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Executive Summary

At the heart of an on-going humanitarian situation in Borno State is human insecurity propelled by violence, forced migration and population explosion. Hundreds continue to make their way to Central Borno from the troubled regions of Bama, Dikwa, Kala Balge and Kukawa, currently under the partial control of the Islamic State in the West African Province (ISWAP), Boko Haram’s break-away faction. Day by day, these victims are confronted by living conditions that constantly point to their unenviable status of internally displaced persons – a status symbol representative of their limitations to human rights and access to resources, and with the potential of exacerbating tensions between them and the host community, Bolori II. It is against this background that the interactions between IDPs and their host communities takes centre-stage in the first ever conflict -scan launched by Search-Nigeria, with the support of the French Embassy in Nigeria, to monitor the situation in Bolori II, an informal settlement for IDPs. The scan investigates both recent and past developments in the camp, with the aim of integrating the evolving scenarios into Search’s broader objective of successfully integrating and resettling the IDPs back to their present and home communities in future, armed with the knowledge on how to build and foster social cohesion wherever they choose to settle. The scan gives some insight into the current state of affairs between the IDPs and some humanitarian actors, going by previous strained relations between both parties. Search’s objective in this regard is to identify situations of do no harm and conflict insensitivity in the operations of those humanitarian actors that can inform its programming.

While counter-measures are also being developed to address the existent challenges earlier identified, a more worrisome situation induced by an internal migration surge is fast unfolding in Bolori II. The bulging population is accompanied by dangerous contestations exhibited by various groups over fast depleting resources like shelter, food, and water, originally owned by the host communities. Inevitably, ingroup vs outgroup dichotomies, demeaning social constructs intended to put one group at an advantage over the other, all begin to manifest in this fierce competition for survival. Empirical findings drawn from the scan also uncover some positive outlooks for the future of Bolori II. They are prospects that could contribute to the successful integration and resettlement of IDPs through focusing on their commonalities.

It is part of Search’s priority in this scan to identify and work with these emerging opportunities so as to bring into alignment with reality, the objectives of this project to support the humanitarian aid, development and peacebuilding nexus. Among those opportunities are; the perception amongst the host community and the IDPs, that their joint utilisation of public infrastructures serves as an avenue for socialisation and bonding for every member of the communities. Following closely is the willingness and shared understanding by both the IDPs and the host community that there is need for them to engage in micro-business ventures for their livelihood and survival. Lastly is yet another shared understanding within every member of the Bolori II community that their common ethno-religious orientation is yet another unifying factor. Some of these connectors however remain weak and could get easily eroded especially in the face of stiff competition over the meagre resources occasioned by the forced migration in this context of internal displacement and humanitarian crises.

Findings

Utilising some early warning socio-economic and political indicators designed by the 2014 Fund for Peace Report, the findings of this conflict scan are represented as follows.
**Demographic Pressures and IDPs**

Latest figures from the December 2018 Flash Report of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), depict an escalation in the inflow of IDPs into the Maiduguri Metropolitan Council (MMC) and Jere areas from Baga, Northern Borno. Between December 24 and 31st, 2018, alone, IOM reported that 8,248 displaced persons forcefully migrated down southern Maiduguri to the following locations: Teacher’s Village, Baga Road Motor Park, and Madinatu Camps. The Bolori II informal settlement was not spared from this demographic chaos. With every attack in any part of Borno, comes the expectation and an increase in both the wave of forced migration and number of internally displaced persons in not just Bolori II but every other part of Maiduguri capable of housing displaced persons. According to Search’s community observer in Bolori II. The population of the IDPs in Bolori II last year was estimated at over 4000. In January, 2019, over a thousand more IDPs were added to this number, with most of the IDP settlements extending right into the heart of the host communities. A typical 3-bedroom flat in the Imimi camp in Bolori II could house as many as 40 people. The significance of this factor lies in it being an inhibitor to social cohesion. As a proximate causal factor, it magnifies the effects of structural defects in Bolori II, making social cohesion among people even more difficult.

**Poverty and economic decline/public services**

The population bulge in Bolori II also has its ripple effect extended to the economy of this community. With the number of IDPs ever on the increase, house rents in Bolori II presently, are at an all-time high, affecting both IDPs and host communities alike. Reality as to the day to day living in Bolori II has come to make the situations of overcrowded rooms, or the grossly inadequate or lack of basic amenities like water, food, electricity, toilet facilities and shelter, the new normal. Farming, the predominant occupation of the bulk of the different ethnic groups in Maiduguri has been brought to an abrupt end on account of the attacks by Boko Haram, carried out in the rural areas where the bulk of agrarian activities take place. The cost of firewood and charcoal, the two core tradable commodities of the Borno people is exponentially going higher.

**Group Grievances**

Social cohesion between the IDPs and host communities in Bolori II appears to be propped on very tenuous relational foundations. On the one hand, the movement of IDPs are unrestricted by their hosts who have allowed them to take up accommodations and livelihood ventures in any place of their choosing. On the other hand, reports from some IDPs during the interview and FGD sessions revealed cases of discrimination and stereotyping against them when they first arrived, including ill-treatment at the hands of host community landlords due to their inability to pay rent. The IDPs with little or no favourable alternatives to rely on for redress and the equitable resolution of their problems with their hosts, are now compelled to adopt the humiliating form of compromise just to keep the peace. Hence, even when cases of diversion of relief materials meant for the IDPs, by the host communities arise, most of them go unchallenged because the IDPs are too afraid to speak for fear of reprisals such as eviction from the community, and victimisation. Most male IDPs also now suffer low self-esteem as a result of not being able to fend for their families. In addition, the community is still recovering from the polarising effect created by the distribution of relief items by some humanitarian aid agencies who gave aid to only the IDPs, neglecting the host community.

**State Legitimacy**

From the field observation, government presence at the federal, state and local levels remains very minimal, obscure at best in Bolori II. Consequently, some basic needs like shelter, livelihood schemes and water which they can provide for the Bolori II residents at very affordable and modest rates continue
to elude the people. Asides the succour the provision of these basic amenities will bring, spots like water points and markets also create spatial opportunities for interactions between IDPs and their hosts, spatial opportunities best known as spaces for peace. Where there are public amenities, there are interactions and development, there is peace, there is social cohesion.

**Recommendations**

- Government must begin to compliment the mostly short-term interventions by the INGOs and CSOs, with robust, long-term ones particularly in the areas of livelihood and resettlement of IDPs. Federal and State government agencies like the Small and Medium Enterprises Development of Nigeria (SMEDAN), National Directorate of Employment, and the Bank of Industry have a lot to contribute in this regard, especially when putting into consideration, the possibilities of INGOs completing their mandates one day and leaving the region.

- It has become imperative that the humanitarian context of the North East must be taken into consideration if social cohesion is to be achieved in Bolori II. Maintaining its relevance before beneficiaries therefore requires that Search responds to the enormous humanitarian crisis of the region by either incorporating minimum components of humanitarian aid into its resilience building agenda for Bolori II or partnering with other humanitarian actors that are into the provision of these humanitarian reliefs that most IDPs in Borno State need, including those in Bolori II.

- Intervention efforts from Search need to consider the nomination of deserving community heads (bulamas) as peace champions in future. This could serve as an entry point for breaking into the stiff relational defences that some host communities tend to put up against IDPs they have problems trusting.

- Search needs to introduce pilot surveys to partnering INGOs, as a robust and reliable empirical means of complimenting the traditional selection criteria used by most INGOs for humanitarian interventions. This way, situations of conflict insensitivity and doing harm in project implementation can be significantly reduced.
**Objective of the Conflict Scan**

**Context**
Bolori II, a community under Maiduguri Municipal Council (MMC) is the take-off point of this conflict scan designed to inform Search for Common Ground’s strategic objective of integration and resettlement of IDPs both in their host and home communities. Once an industrial layout for the production of mattresses and yogurt, and with lands not suitable for agrarian purposes, Bolori II still maintains much of its big landmass, making it an ideal attraction for IDPs fleeing hostilities back home. The Bolori II informal settlement is home to two different camps – The Imimi camp (Camp A) and the Rail Foam camp (Camp B). The Imimi camp as at November was harbouring approximately 40 households, with each household having no more than 10 persons per room, while the Railfoam camp had a slightly lower population, containing 8 tents as it the time of the field work for this scan. Each of the tents at Railfoam has the capacity to contain a slightly large nuclear family, but the situation has changed drastically between November and January as there are now more people than the tents can contain. Due to the insurgency, Bolori II presently is a shadow of its old industrial self with very little commercial activities taking place there. In terms of physical security, the environment could be termed, porous, going by the numerous entry and exit points that characterises its spatial compositing. This feature makes it impracticable to keep track of who comes and goes in the camp.

**Objectives**
In order to complement the humanitarian response work conducted by PUI in Bolori II IDP camp, address the need to build social cohesion as the IDPs begin to prepare for their eventual return or resettlement into communities. Using transformative dialogue processes, participatory theatre, and training community members to be champions of reconciliation and peaceful coexistence, this project will aim to build the community’s resilience to conflict and capacity to address issues that can arise in the return and resettlement process. On a bimonthly basis, Search staff will produce a conflict scan of Bolori II community and IDP camp to further inform PUI staff and other humanitarian and development actors working in Bolori II of context updates and changes in the conflict dynamics. These snapshots will be shared confidentially with relevant actors for them to adapt their programming to respond to the changes in the context and take action when directly implicated in reports of conflict.

This conflict scan which was carried in November 2018, at Bolori II was designed to monitor interactions between IDPs and their host communities. The scan investigated both recent and past developments in the camp, with the aim of integrating the evolving scenarios into Search’s broader objective of successfully integrating and resettling the IDPs back to their present and home communities in future, armed with the knowledge on how to build and foster social cohesion wherever they choose to settle.

**Methodology**
This conflict scan adopts a purely qualitative approach in investigating the challenges and opportunities relating to the integration and resettlement of IDPs in Bolori II and their home communities. Target population for this exercise featured four categories of persons – the people, religious leaders, the leadership of the community and the government. More specifically, we had the IDPs, host community, the Bulama, heads of the camp (male and female), clerics, local government officials and secondary school teachers. At the end, a sum total of 50 respondents were engaged for this scan. The composition
of this group is not meant to be statistically representative of the community at large but rather to include various constitutive group of the community potentially holding differing views on the current situation. Therefore, the target group aims at representing the diversity of viewpoints and situations related to conflict dynamics between IDPs and host community.

In recognition of the largely communal structure of the study area, the hierarchical and purposive sampling techniques were selected. This was to give insight into the levels of power influence that exist and dictates day to day activities amongst the various categories of persons in Bolori II. The scan utilised mostly primary data acquired qualitatively via key informant interviews and focus group discussions. With the support of a community mobiliser, and an observer, 10 enumerators with audio recording gadgets engaged the target respondents. The feedback which were mostly in Kanuri and Hausa, were first translated to English, and then subsequently transcribed to writing. For the analysis, there was a deliberate attempt to apply content analysis in exploring the critical aspects of this scan which in turn, informed the adoption of the actor-based analysis model, the issue/causal-based analysis model, and the connector-divider model of analysis.

**Findings**

**Stakeholder analysis**

Four categories of stakeholders accompanied by different degrees of influence were identified in this scan. These include:

- Government Officials
- Leadership of the Bolori II Community
- Religious leaders
- The people

Having the highest level of influence amongst all the categories mentioned is the leadership of the community, specifically, the office of the Bulama. Northern Nigeria, from pre-colonial times has always been rooted in a feudal, hierarchical system of governance that vests so much power on the top. This centralised system of governance further complimented by a high level of influence was found playing out at the Bolori II camp where the Bulama remains the epicentre of almost everybody’s utilisation and access to resources, including the resolution of disputes. The Bulama is even more powerful and influential in the face of the conspicuous government absence. In the words of a female host community member interviewed during the conflict scan, “Bulamas are the ones that settle dispute among us…the Bulama is in position to resolve the whole issue but if the dispute is beyond the Bulama, then the police or soldiers are then involved…”. From the position of the IDPs, the situation is no different as confirmed by a female IDP, “We do go to the Bulama, anything he says will be taken and everyone will be called to know his/her limit”. Another male IDP concurs, “we don’t know of any, and we don’t have anyone else to take our issues to except the Bulama”. This commendation however, does

---

1 *Bulama*, in the core parts of northern Nigeria is the term used to describe the district head of a particular community. *A bulama* is believed to be the first person to have set foot on a particular land. This inherently bestows on him the right to precede over all disputes, particularly land disputes; his power also extends to the allocating of lands. The powers of the *bulama* is usually passed on to his children when he dies.
not go without some counterclaims as the Bulamas too have on some occasions being accused of unjust practices especially in cases involving IDPs.

In the absence of the Bulama, clerics (either Christian or Muslim) are next in the order of influencers in the Bolori II. Most IDPs are more comfortable referring their private concerns or issues to either their Imam or pastor. They believe in the measures of justice these individuals can employ to help them resolve their issues, measures anchored and drawn from the teachings/ doctrines of Christianity or Islam, doctrinal affiliations that command a high level of influence among the people. Take for instance, the account of the only Christian male engaged in a key informant interview during the Bolori II conflict scan, “Yes we have peaceful cooperation, we have good relationship, like I use to refer you back to scripture, the scripture said that we should not pay back evil with evil. God showed us how to love, therefore if you are a true Christian; you should show love…”

At the moment, government influence in the Bolori II settlement remains minimal especially on matters relating to infrastructure. According to a local government official who also happens to be an internally displaced, even the successful resolution of the conflicts faced by the IDPs is mostly dependent on government’s intervention, specifically its ability to create jobs, “Like I earlier said, government or organization should create job opportunities for youth, create skill acquisition and get them engaged.” He further explains that, “it is because of this lack of jobs that makes our youths to join Boko-Haram carrying guns all around”. It can be argued from the insight given by this government official, that the government’s contribution to the resettlement and integration efforts towards the IDPs in the Bolori II camp is for now, felt only at the level of the scanty law enforcement services they occasionally provide through the Civilian Joint Task Force (CJTF), the police and the military.

Last among the outlined stakeholders are the people, both IDPs and members of the host community alike. Together they are both responsible for bestowing varied levels of legitimacy and acceptance on the other categories of actors, depending on how the latter contributes to their well-being and relates with them. Interactions between IDPs and the host communities also help in measuring the levels of successes or failures of the integration and reintegration efforts for the displaced in Bolori II. The Bulama for instance is highly revered by both members of the host community and a large population of the IDPs because he has overtime, as testified to by some members of the Bolori community, depicted himself as a peacemaker especially when it comes to the settlement of disputes. The government does not necessarily enjoy the goodwill of the people for reasons earlier outlined. They are only surpassed in this category by some INGOs that have incurred the deep-seated displeasure of the community as a result of their inequitable distribution of relief materials, accompanied by the polarising effects this has left behind.

**Issue/Causal based analysis**

Integrating the connector-divider model of analysis as a subgroup of the causal model in this context, this scan goes beyond merely highlighting the issues at play at Bolori II, to attempting to establish the inter-connectivity of those issues with social cohesion. The issues in Bolori II are represented thus:

**Root causes**

**Bad governance made manifest in poverty, lack of/inadequate food, water, shelter, other basic infrastructure and unemployment.**

Complaints in this regard, abound from the various feedbacks in the FGD sessions conducted in Bolori II. Starting with the FGD session conducted for the IDP adult males, a respondent summaries the above
mentioned problems in this way; "… we don’t have food and other essential needs we are begging you people to come and help us with food and toilets, because we are 34 persons using only one toilet is not easy for all of us sometimes we have to give up and wait for turn in order to use the toilet”. For another respondent in this same category, the problems arising due to the lack of food and shelter, alone, are enough to cause tension. Worse still, this particular IDP male has to grapple with these challenges, together his three wives and 22 children. The account from the adult females still in the IDP category is no different; one woman in particular laments the psychological ordeal they go through as a result of their helplessness in this area of need; “no food, no house, no clothes to wear, even sometimes we are irritating because we smell”.

**Proximate causes**

Stereotypes against IDPs, feelings of low esteem and inequality among the men, juvenile disposition from children capable of setting mothers (IDPs and HCs) against one another, forced migration, population explosion, diversion of humanitarian relief items by members of the host community, inequitable distribution of relief items by INGOs, and weather changes particularly the rainy season which is capable of worsening the structural conditions (accommodations) of the IDPs.

These are cases and feelings that are widespread amongst the IDPs. While some like the local government official, and the only male Christian found in the camp, may have found ways of dealing with these relational anomalies, others still continue to struggle. For the local government official, it’s all about patience and forgiveness as instructed by the Bible, however he still cannot help but recollect nostalgically, how successful he was in his farming business and how presently he has been made ill by his inability to provide for his family. He most importantly did not leave out how his relationship with the host community has compounded his woes, “I don’t experience any tension, the only problem I have with the host community is that there is not mutual relationship between us. They don’t like to cooperate with us”. An adult male participant from the IDP FGD sessions, from the perspective of humanitarian aid, adds that “we believe that items have been collected in our names but those items are being diverted by the wrong people. The reason why I am telling you this is because of your coming if not we wouldn’t have shared it with anybody.” Even more specifically another male in the group asserted that the issues between them and the communities began when they started noticing the diversion of the food by people they believe to be community members. Considering that they the IDPs were the disadvantaged group, and stood no chance against their hosts if they had chosen to assert themselves, they all opted for the peaceful way out; In his words, “we the IDPs have accepted the fact that things are not going right but all we can do is to let peace to reign because we don’t have where to go or who to fight for our rights”. It is only logical to conclude from this scenario that this compromise unwillingly demonstrated by the IDPs is not durable. What is the certainty of this situation remaining stable when the IDPs get three-four times bigger than their hosts, will compromise at that time still be an option? Or are we faced with a likely violent outcome? In all, social cohesion, even though grudgingly admitted particularly by the host community, still remains low between the IDPs and the host communities.

The women paint an even more gory picture of this situation with their host community; one respondent in the IDP adult female FGD session has this to say; “Some people in the community also refer our children as Boko-Haram, because when I gave birth and lost lot of blood, we went to a doctor in the community, he refuse despite the intervention of the soldiers, he refuse until we have to seek for help somewhere. The level of peaceful cooperation does not exist very well among us”. Another female participant in this category, concurs, stating clearly that there is no good relationship between them and the host community, and that the latter is scared of them. These dysfunctional relationships also play
out when the children of both IDPs and host communities come to play; their mothers, particularly the host community mums never hesitate to escalate or turn these gatherings into arenas for heated misunderstandings at the slightest squabbles amongst these children, thus risking an escalation to violent conflict amongst the two parties.

With so much pent-up feelings, anger, sadness and fear nursed within the IDPs, the continuous interaction of these feelings which in this context could pass for proximate causal factors, with the root causal factors of conflict, inevitably points to a violent end at the long run. Even at the level of structural factors, the situation is not different. From observation during the field study, weather conditions like erosion, torrential rainfalls and storms with the capacity to destroy the make-shift tents put up by the IDPs could easily trigger fierce competition with the host community over housing, by the time many are left homeless as a result of potential environmental conflicts. As revealed by the Bolori II community observer, house rents are already causing problems between the IDPs and the host community landlords. The weather changes are only bound to make things worse in this area.

**Triggers**

Considering that there has been no major incident of direct violence in Bolori II since the conclusion of the first scan, it is safe to assume that there are no triggers at this point. Bolori II is immersed more in structural and relational conflict than any other. However should there be an escalation in terms of a negative interaction of the aforementioned root and proximate causes of conflict, the situation might degenerate quickly to a violent end.

**Connectors – Dividers Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Dividers</th>
<th>Connectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>In the face of population increase and the limited</td>
<td>Water points, markets, and other publicly used products tend to also serve as avenues for bringing both the IDPs and members of the host community together. Some individuals have testified to water points serving as locations where many young people have met and kicked off relationships that led to marriage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defects</td>
<td>Supply of basic amenities like food, water and shelter, Structural defects could do more harm than good in the face of fierce contestations for these resources.</td>
<td>The same Boko Haram attacks have also served as a unifying force for both IDPs and host communities alike, who now see the insurgents as a common enemy that has afflicted them, and against whom they all must unite if they are to survive. The testimony of one IDP adult female, collaborated by another give further insights into the situation being described, “…it’s because of the conflict that we have to leave our places (Kumshi) which is ahead of Bama to come to this town, because there were so many gun shots from the soldiers and terrorist. This led to my father catching a bullet in the eye…”. Her female counterpart from the host community admitted to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Attacks by Boko Haram have led to situations were IDPs who forcefuly migrated to safer regions were discriminated against, and stereotypes constructed against them on account of their ethnicities and the regions of Borno State where they migrated from, by the host communities. The children of IDPs have even been accused to be sired by Boko Haram.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sufferings caused by the attacks, saying that the town has gone bad, and that there is hunger, homelessness and chaos everywhere, affecting everyone, IDPs and members of the host community alike.

| Humanitarian Actors | Not all INGOs have been of support to the humanitarian needs of the Bolori II camp. Some have only succeeded in magnifying the relational fault lines between the IDPs and their host communities, courtesy of their inequitable distribution of relief aid. The local government official in his interview specifically mentioned that the INGOs operating in their locality only selected members of the host community as the beneficiaries of the card they were sharing. A young female and member of the host community collaborated this story, revealing that indeed, some members of the host community do collect the relief items meant for the IDPs, even when the former can afford those items. Another female in the host community also added, “there are issues between us members of the community and the IDPs, sometimes when food items are brought to be shared, it is only shared to the IDPs and we members of the community are left out, that is the reason for the conflict at the point of distribution”. The last major conflict in Bolori II between the IDPs and their host communities was on account of such a harm being perpetuated by an INGO. | The activities of INGOs, particularly those in the provision of relief services have brought great succour, physical and psychological healing to the hundreds displaced by Boko Haram. These communities are united by the help which these INGOs provide them. |

Opportunities for peace

*Infrastructural development*

This is much about social cohesion as it is about infrastructural development. For the inhabitants of the Bolori II community, the presence of public infrastructure also presents more spatial opportunities for where both IDPs and members of the community can come together to interact and socialise. Hence, the more the number of public infrastructures, the higher the spaces for socialisation and overtures for peaceful co-existence between IDPs and host communities. According to a young female in the FGD youth session, friendships and even romantic relationships that eventually ended in marriage, had their origins in this such environments or settings.
Livelihood support and small-scale businesses

Regardless of their variegated ethnic compositions, the need for survival is one thing the host community and IDPs hold in common. The women in particular share the need for collaboration in the area of small-scale businesses, and with the financial and skill support to keep various small business ventures going for different families. For some of them, it is one of the fastest ways of recovery from the trauma of getting attacked by AOGs.
Recommendations

For the Government

There is need to compliment the mostly short-term interventions by the INGOs and CSOs, with robust, long-term ones. The advocated interventions are in the areas of livelihood, the provision of basic infrastructure, amenities and the resettlement of IDPs. In carrying out their interventions, the government, like the INGOs must also be sensitive to the context they are operating under so as to avoid doing harm. Federal and State government agencies like the Small and Medium Enterprises Development of Nigeria (SMEDAN), National Directorate of Employment, and the Bank of Industry have a lot to contribute in the area of interventions, especially when putting into consideration, the possibilities of INGOs completing their mandates one day and leaving the region.

For Search/Humanitarian Actors

It has become imperative that the humanitarian context of the North East must be taken into consideration if social cohesion is to be achieved in Bolori II. Maintaining its relevance before beneficiaries therefore requires that Search responds to the enormous humanitarian crisis of the region by either incorporating minimum components of humanitarian aid into its resilience building agenda for Bolori II or partnering with other humanitarian actors that are into the provision of these humanitarian reliefs that most IDPs in Borno State, including those in Bolori II, need.

For Search/Humanitarian Actors

Search needs to introduce pilot surveys to partnering INGOs, as a robust and reliable empirical means of complimenting the traditional selection criteria used by most INGOs for humanitarian interventions. This way, situations of conflict insensitivity and doing harm in project implementation can be significantly reduced.

For Search for Common Ground

Intervention efforts from Search need consider the nomination of deserving community heads (Bulamas) as peace champions in future. This could serve as an entry point for breaking into the stiff relational defences that some host communities could put up against IDPs they have problems trusting.

To achieve best results in the area of analysis, Search will need to encourage some liberalisation in the area of selecting the tools for conflict analysis. Best practices in the field of conflict analysis dictate that the conflict under study informs the tools for analysis. So far, the tools in use for the conflict scan are rudimentary, and quite restricting in terms of the outcome they produce. The use of more advanced tools provides more in-depth study, including a clear depiction of the dynamics in play, and case study comparisons if any.
Annex

Conflict Scan:

Questionnaire for Focus Group Discussions (FGD)

A. Instructions

Listen actively:

- Allow enough time for the group to answer each question and to elaborate on answers.
- Listen to identify the perceptions, ideas, and themes that participants are discussing.
- Show interest: 'shake your head', 'I see', 'yes', 'it is useful to know'
- Clarify the meanings of the answers and ask for details.

Encourage participants to include details without influencing responses:

- Repeat part of the question.
- Paraphrase the response to the respondent to confirm the interpretation.
- Ask neutral questions: "Can you tell me more about that?", or "Can you give me an example?"

Inclusive participation:

- Encourage the participation of each member of the group.
- Allow multiple people to answer each question to hear different perspectives and encourage discussion among participants and not just between participant and facilitator.
- If one person dominates the discussion, facilitate inclusive participation: "Thank you for your contributions to the discussion, but we want to hear from someone or someone who has not spoken yet."

Note taking:

- Record responses as much as possible, word-for-word, and include additional comments provided.
- Directly after the discussion, review the notes and fill in the missing information.

B. Information

| FGD # : | 
| Date : | ___/___/2018 |
| Site/Camp : |  |
| Number of persons by gender in the FGD | Number of men: _____; Number of women: _____; Total: _____ |
| FGD of: | a) Adult males  
| | b) Adult Female  
| | c) Young Adult male  
<p>| | d) Young Adult Female  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>e) Selected school ages children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) IDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Host community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Introduction**

Hello,

We thank you for receiving us today and for devoting some of your valuable time.

My name is _______________________________________. In a nutshell, the interview we invite today is part of an investigation initiated by Search For Common Ground. Search is an international NGO that aims to transform how conflicts are managed. We are conducting a research to gather information to identify and understand the changing context of conflicts, tensions and risks in this site. We seek to better understand and obtain your opinion and perspective on these issues.

The information we collect will help a range of national and international actors who are active in the site to understand and find solutions to current problems. The main purpose of these interviews will be to gather your ideas, opinions, perspectives and suggestions as an individual in this community about these issues.

You have been selected for this survey in order to collect your personal perception and your analysis on this subject as well as your proposals of solution. **We will not pay for your participation today, but the information you provide will be taken into account to improve Search and others humanitarian organizations interventions in your community.**

The information provided about you and your community will be kept confidential and anonymous and will only be used in the professional context.

While counting on your availability, we assure you that participation in this survey is voluntary. If it happens that I ask a question that you do not want to answer, tell me and I will go to the next question; you are free to suspend the interview at any time.

The duration of the discussion is approximately 1 hour.

**Do you consent to participate in this discussion?**

**YES / NO  (Circle the answer)**

Before you start do you have questions to ask me?

**Questions**

**For the investigator:** There are basic questions proposed here and which are followed by examples and additional explanations in italics and parentheses and italicized questions to
continue the conversation. Familiarize yourself with all the questions. It is important that this guide serves as a basis for discussion, and the questions serve to guide you. However, YOU DO NOT NEED TO READ ALL THE QUESTIONS ALOUD.

**Introduction - icebreaker: (do not exceed 2 minutes)**

Put the participants in groups of two to introduce themselves to each other for a few minutes, then each participant introduces his partner to the group.

**Security context and social cohesion:**

1. What are the signs of peace / security in your community? When all is well, what are the things that make you feel safe?

2. In the last 3 months, are there any signs of peace (among those you have just identified) that you no longer observe or that have returned?

3. What are the obstacles to peaceful cooperation in your community?

4. Over the last 3 months, has the security situation worsen, improve or remain the same? Why do you say so?

   **4. Answer : (note how many people give each answer)**

   worsens _____________ improves _____________ remains the same _____________

5. How would you describe the relationship between IDPs and members of the host community, especially within the last three months?

6. On a scale of 1 to 10, 1 being a sense of complete lack of social cohesion and 10 a sense of complete social cohesion where one feels a sense of unity and trust with other community members within the community, how do you rate the level of social cohesion in your community? Explain your answer

   **6. Answer : (circle the number that corresponds to the answer)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Complete lack of social cohesion          complete social cohesion

   **Answer : (note how many people give each answer)**
Conflict identification, risks and effects:

7. What kinds of tensions and/or conflicts arose in your community in the last 3 months?

(After the group identifies the kinds of conflict, ask for details about each conflict that has been mentioned.)

7. Reply:
Example 1: ___________________________________________________________________________

a. Which groups and individuals take part in identified conflicts? (parties in conflict, victims, other actors)

b. What are the causes/reasons that led to this conflict in your community? Why are these parties in conflict?

c. What are the consequences of these conflicts for you, for your family, for your community?

7. Reply:
Example 2: ___________________________________________________________________________

a. Which groups and individuals take part in identified conflicts? (parties in conflict, victims, other actors)

b. What are the causes/reasons that led to conflict in your community? Why are these parties in conflict?

c. What are the consequences of these conflicts for you, for your family, for your community and for the parties in conflict?

8. In the last 3 months, have you seen or heard of conflicts leading to violent outbursts in your community?

8. Example 1: _________________________________________________________________________

a. How often does that violent conflict happen? (per day/week/month/year)

8. Example 2: _________________________________________________________________________

a. How often does that violent conflict happen? (per day/week/month/year)

10. Are there conflicts around humanitarian distributions/activities and/or water points? Why do you think these conflicts exist?
11. How are women and men, young women and young men, and children affected differently by the conflict situation? Describe examples

Peace mechanisms:

11. Are there community structures that resolve conflicts between IDPs and host communities in your community? Which ones? Do their actions contribute to peace and justice? If yes, how? If not, why?

12. Are there other actors that contribute to conflict prevention or resolution? Who? How?

13. What advice would you give to prevent conflicts and tensions that may arise in the future?

14. Is there anything else you would like to add?