led to the postponement and/or cancelling of some of our activities.

Graph 2: Proportion of survey respondents who think that violence is necessary to resolve conflicts (Baseline compared to final evaluation, in %)

To assess whether the messages on non-violent conflict transformation were adopted by the communities, the enumerators asked respondents what their reactions would be if a child of another community had attacked and injured their child. About 46% of respondents stated that they would analyze the problem before taking any action, indicating a willingness to solve the problems in a non-
violent way and recognize commonalities (Graph 3). Showing a similarly positive trend, the recognition of common interests between the communities has also increased: as we can see in Graph 4, 98% respondents said they had common interests with the other communities, whereas in the baseline evaluation only 50% were of the same opinion (an improvement of 48%). As one of our interviewees said:

"One of my sisters was married to a Muslim and they have already a child. This is already a common interest we have between us. " (FGD, a youth formed on the 22nd December 2017).

Similarly, as Graph 5 shows, young people became very engaged in the discussion with their peers from other communities: 86% of them felt ready to engage with the youth from other communities. This willingness to interact is linked to the increased perception of having common interests, so although other factors might have played into this positive trend, the project has also contributed to strengthening ties between the two communities by bringing communities together in activities such as sport and trainings.
"We all have a common interest: we share this country between us Muslims and them, Christians." (participant of a training in a FGD, December 22, 2017).

As a way of measuring whether trust and communication between communities has effectively increased, we also asked the respondents to estimate the frequency of their interactions with people from the other community. 36% of our respondents reported interacting with them on personal issues, while 40% said they discuss common challenges arising in the community on an everyday basis with “others”. Many have also said that they exchange at least once a week (respectively 28% and 37% for personal matters and common challenges in the community).

In addition to opening up platforms of dialogue, we have also targeted the youth from the mentioned communities through conflict resolution and entrepreneurship trainings. The aim of these trainings was also to involve the youth in active conflict resolution. As evidenced by the results of the final evaluation, these trainings have been very effective as they allowed young people to build up their networks and stay in touch, while building trust between young people from Christian and Muslim communities. Thanks to this, young people have remained engaged throughout the project: both in the implementation of the solidarity activities, in the preparatory meetings, as well as in the post-project period.

Our activity reports mention that young people have created a synergy between them during the implementation of activities. Young people from the PK5 went to carry out activities in Miskine, those in Miskine went to Fatima, and so on. Some of the participants in the FGDs added that they were also working with other youth in their community.
"In my community (Fatima) with my association called New Era of CAR, we work with young people." (participant of a training in a FGD, December 22, 2017).

"There is improved collaboration. We see a free flow of Muslims taxi-motos in almost all districts of Bangui." (participant of a training in a FGD, December 22, 2017).

These newly created synergies have remained dynamic also after the end of the project, as we have noticed a willingness on the part of the youth to train their peers on non-violent conflict transformation methods. As such, the majority of young people during the focus groups stressed that they were members of groups and/or associations that initiate solidarity activities within their respective communities. Table 5 shows that approximately 88% of young people said they had contributed to the resolution of conflict between two or more persons.

Table 5: Distribution of surveyed young people according to whether they helped others to resolve conflict, disaggregated by neighborhood (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Have you helped resolve a dispute between two or more people?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatima</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakite</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miskine</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK5</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the participants of our trainings, 74.6% of them said they have taken on the role of mediators in their respective communities, families and schools. This figure was even higher among the trained community leaders, 89% of whom reported the role of mediator in the past 12 months (Graph 7). As one of the participants put it:

"We are reaching out to every place where there is conflict in our surroundings" (participant in a training, FGD, December 22, 2017).

**Outcome 2: Targeted youth from PK5, Yakite, Fatima and Miskine resist political manipulation to commit violence.**
As part of this objective, we expected two outcomes: first, that the youth and key community leaders would have the opportunity to share their fears, concerns and expectations with the local authorities and that the mechanisms leading to an escalation of violence would be identified in communities. Second, that young people would have more space to talk to community leaders and policy makers on key issues and inclusive communication channels would open to break the cycle of marginalization and exclusion leading to political manipulation and violent expression of grievances.

To achieve the first outcome, the project has carried out activities that opened up platforms of dialogue between young people and local authorities.

The participating youth explained that before the project it was difficult for them to discuss and reach out to the authorities of their communities. But the town hall meetings of this project allowed them to approach the authorities and to share their concerns, thus creating a bridge between young people and authorities. They added that they would like to move this to an advanced level and organize meetings with representatives of the central government. Football matches have contributed to combatting the fear that existed between the Christian and Muslim communities. Some young people said that thanks to these games, they have gone to some areas they have not been to since the beginning of the crisis in 2013, adding that it has also permitted them to forge new links with young people from other communities. Others wished that this kind of activity could be carried out in all districts of Bangui and in the provinces and that it could also include a dialogue between communities and armed groups.

The project facilitated six community town hall meetings bringing together the authorities, community leaders and the members of the community. Initially, we had planned to carry out 12 meetings. However, as mentioned before, these had to be cancelled due to security concerns. The meetings gave occasion to exchange on key issues affecting the community. The reports of these activities show that discussions were successful in addressing key community concerns and issuing action plans, which will enable the authorities and the youth to jointly follow the political context and act together.

“There is very good communication between young people and the authorities especially the members of the 3rd district.” (FGD, training beneficiary, December 22, 2017).

Another participant added that as a result of these activities, he has learned to communicate better with neighborhood leaders in their community.

Table 6: Proportion of respondents who said they can share their grievances and ideas with the local authorities (disaggregated by category of respondent, in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of respondent</th>
<th>Ability to share their grievances and ideas with local authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community member</td>
<td>41.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project participant</td>
<td>57.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>88.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young leaders</td>
<td>44.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that 57.7% of direct beneficiaries of the project (including 88.2% of community leaders and 45% of young people) have stated that they have the opportunity to share their concerns with local authorities. This figure was only 41% amongst community members who haven’t been involved in our activities.
"Yes indeed, young people in my neighborhood often come to me and share their complaints and ideas. And that’s the same for other authorities, except from the areas where armed groups are still present." (KII, traditional chief, December 20, 2017).

50% of survey respondents reported an improvement in communication with the authorities during the last 12 months. Community leaders particularly felt the change (about 78%), whereas only 48% of young people reported a positive change.

"When young people want to organize a football game with people from other neighborhoods, they keep me informed and we analyze the context together before." (KII, traditional chief, December 20, 2017).

Table 7: Proportion of respondents who feel that their communication with your community leaders and/or decision makers has improved over the past 12 months (disaggregated by category of respondent, in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of respondent</th>
<th>It has improved, I can communicate more</th>
<th>It has remained the same</th>
<th>It has deteriorated, I can communicate less</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary of the project</td>
<td>56.40%</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>77.80%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young leaders</td>
<td>47.90%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>22.90%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.10%</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
<td>19.70%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since only half of young people said their communication channels with the authorities improved, there is still work to be done in this area. The presence of armed groups in areas of the implementation of the project is one of the reasons why the access might still be lacking, since these groups in most cases have acted as a replacement to local authorities. Because of this, young people are afraid to confide in local authorities, fearing a backlash from armed groups.

As a direct cause of improved communication, we tried to assess whether communities would be able to withstand manipulation better. As we can see in Graph 8, the resistance to manipulation has improved: 81.6% said they would easily recognize if someone was trying to manipulate them (as opposed to 79.8% in the baseline) 98% said that they could easily resist manipulation (as opposed to 87% in the baseline study).

Graph 8: Proportion of respondents able to resist manipulation (in %)
To test the respondents, the survey enumerators have presented the following scenario of manipulation: "Imagine a political leader or civil society actor who had come to your community to tell you to protest in the street for your rights, because according to him/her, your rights are not respected by the other community. What would your community do?" In this case, only 6% of the respondents thought that their community would come out to protest. The others have either said no or proposed to first analyze the politician’s statements.

Our activities, especially the media and SMS component, have contributed to this change as they have targeted a larger audience, spreading messages of peace.

"Central African people, banish the spirit of hatred and violence, so that peace and social cohesion can come in our country" Excerpt from SMS messages sent on 17th of July, 2017.

Graph 9: Community response to example of manipulative political discourse (desegregated by options, in %)

Next, we tried to assess whether the project has enabled the communities to recognize hate speech. As Graph 10 shows, faced with a message that states "I hate all people who are not of the same religion as me," nearly 96% of respondents detected it as hate speech. This is an improvement compared to the baseline study where 91.6% of respondents were able to distinguish between hate speech and someone simply giving their opinion.

Graph 10: Distribution of respondents according to their reactions to a specific example of hate speech (in %)
Outcome 3: Alternative livelihoods for at-risk youth are promoted, diverting them away from political manipulation and violence

As part of this objective, the first expected outcome of the project was that young people would see an increase in their knowledge and skills to develop livelihoods. The second expected outcome was that young people would have greater access to economic opportunities and alternatives to violence based on their community-level needs.

As a part of this effort, we have trained 59 young people in entrepreneurship. The results of the final evaluation show that young people and youth leaders appreciated the quality and content the training, which they deemed appropriate to their needs. To assess their opinions of the trainings, we asked the following questions: What is your overall satisfaction with the training? Do you think this training has helped you widen your knowledge? Was the training methodology adapted to your needs? Was the trainer adequately trained? Was the language of the training easy to understand? Was the time allocated for this training well managed? Were the participants engaged in the discussion? Were the logistics and the organization of the training satisfactory?

These criteria have yielded above average rating with the exception of the last question. The results of the pre and post-training tests show that participants improved their knowledge in conflict management and entrepreneurship. For the training in conflict management, only 23 participants scored equal or superior to 50% before the training. After the training, the number has tripled from 23 to 83. In other words, 60 people in this training improved their level of knowledge in this area.

The entrepreneurship training was practice-based rather than theory-based. Thanks to that, many of the participants stated that they have increased their knowledge in the area, in which they were already working but did not sufficiently know. One participant said it was thanks to the training that they have finally understood how trade worked. Another added that thanks to the training some have been able to develop their income-generating activities.

"We gained a lot of new knowledge. As for me, I now make my living from working on a farm that we work on with the others." (participant of an entrepreneurship training, FGD, 22 December 2017).

Graph 11: Distribution of survey respondents according to whether they have access to economic activities (in %)

When asked whether they had access to economic opportunities, 77.6% responded affirmatively. Following the entrepreneurship training and with the support of Search, young leaders developed 11 economic micro-projects. Participants said they appreciated the fact that they were able to practice what they learned during the more theoretical trainings and the implementing partners were happy to see the adaptability and new competences of the training participants. The latter added that this training has enabled them to build relations and cooperation between the Christian and the Muslim community, as well as between community members and ex-combatants. In addition, it has also
helped to provide alternative livelihoods to youth. One of the representatives of the partners explained that among the participants, there were some who had tried to join the armed groups of the PK5. However, after this entrepreneurship training, they completely turned away from these groups.

Graph 12: Distribution of respondents who are tempted to enter groups that use violence (Baseline data compared to final evaluation, in%)

As we can see on Graph 12, after the project young people became less likely to get involved in groups that advocate violence: In 2016, as reported in the baseline study, 99% of young people were tempted to enter armed groups that advocate violence. In 2017, this figure was only about 10%. Although the assessment cannot attribute this with certainty to the project, it is very plausible that the project has contributed directly and/or indirectly through its programming, its socio-cultural events, its SMS and radio campaigns, community meetings etc. We can see the impact of the project also through the feedback received from the listeners of the radio shows.

"See what is happening in our provinces? Seriously, Central Africans have suffered too much... tell those rebels that we need peace, we need to live." (Feedback received via SMS July 31, 2017.)

"We really need your approach so we could change the mentality of Central Africans." Feedback received via SMS July 30, 2017

"I'm really touched by your message. It really inspires me to change my way of seeing others. This is a good message that will improve the lives of Central Africans." Feedback received via SMS, March 14, 2017

"We are observing a change in the attitudes of the community because we can see that Christians and Muslims live together now and this is already a change in behavior." Participant in a training, FGD, December 22, 2017

The project's exact contribution to this community-wide behavioral change is difficult to assess, since our activities only involved a few hundred people directly. On the other hand, the mass media component of the project has reached over 500 participants. Overall, via all our project activities, either directly or indirectly, we have reached nearly 6000 people. This means that more than half of the original target (9600) has been reached. These 6000 are able and equipped to influence others positively. The testimonies collected during the final evaluation and the SMS feedback already demonstrate this positive snowball effect:

"A self-defense chief told my brother to leave school and join his group. But he took my advice and refused his invitation to join the group ". (participant in a training, FGD, December 22, 2017).

"I am happy to speak of peace to my neighbors and to transmit them the knowledge and the know-how that I received from you." (SMS feedback)

"I support you. With the peace we have now I was able to have my house back here in the 5th neighbourhood. " (SMS feedback)
Cross-cutting Result: The attitude of youth towards the "other" (youth of different affiliate) is positively transformed.

The survey data shows some changes in the perception of "others", including people from another family, religion, tribe, city or country (see Graph 13). Those who perceive the "other" as people of different religions represent 8.2%. People of another family were identified as "other" by 4% of respondents, while 63.3% of the respondents defined the "Other" as a foreigner.

Graph 13: Distribution of the respondent's definitions of the "other" (in %).

Despite efforts to promote non-violence and tolerance, perceptions of community members in relation to the trust "others" are still low. The percentage of survey respondents who consider that trust towards the “Other” has greatly increased for the last year is only about 27%, while almost 50% think that trust has only increased moderately (Graph 14).

Graph 14: Distribution of survey respondents according to whether they have access to economic activities (in %)

Whether we are talking about the “Other” as someone of a different religion, or of a different community, the majority of the survey respondents still have a difficulty trusting other groups. Only 40% of our survey respondents said that they could easily trust someone of a different community/affiliation, whereas 45% said that they would have to really know that person to confide in them. 14% simply said they wouldn’t be able to trust the “other”.

Graph 15: Proportion of respondents who trust “others” from different communities or affiliations (in %)
On the other hand, when faced with a concrete example, the majority of our respondents proved to be very trusting to others. We asked the participants the following questions:

- Would you invite a Christian/Muslim to eat with you on Christmas or on New Year’s Eve?
- Would you let your child play with a Muslim/Christian child?

As a sign of growing trust, we can see that over 79% of the respondents gave affirmative answers.

Graph 16: Proportion of respondents who trust “others” from different communities or affiliations (in %)

Additionally, nearly two thirds of respondents (61%) found that they have more respect for other groups than they did before the project, and about 28% have some level of respect for them. Our project activities, especially those aiming to bring the communities together through dialogue, have certainly contributed to this result.

Graph 17: The perception of the respondents on whether their respect for the “Other” has increased over the last year (in %).

The impact of our activities on this trend is also recognized by some of the testimonies that confirm that the activities have enabled them to meet regularly and revisit areas they haven’t been to since the beginning of the crisis.

"I liked fighting, but this training and the activities I attended have changed my opinion, and now it’s me who’s advising others on peaceful methods." (FGD, participant, December 22, 2017).
3.2.2. Factors influencing the project Implementation

This section provides an overview of the positive and negative factors (as identified by our survey respondents and Search staff) that impacted the project implementation.

Firstly, as one of our staff members pointed out, the conflict scan, performed at the beginning of the project has shaped the profile of almost all of the activities that were implemented as well as the topics that were addressed in these activities, making sure that they would be adapted to the local context and address the main conflict points.

Secondly, the choice to focus on youth at risk has both been a key element success of this project and a shaping factor that defined the intervention targeting and the choice of location for the project activities. For example, the SMS campaign was created to target youth and involve them through a means of communication that is most relevant to them. The economic innovations that accompanied the social cohesion activities enabled young people to serve as an example in their community, as well as giving them an occasion to come together and continue to communicate, even after the project had finished.

The most frequently reported factor that influenced the project implementation in a negative way, limiting its impact, was the persisting insecurity accompanied by the flow of weapons and violent incidents, leading to the delayed implementation of some activities.

3.3. Impact

The main goal of this project was to "prevent the risk of mass atrocities between Muslims and Christians in the PK5 and its surroundings."

According to the majority of the survey respondents, the project has only partly achieved its goal. Although the areas targeted by the project were the most high-risk areas of Bangui, the respondents pointed out that there is also violence in the “hinterland”, and that the youth from the lower risk areas are more prone to become subjects of manipulation when violence happens in other parts of the country. Adding to that, the number of activities on the ground was said to be too limited in time and space, which in the end hindered the achievement of large-scale changes.

The training of young leaders on conflict transformation, the weekly SMSs, the radio spots as well as the other solidarity activities carried out during the project contributed significantly to strengthening popular consciousness vis-à-vis the risks of violence in the life of the community. This change could be felt in the attitudes of the two communities present in Bangui and especially in the PK5 and its surroundings. In 2013, at the beginning of the crisis, every time there was violence in the community, severe retaliation followed in the form of road blocks and protests. But for the past year, no such cases have been reported in Bangui, not even in the PK5 and its surroundings, which is considered to be one of the most high-risk areas. Since this data was collected, there have been several incidents of violence but none of them have led popular uprising nor to intercommunal clashes. For example, the incidents causing casualties among the Muslim community or their enclave in the Roman Catholic Church could have provoked retaliation by the members of the PK5 community, however no such retaliation has been reported. This indicates that the population is distancing itself from political-military issues and is capable of simply settling community conflicts such as the management of garbage, or water points independently from the political context.

The project worked with four theories of change. Since not all of the activities were carried out, not all of these theories of change were realized.

The first and third theory stipulates that "if young people and leaders are working more and more effectively together, then they will respond better to the security challenges they face and they will jointly improve social cohesion" and that "if young people and leaders are building their capacity to
communicate with each other and with external actors, then they will collect, manage and share safety-related information, minimizing their negative impact.

The six town hall meetings have allowed young people, community leaders and local authorities to discuss the political context of their environment and analyze the risk of conflict, but it has not enabled them to implement a strategy to follow up on the recommendations which came out of these meetings. Even though the conflict analysis produced by Search has pointed this out prior to the activities, no action followed, thus limiting the impact of the project.

The second theory of change focused on building trust between young people and the community leaders: "If young people and leaders learn to accept and trust each other, then they will use their capacities in a more efficient way and will develop effective coping strategies." Youth and community leaders attended a joint training on conflict transformation, ensuring that they would have the same level of understanding about the subject and that they could interact with each other at community events. However, the project failed to incite the youth and the community leaders to reflect on adaptation strategies that would enable them to intervene independently or jointly with the community. Thus, through this project the participating youth did not have the chance to learn how to act independently, undermining the sustainability of the results.

The last theory of change focuses on non-violent communication and states that "If stakeholders improve their coordination and communities are widely informed, then the protection given to and the assistance provided to communities will be improved." Changes achieved in this area have been very visible. Search has enabled young people and community leaders to share messages of peace through SMS and radio spots. The approach used by Search was to provide young people and community leaders with telephones and credit that allowed them to share these messages weekly. Thanks to that, young leaders starting networking and sharing information. As the SMS feedback and the collected testimonies show, this strategy has worked well, and has greatly contributed to proving the theory of change.

The mass media activities have allowed the project to reach out to a wider audience, both in the communities, and amongst the authorities. The operational reports and project database show that an average of 600 people were affected by each solidarity activity. Project data shows that about 10,000 people were affected by the SMS campaigns. The radio spots have greatly contributed to raising awareness on a wider level, reaching beyond the target areas of the project. We have received a total of 1600 feedback messages during this project related to media activities, including those quoted below.

"What I really like are the testimonies that we can hear in the radio shows." (FGD, Participant, December 22, 2017).

"Thank you for supporting the process of building peace in the CAR. We will have peace one day, and this will all be history." (Feedback received via SMS, July 30, 2017)

"If you manage to change the mentality of Central Africans, and bring the concept of citizenship and national heritage to schools, all of us will be greatly relieved." (Feedback received via SMS, July 30, 2017)

"I admire your way of reaching out to Central Africans. Please also send this message to the main actors of influence, so we could have peace in CAR." Feedback received via SMS, July 31, 2017

Some participants regretted the fact that the project has only focused on four districts of Bangui. According to them, these activities should have continued in other areas where violent conflict continues.

"When I read your message, it really had an impact on me. This is a very good message. I encourage you to send them also to Bandoro, Paoua, Batangafo, Ndele and to other towns." (Feedback received July 31, 2017)
Re-Establishing Trust entre Communities and around Hot Spots

One of the issues addressed in this evaluation is the level of respect towards people considered as “others”. As illustrated above (graph 16), there has been an improvement in respect of the “other”. According to the survey data, about 62% of respondents claim to have a lot of respect for others.

In addition to respect for the ”other”, we have also assessed the daily contact with the ”other” (Graph 6). Survey respondents feel that they interact every day with the ”other” to talk about personal matters (36%) and common challenges in their communities (40%). About 28% and 37% do so at least once a week.

We see the improved level of mutual interest and interaction between communities and others. Talking about personal matters and common challenges of the community is the first step to understanding what we have in common and to work from that in a positive way by following the Common Ground approach.

Although the level of respect for others has improved, we see challenges with regard to increased trust in others. As we saw on Graph 14, only 27% of respondents reported an increased sense of trust towards the others. One factor which is influencing this level of mistrust, as reported by several respondents, is that some people still keep their weapons and use them as a means of defense and subsistence.

The survey enumerators also noticed a change in behavior and attitude within the community. One of the traditional chiefs interviewed by our team said that now Muslims can go to Miskine (one of the districts feared by Muslims) without being threatened. He added that he would have wished for the project activities to continue and multiply in 2018.

The district leaders testified that the two communities have changed their attitudes towards each other. At the beginning of the crisis, it was impossible for a Muslim and a Christian to play together or visit an area where the other lived, while today the fact they start playing sports together and interacting marks a positive change favoring the return of social cohesion.

"Last year, Muslims could not bring their children to school in Elim (a Christian district), but now they can do that " (FGD, participant, December 20, 2017).

As the project staff explained, in the past, every time there was a violent event in the provinces, this provoked a severe backlash in PK5. But now this can be avoided and leaders can call for calm and cohesion. Similarly, the Project Manager explained that at start of the project, some areas were inaccessible. During the project, the implementation team developed a system that brought together young people from different communities on the football field in parts of the city that were before thought to be inaccessible. This has created a climate of trust between young people for the first time, encouraging them to participate in the sports activities.

We also see a change in the perception of each other. The youth training on conflict transformation has had a positive influence on the main beneficiaries. Even if this has only happened at the level of participants, we can also see a certain willingness on their part to spread the messages and lessons that they learnt. The majority of respondents who are in associations said that they have conducted many activities to support social cohesion, also initiating solidarity activities within their group or association.

"We go from door to door, work on raising awareness and on organizing community discussions that promote peace."(FGC participant, December 21, 2017).

By analyzing the reports on economic activities, the survey enumerators found that the young people trained in the entrepreneurship program have unexpectedly quickly adapted to the context and to the challenges they faced. They themselves have taken on the task of organizing and have proposed new, innovative solutions. For example, one of the groups focusing on producing food has decided to work
more efficiently by dividing the tasks so that one group took charge of producing flour, while the other concentrated on selling food.

The football matches have also yielded good results: many young people who participated in these activities have recognized that these games have allowed them to go again into the neighborhoods where they did not have the courage to go since the beginning of the crisis. Others noted that these games have created a sense of mutual interest between the groups, allowing them to build friendships. Reopening areas that were previously no-go zones was also made possible by the cooperation of both the traditional and administrative authorities.

On the other hand, continuous clashes in some of the target areas have impeded the implementation of some of the activities, and/or have stopped some of the youth from participating. The presence of self-defense groups in these areas continues to create fear amongst the population, thus also contributing to the persistence of mistrust between communities.
3.4. Sustainability

3.4.1. Continuity after the end of funding

The sustainability of the project outcomes is questionable with the exception of the economic activities. These will likely continue even after the end of the project, and the mixed groups of Muslims and Christians will continue working together and remain in contact. The more these young people are involved in these economic activities, the more they will be deterred from turning to violence and from supporting atrocities. There are good indications that these economic activities will continue on the long term: youth have adapted quickly to the market requirements and to new challenges. This shows that with the right support these initiatives could continue to flourish.

For other project activities, our analysis predicts a low level of continuity after the end of funding. Prior to the end of the project, no exit plan had been developed with the exception of one of the economic activities. However, as most of the trained young people and community leaders are representatives of associations, or traditional authorities, they could still make use of the experiences gained through the project to bring about lasting change in their communities.

On the other hand, in terms of the general population, the effects brought by the project are likely to dissipate as the activities bringing together members of different communities, and awareness-raising activities cease. Even though we trained the participants together, thus creating links between them, there is no institutionalized structure that could continue bringing these actors together after the end of the project.

3.4.2. Integration of the Project in Local Community / Institutional Structures

The KIIs with the implementation partners revealed that working with local partners gives them the opportunity get involved in peacebuilding, which was not their primary purpose. The two partners appreciated this approach and said they would try to continue applying it after the end of our project, as they believed that it is an effective way of deterring the youth from getting involved in conflict. On the other hand, these implementing partners lack the capacity to monitor the former participants, and they would need capacity building to continue implementing similar programs.

The low involvement of civil society organizations (CSOs), the National Youth Council, as well as religious leaders, is also a predictive indication of lack of sustainability, as these organizations have a big role to play in community organization and peacebuilding.

3.4.3. Engaging Participants and Partners in Decision-Making

Participants and implementation partners were involved in decision making on different levels. The partners were involved directly as they had the responsibility to propose training modules as well as to coach the young people after their participation in the training. They have also facilitated the creation of youth groups, the initiation of economic activities, and have participated in strategic project workshops to reflect together on the implementation strategies.

The youth leaders have developed their own economic initiatives, supported by the project and under the supervision of partners (Don Bosco and Fondation J’ai rêvé). Due to this, they reported at the end of the project that their ability to design and develop initiatives has greatly increased. Some noted that they have become experts in community mobilization and can now see themselves at the forefront of the implementation of community activities.

3.4.4. Exit Strategy

None of the project documents mentioned specifically a clear exit strategy for the project.

As said before, the youth economic initiatives will continue after the project’s end. However, they would still need technical and financial support to be able to last over time. Additionally, distributing
phones to youth and community leaders was part of the exit strategy of the project, as a means to allow staying in touch. Although there are limitations to this (lack of credit), it still has allowed young people to continue sending text messages and exchanging information about their communities and personal lives.

In addition, the project had no support for participants and partners to design solutions that would allow them to finance their activities after the end of the project. Technical support given by Search in helping the partners and participants to enter into contact with similar programs could be a good entry point to ensuring the sustainability of our results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
<th>Comments on % of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Project Goal:** Prevent high-risk atrocities between Muslims and Christians in the PK5 and its surrounding areas

**Specific Objective 1: Youth in the neighborhood of PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine are deterred from participating in atrocities**

1.1. % Targeted youth who think it is necessary to use violence to resolve conflicts between different groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
<th>Comments on % of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Target not met, due to the insecure context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. % of youth who say they have shared interests with the others and can engage in a dialogue with them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
<th>Comments on % of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Target surpassed, thanks to the active involvement of youth in the project design and implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3. % Young participants who can cite at least one concrete example of a time when they sensitized their peers on the rejection of participation in atrocities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
<th>Comments on % of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Target not met, due to the postponement of some activities, the persisting mistrust in the communities and the insecure context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected Result 1.1**

Youth, community leaders and communities in general have better access to inspirational and positive messages in preventing violence and promoting peace.

1.1.1. % Of respondents who say that they listen / receive often or very often emissions or messages on conflict transformation and the promoting peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
<th>Comments on % of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98.5%, with 73.1% often</td>
<td>95%, with 75% very often</td>
<td>Target met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.2 % Of the population beyond 18 years in target areas who are exposed to the SMS and spot campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected Result 1.2**

Young people and communities humanize people from other neighborhoods and resist manipulation that encourages violence and hate speech.

1.2.1: % Of participants who say they are able to distinguish a "hate speech" from an expression of an opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
<th>Comments on % of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95,5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Target met, thanks to the trainings on conflict prevention and the success of the SMS and media campaign.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected Result 1.3**

Trust and collaboration is increased in target communities.

1.3.1 % Of respondents who can cite a concrete example of collaboration with someone from another community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
<th>Comments on % of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Target surpassed, due to the involvement of youth, as well as the active involvement of community leaders as actors of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Final evaluation | Engaging youth and community leaders to prevent mass atrocities in the CAR

### Specific Objective 2: Targeted youth from PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine resist political manipulation to commit violence.

1. **2.1:** % Of respondents who say they can recognize attempts of manipulation and feel able to resist.  
   - **Target met.**
   - 90%  

2. **2.2:** % Of targeted youth able to cite a concrete example of a time when they advocated for others to resist to manipulation for violence, or when they resisted themselves.  
   - **Target not met**
   - 35%  

### Expected result 2.1

Young people and key community leaders have the opportunity to share their fears, their concerns and their expectations with the local authorities; and the mechanisms leading to an escalation of violence are identified within communities.

1. **2.1.1.** % Of young participants and community leaders who claim to be able to share their concerns and ideas with local authorities  
   - **Target not met**
   - 50% of youth and 88% of leaders  

### Expected result 2.2

Young people have more space to engage with community leaders and policy makers on key issues and inclusive communication channels open up to break the cycle of marginalization and exclusion leading to political manipulation and the violent expression of grievances.

1. **2.2.1.** % Of youth who report having gained a better capacity to communicate with community leaders and decision-makers in the last 12 months.  
   - **Target not met**
   - 48%  

### Specific Objective 3

Alternative livelihood activities for at-risk youth are promoted, diverting them away from political manipulation and violence.

1. **3.1.** % Of young participants in the activities for the development of livelihoods that say they are tempted to enter in groups that promote violence.  
   - **Target not met, but largely improved from the baseline**
   - 10.2%  

### Expected result 3.1

Young people see an increase their knowledge and skills in developing livelihoods.

1. **3.1.1.** % of young people who have improved their knowledge in entrepreneurship and vocational skills after the training cycle  
   - **Target met**
   - 100%  

### Expected result 3.2: Young people have more access to economic opportunities and are aware of alternatives to violence based on their community-level needs.

1. **3.2.1.** % of people who say that they have access to economic opportunities and feel able to develop their own activities to live  
   - **Target not met**
   - 86%  

### Cross-cutting result: The attitude of youth towards the "other" (youth of different affiliate) is positively transformed.

1. **4.1.** % Of young people in the PK5, Yakite, Fatima and Miskine who say they trust the young people of different affiliations  
   - **Target not met.**
   - 67%
4. Conclusions

Thanks to the detailed context analysis carried out at the beginning of the project, the activities and themes of the project responded well to the community’s needs. The main strength of the project lies in targeting youth as main beneficiaries and partners, building on their experiences as both actors and victims of the violence and as potential actors of conflict transformation. Our partners Fondation J’ai rêvé and Don Bosco have confirmed the relevance of the project and have especially praised the high level of youth involvement in its implementation. On the other hand, the survey respondents lamented the limits of the geographical targeting of the project, as well as the non-inclusion of religious leaders, who as of today remain important community organizers.

The study found that the project has only partly achieved its overall goal of preventing high-risk atrocities between Muslims and Christians in the PK5 and its surroundings. While the media component of the project (radio spots and SMS campaign) proved to be very successful in targeting the youth and raising awareness, our ambitions to open up platforms of dialogue have been greatly obstructed due to security concerns and the volatile context. Thus, out of the originally planned 12 town hall meetings we were only able to carry out six, which also explains why some of our objectives were not met. On the other hand, the project has been very successful in involving and mobilising the youth of the targeted neighbourhoods who have also become active mediators of conflict after having benefited from Search’s trainings. Similarly, the recognition of hate speech and the resistance to manipulation have also increased. Finally, the entrepreneurship trainings have contributed to the reduction of violence by providing alternative livelihood activities for youth; nonetheless although these youth initiatives supported by the project have started off on a good path, they would need further follow-up and monitoring to ensure their sustainability.

To sum up, the project has strengthened the capacity of young people in conflict management and sensitized a large number of young people on non-violence and Common Ground approach. It has also contributed to creating new platforms of dialogue between authorities and the youth. However, the impact on a larger scale of these actions is not guaranteed due to lack of a clear plan for sustainability, as well as the limits in terms of budget and time.
5. Recommendations

Based on the analysis and conclusions presented above, the evaluation team would like to provide the following recommendations in order to guide the development and the implementation of similar interventions in the future.

5.1. Relevance

- The results of the conflict scans and previous evaluations show that community and religious leaders have largely contributed to building peace in the target communities. Unfortunately, the project did little to involve them as they were not an initial target in the proposal. An essential step to achieve success, would have been recognizing them as key players in building peace and promoting reconciliation, and including them among the project’s participants.

- To ensure do no harm and that the project remains sensitive to the evolution of conflict dynamics, lessons learnt from the conflict scans should have fed into the project implementation. To achieve that for the next time, it is recommended to put in place internal restitutions and incorporate them into regular planning. A plan of action could also be developed during the project implementation period, serving to roll out the recommendations internally and externally. There is also the need to make sure that there is an internal reflection that could guide the reshaping and adaptation of our activities.

- The project failed to ensure a proper follow-up of all activities and setting up a strong monitoring system which would have allowed for continuous assessment and correction throughout the project implementation, rather than at the end. This could allow to integrate the participants’ feedbacks and findings into the design of the project activities, making them more relevant.

5.2. Effectiveness

- The community town hall meetings should have been constructed in a more logical and sustainable way. Most importantly, there is a need to put in place mechanisms that could help ensure that the recommendations formulated during the meetings receive adequate follow-up. This could ensure that progress is being made on the issues discussed in the meetings, but also that it could maintain its legitimacy, and not create false hopes and expectations amongst the participating youth.

- It is especially recommended to continue working with young people who have left the armed groups to ensure that they don’t fall back to those networks, and to keep them engaged in the promotion of the values the project stands for, such as tolerance, non-violence and reconciliation. Setting up a formal space of dialogue between them and other youth groups, and promote a joint action plan, could be the key to ensure their continuous engagement, as these platforms would permit them to share their dilemmas and help one another. Reaching out to these youth groups could be facilitated by a solid partnership with the CNCJA.

- The project could have negotiated a longer period of involvement with radio partners. This would allow to continue raising awareness by keep broadcasting the radio spots even after the project’s end. To achieve this, it is recommended to set up an initial contract of expectations and duration of partnership at the beginning of the project.
5.3. Impact

- In order for the project to be able to impact the past and current conflicts in CAR, the area of intervention should have been expanded outside of Bangui. Some of the youth initiatives on poultry farming, grocery store, could have been scaled up in other locations in the country, where the market is vibrant. The SMS campaign was very successful and could have been scaled up by building the capacity of many other youths and including them in the communication float to send peace messages to other at-risk youths.

- Although the project targeted young people, it failed to involve the National Youth Council (CNJ) or the SCRCA, both of which are well-structured organizations, with experience in peace-building. The project could have ensured strengthened its impact both in terms of space and time, by involving these two actors in the project design and implementation and building on their experience.

5.4. Sustainability

- The project missed the opportunity to link youth initiatives to the CNJCA and other community-based structures, such as organizations, businesses or cooperatives that could have carried forward the project’s achievements and ensure their sustainability while embedding them in the social context after Search’s departure.

- To ensure local buy-in and sustainability of the project’s results, Search and its partners should have equipped the participating civil societies and other members, such as the CNJCA (National Youth Platform), with the required tools to lead the follow up by channeling achievement to higher authorities, and by advocating for their inclusion in the National Action Plan.

- Discussion around sustainability of the project should have been an integral part of the implementation process. Search should have established quarterly meetings with all project stakeholders to discuss sustainability in a participatory way and involve the project’s stakeholders in discussions around the future of the project. This would have to assess and adapt the overall project’s strategy and make its results sustainable, as well as enabling a tighter collaboration and a mutual understanding of the project goals, included in the long term.
6. Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

1. Context of the project
"Engaging Youth and Community Leaders to Prevent Mass Atrocities in Central African Republic" was implemented by Search for Common Ground (Search) in collaboration with the Fondation J’ai rêvé, Don Bosco and with the financial support of the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations (CSO) of the US Department of State. The project started on September 23, 2016 and ended on December 31, 2017. It was implemented in the city of Bangui, particularly targeting risk areas, namely PK5, Miskine Yakite and Fatima.

2. Specific objective of the project
The overall objective of this project was to prevent high-risk atrocities between Muslims and Christians in the PK5 and its surroundings.

In order to achieve this goal, SFCG proposed three specific objectives:
1) Youth in the neighborhood of PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine are deterred from participating in atrocities;
2) Targeted youth from PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine resist political manipulation to commit violence;
3) Alternative livelihood activities for at-risk youth are promoted, diverting them away from political manipulation and violence.

3. The expected results of the project are
Expected result 1.1
Youth, community leaders and communities in general have better access to inspirational and positive messages on preventing violence and promoting peace;

Expected Result 1.2
Young people and communities humanize people from other neighborhoods and resist manipulation that encourages violence and hate speech;

Expected Result 1.3
Trust and collaboration is increased in target communities;

Expected result 2.1
Young people and key community leaders have the opportunity to share their fears, their concerns and their expectations with the local authorities; and the mechanisms leading to an escalation of violence are identified within communities.

Expected result 2.2
Young people have more space to engage with community leaders and policy makers on key issues and inclusive communication channels open up to break the cycle of marginalization and exclusion leading to political manipulation and the violent expression of grievances.

Expected result 3.1
Young people see an increase in their knowledge and skills in developing livelihoods.

Expected result 3.2
Young people have more access to economic opportunities and are aware of alternatives to violence based on their community-level needs.

Cross-cutting result
The attitude of youth towards the "other" (youth of different affiliate) is positively transformed.

4. Project activities:
Activity 1.1 Conflict scan, mapping grievances and the expectations of young people
Activity 1.2 Solidarity activity
Activity 1.3 SMS campaign on the participative violence prevention
Activity 1.4 Radio spots promoting peace and dialogue
Activity 2.1 Training of youth and community leaders in the field of conflict transformation, mediation, leadership and advocacy
Activity 2.2 Monitoring of the activities for young people and community leaders
Activity 2.3 Community Town Hall Meetings
Activity 3.1 Entrepreneurship and vocational training
Activity 3.2 Joint economic initiatives

5. The theory of change
The project was based on four theories of change related to the dynamics of conflicts in the CAR. According to the main theory of change, if the Central-African youth has the means to resist political manipulation and get to know the “other”, and if leaders support social cohesion efforts and peaceful conflict resolution, then the young people will be less likely to participate in atrocities against the “other” communities.

In addition to the main theory of change of the project, the following underlying theories support the logic of this project:
1: "If young people and leaders are working more and more effectively together, then they will respond better to the security challenges they face and they will jointly improve social cohesion."
2: "If young people and leaders learn to accept and trust each other, then they will use their capacities in a more efficient way and will develop effective coping strategies."
3: "If young people and leaders are building their capacity to communicate with each other and with external actors, then they will collect, will manage and share safety-related information, minimizing their negative impact."
4: "If stakeholders improve their coordination and communities are widely informed, then the protection given to and the assistance provided to communities will be improved."
6. Justification and objectives of the study

RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

As the project "Engaging youth and community leaders to prevent CAR mass atrocities" came to an end, it is important to assess the extent to which the project activities have contributed to inter-communal conflict prevention and conflict-transformation in the areas of PK5 and its surroundings. This evaluation will enable SFCG to improve its approaches of conflict resolution in the CAR and to support other ongoing projects, as well to inform other partners working in the same field and report to different parts stakeholders of the project. The report will be circulated to all project partners published on the website of SFCG to ensure greater visibility.

The main aim of this final evaluation is to make a systematic analysis of the effectiveness, relevance, impact and sustainability of the project activities in order to provide lessons learned and recommendations to SFCG for similar interventions in future, and collect quantitative and qualitative data on the attitudes and practices of the population.

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The main objectives of this evaluation were the following:

1. Analyze the context and its changes during the project duration and analyze the relevance of the project (activities and targets) in relation to this context;
2. Analyze the project along the following evaluation criteria: effectiveness (including the collection of project indicators), impact (expected and unexpected) and sustainability of activities;
3. Draw lessons and recommendations of this project so as to define an intervention approach for future programs.

7. Evaluation Issues

Relevance:
- Is the intervention based on a valid assessment of the conflict and does it assess the fragility of the area?
- Given the findings of the conflict analysis of the conflict, do the project activities respond to the identified needs and context? Do they incorporate the behavior of the main actors driving the conflict? Was the project adapted to changes in its context during the implementation? Was the project reassessed following the second conflict scan?
- What is the opinion of beneficiaries and potential outsiders on the relevance of the intervention? Have the opinions been categorized according to specific groups?
- Are the target groups / beneficiaries of the project the actual beneficiaries of the project? Do the people targeted in the project play a significant role in the conflict in targeted areas?
- Are the radio emissions of this project appropriate for the context?
- Does the training organized by SFCG respond to the current context?

Efficiency:
- Have all specific objectives and planned outcomes been achieved?
- Has the collaboration with Don Bosco and the Fondation J’ai rêvé led to better implement the project?
- What are the factors that have been in favor or against the effective implementation of the project?
- Are the training courses organized by SFCG of good quality?
  - Have the skills of the trained youth increased in entrepreneurship or other areas allowing them to develop their livelihoods?
Did the project activities contribute to helping the targeted youth resist political manipulation that drives them to commit violence?
  o Are young people able to recognize manipulation?
  o When young people are manipulated, are they able to resist? Is it difficult for them to do so, and why?
  o Has the project offered alternative livelihoods to the youth, diverting them from violence and manipulation?
  o Do young people have greater access to economic opportunities? Do these provide them with alternatives to needs-driven violence?

Has the capacity of youth to resolve conflicts, and engage in peaceful conflict mediation and effectively communicate with their peers on promoting peace been strengthened?
  o Have young people been adequately coached to play the role of community mediators?
  o Have they worked together to promote peace in their communities?
  o Have they sensitized their peers on rejecting to participate in atrocities?

Has the participation of youth helped deter them from the atrocities?
  o Do young people consider that violence is necessary to resolve conflicts?
  o Do young people feel they have common interests with people of other communities?
  o Are young people tempted to enter groups that use violence?

Are people listening to broadcasts or receiving messages calling to limit violence and promote peace?

Can the population recognize hate speech?

Do people of different communities work together?
  o Did the actions result in a real improvement of relations between Christians and Muslims?
  o Was a trusted environment and mutual exchanges between communities introduced?

Are young people able to share their concerns and ideas with the local authorities?
  o Has the level of communication between youth leaders and policy makers improved during the past 12 months?

Impact:
  o Has the conflict changed over time and what was the project's contribution to this change? What kind of changes in attitudes, behavior, relationships or practices are observed and how can they be attributed to this project?
  o What are the expected and unexpected result of this project? Are there negative, unintended consequences, and what are the primary and secondary consequences of the project?
  o Was popular consciousness vis-à-vis the risks of violence in the community enhanced?
  o What are the social changes (positive or not) triggered by the project? To what degree can these be directly attributed to the project?
  o Have young people been able to resist to manipulation and have they reached out to their peers to encourage them to do so as well?
  o Which factors have been in favor or against the impacts of the project?

Sustainability:
  o Will the benefits and impacts of this project continue after the end of external financing?
  o To what extent is the project embedded in community / institutional structures that will continue existing after the project ends?
  o What steps have been taken to create long-term processes, structures and institutions for a sustainable peace?
  o How actively were the target groups and relevant beneficiaries involved in the process of making decisions about the direction and implementation of the project? Are the project partners adequately prepared to take over the project?
• Is there going to be a continuation of the activities?
• Were strategies of sustainability taken into account in favor of social cohesion, peace and protection in the target population (long term) ?
• What are the criteria (proposals) for viability on which SFCG could build for the future implementation of similar projects?

8. Expected deliverables of the study

The deliverables of this study are:
- the data file in SPSS format and the data entry form;
- a final evaluation report clearly analyzing the effectiveness, effects, project sustainability and lessons learned;
- a PowerPoint presentation that contains a short summary on the effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project, etc.

9. Use of results

The data collected during this study, as well as the analysis produced on the basis of these results will be used to:
- identify lessons learned and provide recommendations for future interventions;
- measure the progress of the project at the end of the intervention;
- compare the final project results with the project objectives.

10. Methodology

Type of survey

This assessment will use two types of approaches in addition to a literature review of the project documents: a qualitative survey (focus group and individual interviews) and a quantitative survey collecting data related to the different objectives of the project.

To collect data, the following collection tools will be used: focus group discussions (6 FGDs) and key individual interviews (7 KIIs), individual questionnaires and the totality of of project documents.

Literature review of the project documents

All of the project documents will be taken into account for this study, allowing us to collect the necessary details on activities, the logical framework of the project, the trainings and trained beneficiaries and all of the aspects of the project implementation. Other reports produced by SFCG or other organizations working in the CAR for the project implementation period will also be consulted.

This phase allows for an assessment of the overall environment in which the project was implemented.

Qualitative approach

The qualitative approach will evaluate both the process and the results. Process evaluation involves both project staff and direct project beneficiaries. We will exchange with project staff on specific issues regarding the project such as the reasons for the ineffectiveness of a particular activity, the evidence for or against the project, the deviations from the logical framework, etc. In addition, the direct beneficiaries will be asked during the interviews of groups and individuals, to express their opinions on various aspects.

An emphasis will be put on the acquired knowledge, changes by the action of the project, the implementation of project achievements, etc.

The distribution of individual interviews and focus groups is summarized in the following sections.

Briefing of interviewers

This session will be co-hosted by the DME and assistant for four (4) days. For this session, the participants will benefit from transport costs up to 2500 CFA and refreshments up to 4,000 FCFA.
Individual interviews with resource persons
In order to collect relevant information regarding the objectives of this evaluation, SFCG will conduct a series of interviews with the following people:
- The Representatives of the Fondation Don Bosco and Fondation J’ai rêvé
- 1 Project Manager
- 2 producer journalists SFCG
- 4 heads of district
A total of 7 interviews will be conducted.

Group discussions
A total of 6 focus groups will be carried out. Each focus group will be conducted using a discussion guide:

Board 1: Type of FGDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Number of FDG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Male beneficiaries of conflict resolution training and AGR</td>
<td>At least 8 people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young female beneficiaries of conflict resolution training and AGR</td>
<td>At least 8 people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of implemented initiatives</td>
<td>At least 8 people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male participants of football matches, solidarity activities and educational talks</td>
<td>At least 8 people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female participants of football games, solidarity activities and educational talks</td>
<td>At least 8 people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of traditional authority</td>
<td>At least 8 people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample
For this study, we used the stratified sample system. We speak of stratified sample when the fraction selection differs depending on certain characteristics of the population. We stratify to allow all categories of the population that interest us be represented in sufficient numbers (law of large numbers). In our case, the target neighborhoods (PK5, Fatima, and Yakite Miskine) are our stratum.

Determining the volume of sample required
To determine the sample size, we used the online software Raosoft or Sample Size Calculator. Raosoft is a statistical software used for determining a sample size using the law of large numbers.

For the size of our sample, we have used the following parameters: an error margin of 5% for a 95% confidence level. The three districts (3rd, 5th and 6th) account for a total 450,830 people. Taking into account the information listed above, we calculated with a sample of 384 people. So as to ensure equal distribution, we surveyed 431 people (around 100 per district).

Through the quantitative survey, the population was asked to assess the results of the project, and in particular
✓ whether the radio spots were efficient in raising awareness;
✓ the behavioral changes of the population due to project;
✓ the level of tolerance between the communities;
✓ the use of non-violent mechanisms of conflict resolution;
✓ the access to reliable and credible information;
✓ Etc.
Data collection methods
The methods include surveys, individual interviews, focus group discussions and key informant interviews.

Collection of data
In all areas, the study will be overseen by the Monitoring and Evaluation department SFCG namely Magbè Teddy Junior who will be supported by an external assistant.
On average, an enumerator must complete about 8 questionnaires per day, adding up to a total of 64 questionnaires for 8 enumerators collected within 7 days. In addition, 2 days will be spent to facilitate focus group discussions and individual interviews with the key participants of the project.
To identify households and ensure geographical representation, the project area has been divided into areas composed of different neighborhoods. In each area, the enumerators selected households randomly, interviewing only adults (18 years or above).

11. The phases of the study
In order to collect all data mentioned in this document, SFCG will conduct the evaluation in three phases: the preparatory stage, the data collection stage, and report writing stage.

Phase 1: preparatory step
The preparatory stage will last for 10 days. This step, conducted by the Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator (DME) in coordination with the assistant and the Institutional Learning Team of SFCG (ILT) will consist of:
✓ The implementation of data collection tools of interview guides and group discussion guides
✓ The training of enumerators
✓ The tabulation plan
✓ The validation of the evaluation tools
✓ The development of the data entry form
✓ The final selection of target areas and groups
This preparatory phase will be accompanied by the ILT team to ensure the methodological rigor of the process.

The ILT regional team, together with its intern will also ensure the translation of the ToR and evaluation tools to English in order to transmit it to the donor.

Phase 2: Data collection on the field
During this phase Search will go on the field to conduct data collection. This stage will last 9 days and will be supervised by the assistant.

Phase 3: Final evaluation report
The collected data will be processed and fed into the final evaluation report. This is a step that will last approximately 20 days under the supervision of the DME with the support of the assistant.

The intern of the ILT regional team will support the drafting and structuring of the report and will ensure its translation to English.

12. Target of the study:
The target population of the project consists of the communities of the target areas in general and of the direct beneficiaries, namely:
✓ The community: all people aged at least 18 and residing in the 3rd, 5th and 6th arrondissement of Bangui;
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- **Focus groups discussions**: 72 people in the focus group, including:
  - 12 Young beneficiaries of conflict resolution training
  - 12 Young training beneficiaries of the entrepreneurship programs
  - 12 leaders of youth initiatives
  - 12 Participants of football matches
  - 12 Participants of solidarity activities
  - 12 Participants of educational talks + public cleaning

Overall, we are aiming to have six focus groups of about 12 people, adding up to a total of 72 participants.

- **Individual interviews**: As far as possible in the respect of security conditions, the study will reach out to:
  - 2 Representatives of the Don Bosco Foundation partners and of the Fondation J’ai rêvé
  - 1 Project Manager (out of contract)
  - 2 producer journalists SFCG
  - 4 heads of district

A total of 9 people.

13. Geographical area:

This study will cover the neighborhoods of Miskine, Yakite, Fatima and areas PK5, all of which are the target neighborhoods of the project.

14. Teams

In the interest of the achieving expected results, the positions and responsibilities of each team members must be clarified in advance to set up a good operating system. The team composition is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Final Evaluation Coordinator** | Train the enumerators;  
Coordinate the data collection in the field;  
Ensure proper supervision of data collection;  
Write the final report;  
Implement the designed evaluation tools (questionnaires, methodology, planing etc.) |
| **Assistants / supervisors** | Oversee the collection in the field;  
Collect all the questionnaires at the end of the day;  
Sort out the questionnaires as per city and / or district;  
Provide the questionnaires to the enumerators;  
Ensure the quality of the interviews, and the adequate use of questionnaires;  
Continue filling out uncomplete questionnaires  
Check the questionnaires;  
Identify potential errors in filling out;  
Elaborate the data entry form  
Supervise data entry  
Suggest the first drafts of the tabulation plan (tables and charts)  
Make the tabulation  
Support the training of the enumerators |
| **Enumerators** | Carry out individual interviews and focus group discussions |
List of enumerators
SFCG will turn to its eight enumerators who conducted the data collection for the baseline study and the final evaluation of the project "Zo Kwe Zo" in April 2016.

Data entry

Data entry form: The data entry form will be created by the assistant under the supervision of DME. The input will be done with the CSPro software, which will allow data entry in a fast way, minimizing data entry errors. We have already used this software in several of our previous studies.

Data entry: A data entry clerk will be hired to support the assistant to do data entry. The entry clerks will need nine (9) days for the data entry.

15. Data processing

The quantitative survey data will be entered on the CSPro software, then processing will continue with SPSS for the production of analytical charts and indicators. Before this step, consistency checks will be made on each questionnaire.

16. Writing of the report

The final report will be mainly provided by the M&E Specialist of SFCG with the support of the Assistant. The correction of the report will be provided by the specialist and / or Associate Design, Monitoring & Evaluation for Eastern and Southern Africa.

17. Tools

1- Methodology (TDR);
2- Invitation to collaboration;
3- Operational Plan;
4- A guide for the discussion and interviews
5- Individual Questionnaire
6- Car.
7- Credit card for interviewers and supervisor
8- Printed out guides and other documents on the methodology
9- Badge for enumerators and supervisors
10- Training Kit for the enumerators
### Board 2: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective (s)</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of evaluation tools, operating plan, budget and TDRs to ensure the smooth running of the mission.</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the context in order to ensure the success of the evaluation</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the data entry form</td>
<td>DME, Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the data collection agents are available and ready for data collection</td>
<td>DME, Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the enumerators understand and master the tools and data collection techniques.</td>
<td>DME, Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of the qualitative and quantitative information</td>
<td>DME, Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data entry</td>
<td>DME, Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export and analysis of data</td>
<td>DME, Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare the first draft and submit to other stakeholders.</td>
<td>DME, Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather feedback from stakeholders</td>
<td>DME, Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take into account the various comments and any comments from the ILT, Program Director and the Management Department.</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorize the publication of the report</td>
<td>Bernadette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translate the report and send to CSO</td>
<td>ILT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 18. Matrix of evaluation questions

In order to achieve the evaluation objectives, the required data will be structured in the guides on surveys, discussions and structured interviews. The guides will structure the collected data as follows:

#### Board 3: 18. Matrix of evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of the development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries, country needs, global priorities, policies partners and donors.</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the intervention based on a valid assessment of the conflict and does it assess the fragility of the area?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Literature review of the project documents, Interviews with the SFCG staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the findings of the conflict analysis of the conflict, do the project activities respond to the identified needs and context? Do they incorporate the behavior of the main actors driving the conflict? Was the project adapted to changes in its context during the implementation? Was the project reassessed following the second conflict scan?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Literature review of the project documents, Interviews with SFCG staff, Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries and partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the opinion of beneficiaries and potential outsiders on the relevance of the intervention? Have the opinions been categorized according to specific groups?</td>
<td>This issue will be analyzed solely on the basis of interviews with local leaders and beneficiaries / project partners.</td>
<td>Literature review of the project documents, Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries, partners and external observers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the target groups / beneficiaries of the project the actual beneficiaries of the project? Do the people targeted in the project play a significant role in the conflict in targeted areas?</td>
<td>The answer here will show only if all the intended target groups actually benefited from the project. The category and degree of impact will be analyzed the effectiveness and impact.</td>
<td>Literature review of the project documents, Interviews with the SFCG staff, Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries and partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the radio emissions of this project appropriate for the context? Does the training organized by SFCG respond to the current context?</td>
<td>Final quantitative survey - Interviews and focus groups with project beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency: The extent to which the objectives of the action have been met, or are to be, given their relative importance.</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have all specific objectives and planned outcomes been achieved?</td>
<td>This section will give an answer in a paragraph on whether each objective has been achieved. Next, the details will be presented.</td>
<td>Literature review of project documents (particularly the Monitoring Plan, the project document, reporting on progress, SFCG database on beneficiaries) Interviews with the SFCG staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>evaluation questions</th>
<th>Indicator in the logical framework</th>
<th>Reference value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the collaboration with Don Bosco and the foundation J’ai rêvé led to better implementation of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the factors that have been in favor or against the effective implementation of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The interviews and focus groups with project beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the training courses organized by SFCG of good quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The interviews and focus groups with project beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specific Objective 1: Youth in the neighborhood of PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine are deterred from participating in atrocities;

| Has the participation of youth helped deter them from the atrocities?            |                                   |                 |        |         | The interviews and focus groups with project beneficiaries. final quantitative survey |
| Has the capacity of youth to resolve conflicts, make analyzes, engage in peaceful conflict mediation and effectively communicate with their peers on promoting peace been strengthened? |                                   |                 |        |         | The interviews and focus groups with project beneficiaries. final quantitative survey |
| Do young people consider that violence is necessary to resolve conflicts?        | % Targeted youth who think it is necessary to use violence to resolve conflicts between different groups. | 15.6%           | 5%     |         | final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data                  |
| Do young people feel they have common interests with people of other communities? | % Of targeted youth who say they have common interests and can interact with other youth groups. | 48.2%           | 70%    |         | final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data                  |
| Have young people been adequately coached to play the role of community mediators? |                                   |                 |        |         | The interviews and focus groups with project beneficiaries. final quantitative survey |
| Have they worked together to promote peace in their communities? |  |  | final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data |
| Have they sensitized their peers on rejecting to participate in atrocities? | % Of young participants who can name at least one specific example of a time when they have educated their peers about the rejection of atrocities. | N / A | 60% |
| Expected result 1.1: Youth, community leaders and communities in general have better access to inspirational and positive messages on preventing violence and promoting peace; | % Of respondents who say they listen / receive often or very often emissions or messages calling to limit violence and promote peace | 93.4% = 68.8% often 24.6% often | 95% 75% very often |
| Expected Result 1.2 Young people and communities humanize people from other neighborhoods and resist manipulation that encourages violence and hate speech; | % Of the population above 18 in the target areas who is exposed to the SMS campaign spot | N / A | 50% |
| Can the population recognize hate speech? | % Of participants who say they are able to recognize a "hate speech" from someone sharing a different opinion | 90.9% | 95% |
| Expected Result 1.3 Trust and collaboration is increased in target communities; | % Of respondents who can cite a concrete example of collaboration with someone from another community. | 49.7% | 70% |
| Specific Objective 2: Targeted youth from PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine resist political manipulation to commit violence; | % Of respondents who say that targeted young people can recognize | 79.3% | 90% |

Question of the questionnaire: Do you sometimes hear hate speech against a community? If so, can you distinguish a hate speech of someone who gives a different opinion? final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data

Do people of different communities work together? final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data

Questions in the survey: Can you recognize when someone is trying to manipulate final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>manipulation that drives them to commit violence? Are young people able to recognize manipulation?</th>
<th>attempts of manipulation and feel able to resist.</th>
<th>you or manipulate anyone you know? When handling you, do you feel able to resist?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Expected Result 2.1:** Young people and key community leaders have the opportunity to share their fears, their concerns and their expectations with the local authorities; and the mechanisms leading to an escalation of violence are identified within communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are young people able to share their concerns and ideas with the local authorities?</th>
<th>% Of young participants and community leaders who claim to share their concerns and ideas with local authorities</th>
<th>72% of youth and 92% of leaders</th>
<th>85% of youth and 92% of leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Do young people have already shared their concerns and ideas with the local authorities? | 72% of youth and 92% of leaders | 85% of youth and 92% of leaders | final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data |

**Expected Result 2.2:** Young people have more space to engage with community leaders and policy makers on key issues and inclusive communication channels open up to break the cycle of marginalization and exclusion leading to political manipulation and the violent expression of grievances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has the level of communication between youth leaders and policy makers improved during the past 12 months?</th>
<th>% of respondents who say they can communicate more with community leaders and policy makers than during the previous year</th>
<th>N / A</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data |  |

**Specific Objective 3:** Alternative livelihood activities for at-risk youth are promoted, diverting them away from political manipulation and violence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are young people tempted to enter groups that use violence?</th>
<th>% Of young participants of the entrepreneurship trainings who say they are tempted to enter in groups that promote violence.</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When young people are manipulated, are they able to resist? Is it difficult for them to do so, and why?</th>
<th>% Of young participants declaring that they cannot easily withstand manipulation for financial reasons</th>
<th>63.6% or 7.7% of all young people</th>
<th>Less than 5% of all young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Result 3.1:** Young people see an increase in their knowledge and skills in developing livelihoods.</th>
<th>% Of young people improved their knowledge in entrepreneurship or other</th>
<th>N / A</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Questions of the survey: Have you ever been trained in entrepreneurship or all similar | Final quantitative survey, completed by qualitative data |  |
### Expected Result 3.2: Young people have more access to economic opportunities and are aware of alternatives to violence based on their community-level needs.

| Question of the survey: Are you able to develop your own business for a living, generate revenue? |
| % of people who say that they have access to economic opportunities and feel able to develop their own revenue-generating activities |
| 94.3% | 95% |

### Cross-cutting result: The attitude of youth towards the “other” (youth of different affiliate) is positively transformed.

| Question of the survey: Are you able to develop your own business for a living, generate revenue? |
| % of people who say that they have access to economic opportunities and feel able to develop their own revenue-generating activities |
| 50.4% | 70% |

### Impact: Long-term effects, positive and negative, primary and secondary, produced by the intervention (directly or indirectly, intended or not)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the conflict changed over time and what was the project’s contribution to this change? What kind of changes in attitudes, behavior, relationships or practices are observed and how can they be attributed to this project?</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
<td>Literature review of the project documents. Interviews with SFCG staff. Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries and partners. Interviews with external organizations working in the same field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the expected and unexpected result of this project? Are there negative, unintended consequences, and what are the primary and secondary consequences of the project? The text will first present the expected effects and the unexpected effects (if any).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Indicator in the logical framework</th>
<th>Reference value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was popular consciousness vis-à-vis the risks of violence in the community enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature review of the project documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with SFCG staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries and partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the social changes (positive or not) triggered by the project? To what degree can these be directly attributed to the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Indicator in the logical framework</th>
<th>Reference value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have young people been able to resist to manipulation and have they reached out to their peers to encourage them to do so as well?</td>
<td>% Targeted young people to give a concrete example of a time when they resisted manipulation to violence, or where they made the plea for others resist.</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final quantitative survey, completed by the qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which factors have been in favor or against the impacts of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature review of the project documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with SFCG staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries and partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability: Continuation of benefits from a development intervention after the end of the intervention.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the benefits and effects of this project continue after the end of external financing?</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
<td>Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with SFCG staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is the project embedded in community / institutional structures that will continue</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
<td>Interviews and focus groups with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing after the project ends?</td>
<td>beneficiaries; Interviews with SFCG staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What steps have been taken to create long-term processes, structures and institutions for a sustainable peace?</td>
<td>No comment. Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries; Interviews with SFCG staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How actively were the target groups and relevant beneficiaries involved in the process of making decisions about the direction and implementation of the project? Are the project partners adequately prepared to take over the project?</td>
<td>Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries; Interviews with SFCG staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there going to be a continuation of the activities?</td>
<td>Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries; Interviews with SFCG staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were strategies of sustainability taken into account in favor of social cohesion, peace and protection in the target population (long term)?</td>
<td>Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries; Interviews with SFCG staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the criteria (proposals) for viability on which SFCG could build for the future implementation of similar projects?</td>
<td>Interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries Interviews with SFCG staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

### Board 4: Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Logic</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition of the indicator</th>
<th>Baseline value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Final evaluation</th>
<th>Disaggregated by</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Objective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Objective 1</strong>: Youth in the neighborhood of PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine are deterred from participating in atrocities</td>
<td>Indicator 1</td>
<td>% Targeted youth who think it is necessary to use violence to resolve conflicts between different groups.</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Project database and final evaluation</td>
<td>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</td>
<td>Start and end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2</td>
<td>% of youth who say they have common interests with the others and can engage in a dialogue with them</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Project database and final evaluation</td>
<td>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</td>
<td>Start and end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 3</td>
<td>% Young participants who can cite at least one concrete example of a time when they sensitized their peers on the rejection of atrocities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
<td>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</td>
<td>End of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected result 1.1</strong>: Youth, community leaders and communities in general have better access to inspirational and positive messages in preventing violence and promoting peace.</td>
<td>Indicator 2</td>
<td>% Of respondents who say that they listen / receive often or very often emissions or messages on conflict transformation and the promoting peace</td>
<td>93.4% = 68.8% often 24.6% very often</td>
<td>95% 75% very often</td>
<td>98.5% 73.1% often 25.4% often</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Project database and Final Evaluation</td>
<td>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</td>
<td>Start and end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 3</td>
<td>% Of the population beyond 18 years in</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
<td>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</td>
<td>End of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.1 Conflict scan mapping grievances and the expectations of young people</td>
<td>Indicat</td>
<td>Number of Conflict scans</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Conflict Scan Report</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Beginnin g and halfway of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Result 1.2 Young people and communities humanize people from other neighborhoods and resist to manipulation that encourages violence and hate speech.</td>
<td>Indicat</td>
<td>% Of participants who say they are able to distinguish a &quot;hate speech&quot; from an expression of an opinion</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Project database and Final Evaluation External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</td>
<td>Start and end of project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Result 1.3 Trust and collaboration is increased in target communities.</td>
<td>Indicat</td>
<td>% Of respondents who can cite a concrete example of collaboration with someone from another community.</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Project database and Final Evaluation External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</td>
<td>Start and end of project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.2 Solidarity activity</td>
<td>Indicat</td>
<td>Number of solidarity activities</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Activity Report</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Each activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.3 SMS campaign on the participative violence prevention</td>
<td>Indicat</td>
<td>Number of distributed phones</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Certificate of receipt</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>After the distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicat</td>
<td>Number of SMSs sent per week</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>2 sms per week Number of people</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Database of SMSs</td>
<td>Media Manager</td>
<td>Each month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.4 Radio spots promoting peace and dialogue</td>
<td>Indicat or 1</td>
<td>Number of received feedback</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Database of SMSs</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Each month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicat or 2</td>
<td>Number of radio stations that aired the spots</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Monthly production report, diffusion sheet</td>
<td>Media Manager</td>
<td>Each month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective 2 Targeted youth from PK5, Yakité, Fatima and Miskine resist political manipulation to commit violence.</td>
<td>Indicat or 1</td>
<td>% Of respondents who say they can recognize attempts of manipulation and feel able to resist.</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Project database and Final Evaluation</td>
<td>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</td>
<td>Start and end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicat or 2</td>
<td>% Of targeted youth able to cite a concrete example of a time when they advocated for others to resist to manipulation for violence, or when they resisted themselves.</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Project database and Final Evaluation</td>
<td>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</td>
<td>Start and end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected result 2.1 Young people and key community leaders have the</td>
<td>Indicat or 1</td>
<td>% Of young participants and community leaders who claim to be able to share</td>
<td>72% of youth and 92% of leaders</td>
<td>85% of youth and 92% of leaders</td>
<td>50% of youth and 88% of leaders</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Project database and Final Evaluation</td>
<td>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</td>
<td>Start and end of project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expected result 2.2
Young people have more space to engage with community leaders and policy-makers on key issues and inclusive communication channels open up to break the cycle of marginalization and exclusion leading to political manipulation and the violent expression of grievances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1</th>
<th>% Of youth who report having gained a better capacity to communicate with community leaders and decision-makers in the last 12 months</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>48%</th>
<th>Category, Gender and Neighborhood</th>
<th>Final Evaluation</th>
<th>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator</th>
<th>End of project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 2.1</th>
<th>Training of youth and community leaders in the field of conflict transformation, mediation, leadership and advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1</td>
<td>Number of conducted trainings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Indicator 2   | Number of trainees | N/A | 120 | 115 | Category, Gender and Neighborhood | Training Report Pre and post-training assessment | Project Manager | Each training |

| Indicator 3   | % Of women among the trainees | N/A | 25% | 33% | Category, Gender and Neighborhood | Training Report Pre and post-training assessment | Project Manager | Each training |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 2.2</th>
<th>Monitoring of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1</td>
<td>Number of monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.3 Community Meetings</td>
<td>Indicator 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2</td>
<td>Number of participants in activities / community meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specific Objective 3**

**Alternative livelihood activities for at-risk youth are promoted, diverting them away from political manipulation and violence.**

| Indicator 1 | % Of young participants in the activities for the development of livelihoods that say they are tempted to enter in groups that promote violence. | 15% | 5% | 0% | Category, Gender and neighborhood | Project database and Final Evaluation | External evaluator and M&E coordinator | Start and end of project |
| Indicator 2 | % Of young participants declaring that they cannot easily withstand manipulation for financial reasons | 63.6% or 7.7% of all young people | Less than 5% of all young people | 0% | Category, Gender and neighborhood | Project database and Final Evaluation | External evaluator and M&E coordinator | Start and end of project |

**Expected result 3.1**

Young people see an increase their knowledge and skills in developing livelihoods.

| Indicator 1 | % of young people who have improved their knowledge in entrepreneurship and vocational skills after the training cycle | N / A | 100% | 100% | Category, Gender and neighborhood | Pre and post-training assessments | Trainer and M&E coordinator | Begining and end of each training |

**Expected result 3.2**

Young people have more access to economic opportunities and are aware of alternatives to violence based on their own activities to live.

<p>| Indicator 2 | % of people who say that they have access to economic opportunities and feel able to develop their own activities to live | 94.3% | 95% | 86% | Category, Gender and neighborhood | Project database and Final Evaluation | External evaluator and M&amp;E coordinator | Start and end of project |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 3.1 Entrepreneurship and vocational training</th>
<th>Indicato r 1</th>
<th>Number of trainings</th>
<th>N / A</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Category, Gender and neighborhood</th>
<th>Pre and post-training assessment</th>
<th>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordina tor</th>
<th>Beginnin g and end of each training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicato r 2</td>
<td>Number of trainees</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Training Report Pre- and post-training assessment</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Each training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.2 Joint economic initiatives</td>
<td>Indicato r 1</td>
<td>Number of implemente d initiatives</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Category and neighborhood</td>
<td>Action Plan and activity report</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>After each activity initiative s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicato r 2</td>
<td>Number of teams in place</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Activity Report</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting result 1.1 The attitude of youth towa rds the &quot;other&quot; (youth of different affiliate) is positively transformed.</td>
<td>Indicato r 1</td>
<td>% Of young people PK5, Yakite, Fatima and Miskine who say they trust the young people of different affiliations</td>
<td>50.4 %</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Category, Gender and neighborhood</td>
<td>Project database and Final Evaluatio n</td>
<td>External evaluator and M&amp;E coordina tor</td>
<td>Start and end of project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>