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<tr>
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Executive summary

Context of the baseline

This baseline study was carried out as part of the “Anw Ko Hêrê” project which is implemented by Search Mali in partnership with the Association des Jeunes contre l’Enrôlement dans le Terrorisme (AJCET). This 24-month project funded by the Department of State aims to “strengthen the resilience of communities in central Mali” to prevent atrocities and is implemented in 12 municipalities of 3 prefectures (Bandiagara, Bankass and Koro) in the Mopti region. Search Mali carried out the baseline study between November 2019 and March 2020 in the target municipalities of Bandiagara, Doucomo, Pignari Bana and Sangha in the prefecture of Bandiagara, the ones of Bankass, Baye, Koulogo and Ouenkoro in the prefecture of Bankass and finally Dinangourou, Dioungani, Koro and Yoro in the prefecture of Koro.

Objectives, methodology and limitations of the study

A mixed methodology was adopted to implement the baseline in order to understand the security and social context of the target areas, to provide a state of violence committed in the target municipalities, to identify risk factors for atrocities and to measure the indicators of the project at the beginning. The study included, in addition to the documentary review on the context analysis and the prevention of atrocities, the realization of 93 interviews (Key Informant Interviews - KII) with the key actors of security and protection (community leaders, administrative authorities and local elected leaders, members of Security Defense and Forces - SDF, and media professionals), 35 Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with communities members (including 12 FGD with women and 12 FGD with youth), and a random survey of 424 people (including 186 women) distributed among target municipalities.

The percentage of women required for the study (50%) was not reached due to their reluctance to be interviewed. The research teams (24 investigators under the supervision of the Design Monitoring & Evaluation - DM&E team of Search Mali) also had difficulty interviewing magistrates and justice officials because they were not available.

Results of the baseline

Security Context

The results of the study show that the project will be implemented in a deteriorated security context characterized by the presence of SDF with bases in some municipalities (Bankass, Koulogo, Ouenkoro, Dinangourou, Dioungani and Koro) and conducting patrols in others, the presence of self-defense and armed groups affiliated to ethnic groups in all the municipalities except Dinangourou and the presence the extremist groups presumed infiltrated among the population. They also reported small arms proliferation and an increase in acts of banditry, attacks by extremist groups and Improvised Explosive Device (IED) placed on busy routes such as the roads between Bandiagara and Bankass, Bankass and Baye, Koro and Dinangourou, Koro and Dioungani, and Koro and Yoro. Thus, during the six-month retrospective period considered for this study, attacks against civilians and the armed forces (national and foreign), murders, kidnappings, thefts of livestock, destruction of villages and other violence have been reported in the target municipalities.

Social environment, relationships between actors, and factors of division and connection in the target municipality

The interviewed people described the social environment of target municipalities as tense and characterized by violent inter-community conflicts (between Fulani and Dogon) especially in the prefectures of Bandiagara and Bankass and the main actors of these conflicts are the self-defense groups affiliated to ethnic groups and villages, armed groups and extremist groups. The government and
the armed forces are sometimes considered as actors of conflicts by the communities of the Bandiagara’s prefecture because of the slowness of the response of the SDF, the absence of the administrative authorities and the functioning difficulties of the judiciary services.

The main factors that divide populations and actors are the poor or non-functioning of decentralized services (social services, justice), armed banditry, the ideology and actions of extremist groups, the spread of rumors and false information on the security and social situation, and mutual mistrust and tensions. Mistrust is the main characteristic of the relationship between the communities in the 8 targeted municipalities of the Prefectures of Bandiagara and Bankass. Especially in the municipalities of the Bandiagara’s prefecture, relationship between the state (represented by the SDF and the administrative authorities) are very weak. In all the municipalities, the collaboration between the communities and the local elected representatives is reported to be good.

**Situation of violence in target municipalities and triggers**

The analysis of the data collected among the target communities shows that 96.7% of respondents affirm that violence is committed in their municipality, the most recent violent actions are murders (88.4%), executions of people (51.4%), kidnapping and missing or torture of people (81.4%) and destruction and looting of public and / or private property (65.1%). Community members who participated in the study rated the violence above 2 with the maximal rate of 5 (most high level of violence) in the municipalities of Dioungani, Koro, Ouenkoro, Yoro, Koulogon. Sexual violence, even not as high as the violent actions mentioned above, was mentioned by 20.4% of respondents in the municipality of Baye, 36.6% in Dinangourou, 20.0% in Dioungani, 64.3% in Doucombo, 28.2% in Koro and 37.6% in Ouenkoro. The main causes of this violence, according participants to the study, are the absence of military bases or the permanent presence of the armed groups in some target municipalities and localities, inter-community conflicts, false information and rumors about the security and social situation and hate speech, armed banditry and violent extremism.

**Risk factors for atrocity at community level**

As the project “Anw Ko Hêrê” aims to prevent atrocities in the targeted municipalities, the baseline study analyzed at the community level the presence of the 14 risk factors for atrocity commission identified by the United Nations Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes. The results of this analysis show that the population of target municipalities confirmed the presence of: risk factor 1 (Situation of armed conflicts or other forms of instability caused by tensions based on questions of identity, perceptions and forms of extremism ), risk factor 2 (lack of confidence in state institutions resulting from impunity), risk factor 3 (weaknesses of state structures, lack of independent and impartial justice and insufficient resources to implement measures to protect populations), risk factor 5 (ability to commit criminal atrocities, availability of people, weapons or ammunition, availability and financial support) and risk actor 6 (absence or weak presence of mitigating factors and lack of early warning mechanisms to prevent criminal atrocities). The mitigating factors and opportunities for peace from which preventive actions can be carried out are the early warning mechanisms identified in the main towns of the three prefectures (Bandiagara, Bankass and Koro) but these mechanisms are experiencing difficulties in their functioning.

**The project indicators’ level at the baseline**

The data analysis revealed that 48% of respondents affirmed that participatory conflict analysis was carried out in their municipalities even if their results were not very widely shared (only 33.0% respondents received the results). They mentioned cultural activities (theaters, dances, wrestling, bicycle races, etc.) and community dialogues as the main factors of connection and cohesion between communities and recommended to Search to integrate cultural activities in its program intervention strategy. In fact, 28% respondents have already confirmed having participated in participatory theaters in their municipality and suggested those actions to be strengthened.
Recommendations

It emerges from this study that the objectives of the project are relevant according to the security and social situation prevailing in the target’s municipalities and the planned activities (capacity building of local actors in conflict prevention and transformation, mediation of (emergency and communication) are adapted to the needs of the target communities. However, in order to facilitate the implementation of project’s activities, to comply with “do no harm” principles, and to ensure sustainability, it is recommended to:

- Adapt topics on community activities to the security and social contexts of target municipalities;
- Include topics on Gender Based Violence and self-protection (of communities in a nonviolent manner) in community dialogue in order to tackle factors of violence;
- Ensure participation of the militias’ members in community activities to change their perception, attitudes and behaviors toward violence and conflicts;
- Produce and broadcast radio program in line with the contexts of the target municipalities and which will not only tackle social cohesion and peace issues but also sexual violence.
I. The project

Since September 2019, the Department of State funded the "Anw Ko Hêrê" (Peace, now!) project implemented by Search in three prefectures of the Mopti’s region for a period of two years. This region has been the epicenter of the instability prevailing in central Mali for more than 4 years. Indeed, since the start of 2018, inter-community conflicts between the Bambara, Dogon and Fulani communities over access to land, resources and justice have led to massive violations of human rights and displacement forced, setting off an unexpected cycle of community violence that the government, its international partners and local elites have not yet contain\(^1\). The deadliest of this violence the first quarter of 2019 was the attack of Ogossagou, which left more than 160 people dead. The scale of this violence in Center led the General Secretary of the United Nations to declare about the situation in Mali that "there is a high risk of escalation which could lead to the commission of atrocities\(^2\)."  

In fact, according to the United Nations Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes, the term atrocity crime "... qualifies three legally defined international crimes: genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes\(^3\)." According to the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the 1949 Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols of 1972, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court of 1998 and other treaties, these crimes take into account murders and assassinations, executions of people, kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people, massacres or mass persecutions, sexual violence (rapes), looting or destruction of public or private property, destruction of villages or cities, improper imprisonment, and the extermination or exclusion of groups of people because of language, race, nationality or religion.

In response to this context and on the basis of lessons learned across Mali and the Sahel, Search designed a project “to strengthen the resilience of communities in central Mali.” With the purpose of preventing atrocities in the targeted areas, the project is implemented in 12 municipalities in the Mopti’s region distributed in the 3 prefectures most affected by the violence: prefecture of Bandiagara (Bandiagara, Doucomo, Pignari Bana and Sangha), prefecture of Bankass (Bankass, Baye, Koulogon and Ouenkoro) and prefecture of Koro (Dinangourou, Dioungani, Koro and Yoro).

Through the strengthening capacity of target communities and stakeholders in the prevention and transformation of conflicts, communication and information sharing supported by awareness messages on social cohesion using local media, the target targets the 5 main groups who likely to influence the dynamics of conflicts in central Mali if their perception, attitudes and behavior are transformed. These groups are:

- National, regional and local authorities (governor of Mopti, prefects and sub-prefects, local elected representatives);
- Security and Defense Forces;
- Community leaders (traditional and religious leaders, women and youth leaders);
- Community members of the target municipalities
- and Civil Society Organizations -CSOs (the president of the CSO platform, the Coordination of women's Association in Mali, the Regional Youth Council);
- Media professionals.

Before the implementation of project’s activities, Search Mali realized a study at the project’s start.

---


II. The baseline study

The main objective of the study was to establish the baseline situation from which the progress of the project will be monitored, and its relevance and effectiveness evaluated. The aim of this study was also to assess the risks of atrocities to which the populations who living in the target areas are exposed in order to set up an intervention which will address them. More specifically, the study aimed to:

- Understand the security and social context of the municipalities where the project will be implemented;
- Make a situational analysis of the violence committed in the target municipalities during the six months preceding the launch of the project and identify their triggers;
- Identify the risk factors for atrocities already present at the community level;
- Measure the levels of indicators at the start of the project (Annex 1: Indicators to be measured at the project’s start);
- Formulated recommendations to adjust the project implementation strategy.

In order to achieve the specific objectives of the study, the following research questions guided the research.

- What is the security situation in the project implementation area? What are the dynamics of conflict and their characteristics?
- What is the state of relations between the communities and between the actors living in the project implementation area? Which actors play a decisive role in social cohesion? What are the factors that divide community members and actors? What are the factors that contribute to social cohesion?
- What types of violence are committed in the target areas? How widespread is this violence? What are the causes of this violence? What were the warning signs of this violence? What are the triggers for violence?
- What are the risk factors for atrocities that exist at the community level? How can the project through its activities help to address them?
- What is the level of indicators at the start of the project?
- How can the activities planned within the framework of the project be adjusted in the light of the results of the study?

III. The methodology of the baseline

1. Scope of the study

The study was carried out in all 12 target municipalities, in Bandiagara, Bankass, Baye, Dinangourou, Dioungani, Doucomo, Koro, Koulougon, Ouengkor, Pignari Bana, Sangha, and Yoro; and data were collected from December 14th to 27th, 2019 and it included all stakeholders as well as community members according to the methodology developed.

2. Methodological approach and methods

In order to collect the information needed to answer the research questions, a mixed approach combining a document review and a quantitative and qualitative approach was adopted.

a. Literature review

The literature review consisted of a documentary research and analysis on three key aspects of the study: the description of the security and social context of the municipalities where the project will be implemented implementing the project, the situational analysis of violence committed and the identification of factors risks of violence and atrocities in central Mali and particularly in the targeted areas.

The description of the security context and the relationships between the actors was carried out not only by analyzing the data collected through the matrix of connectors and dividers developed by Search but also by reviewing the articles and reports available on the security and social situation which is prevailing
in the Center from Mali. The situation of violence in the 3 target prefectures was partly based on quarterly reports of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), on the reports on the atrocities in Mali and in the Sahel as well as on the articles published online on the security and social situation in central Mali (Annex 7: Bibliography).

The methodology used for the identification of risk factors for atrocity commission at the community level was inspired by the Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes of the United Nations[^4]. It is a tool for preventing violence which presents a set of risk factors which can cause for atrocities crimes if they are not addressed. It presents also for each risk factor the main indicators that can indicate the presence of risk factor among a population or in a country. As Search's intervention in this project is based a community approach with the participation of the national, regional and local key stakeholders, the study focused on identifying the risk factors present or observed at the community level.

**b. Qualitative methods**

The qualitative approach aimed to collect information to understand the security context for the implementation of the project, to know the state of relations between the actors and the state of social cohesion, and to identify the triggers of violence and the risk factors for violence and atrocities present at the community level. It used Key Informant Interviews (KII) and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) methods. KII targeted key actors and FGD community members. For these two methods, the data were collected using an interview guide developed (Annex 6: Data collection tools) in line with the research questions previously mentioned.

For this study, 93 KII were carried out with the main stakeholders targeted by the project and included:

- 56 community leaders (traditional and religious leaders),
- 14 administrative and local authorities (prefects or sub-prefects, mayors, women and youth leaders),
- 3 members of Security and Defense Forces (SDFs),
- And 20 media professionals.

The graph below shows the percentage of people interviewed for each category of key actors.

![Figure 1: Distribution of key actors interviewed by category](image)

As the graph above shows, very few of SDFs (3.2% of key actors interviewed) were interviewed because they wanted the authorization from their hierarchy to answer the questions. Similarly, only women leaders

interviewed were the representative of the women associations and they represented only 13.9% of the key actors involved in interviews.

In addition, 35 FGDs, realized with 8 community members chosen among the target communities, were also carried out. They included 12 FGD with women and 12 mixed FGD with young people (women and men). In total, 280 people participated in group discussions.

c. The survey and target communities

The quantitative approach aimed to measure the level of indicators at the start of the project. A sample of 424 people, whose size was determined according to the Simple Random Survey method have been considered. This sample was distributed among target municipalities in proportion to the size of their respective total populations and the surveyed people were randomly selected from the target municipalities. A quantitative questionnaire (Annex 6: Data collection tools) in line with project’s indicators and research questions have been developed by Design, Monitoring and Evaluation (DM&E) Team of Search and aimed to:

- estimate the extent to which the violence actions (such as assassination, execution of people, kidnapping or disappearance or torture of people, massacre or mass persecution, sexual violence, looting/destruction of public or private property, destruction of villages or cities, improper imprisonment, and existence of groups of people exterminated or destroyed because of their language, race, nationality or religion) are committed in the target communities;
- assess the levels of access of the populations living in the target municipality to a sensitive and verified information on the security and social situation;
- assess the level of participatory conflict analyzes and the sharing of their results within communities to strengthen resilience;
- and check the relevance of the activities planned such as participative theaters for beneficiary communities.

424 people randomly selected from the project target municipalities questioned are distributed among target municipalities as shown by the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefectures</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Total population size</th>
<th>Total sample size</th>
<th>Number of women sampled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bandiagara</td>
<td>Bandiagara</td>
<td>17 166</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doucomo</td>
<td>11 510</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pignari Bana</td>
<td>30 079</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangha</td>
<td>30 789</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankass</td>
<td>Bankass</td>
<td>30 159</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baye</td>
<td>39 096</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koulogon</td>
<td>13 657</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ouenkoro</td>
<td>21 723</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koro</td>
<td>Dinangourou</td>
<td>32 823</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dioungani</td>
<td>32 418</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koro</td>
<td>62 681</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yoro</td>
<td>19 109</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total       |                | 341 219               | 424                | 186                     |

The women interviewed in this survey represent 43.9% of all respondents.
The quota of 50% for women participation was not met due to the reluctance of some of them to be interviewed by surveyors. Because of the very volatile security environment in the target municipalities, the surveyors replaced them with men who were available.

All respondents were at least 18 years of age and are distributed as follows according to the age groups defined.

The average age of surveyed people is 38.2 years, with an average of 36.3 for women and 39.6 for men.

3. The research team

24 surveyors living in the 12 target municipalities were recruited and trained to carry out interviews and lead group discussions as well as to administer the questionnaires. Under the supervision of the DM&E team, they collected information by consulting 797 people: 93 interviews with key actors of security and protection, 280 participants in group discussions and 424 people interviewed in the survey). This report presents the results of the analysis of the data collected.

4. Difficulties and limitations

The research teams did not reach the required quota of some key stakeholder. The magistrates were not available and some SDFs did not answer the question because they asked the authorization from their...
The results of the study

1. Security context and social environment in target areas
   a. Security environment

The security situation is deteriorated or critical in most of the target municipalities. The permanent presence of the SDF (with military bases) to protect population was reported in the chief towns of the municipalities of Bankass, Koulogon and Ouenkoro (in Bankass’ prefecture) and the chief towns of the municipalities of Dinangourou, Dioungani and Koro in Koro’s prefecture. In Bandiagara’s prefecture, the SDFs are present in the municipality’s chief town, but the populations reported still feeling afraid and not safe. A young woman, participating in the group discussion (FGD) organized in Bandiagara as part of this study, related the state of the security situation in these terms: “... the security situation is degraded. The peasants have not cultivated, and we can neither travel nor cultivate our fields, go about our business. ... the traders are robbed by the terrorists. It is Dan Na Ambassagou the self-defense group who ensures our safety and we thank them constantly”. For the 3 other targeted municipalities of the Bandiagara’s prefecture (Doucomo, Sangha and Pignari Bana), community members who participated in the group discussions report that the SDFs are neither present in their municipalities, nor carry out patrols. A man from Sangha explains: “There are no more SDFs here. It was the people themselves who organized themselves into a self-defense groups to ensure the safety of the people. Even in urban communities, they are not totally secured”. Another woman reports the same information: “... in the Sangha municipality specifically, the SDFs do not ensure our security. It’s Dan Na Ambassagou, who secures us, they always patrol, as well as the young people of the village who patrol in turn in numbers of 20. We do not know the SDFs and we ask ourselves the question whether they are black or white. Besides, we suspect them of being an accomplice of the terrorists .... ”. As these testimonies show, in the Bandiagara prefecture, the members of the communities are grateful to an armed militia, whom they said ensure their protection.

Concerning the Bankass prefecture, the populations interviewed reported that the security of the populations and their property is ensured by the SDFs, even if it is not sufficient. Fulani and Dogon militias exist in the target communities of the prefecture. The stakeholders report that the security situation remains critical in the municipalities of Bankass and Baye because of the frequent attacks of extremist groups. But the situation is calmer in the municipalities of Koulogon and Ouenkoro. In the...
Koro’s prefecture, the security situation is relatively better compared to that of the municipalities of Bandiagara and Bankass. The SDFs have bases in all the municipalities, and the participants to the study agreed that the security situation has improved in the chief towns of the municipalities. However, the surroundings of villages are still exposed to insecurity. Communities reported during group discussions that Improvised Explosive Devices have been set outside the villages of Tonou and Tonou Bela.

As already mentioned, there are several self-defense and armed groups whose purposes are also to protect communities. They are generally linked to the ethnic groups living in the target areas. The main ethnic groups living in the target municipalities are the Bozos, Songhai, Bambara, Dogons, Tamasheqs, Moors and Fulani, but the majority ethnic groups are the Dogon, the Fulani and the Bambara5. Thus, the main armed or self-defense groups cited by the respondents are:

- for the Dogon communities, Dan Na Ambassagou or also called Donzo Hunters, Dan Na Ateme, the Ogossagou Movement and some community self-defense groups made up of young people from Dogon villages;
- for the Fulani communities, the Alliance for the Salvation of the Sahel, the Katiba Macina or Front de Libération du Macina, other community self-defense groups also made up of young people from Fulani villages.

Community Members interviewed during the data collection reported an increase in crime, a proliferation of small arms and the manufacture of Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) and the main access routes to the target prefectures are often mined. The main routes with IEDs are roads between Bandiagara and Bankass, Bankass and Baye, Koro and Dinangourou, Koro and Dioungani, and Koro and Yoro. Other information sources confirmed these facts. According to MINUSMA report from July to September 20196, “... central Mali continued to be the most affected by incidents related to improvised explosive devices, with 69% of the attacks having taken place in the first half of the year of 2019 having been committed in this region against 51% at the same period in 2018. Civilians continue to be the main victims, with 110 in the first half of 2019, against 112 during the same period in 2018”.

b. Conflict dynamics in target municipalities

In all the target municipalities, conflicts have been reported between Fulani and Dogon. The conflict, as defined by Search’s Common Ground Approach (CGA)7 to transform conflicts, is a situation when “...two or more parties have apparently incompatible objectives”. The conflicts between Fulani and Dogon, often assimilated respectively to groups of breeders and farmers, were disputes over land and the management of natural resources which, unresolved and catalyzed by impunity, prejudices and stereotypes, led to misunderstandings, mistrust and violence between the two communities.

i. Conflicts and their manifestations and causes

In the municipalities of the Prefectures of Bandiagara and Bankass, the analysis of qualitative data collected showed that tensions between the different ethnic groups, in addition to the actions of extremist groups and armed banditry, are the causes of violence such as targeted assassinations, looting, and destruction of villages and theft of cattle. It showed also that community members believe that the violence is caused by the misunderstanding and mistrust between the Fulani and Dogon communities. When there is an incident or an attack, the members of the community victim believe they are attacked by the other ethnic group or their militia. A woman participating in the group discussion carried out as part of this study at Yoro explains: “We cannot identify the causes of this conflict. As a member of Dogon community, we were there, and the Fulani came to attack us ... that was the surprise with us. We have no...

---

dispute with the Fulani before and now they have deprived us of cultivating and doing other activities."

On the other hand, the key actors interviewed (media professionals, administrative authorities and local elected representatives) pointed the fight against the violent extremist. "The conflict is against the expansion of terrorist groups. but that has nothing to do with the conflict between ethnic groups," said a journalist interviewed in Bandiagara. The analysis showed that for some Dogon community members, the self-defense groups affiliated to the Fulani communities are very often assimilated to the extremist groups and are called "terrorists".

The tensions between population and the deteriorated security context caused important population displacements especially in the targeted prefectures. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) report, 31,476 people representing 5,404 households moved in the three prefectures (Bandiagara, Bankass and Koro) only for between August 1st and 31st, 2019.

In Bandiagara's prefecture, the local authorities and elected officials interviewed affirmed that certain villages such as Makkou in the municipality of Pignari Bana and its eight hamlets were deserted after an attack in 2019. According to the testimonies of the participants, the people who stayed behind live in fear of being attacked and distrust each other (Annex 2: Summary of the security situation by target municipality).

ii. The factors that divide populations

The Analysis of the data collected using the connector and divider matrix confirms that the dividing factors are linked to Systems and Institutions, People's Attitudes and Actions, Values, Myths and Interests and Past Stories and Experiences and even Culture and Symbols. The table below resumes the divider factors for each level.

Table 2: Divider factors underlying a tense social environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Division factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System and Institutions</td>
<td>• Poor governance, corruption and partiality of officials in state structures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of failure of basic social services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inaction or late reaction of the SDFs when there are attacks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-permanent presence of the SDFs in areas affected by conflicts and attacks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impunity, poor management of disputes by the judicial system;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Levels | Division factors
---|---
**Attitudes and Actions** | ● Circulation of rumors and false information;  
● Robbery, theft and armed banditry;  
● Actions of extremist groups;  
● Murders and assassinations;  
● Suspicions of the collaboration of communities with extremist groups;  

**Values, Myths and Interests** | ● Membership of a group (Fulani or Dogon) based on the identity;  
● Prejudices and stereotypes;  
● Stigmatization of the beliefs of certain groups as being witchcraft or worshipping idols;  

**History and Past Experiences** | ● Disputes and conflicts between farmers and breeders;  
● Natural resource management;  
● Assassinations of community leaders or local elected officials  

**Symbols and Culture** | ● Difference in folk identity;  
● Provocative music that takes position in the conflict between communities;  
● Passage of animals because of the nomadism of the Fulani communities;  

Respondents report that symbols and culture such as cultural places, music, language, rituals and celebrations, in general, are not factors that divide communities in the target areas. However, these cultural activities linked to beliefs or the management of natural resources have had negative effects on the organization of certain cultural events. For example, because of the stigmatization of the beliefs of the Dogon communities as being animists, the participants in the study reported that the members of the Fulani communities have ceased to participate in the Dogon traditional festival called "Bouro" organized each year in Bandiagara. Similarly, in Pignari Bana (Bandiagara prefecture), the collective fishing festival between the inhabitants of Pignari Bana and Bandiougou no longer takes place after the inhabitants of Bandiougou have taken control of the pond where the fishing took place.

### iii. Collaboration and relationships between key actors

The level of relationships between the actors (community leaders, administrative authorities, local elected representatives, SDFs and members of civil society) differs from one municipality to another.

In the Bandiagara’s prefecture, people distrust each other because of the tensions between the Fulani and Dogon communities. Collaboration is weak or absent with the SDFs and administrative authorities, and good with local elected officials. Indeed, the communities of Bandiagara criticize the SDFs for the slowness in their reaction or the lack of reaction. In the other municipalities of the prefecture (Doucombo, Pignari Bana and Sangha), populations who participated in the group discussions reported being protected by the Dan Na Ambassagou armed group. In this way, extremist groups, the government and SDFs are considered by some members of the communities as a party to the conflict and their actions as the causes or triggers of conflicts. In the Bankass’ prefecture, the relationships between the actors are similar except that the collaboration is considered good with the administrative authorities. The SDF and the state are not considered to be parties to the conflict.

On the other hand in the prefecture of Koro, the relations are different. Social cohesion is reported acceptable by interviewees; collaboration is good between community leaders, the SDFs, local elected officials and the administrative authorities. According to interviews with key actors (administrative authorities, local elected officials and media professionals), the party to the conflict are mainly extremist groups and armed bandits living in the bush. According to them, the improvement in the security and social situation is due to the presence of the SDF and the departure of the self-defense militias from in the municipality of Dinangourou.
2. Situation of violence in the target municipalities

Based on the United Nations Framework of Analysis for Atrocity crimes which groups violence in 8 categories (murders and assassinations, executions of people, kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people, massacres or mass persecutions, sexual violence (rapes), looting or destruction of public or private property, destruction of villages or cities, improper imprisonment, and the extermination or exclusion of groups of people because of language, race, nationality or religion), the results of the study showed that 96.7% of respondents to the survey affirmed that these violent actions are committed in their municipality. And in 7 over the 12 target municipality, all the respondents (100%) were unanimous on the commission of atrocities and violence in their municipalities.

a. Types of violent actions committed

According to the United Nations Secretary-General's reports on the situation in Mali, 31% of the attacks in Mali between July and September 2019 were perpetrated in the Mopti region and this violence tends to worsen. In fact, the following quarter (between October and December 2019), 85% of the attacks in Mali that left more than 200 dead were perpetrated in the Mopti region. The analysis of the data collected from the populations and key stakeholders during this study confirmed this information and showed that the main types of violence observed are murders and assassinations, kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people and looting of public or private goods. 88.4% of the respondents affirmed that assassinations are observed in their municipalities, 81.4% report the abduction, disappearance or torture of people and 67.0% reported looting or destruction of public or private properties.

![Figure 5: Percentage of respondents affirming the occurrence of violence per category](image)

Improper imprisonments, destruction of towns and villages, sexual violence, massacre of people or executions of people have also been reported, but to a lesser extent.

Especially sexual violence rate is high in 5 target municipalities. 20.4% of respondents reported them in the municipality of Baye, 36.6% in Dinangourou, 20.0% in Dioungani, 64.3% in Doucomo, 28.2% in Koro and 37.6% in Ouenkoro. According to the lessons learned in implementing atrocity prevention and peacebuilding programs, Peace Direct numerated six risk factors associated with sexual and gender-based atrocity crimes: weak protection of women’s rights, lack of accountability for perpetrators, limits to SGBV data collection and reporting, the proliferation of small arms and light weapons (SALW), and the

---

marginalization of women in transitional justice mechanisms\textsuperscript{11}. At least 3 of these risk factors (lack of accountability for perpetrators, the proliferation of small arms and light weapons, marginalization of women in transitional justice mechanisms) were confirmed in the presentation of the security and social contexts and they could explain the rates of sexual violence in target municipalities.

b. Scope of the violence

Participants in the group discussions were also interviewed on the severity level of these types of violence, which rated them 0 to 5 depending on their severity. The analysis the rates of participants showed that the violence is serious both in the municipalities where the SDFs have not or not established military bases (municipalities of Dioungani, Doucomo, Koro, Koulogo, Ouenkoro and Yoro) and where the security of populations and their property is provided by Dogon and Fulani militias and armed groups and the seriousness of the violence are presented in the figure below by target municipality.

The analysis of the ratings showed also that the most serious forms of violence are assassination, execution of people, kidnapping or missing or torture of people, massacres or mass persecution and looting or destruction of public or private property. The details of the severity of the category of violent actions by target municipalities are presented in the \textit{Annex 4}: Severity level rating by violent actions and by .

These levels of severity crossed with the percentage of respondents affirming the committing of types of violence in their municipality (which can be considered as a proxy for the frequency of commission of violence) made it possible to represent the different types of violence as the figure below.

\textsuperscript{11} Peace Direct, \textit{Atrocity prevention and peacebuilding: Key insights and lessons from a global consultation convened by Peace Direct}, p12.
The most recurrent and serious types of violence are assassinations, kidnapping or disappearance or torture of people, looting or destruction of public and private property and the execution of people. Nevertheless, as the figures above showed it, the level of severity of violence given by community members who participated in group discussions does not exceed level 3. While overall, these four types of violence were the most cited, the realities of the municipalities differ according to the target municipalities. The table below presents the first three types of violence most committed in each target municipality in the last 6 months (see Annex 3: % of respondents affirming the commission of violence or atrocities according to the target municipalities).

**Most observed types of violent actions by municipality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bandiagara</td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
<td>Executions of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankass</td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Executions of people</td>
<td>Destruction of villages or cities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The severity level out of 5 given by study participants:

- 100% - Assassinations; Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people;
- 80% - Looting or destruction of public or private properties;
- 60% - Execution of people;
- 40% - Sexual violence (rapes); Massacres or mass persecutions; Destruction of villages or cities;
- 20% - Improper imprisonment;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baye</strong></td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
<td>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dinangourou</strong></td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
<td>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</td>
<td>Sexual violence (rapes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dioungani</strong></td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
<td>Sexual violence (rapes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doucomo</strong></td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
<td>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koro</strong></td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
<td>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koulogo</strong></td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Massacre ou persécution de masse</td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ouenkoro</strong></td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
<td>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pignari Bana</strong></td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</td>
<td>Destruction of villages or cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sangha</strong></td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yoro</strong></td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c. Triggers of the violence

Some causes of the violence in target municipalities are structural. The lack or insufficient protection of populations by the armed forces, the presence and action of extremist groups, armed banditry and unmanaged and / or resolved conflicts and disputes were cited by the interviewees as being at the basis of violence. In addition, the violence linked to the conflicts between the Fulani and Dogon communities, catalyzed by rumors and hate speech, were mentioned as being triggers of the violence. Indeed, the participants in the group discussions reported that even if in general the perpetrators of the violence are not known, the rival communities (Fulani or Dogon) through their militia are suspected. And amplified by rumors, the victims seek revenge. This leads to targeted assassinations, kidnappings and disappearances, and other types of violence. As the graph below shows, almost three-quarters of those questioned said that they did not have access to verified information sensitive to the conflict or linked to the security situation due to the spread of rumors.
In the absence or bad functioning of judicial institutions, the perpetrators of violence are generally not known and even less punished. The people, in the absence of reliable information, seek justice, form self-defense militias and acquire weapons to protect themselves. This maintains the cycle of violence in the target communities and constitutes a risk factor for criminal atrocities.

3. Identification of risk factors for atrocity crimes at the local level

The Framework of Analysis for Atrocity crimes lists 14 risk factors which, if their presence is confirmed within a population or a country, it runs the risk of having the 3 types of atrocity crimes committed within it, genocides, war crimes and / or crimes against humanity cited above. These factors can be identified at the structural, economic, national or local (community) level. As the "Anw Ko Hêrê" project aims to prevent violence and atrocities at the community level, the identification of risk factors was based on their indicators at the community level listed in the table below. In all, 21 indicators were considered during this study to analyze the presence of risk factors for atrocities at the local level.

Table 3: Indicators considered at community level to identify risk factors for atrocity commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factor for atrocity</th>
<th>Indicators at local level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Risk Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 International or non-international armed conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.11 Social instability caused by exclusion or tensions based on identity issues, their perception or extremist forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Factor 2 Record of serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law</td>
<td>2.8 Widespread mistrust in State institutions or among different groups as a result of impunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Factor 3 Weakness of State structures</td>
<td>3.3 Lack of an independent and impartial judiciary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10 Insufficient resources to implement overall measures aimed at protecting populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Factor 4 Motives or</td>
<td>4.4 Other interests, including those aimed at rendering an area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk factor for atrocity</td>
<td>Indicators at local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| incentives              | homogeneous in its identity.  
4.8 Politicization of past grievances, tensions or impunity. |
| Risk Factor 5 Capacity to commit atrocity crimes | 5.1 Availability of personnel and of arms and ammunition, or of the financial resources, public or private, for their procurement.  
5.7 Financial, political or other support of influential or wealthy national actors. |
| Risk Factor 6 Absence of mitigating factors | 6.11 Lack of an early warning mechanism relevant to the prevention of atrocity crimes. |
| Risk Factor 7 Enabling circumstances or preparatory action | 7.5 Creation of, or increased support to, militia or paramilitary groups.  
7.13 Increased politicization of identity, past events or motives to engage in violence.  
7.14 Increased inflammatory rhetoric, propaganda campaigns or hate speech targeting protected groups, populations or individuals |
| Risk Factor 8 Triggering factors | 8.7 Acts of incitement or hate propaganda targeting particular groups or individuals. |

**Specific Risk Factors**

**Genocide**

| Risk Factor 9 Intergroup tensions or patterns of discrimination against protected groups | 9.3 History of atrocity crimes committed with impunity against protected groups. |
| Risk Factor 10 Signs of an intent to destroy in whole or in part a protected group | 10.6 Resort to means of violence that are particularly harmful or prohibited under international law, including prohibited weapons, against a protected group.  
10.8 Attacks against or destruction of homes, farms, businesses or other livelihoods of a protected group and/or of their cultural or religious symbols and property. |

**Crimes against humanity**

| Risk Factor 11 Signs of a widespread or systematic attack against any civilian population | 11.3 Increase in the level of organization or coordination of violent acts and weapons used against a civilian population.  
11.8 Signs of development or increased use of means or methods of violence that are incapable of distinguishing between civilian and military targets or that are capable of mass destruction, persecution or weakening of communities. |
| Risk Factor 12 Signs of a plan or policy to attack any civilian population | 12.6 Access to and use of weaponry or other instruments not easily obtained inside the country. |

**War crimes**
The Analysis of the data collected through interviews with key stakeholders and the populations showed that most of the risk factors for atrocities exist at the local level, although their severity varies according to the target municipalities.

**a. Situation of armed conflict or other forms of instability**

In the Prefectures of Bandiagara and Bankass, a conflict based on the identity has been reported. It mainly opposes the Fulani and Dogon communities and their armed militias, and the intense tensions caused by these conflicts have aroused mistrust between the populations. In the municipalities of Bandiagara, for example, the two ethnic groups have ceased all forms of collaboration and exchange, and their low collaboration between communities and the SDFs and state services, suspected to be a party in the conflict, has ensued. These tensions caused large movements of populations towards the cities (more than 39,000 internally displaced people in 2019 in the 3 target prefectures of the intervention\(^{12}\)) and had an impact on social cohesion, economic activities (decrease in activities of fairs) and socio-cultural and religious communities of intervention.

**b. Record of serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law and weakness of State structures**

The indicator used in this study to analyze the presence of risk factors 2 (history of serious violations of international law, human rights and international humanitarian law) is indicator 2.8: Widespread mistrust in State Institutions or among different groups as a result of impunity. For risk factor and 3 (weaknesses of state structures), the indicators used were the 3.3 Lack of an independent and impartial judiciary indicators, and 3.10 Insufficient resources to implement overall measures aimed at protecting populations. Because these two risk factors related the resources and capacities of institutions, the analyzes of the two factors were made together.

The analysis of data collected showed that in the target municipalities where the conflict is not violent, armed banditry and attacks by extremist groups are almost present. In general, the perpetrators of these violent actions are not known and therefore are neither arrested nor punished, because of the bad functioning of the judicial system.

Most of those interviewed said that justice is not always impartial in its judgments. Officials are mostly not posted at their duty station and the people of Bandiagara in this case claimed to no longer trust the State because they see neither the administrative authorities of their municipality nor the SDFs who are supposed to ensure their protection. According to them, the government does not have sufficient resources to protect populations and less than 50% of those questioned said they trusted the government (27.3% in the Bandiagara’s prefecture, 41.2% in the Bankass’ prefecture and 53.0% in the Koro’s prefecture).

---

c. Risk Factor 5 Capacity to commit atrocity crimes

As the description of the security context, there is a high circulation of firearms in the target municipality. A local representative of Bankass explains in these terms: “Of course the proliferation of weapons has contributed to the increase in violence. Before we only saw hunting rifles. Since then heavy weapons have started to proliferate and violence has increased. The more they proliferate, the more the violence increases. When you have a weapon, you become impatient and aggressive”. A study realized by the international NGO Oxfam on the proliferation of small arms in Mali in 2017 shows that 143,000 firearms are in circulation. This figure appears to be increasing sharply with tensions. In fact, 17% of those questioned in the Mopti region during a survey conducted by Danish Church Aid and the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) admitted to possessing a firearm in a legal or illegal manner\(^\text{13}\). In addition to this, the people interviewed during this baseline study reported possible financial or material support to the militias for their firearms equipment from the members of ethnic groups living in cities or abroad.

d. Risk Factor 6 Absence of mitigating factors

Group discussions revealed that there were no alert mechanisms known by community members to prevent violence and atrocity crimes excepted in the three chief towns of targeted prefectures (Bandiagara, Bankass and Koro). Even at the level of chief towns, the alert mechanisms are crisis committees which meet in the case of a security incident and aimed to report the facts to the SDF and are not always functional. None of them does not have the 4 required components for the functioning of an early warning system: data collection for risk assessment, monitoring and alert, dissemination of information and communication, and response.

e. Other risk factors

The inter-community conflicts between Fulani and Dogon crystallized around the self-defense militias have as the main characteristics the violence committed by their respective self-defense groups. The perceptions members of one community have toward the members of the other seemed be diminished. Indeed, interviews with people from both communities show that their actions or even acts of reprisal or the acquisition of a firearm are mainly intended to protect themselves from violent actions they believe are committed by other community. A woman participating in the FDG in Sangha explains: “... following the assassination of a hunter towards the plain (border between the municipality of Sangha and Madougou in the prefecture of Koro) by individuals who shot him and without reasons, they tied his feet and killed him because he accused him of being a unbeliever. Thus, his children and the other villagers (Dogon) left to attack the Fulani village to avenge him. In addition, according to certain sources, the Fulani’s were contributing, before we began; for the purchase of weapons and the recruitment of mercenaries with the aim of exterminating all the Dogon community and to occupy the territory to make it their pasture” To the question of whether conflicting parties tend to find common ground or to agree on their positions, people who participated in the group discussions said they were ready to negotiate for an end to the violence but did not know which actors to turn to. Others reported not conflicting with other communities, but some ethnic group tolerated among them or accepted the presence of extremist groups who commit atrocities in their communities. For that, they had no other choice but the one to defend themselves. The specific risk factors for the commission of genocide, at the local level in the target municipalities are therefore not very high. However, consideration of other cyclical or structural indicators (not taken into account in this study) can lead to other conclusions.

\(^\text{13}\) Mali 7, Small arms: 143,000 weapons in circulation, October 2018.
4. Community measures to mitigate risk factors for atrocity and peace opportunities

a. Mitigation factors
The results of the baseline revealed that the main mitigating factors are dialogues and the mediation between the main groups and actors in conflicts led by government services and peacebuilding and protection NGOs. Psychological support for populations, in particular for the victims and people who have experienced trauma, and public sensitization on social cohesion and peace are also the factors which contributed to ease tensions and therefore contributed to reduce violence. Finally, a restrictive policy for the possession of a firearm and an effective disarmament strategy, not only for ex-combatants but also for the population in general, would constitute, according to the key actors interviewed, a factor that would significantly reduce violence and the risks of atrocity crimes in central Mali.

b. Conflict analysis, information management and sharing
Even though almost half of the people questioned during the study (48%) said that the key actors in their municipality regularly carried out conflict analysis and information sharing on the security situation, only a third said they had received the information from these analyzes.

![Figure 8: Percentage of respondents who affirm receiving information from participatory conflict analyzes and those](image)

This information shared come from the crisis committees which act as early warning mechanisms in the various target municipalities. However, these systems are experiencing operating difficulties. As the women of Sangha who participated in the group discussions pointed the problem out, “... the mechanisms exist but they don't work. If they work it is punctual, because of the lack of financial means and training of actors in this direction. Even tomorrow, the traditional chiefs of 60 villages and the Dozo hunters are invited, but the means are limited...”. Thus, the efforts of the authorities, SDFs, community leaders and other actors of the chief towns of the Prefectures of Bandiagara, Bankass and Koro as well as the existing alert systems are opportunities from which actions can be taken to prevent atrocities in target municipalities.

c. Peace opportunities and cohesion factors
The other peace opportunities mentioned by those who participated to the study come from the Search's connector and divider matrix. At the level of national systems and institutions and national symbols, basic social services, national days and celebration of independence as well as an effective employment policy
and the intervention of the armed forces are considered as cohesion factors. In fact, according to the declaration of a resident of Koro, “… we are asking government to create a lot of jobs. The actors of the conflict are also young people; if the project succeeds in creating jobs for young people it can help to avoid violence and atrocities…”.

**Table 4 : Connectors between actors and communities living in the target municipalities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Connection factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **System and Institutions**         | ● Basic administrative and social services (markets, hospitals and prefectures, social development services);
|                                    | ● Employment policy promoting economic opportunities and reducing unemployment;  |
| **Attitudes and Actions**           | ● The fast intervention of the armed forces in the event of attacks or security incidents;
|                                    | ● Community dialogue and consultation framework including with extremist groups;
|                                    | ● Caravans of awareness and peace through theater and other cultural activities;
|                                    | ● Sharing reliable, sensitive and credible information on the security situation;  |
| **Values, Myths and Interests**     | ● Promotion of the values of forgiveness, peace, social cohesion;  |
| **History and Past Experiences**    | ● CousinHood ;                                                                     |
|                                    | ● Former traditional exchange of goods between the Fulani and Dogon communities (example: the Dogon gives the Fulani cereals and the Fulani gives the Dogon milk); |
| **Symbols and Culture**             | ● National holiday and celebration of the Independence Day;  |
|                                    | ● Cultural activities (traditional struggles, bicycle races, Toguna constructions, artistic and cultural weeks, dances, etc.); |

At the community level, the populations mentioned community dialogues, awareness of peace and social cohesion, cultural activities (theaters, solidarity activities, awareness caravans) that promote social cohesion and peace as peace opportunities.

![Figure 9: Percentage of respondents affirming the realization of the participatory theatres and the participants](image)

Even if the social context remains tense because of the mistrust, the tensions between the communities as well as the deteriorated security context, 28% of respondents affirmed they attended participative
theaters organized their municipalities and recognized the cultural activities like this one as contributing to connect the communities living in their municipalities.

**Conclusion**

The study which aimed at establishing the baseline situation for the "Anw Ko Here" project showed that the project and its objectives are adapted to the needs of the populations living in the target municipalities. Analysis of the data from 797 people interviewed showed that these municipalities, whose security and social contexts are degraded, face different types of violence (murder or murder, execution people, destruction of villages or towns, kidnapping or disappearance or torture of people, looting / destruction of public or private property, etc.). The social environment is undermined by conflicts between community self-defense militias, and with the actions of extremist groups and armed bandits, and this situation led to the commission of various acts of violence. Even if the risk factors for atrocities specific to genocide were not specifically identified by the populations and actors who participated in the study, several other risk factors were highlighted, especially the situation of armed conflict, the history of serious human rights violations, the weakness of state structures and the absence of mitigating factors such as early warning mechanisms. Despite the situation presented, some opportunities for peace were mentioned by the populations. They related to the efforts of the populations and local authorities to set up and operate early warning systems, the carrying out of community dialogues and socio-cultural activities (such as participatory theaters). The populations questioned therefore requested the strengthening of mechanisms and actions to help prevent violence in their communities. These recommendations confirmed the relevance of Search's intervention strategy which consists in implementing the activities of:

- Training of a network of conflict analysts covering high-risk prefectures (A1.1.1.1)
- Participatory analysis of conflicts in risk and scenario planning exercises (A1.1.2)
- Bi-monthly risk analysis with national early warning systems (A1.1.2)
- Semi-annual working group on conflict prevention (A1.2.2.2)
- Participatory capacity building sessions (A1.3.1)
- Establishment of mediation units (A1.3.2)
- In situ coaching sessions on common ground journalism techniques (A2.1.1.1)
- Production and distribution of radio news magazines and advertising messages (A2.1.2)
- Participatory theater sessions led by young people (A2.1.3)

But in order to ensure that the project has a significant impact on the populations of the target municipalities, it would be necessary to take into some recommendations while implementing project’s activities.

**Recommendations**

**For community activities**

The Analysis of data collected showed that security and social contexts, as well as the types of violence or the risk factors vary from one municipality to another.

- The themes of participatory theaters or socio-cultural activities should therefore be adapted to the realities of each target population. In particular in the Bandiagara district, there is collaboration between the security forces and the administrative authorities and the communities. The project could also to a certain extent work to create contacts between the populations and the SDFs.
- The results of the study also showed that in the municipalities of Doucomo, Dinangourou, Dioungani, Koro, Ouenkoro, Baye, Sangha and Yoro, the sexual violence rate is significant. As part of the establishment of mediation units and early warning systems, it would be advisable for the teams of Mediation Units to be set up under the project to include members who are women.
Topics around sexual violence can also be discussed in community dialogues and the solutions proposed to tackle the issue.

- Community dialogue can also touch on the strategy for a self-protection of community member. In fact, "self-protection refers to when a targeted or vulnerable community comes together to protect themselves in a nonviolent manner from impending violence and atrocities"\(^{14}\).
- The project activity’s implementation should also ensure the participation of the members of militias and self-defense groups. Actually, they have been identified by communities as the actors who play a role in conflicts and violence. By participating to the community dialogue sessions, participatory theatres and Town Hall meetings as disarmed civilians, their perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors toward violence and conflict can be transformed positively and then contribute to reduce and prevent violence in the central Mali.
- In the municipalities of Pignari Bana, the study highlighted that a conflict between the communities of Bandiougou and Pignari Bana over access to a pond whose appropriation by a community had not only repercussions at the economic level but also cultural. Project teams could take this conflict into account in mediation activities so that mediation units could lead the two communities to find a “win-win” solution.

**For media and communication activities**

- Radio programs produced on the project should also seek to address collaboration issues and build confidence between key actors especially the relationships which have been identified as weak.
- Likewise, during capacity building for media professionals, training sessions should ensure that participants are trained in conflict sensitivity in not only broadcasting Search radio productions, but also broadcasting music programs. In fact, the results of the study have shown that the musical content which takes part in the conflict between communities is a factor that divides.
- Messages and spots, involving authorities, local leaders and champions on speaking about sexual violence, in addition to the social cohesion and peace topics planned, could contribute to reduce sexual violence in the municipalities of Doucomo, Dinangourou, Dioungani, Koro, Ouenkoro, Baye, Sangha and Yoro where sexual violence rates were significant.

---

\(^{14}\) Peace Direct, Atrocity prevention and peacebuilding: Key insights and lessons from a global consultation convened by Peace Direct, p12.
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### Annex 1: Indicators to be measured at the project’s start

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators and disaggregations</th>
<th>Value of the indicators and disaggregations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 : Percentage of community members who think that the monthly conflict and risk analysis shared with them and the activities of the mediation units contributed to prevent atrocity and reduce violence in their communities</td>
<td>26.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaggregation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female (24.2%) ; Male(29.0%) ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18 to 24 years (23.8%); 25 to 29 years (26.3%); 30 to 34 years (30.5%); 35 to 39 years (28.9%); 40 to 44 years (21.2%); 45 to 49 years (34.4%); 50 to 59 years (26.5%); 60 to 98 years (22.6%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Bandiagara(28.6%); Bankass(5.3%); Baye(30.6%); Dinangourou(56.1%); Dioungani(0.0%); Doucomo(57.1%); Koro(46.2%); Koulogo(0.0%); Ouenkoro(33.3%); Pignari Bana(16.2%); Sangha(23.7%); Yoro(0.0%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefecture</td>
<td>Bandiagara(26.4%); Bankass(19.8%); Koro(32.2%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1: Percentage of community members who received information providing from participatory conflict analysis or heard about monthly meetings held on conflict risks analysis</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaggregation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female (29.0%); Male (36.1%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18 to 24 years(26.2%); 25 to 29 years(32.9%); 30 to 34 years(35.6%); 35 to 39 years(31.3%); 40 to 44 years(25.0%); 45 to 49 years(40.6%); 50 to 59 years(38.8%); 60 to 98 years(38.7%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Bandiagara (38.1%); Bankass (10.5%); Baye (51.0%); Dinangourou (63.4%); Dioungani (0.0%); Doucomo (57.1%); Koro (51.3%); Koulogo (5.9%); Ouenkoro (40.7%); Pignari Bana (21.6%); Sangha (23.7%); Yoro (0.0%); Total (33.0%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefecture</td>
<td>Bandiagara(30.0%); Bankass(31.3%); Koro(36.1%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: % of community members who think that participatory theatres contributed to change their perception and attitude and prevent violence and atrocity</td>
<td>30.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicators and disaggregations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Value of the indicators and disaggregations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Female(24.7%) ; Male(35.7%) ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>18 to 24 years (28.6%); 25 to 29 years (35.5%); 30 to 34 years (39.0%); 35 to 39 years (31.3%); 40 to 44 years (30.8%); 45 to 49 years (21.9%); 50 to 59 years (18.4%); 60 to 98 years (35.5%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipality</strong></td>
<td>Bandiagara(52.4%); Bankass(15.8%); Baye(24.5%); Dinangourou(43.9%); Dioungani(0.0%); Doucombo(57.1%); Koro(61.5%); Koulogo(76.5%); Ouenkoro(40.7%); Pignari Bana(5.4%); Sangha(5.3%); Yoro(0.0%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prefecture</strong></td>
<td>Bandiagara(20.9%); Bankass(32.1%); Koro(36.1%);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.1: Percentage of community members who think they have increased their access to verified and conflict sensitive information on their municipality

26.40%

| **Gender**     | Female(29.0%) ; Male(24.4%) ;              |
| **Age**        | 18 to 24 years (26.2%); 25 to 29 years (25.0%); 30 to 34 years (30.5%); 35 to 39 years (25.3%); 40 to 44 years (25.0%); 45 to 49 years (18.8%); 50 to 59 years (34.7%); 60 to 98 years (22.6%); |
| **Municipality** | Bandiagara(47.6%); Bankass(2.6%); Baye(18.4%); Dinangourou(29.3%); Dioungani(17.5%); Doucombo(71.4%); Koro(37.2%); Koulogo(5.9%); Ouenkoro(29.6%); Pignari Bana(43.2%); Sangha(13.2%); Yoro(16.7%); |
| **Prefecture**  | Bandiagara (37.3%); Bankass (14.5%); Koro (28.4%); |
**Annex 2: Summary of the security situation by target municipality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Municipalities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Security Situation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Social Environment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Bandiagara**     | Degraded security situation:  
                      - Security of goods and people is ensured by the Dan Na Ambassagou militia and / or by the young people of the municipality;  
                      - SDS patrols;  
                      - Attacks, killings, kidnapping of people;  
                      - Destruction of granaries, looting;  
                      - Movement / circulation difficulties;  
                      - Presence of armed groups (Alliance du Sahel and Dan Na Ambassagou);  
                      - Presence of so-called "terrorist" groups and bandits. | Unfavorable and precarious social environment  
                      - Interethnic conflicts (Fulani and Dogons);  
                      - Conflict between breeders and farmers;  
                      - Psychosis among populations aroused by the fear of being attacked by the other community;  
                      - Schools closed, school children were killed on their way to class;  
                      - Markets less and less frequented  
                      - Poor functioning of health structures;  
                      - Displacement of populations towards urban centers;  
                      - Tourism stopped. |
| **Bankass**        | Critical security situation:  
                      - Difficult access to other cities in the Mopti region; Escort necessary to move around the municipality and the prefecture;  
                      - Livestock thefts;  
                      - Attacks, killings, Kidnapping of people;  
                      - Roadblock;  
                      - Security provided by armed groups (Dan Na Ambassagou) and village self-defense groups (young people from the municipality);  
                      - No military camp in the municipality, but patrols were carried out by the SDF;  
                      - Permanent presence of the SDS but their reactions are judged in the event of attacks or slow security incidents;  
                      - Presence of “peacekeepers”; | Unfavorable and tense social environment:  
                      - Inter-community conflicts between the Fulani and the Dogons of an identity nature;  
                      - Conflicts between the chiefdoms for power;  
                      - Conflicts over land;  
                      - Lack of trust in authorities and leaders and growing distrust between communities;  
                      - The practice of worship is reduced: calls to prayer are no longer made through loudspeakers for fear of being attacked;  
                      - Psychosis among the populations aroused by the lack of being attacked; |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Security Situation</th>
<th>Social Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Populations (39,096)</td>
<td>Very critical security situation: Presence of jihadists in the municipality; Presence of FDS in Pissa but their patrols are rare; Presence of self-defense groups; Difficult or difficult to access to other prefectures and municipalities in the Mopti region; Attacks, killings, Kidnappings, Targeted assassinations Number of SDSs judged by the respondents to be small enough to secure all of the populations living in the municipality; Presence of armed groups (Dan Na Ambassagou, Dan Na Atémé, Fulani Militias) Security is provided by the armed forces and militias of and community self-defense groups; Presence of terrorist groups; Presence of SDS, but their name is considered insufficient by the communities to ensure their security; Regular installation of Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) on public roads; Robbery and armed banditry on the roads.</td>
<td>Tense social environment: Inter-community conflicts between the Fulani and the Dogon; Collaboration between communities and existing actors but fairly weak; Absence or poor functioning of government structures (justice, prefectures and sub-prefectures); Low trade in goods and fairs are less and less frequented; The populations of Baye suspect an infiltration of members of terrorist groups into the community; Community awareness of the importance of social cohesion and collaboration between actors; Inaccessibility of roads due to improvised explosive devices and robberies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipalities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Security Situation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dinangourou      | Improved security situation:  
The Defense and Security Forces present but the communities and their property are not safe;  
Livestock theft and kidnapping are less frequent;  
Most of the self-defense militias left with the arrival of the military; There are, for example, in Tonou but not in Dinangourou;  
Armed banditry present in the municipality; They are generally present in uninhabited areas (bush)  
The roads are mined by improvised explosive devices;  
Kidnapping, cattle theft, anti-personnel mine poses;  
People are killed during the trip and animals are stolen by bandits;  
Armed bandits; | Social environment:  
Some disagreements remain between leaders for the chiefdom, political parties and because of the action of extremist groups;  
No violent or open conflicts between communities;  
Frustration of members of the population due to the lack of pasture;  
Community conflicts (Fulanis and Dogon), chiefdom conflicts; threats from armed bandits;  
The existing conflict in the municipality is an inter-community conflict (Fulani and Dogon and the chiefdom conflict);  
Mistrust a little reserve because nobody is who is who today;  
No problem of collaboration with the SDS, but the general population is afraid of the SDS |
| **Populations** (32 823) | | |
| Dioungani | Critical Security situation:  
Presence of military base in Dioungani;  
Presence of Fulani and Dogon self-defense militias;  
Forum attacks, targeted assassinations, cattle thefts;  
The weekly market attack; killings;  
Armed bandits and my self-defense groups;  
Permanent presence of SDS;  
Presence of the Fulani and Dogon self-defense militias;  
The town of Dioungani is relatively secure compared to the villages of the municipality; | Tense social environment:  
Lack of collaboration between populations and actors;  
Population psychosis and trauma;  
Unemployment and poverty;  
Mistrust between the populations;  
Collaboration between actors (SDS, authority and leaders) is good;  
The population does not feel safe; |
<p>| <strong>Populations</strong> (32 418) | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Security Situation</th>
<th>Social Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doucomo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Populations (20 835)</strong></td>
<td>**Very critical security situation:**attacks on the roads; no permanent presence of SDS; SDS patrols;</td>
<td>Tense social environment displacement of the population towards Bandiagara;violent conflict between the Fulani and Dogon ethnic groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of self-defense militias;the security of the populations is ensured by the Dozo hunters of the Dan Na Ambassagou militia;</td>
<td>unemployment and poverty;collaboration between SDS, authorities and population;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Killings, kidnapping of people;increase in armed banditry;theft of animals, looting and destruction of villages and fields;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Populations (62 681)</strong></td>
<td>**Precarious security situation:**attacks on the roads;presence of permanent SDS in the municipality;presence of Fulani and Dogon self-defense militias;armed banditry;</td>
<td>Relatively tense social environment:land disputes,conflict over resourcesconflict between the Fulani and Dogon communities;conflicts between self-defense groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>Security Situation</td>
<td>Social Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ouenkoro      | Degraded but improving security situation:  
Presence of permanent SDS with a military base;  
Presence of the Fulani and Dogon self-defense militias (Dozo hunters);  
Sporadic attacks, cattle thefts; | Relatively tense social environment:  
Inter-community conflict between Fulani and Dogon;  
Tensions linked to the action of extremist groups;  
Growing distrust between communities;  
Collaboration between populations, SDS and authorities exists;  
Displacement of populations; |
| Pignari Bana  | Critical Security situation:  
Non-permanent presence of the SDS in the municipality;  
Presence of Dogon self-defense militias (Dozo hunters);  
Training of self-defense militias (by young people from the municipality);  
Destruction of fields, theft of cattle;  
Kidnapping of people;  
Laying of anti-personnel mines on municipal roads and roads;  
Targeted murders and assassinations;  
Armed banditry | Very tense social environment:  
Difficulties of the populations to go to cultivate;  
Destruction of water dams built by communities for market gardening;  
Tensions between communities due to the destruction of property;  
Conflict between farmers and ranchers;  
Very degraded social cohesion; the Fulani and Dogon communities neither speak nor sell goods in certain villages; In others, however, the two ethnic groups collaborate;  
Collaboration between communities, DFS and authorities exists but remains limited and is insufficient; |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Security Situation</th>
<th>Social Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sangha        | Degraded security situation:  
                      No permanent presence of SDS  
                      Presence of self-defense militias (Dan Na Ambassagou);  
                      Looting, burning of villages, destruction of hamlets; cattle theft;  
                      Kidnapping, targeted murders and assassinations;  
                      Armed banditry;  
                      Difficulties in traveling to other towns or villages due to the attacks;  
                      Strong circulation of firearms; | Tense social environment:  
                      Inter-community conflict between farmers and ranchers;  
                      Religious conflict;  
                      Inter-community conflict between Fulani and Dogon;  
                      Lack of collaboration between Fulani and Dogons;  
                      Lack of collaboration between communities and SDS due to the absence of SDS;  
                      Village fairs are down or not functional;  
                      Psychosis among populations aroused by the fear of being attacked by the other community;  
                      Schools closed, school children were killed on their way to class;  
                      Markets less and less frequented  
                      Poor functioning of health structures; |
| Yoro          | Degraded security situation  
                      No permanent presence of SDS; SDS patrols;  
                      No self-defense militias but the young people of the municipality are organized to ensure the security of the populations;  
                      Looting, burning of villages, destruction of hamlets; cattle theft;  
                      Attacks by extremist groups | Relatively tense social environment:  
                      Acceptable collaboration between communities;  
                      Collaboration with SDS and authorities also good;  
                      Displacement of populations towards cities; |
## Annex 3: % of respondents affirming the commission of violence in target municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Annexe</th>
<th>Assassinations</th>
<th>Executions of people</th>
<th>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</th>
<th>Massacres or mass persecutions</th>
<th>Sexual violence (rapes)</th>
<th>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</th>
<th>Destruction of villages or cities</th>
<th>Improper imprisonment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Executions of people</td>
<td>Kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people</td>
<td>Massacres or mass persecutions</td>
<td>Sexual violence (rapes)</td>
<td>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</td>
<td>Destruction of villages or cities</td>
<td>Improper imprisonment</td>
<td>Communes</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>Pignari Bana Sangha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Sangha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Yoro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>Executions of people</td>
<td>Massacres or mass persecutions</td>
<td>Kidnappings, missing or torture of people</td>
<td>Sexual violence (rapes)</td>
<td>Looting or destruction of public or private properties</td>
<td>Destruction of villages or cities</td>
<td>Improper imprisonment</td>
<td>Average severity level</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandiagara</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankass</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baye</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinangourou</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioungani</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doucombo</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koro</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourou</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouengou</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangha</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoro</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average severity level (over 5)
Annex 5: Atrocity risk factors and their indicators

1. COMMON RISK FACTORS

Risk Factor 1 Situations of armed conflict or other forms of instability
1.1 International or non-international armed conflict.
1.2 Security crisis caused by, among other factors, defection from peace agreements, armed conflict in neighboring countries, threats of external interventions or acts of terrorism.
1.3 Humanitarian crisis or emergency, including those caused by natural disasters or epidemics.
1.4 Political instability caused by abrupt or irregular regime change or transfer of power.
1.5 Political instability caused by disputes over power or growing nationalist, armed or radical opposition movements.
1.6 Political tension caused by autocratic regimes or severe political repression.
1.7 Economic instability caused by scarcity of resources or disputes over their use or exploitation.
1.8 Economic instability caused by severe crisis in the national economy.
1.9 Economic instability caused by acute poverty, mass unemployment or deep horizontal inequalities.
1.10 Social instability caused by resistance to or mass protests against State authority or policies.
1.11 Social instability caused by exclusion or tensions based on identity issues, their perception or extremist forms.

Risk Factor 2 Record of serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law
2.1 Past or present serious restrictions to or violations of international human rights and humanitarian law, particularly if assuming an early pattern of conduct and if targeting protected groups, populations or individuals.
2.2Past acts of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes or their incitement.
2.3 Policy or practice of impunity for or tolerance of serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law, of atrocity crimes, or of their incitement.
2.4 Inaction, reluctance or refusal to use all possible means to stop planned, predictable or ongoing serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law or likely atrocity crimes, or their incitement.
2.5 Continuation of support to groups accused of involvement in serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law, including atrocity crimes, or failure to condemn their actions.
2.6 Justification, biased accounts or denial of serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law or atrocity crimes.
2.7 Politicization or absence of reconciliation or transitional justice processes following conflict.
2.8 Widespread mistrust in State institutions or among different groups as a result of impunity.

Risk Factor 3 Weakness of State structures
3.1 National legal framework that does not offer ample and effective protection, including through ratification and domestication of relevant international human rights and humanitarian law treaties.
3.2 National institutions, particularly judicial, law enforcement and human rights institutions that lack sufficient resources, adequate representation or training.
3.3 Lack of an independent and impartial judiciary.
3.4 Lack of effective civilian control of security forces.
3.5 High levels of corruption or poor governance.
3.6 Absence or inadequate external or internal mechanisms of oversight and accountability, including those where victims can seek recourse for their claims.
3.7 Lack of awareness of and training on international human rights and humanitarian law to military forces, irregular forces and non-State armed groups, or other relevant actors.
3.8 Lack of capacity to ensure that means and methods of warfare comply with international humanitarian law standards.
3.9 Lack of resources for reform or institution-building, including through regional or international support.
3.10 Insufficient resources to implement overall measures aimed at protecting populations.

Risk Factor 4 Motives or incentives
4.1 Political motives, particularly those aimed at the attainment or consolidation of power.
4.2 Economic interests, including those based on the safeguard and well-being of elites or identity groups, or control over the distribution of resources.
4.3 Strategic or military interests, including those based on protection or seizure of territory and resources.
4.4 Other interests, including those aimed at rendering an area homogeneous in its identity.
4.5 Real or perceived threats posed by protected groups, populations or individuals, against interests or objectives of perpetrators, including perceptions of disloyalty to a cause.
4.6 Real or perceived membership of or support for armed opposition groups, by protected groups, populations or individuals.
4.7 Ideologies based on the supremacy of a certain identity or on extremist versions of identity.
4.8 Politicization of past grievances, tensions or impunity.
4.9 Social trauma caused by past incidents of violence not adequately addressed and that produced feelings of loss, displacement, injustice and a possible desire for revenge.

**Risk Factor 5 Capacity to commit atrocity crimes**
5.1 Availability of personnel and of arms and ammunition, or of the financial resources, public or private, for their procurement.
5.2 Capacity to transport and deploy personnel and to transport and distribute arms and ammunition.
5.3 Capacity to encourage or recruit large numbers of supporters from populations or groups, and availability of the means to mobilize them.
5.4 Strong culture of obedience to authority and group conformity.
5.5 Presence of or links with other armed forces or with non-State armed groups.
5.6 Presence of commercial actors or companies that can serve as enablers by providing goods, services, or other forms of practical or technical support that help sustain perpetrators.
5.7 Financial, political or other support of influential or wealthy national actors.
5.8 Armed, financial, logistic, training or other support of external actors, including States, international or regional organizations, private companies, or others.

**Risk Factor 6 Absence of mitigating factors**
6.1 Limited or lack of empowerment processes, resources, allies or other elements that could contribute to the ability of protected groups, populations or individuals to protect themselves.
6.2 Lack of a strong, organized and representative national civil society and of a free, diverse and independent national media.
6.3 Lack of interest and focus of international civil society actors or of access to international media.
6.4 Lack of or limited presence of the United Nations, INGOs or other international or regional actors in the country and with access to populations.
6.5 Lack of membership and effective participation of the State in international or regional organizations that establish mandatory membership obligations.
6.6 Lack of exposure, openness or establishment of political or economic relations with other States or organizations.
6.7 Limited cooperation of the State with international and regional human rights mechanisms.
6.8 Lack of incentives or willingness of parties to a conflict to engage in dialogue, make concessions and receive support from the international community.
6.9 Lack of interest, reluctance or failure of United Nations Member States or international or regional organizations to support a State to exercise its responsibility to protect populations from atrocity crimes, or to take action when the State manifestly fails that responsibility.
6.10 Lack of support by neighbouring States to protect populations at risk and in need of refuge, including by closure of borders, forced repatriation or aid restrictions.
6.11 Lack of an early warning mechanism relevant to the prevention of atrocity crimes.

**Risk Factor 7 Enabling circumstances or preparatory action**
7.1 Imposition of emergency laws or extraordinary security measures that erode fundamental rights.
7.2 Suspension of or interference with vital State institutions, or measures that result in changes in their composition or balance of power, particularly if this results in the exclusion or lack of representation of protected groups.
7.3 Strengthening of the security apparatus, its reorganization or mobilization against protected groups, populations or individuals.
7.4 Acquisition of large quantities of arms and ammunition or of other objects that could be used to inflict harm.
7.5 Creation of, or increased support to, militia or paramilitary groups.
7.6 Imposition of strict control on the use of communication channels, or banning access to them.
7.7 Expulsion or refusal to allow the presence of NGOs, international organizations, media or other relevant actors, or imposition of severe restrictions on their services and movements.
7.8 Increased violations of the right to life, physical integrity, liberty or security of members of protected groups, populations or individuals, or recent adoption of measures or legislation that affect or deliberately discriminate against them.
7.9 Increased serious acts of violence against women and children, or creation of conditions that facilitate acts of sexual violence against those groups, including as a tool of terror.
7.10 Imposition of life-threatening living conditions or the deportation, seizure, collection, segregation, evacuation, or forced displacement or transfer of protected groups, populations or individuals to camps, rural areas, ghettos or other assigned locations.
7.11 Destruction or plundering of essential goods or installations for protected groups, populations or individuals, or of property related to cultural and religious identity.
7.12 Marking of people or their property based on affiliation to a group.
7.13 Increased politicization of identity, past events or motives to engage in violence.
7.14 Increased inflammatory rhetoric, propaganda campaigns or hate speech targeting protected groups, populations or individuals.

**Risk Factor 8 Triggering factors**
8.1 Sudden deployment of security forces or commencement of armed hostilities.
8.2 Spillover of armed conflicts or serious tensions in neighbouring countries.
8.3 Measures taken by the international community perceived as threatening to a State’s sovereignty.
8.4 Abrupt or irregular regime changes, transfers of power, or changes in political power of groups.
8.5 Attacks against the life, physical integrity, liberty or security of leaders, prominent individuals or members of opposing groups. Other serious acts of violence, such as terrorist attacks.
8.6 Religious events or real or perceived acts of religious intolerance or disrespect, including outside national borders.
8.7 Acts of incitement or hate propaganda targeting particular groups or individuals.
8.8 Census, elections, pivotal activities related to those processes, or measures that destabilize them.
8.9 Sudden changes that affect the economy or the workforce, including as a result of financial crises, natural disasters or epidemics.
8.10 Discovery of natural resources or launching of exploitation projects that have a serious impact on the livelihoods and sustainability of groups or civilian populations.
8.11 Commemoration events of past crimes or of traumatic or historical episodes that can exacerbate tensions between groups, including the glorification of perpetrators of atrocities.
8.12 Acts related to accountability processes, particularly when perceived as unfair.

2. SPECIFIC RISK FACTORS

2.1 Genocide

**Risk Factor 9 Intergroup tensions or patterns of discrimination against protected groups**
9.1 Past or present serious discriminatory, segregational, restrictive or exclusionary practices, policies or legislation against protected groups.
9.2 Denial of the existence of protected groups or of recognition of elements of their identity.
9.3 History of atrocity crimes committed with impunity against protected groups.
9.4 Past or present serious tensions or conflicts between protected groups or with the State, with regards to access to rights and resources, socioeconomic disparities, participation in decision making processes, security, expressions of group identity or to perceptions about the targeted group.
9.5 Past or present serious tensions or conflicts involving other types of groups (political, social, cultural, geographical, etc.) that could develop along national, ethnical, racial or religious lines.
9.6 Lack of national mechanisms or initiatives to deal with identity-based tensions or conflict.

**Risk Factor 10 Signs of an intent to destroy in whole or in part a protected group**
10.1 Official documents, political manifests, media records, or any other documentation through which a direct intent, or incitement, to target a protected group is revealed, or can be inferred in a way that the implicit message could reasonably lead to acts of destruction against that group.
10.2 Targeted physical elimination, rapid or gradual, of members of a protected group, including only selected parts of it, which could bring about the destruction of the group.
10.3 Widespread or systematic discriminatory or targeted practices or violence against the lives, freedom or physical and moral integrity of a protected group, even if not yet reaching the level of elimination.
10.4 Development of policies or measures that seriously affect the reproductive rights of women, or that contemplate the separation or forcible transfer of children belonging to protected groups.
10.5 Resort to methods or practices of violence that are particularly harmful against or that dehumanize a protected group, that reveal an intention to cause humiliation, fear or terror to fragment the group, or that reveal an intention to change its identity.
10.6 Resort to means of violence that are particularly harmful or prohibited under international law, including prohibited weapons, against a protected group.
10.7 Expressions of public euphoria at having control over a protected group and its existence.
10.8 Attacks against or destruction of homes, farms, businesses or other livelihoods of a protected group and/or of their cultural or religious symbols and property.

2.2 Crimes against humanity
Risk Factor 11 Signs of a widespread or systematic attack against any civilian population
11.1 Signs of patterns of violence against civilian populations, or against members of an identifiable group, their property, livelihoods and cultural or religious symbols.
11.2 Increase in the number of civilian populations or the geographical area targeted, or in the number, types, scale or gravity of violent acts committed against civilian populations.
11.3 Increase in the level of organization or coordination of violent acts and weapons used against a civilian population.
11.4 Use of the media or other means to provoke or incite to violent acts.
11.5 Signs of a plan or policy to conduct attacks against civilian populations.
11.6 Establishment of new political or military structures that could be used to commit violent acts.
11.7 Access to or increasing use of significant public or private resources for military or belligerent action, including the acquisition of large quantities of weaponry or other instruments that can cause death or serious harm.
11.8 Signs of development or increased use of means or methods of violence that are incapable of distinguishing between civilian and military targets or that are capable of mass destruction, persecution or weakening of communities.

Risk Factor 12 Signs of a plan or policy to attack any civilian population
12.1 Official documents, political manifests, media records, or any other documentation through which the existence of a State or organizational plan or policy to target civilian populations or protected groups is directly revealed, or could be inferred.
12.2 Adoption of discriminatory security procedures against different groups of the civilian population.
12.3 Adoption of measures that result in the alteration of the ethnic, religious, racial or political composition of the overall population, including in defined geographical areas.
12.4 Establishment of parallel institutions or autonomous political or military structures, or organization of a network of potential perpetrators belonging to a specific ethnic, religious, national, racial or political group.
12.5 Preparation and use of significant public or private resources, whether military or other kinds.
12.6 Access to and use of weaponry or other instruments not easily obtained inside the country.
12.7 Preparation or mobilization of armed forces en masse against civilian populations.
12.8 Facilitating or inciting violence against the civilian population or protected groups, or tolerance or deliberate failure to take action, with the aim of encouraging violent acts.
12.9 Widespread or systematic violence against civilian populations or protected groups, including only parts of them, as well as on their livelihoods, property or cultural manifestations.
12.10 Involvement of State institutions or high-level political or military authorities in violent acts.

2.3 War crimes

Risk Factor 13 Serious threats to those protected under international humanitarian law
13.1 Fragmentation of parties to the conflict or disintegration or absence of chains of command within them.
13.2 Mistrust between opposing parties based on past or present breaches of commitments or agreements.
13.3 Increased radicalization or extremism of opposing parties within a conflict.
13.4 Promotion of ethnicity or religion as a determinant of national allegiance or allegiance to a party of the conflict.
13.5 Conduct that dehumanizes the enemy or particular groups within the population, or that exhibits disrespect for their religious, ethnic or, in general, cultural traditions, morals and values, objects or institutions.
13.6 Adoption of measures that severely curtail the rights of those protected under international humanitarian law, including those aligned or perceived as aligned with opposing parties but not taking active part in hostilities.
13.7 Evidence of plans or discourse which reveals a threat of or incitement to violence against those protected under international humanitarian law, including as a means to spread terror, intimidate, demoralize, show military strength, provoke displacement, or as preliminary to further violence.
13.8 Evidence of conduct interfering with or impeding delivery or access to supplies, facilities, equipment, objects or medical or humanitarian support indispensable to the survival of those protected under international humanitarian law.
13.9 Evidence of preparation of personnel and logistics enabling the transportation, movement or confinement of large numbers of people, or the conducting of medical experiments.
13.10 Evidence of conduct related to the planning, development, production, storage, acquisition, availability or threat of use of weapons, projectiles, materials or substances which are by their nature indiscriminate or cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering to people, or that can cause widespread, long-term and severe damage to the natural environment.
13.11 Refusal to allow inspections by competent and independent bodies into allegations of conduct included in point 13.10, or action to stop such conduct.
13.12 Refusal to acknowledge detentions or places of detention or to allow visits by delegates of the International Committee of the Red Cross.
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13.13 Issuance of rules of engagement or legislation that allow the disproportionate or indiscriminate use of force, or failure to take action to avoid launching such attacks or to conduct military operations in heavily populated areas or to non-military targets.

13.14 Increase in the number of any of the attacks or operations mentioned in point 13.13.

13.15 Use of methods of warfare that reveal treachery, including taking advantage of the symbols or emblems of humanitarian or peacekeeping personnel, or not wearing uniforms or distinctive combat gear to portray combatants as civilians.

13.16 Threats or appropriation, seizure, pillaging or intentional destruction or damage of civilian objects or property that belong, represent or are part of the cultural, social or religious identity of those protected under international humanitarian law, unless used for military purposes.

13.17 Threats or orders of warfare without concessions or where there would be no survivors.

13.18 Conduct that threatens the rule of law or any other measures that limit protection of the rights to life and physical integrity afforded by applicable international humanitarian law, including denial of its applicability.

**Risk Factor 14 Serious threats to humanitarian or peacekeeping operations**

14.1 Perceptions of partiality or political interference by humanitarian or peacekeeping operations, their members, the broader international community, international, regional or national organizations, individual countries, or others sponsoring or participating in the operations.

14.2 Increase in identity-based conflicts and perceptions about humanitarian or peacekeeping operations as associated with the opponent or as an obstacle to plans of elimination, marginalization or displacement.

14.3 Increased intensity of the conflict and scarcity of livelihoods or other resources.

14.4 Fragmentation of parties to the conflict or disintegration of chains of command within them.

14.5 Interference, limitation or prohibition of access or movement of humanitarian or peacekeeping operations or their personnel.

14.6 Tampering with or removal of signs identifying protected objects or locations where humanitarian or peacekeeping operations are stationed or providing support.

14.7 Incidents of improper use of a flag of truce, of the flag or of the military insignia and uniform of the United Nations and the distinctive emblems of the Geneva Conventions.

14.8 Attacks against locations in close proximity to humanitarian or peacekeeping operations and personnel, or on the routes taken by them during their activities.

14.9 Discourse or evidence of plans that suggest a threat, or the incitement or tolerance of acts of violence against humanitarian or peacekeeping operations and personnel.

14.10 Disrespect, threats or increase in attacks to objects, property or persons using the distinctive emblems of the Geneva Conventions or of other humanitarian or peacekeeping operations.
**Annex 6: Data collection tools**

**Questionnaire**

Dated: /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/__/

Region: ........................................

Prefecture: ....................................

Municipality: ............................... 

Location: ...................................

Surname and first name of respondent:

__________________________________________

Age of respondent: / ____ / ___ / years

Marital status of respondent:

__________________________________________

Gender of respondent: H □ F □

Profession of respondent: .................................................................

Educational level: .................................................................

Consent: Yes □ No □

I. Atrocities and violence committed in target communities

1. Are there acts of violence or atrocities which are committed in your municipality? 1 = Yes 0 = No

2. What types of acts of violence are there? A = Murder / Assassination B = Execution of people C = Kidnapping or disappearance or torture of people D = Massacre or mass persecution E = Sexual violence (Rape) F = Pillage / destruction of public or private property G = Destruction of villages or cities H = Improper imprisonment X = Other violence to be specified ..................................

3. Which of these acts of violence have been observed in the last 6 months in your municipality? A = Murder / Assassination B = Execution of people C = Kidnapping or disappearance or torture of people D = Massacre or mass persecution E = Sexual violence (rape) F = Pillage / destruction of public or private property G = Destruction of villages or cities H = Improper imprisonment X = Other violence to be specified ..................................

4. In your municipalities, are there groups of people who are exterminated or destroyed because of their language, race, nationality or religion? 1 = Yes 0 = No

4a. What groups are these? .................................................................

5. In your municipality are there people or groups of people who are deported, or forced to move for any reason whatsoever? 1 = Yes 0 = No

5a. What groups or types of people are these? .................................................................

II. Sharing conflict information

6. Do members of your community, local authorities or community leaders regularly perform participatory conflict analyzes to prevent violence and atrocities in your community? 1 = Yes 0 = No

7. If yes, have you already received the information from these participatory risk and conflict analyzes? 1 = Yes 0 = No

8. If yes, do you think that sharing this information has helped to prevent violence and atrocities within your municipality? 1 = Yes 0 = No

9. Do you think that on the whole you have access to verified and conflict-sensitive information in your municipality? 1 = Yes 0 = No
III. Activities related to the project
10. Are you aware of participatory theater activities carried out in your municipality? 1 = Yes 0 = No
11. What organizations have carried out these participatory theater activities? ………………………
12. If yes, did you participate? 1 = Yes 0 = No
13. If yes, do you think that these participative theaters have changed your perception and attitudes towards violence and atrocities? 1 = Yes 0 = No
14. If yes, explain how? ………………………………………………………………
15. If No, why? ………………………………………………………………
16. Do you trust state institutions to punish the perpetrators of violence and atrocities? 1 = Yes 2 = No

Interview’s Guide
Prefecture
Commune of Bandiagara
Commune of Bankass
Commune of Koro
5. Information on Focus Group participants
People targeted during the Focus Group
Age group of participants
6. Consent
Do you agree to answer the questions that will be asked of your municipality?
Do you agree to accept that these interviews are recorded to facilitate note taking?
7. The security context
1. Can you describe the state of the security situation in your municipality?
2. In your opinion, are the people and their property safe? Explain.
3. By whom is the security of populations ensured in your municipality? Are the armed forces present permanently or occasionally? Explain.
4. Are there armed groups or self-defense groups in your municipality? If so, can you name them?
8. Conflict dynamics
1. In your opinion, what are the existing conflicts in your municipality?
2. What are the root causes of these conflicts?
3. What are the recent causes of these conflicts?
4. Who are the actors in these conflicts?
5. Do conflict actors tend to find common ground or do they tend to stick to their positions and radicalize?
6. What are the consequences of conflicts?
7. What is your assessment of the relationship between the communities living in your municipality?
8. What is the state of collaboration between SDFs, local authorities and community members?
9. In your opinion, who are the actors who play a decisive role in favor of social cohesion in your municipality?
9. Connection and division factors within communities
1. System and Institution
1.a In your opinion, what, in the policy of the State (laws, social services, economic opportunities, etc.), can bring together the members of the communities of your municipality?
1.b Are there elements in government policy or in the current system of state institutions which help to divide the communities and actors in your municipality?
2. Attitudes and actions
2.a What do you think are the actions and attitudes of the actors and members of the communities that contribute to building trust and collaboration between them?
2.b What do you think are the actions and attitudes of the actors and members of the communities that divide them?
3. Values, myth and interests
3.a Are there beliefs, attitudes or practices among community members and actors (SDS and local authorities) who are likely to bring them together or strengthen collaboration?
3.b What are the beliefs and practices that divide them?
4. Past stories and experiences
4.a Are there facts or events in the past and common history of the people living and actors present in this municipality who are likely to bring them together?

4.b What are the facts or past events common to the members of the communities and the actors (FDS and authorities) of this municipality which contribute to divide them?

5. Symbols and Culture

5.a What are the cultural elements (music, festivities, rituals or places) that are likely to bring communities together and encourage collaboration with the actors?

5.b What are the cultural elements (music, festivities, rituals or places) that divide them?


1. In your opinion, what types of violence and atrocities have been committed in your municipality?

2. Do you have any idea on the number of atrocities committed in the municipality during the last six (06) months?

3.a Murders / Assassinations

3.a.1. Have Murders / Assassinations already been committed in your municipality?

3.a.2. In what context were these Murders / Assassinations committed?

3.a.3. Have these Murders / Assassinations been committed in the last six (06) months?

3.a.4. Who are the alleged perpetrators of these Murders / Assassinations?

3.a.5. On a scale of 1 to 3, how would you rate the severity of this violence?

3.b Execution of people

3.b.1. Have executions of people already been committed in your municipality?

3.b.2. In what context were these executions of people committed?

3.b.3. Have these executions of people been committed in the last six (06) months?

3.b.4. Who are the alleged perpetrators of these executions of people?

3.b.5. On a scale of 1 to 3, how would you rate the severity of these executions?

3.c Abduction or disappearance or torture of persons

3.c.1. Have kidnappings, disappearances or torture of persons already been committed in your municipality?

3.c.2. In what context were these kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people committed?

3.c.3. Have these kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people been committed in the last six (06) months?

3.c.4. Who are the alleged perpetrators of these kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people?

3.c.5. On a scale of 1 to 3, how would you rate the seriousness of these kidnappings, disappearances or torture of people?

Community

3.d. Massacre or persecution de masse

3.d.1. Have these massacres or mass persecution already been committed in your municipality?

3.d.2. In what context were these massacres or mass persecution committed?

3.d.3. Have these massacres or mass persecution been committed in the last six (06) months?

3.d.4. Who are the alleged perpetrators of these massacres and mass persecution?

3.d.5. On a scale of 1 to 3, how would you describe the seriousness of these massacres and mass persecution?

3.e. Sexual violence (Rape)

3.e.1. Have rapes or other sexual violence been committed in your municipality?

3.e.2. In what context were these rapes and other sexual violence committed?

3.e.3. Have these rapes and other sexual violence been committed in the last six (06) months?

3.e.4. Who are the alleged perpetrators of these rapes and other sexual violence?

3.e.5. On a scale of 1 to 3, how would you rate the seriousness of this rape and other violence?

3.f. Looting / destruction of public or private property

3.f.1. Have looting / destruction of public or private property already been committed in your municipality?

3.f.2. In what context were these looting and destruction of property committed?

3.f.3. Has this looting and destruction of property been committed in the last six (06) months?

3.f.4. Who are the alleged perpetrators of this looting and destruction of property?

3.f.5. On a scale of 1 to 3, how would you rate the seriousness of this looting and destruction of property?

3.g. Destruction of villages or towns

3.g.1. Has destruction of villages or cities already been committed in your municipality?

3.g.2. In what context were these destructions of villages or towns committed?

3.g.3. Have these destructions of villages or towns been committed in the last six (06) months?

3.g.4. Who are the alleged perpetrators of this destruction of villages and cities?

3.g.5. On a scale of 1 to 3, how would you describe the severity of this destruction of villages or cities?

3.h. Improper imprisonment

3.h.1. Have improper imprisomnents already been committed in your municipality?
3.h.2. In what context were these abusive imprisonments committed?
3.h.3. Have these abusive imprisonments been committed in the last six (06) months?
3.h.4. Who are the alleged perpetrators of these improper imprisonments?
3.h.5. On a scale of 1 to 3, how would you describe the seriousness of these abusive imprisonments?
4. Are investigations being opened to bring the perpetrators of this violence and atrocities to justice? Explain.
5. In your opinion, what are the root causes of this violence and atrocities?
6. In your opinion, what are the recent causes of this violence and atrocities?
7. Does this violence relate to a history linked to identity conflicts or to events that have occurred in the past?
8. What were the triggers for the violence?
9. Were there warning signs (warning signs) of this violence or atrocities? If yes, what were they?
5. Risk factors for atrocities and mitigating factors
1. Are there people in your municipality who are excluded or in conflict because of their identity or the way they are perceived by others? If so why?
2. What are the consequences of this exclusion or these tensions on social cohesion in your municipality?
3. In your opinion, is the justice impartial and independent? Explain.
4. Do you trust state institutions to punish the perpetrators of violence and atrocities? Explain?
5. Do you think that the State has the necessary resources (material, financial, military, political) to protect the populations? Explain.
6. Are the tensions, violence and impunity that community members face subject to recovery by politicians or local elected officials? If yes, explain.
7. Is this violence and atrocities supported by funding from influential or wealthy people? If yes, explain
8. Are there acts of propaganda, incitement to violence or hate messages directed against a group or individuals circulating in your municipality? Explain.
9. Do you think that perpetrators of violence are using more and more means and methods which are unable to distinguish between civilians and military and who are capable of mass destruction, persecution or weakening of communities? If yes, explain.
10. In your opinion, have the proliferation of weapons and other instruments contributed to the increase in violence and atrocities in your municipality? Explain.
11. In your opinion, what are the factors (attitudes, actions, mechanisms, etc.) that can mitigate the risks of violence and atrocities?
12. Does your municipality have an early warning mechanism for the prevention of violence and atrocities? If yes, is this mechanism functional? Explain.
13. What do you think are the areas to improve to better prevent violence and atrocities?
14. In your opinion, can radios play a role in the prevention of violence and atrocities? If yes, how?
15. In your opinion, how can a framework of collaboration between SDF and communities help to prevent this violence and atrocities?
5. VI. Recommendations
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