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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>Search For Common Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO / NGO</td>
<td>International / Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Insider Mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Community Resolution Committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The Cooperative Communities project is an initiative to re-establish trust between communities and local governance structures, through inclusive dialogue and cooperative action aiming at enabling communities to advance active governance structures to revitalise social services, public order, and the local economy. The project was funded by the Government of the Netherlands and implemented by Search for Common Ground-Yemen (Search-Yemen) in three districts in the governorates of Lahj, Abyan, and Aden. This report presents the findings of the final evaluation conducted from January through March 2020 documenting achievements of the expected results and lessons learned, and to assess the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of the implemented project. A mixed-method approach of quantitative and qualitative data collection tools were used to gather the required information. The tools constitute a community members survey to collect the information from community members who benefited from, or became aware of the interventions implemented by the project, and Key Informant Interviews (KIIIs) with targeted community leaders, and local authorities who approved and contributed to designing the interventions. This was in addition to KIIIs that were conducted with the insider mediators (IMs) who led the process of the conflict scans and managed the community dialogues.

This final evaluation was conducted internally by Search’s monitoring and evaluation team in Yemen with the support of Search’s implementing partners in the targeted governorates for the data collection. Furthermore, this evaluation was conducted with limited financial resources and with time limitations as some of the interventions were still ongoing during the time of data collection. This prevented the process from covering all of the governorates for the community members survey, and community leader and local authority KIIIs, where Abyan was excluded. However, the team managed to conduct IM KIIIs for all the three governorates. For this evaluation activity, a total of 47 individuals were interviewed, 25 men and 22 women, securing 47% of women participation.
● **Relevance**

The project activities and interventions were considered to be of high relevance to target communities. This was manifested in three key areas, as outlined by targeted communities: (i) building the capacity of IMs to conduct conflict scans and design dialogue processes; (ii) actively engaging community leaders and local authorities in dialogue processes to resolve local conflicts; and (iii) implementing community interventions recommended during community dialogues, which met the community’s needs and concerns. All of the community members in the sample size, which was 20, believed that this project responded to the different community members’ needs, including women, young men and women, IDPs, and marginalised groups. Furthermore, 65% of respondents directly benefited from at least one intervention, and all of the community leader and local authority KII participants highlighted how the project was successful in meeting emerging community needs. The majority of IMs who participated in this study revealed that their experience with mediation helped them to acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to support their communities in conflict resolution. Furthermore, the project activities provided interesting new experiences that enabled them to hold essential roles in supporting their own communities. Nevertheless, IMs mentioned some challenges, most importantly in bringing together conflict parties into discussion and in covering large numbers of conflict cases during the scans.

● **Effectiveness**

According to the evaluation findings, the project supported target communities in reducing active conflicts caused by lack of basic services. The project also managed to effectively facilitate the involvement of local authorities and residents in a two-way communication process to serve the identification and solving of local conflicts and related needs. Additionally, community members mentioned that the project was effective in creating trust-building connections between local authorities and community members, especially through the dialogue processes.
Concurrently, all the surveyed community members indicated the importance of having Community Resolution Committees (CRCs) in their communities, because, according to them, these CRCs create needed linkages between their communities and respective local authorities. In addition, CRCs play a vital role in monitoring the implementation of interventions, keeping track of community needs, and raising them to the concerned authorities and offices, as the CRCs members are often influential given their position in the community and/or include members from a local council. According to the 10 surveyed community leaders and local authority members, this project empowered different groups, including women, men, youth, IDPs, and marginalised groups to raise their concerns through the conflict scans and discuss them in the dialogue process. This was in addition to the positive role this project played through different interventions to resolve a number of conflicts in the communities and mitigate their adverse impact, which was often due to a lack of services. The 17 IMs who participated in the study reached the consensus that CRCs provide more practical ways for community members to communicate about local disputes, as they bring people together, which in turn supports the resolution of conflicts, and helps community members connect with local authorities. Furthermore, 88% of the IMs believe in the ability of CRCs to solve and prevent community conflicts and 76% of the IMs think that community members have a high or very high level of trust in the CRCs to support resolving local disputes.

- **Sustainability**

Participants in the community members' survey showed low levels of optimism towards the sustainability of the current interventions implemented during the project; only 13% think that the current interventions will be maintained over a longer period of time. However, all respondents believe that CRCs could have an essential role in monitoring and maintaining interventions, thereby supporting the communities to improve their stability. While all the community leaders and local authorities believe that the project could be sustainable with longer term impact if community members, local councils, and local authorities cooperated to support
maintaining the current interventions especially if communities have increased awareness about collective practices that help to maintain physical project outcomes. The IMs identified that sustainability could be maintained through supporting the CRCs, so that they can continue their work of solving local community issues; meeting community needs through fostering cooperation between local councils and local authorities; listening to communities’ issues and concerns and handling them with high credibility; keeping neutral when handling conflicts; and continuing to offer financial support.

1. Background Information

1.1 Introduction

Entering its 6th year, the Yemen civil war has killed thousands of Yemenis, including civilians as well as combatants, and has significantly damaged the country’s infrastructure. The Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) currently records more than 100,000 reported fatalities in Yemen since 2015, including over 12,000 civilians killed in direct attacks. According to UNHCR, Yemen remains the worst humanitarian crisis worldwide, with more than 80% of the population requiring some form of assistance, 20 million facing food insecurity, 14 million requiring urgent humanitarian intervention, and an estimated 3.6 million people displaced in-country.¹ Prior to the current war, tensions existed between different tribal groups, political parties, and between North and South Yemen.² However, Yemen’s national conflict is further straining relationships within communities, entrenching divisions along pre-existing lines while also creating new lines of division.

¹ https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Humanitarian%20Update%20%203_Final_0.pdf
1.2 Overview of the Project

The Cooperative Communities project was an initiative to re-establish trust between communities and local governance structures, through inclusive dialogue and cooperative action to enable communities to advance effective governance structures to revitalise social services, public order, and the local economy. The overall goal of this 16-month initiative was to support inclusive and accountable local level governance structures in Abyan, Aden, and Lahj (one district per governorate, total three districts). This will be achieved through two specific objectives:

1. Empower communities and governance structures to constructively address conflict through the use of locally-led dialogue processes.
2. Increase trust between local communities and governance structures through inclusive and participatory decision-making mechanisms.

This project was designed to leverage Search’s Community Dialogue Approach (CDA), engaging local communities and targeted stakeholders (e.g. municipal government representatives, tribal and religious leaders, and other “social dignitaries” – informal leaders such as prominent businesspersons, educators, and civil society advocates) to identify local trusted actors from within the community to act as IMs. IMs were empowered to lead community-focused stabilisation activities through Search’s capacity-building training on topics such as conducting conflict scans, designing community dialogue processes, and effective facilitation skills. Through Search’s CDA approach, IMs obtained the skills and experience to enable them to work closely with governance structures to build inclusive and accountable governance processes, build trust between both parties, and resolve local-level conflicts using non-violent means. Following the workshops, IMs and governance actors led inclusive community dialogue processes to identify and prioritise conflict issues at the local level and develop action plans for community initiatives to resolve identified issues in collaboration with local governance structures to establish a precedent of positive interaction.
Additionally, sustainable mechanisms for continued cooperation and inclusive decision-making processes have been instituted to ensure the long-term impact of this initiative.

The project had seven major activities, as follows:

1. Mapping exercise to identify strong local partners to implement activities.
2. IM selection and capacity building on conflict analysis, mediation, and dialogue design and facilitation.
3. Conflict scans to identify key local conflict drivers.
4. Local Level Dialogue Processes to strengthen non-violent conflict resolution processes and improve social cohesion.
5. Implementing community initiatives that address conflicts identified during the dialogue processes.
6. Cooperative Community Committees to strengthen Information-sharing between governing bodies and constituents.
7. Cooperative Community Summits to strengthen cooperation across different communities and local governance actors.
1.3 Evaluation Objective

This evaluation was conducted internally to evaluate the project’s performance in terms of achieving its objectives and expected results by evaluating, from a community perspective, the contribution of the community interventions in improving local peacebuilding processes. Furthermore, the evaluation will aid in understanding and learning from successes and challenges encountered during the realisation of the project, and will document lessons learned, draw conclusions, and make recommendations for the improvement of project management related to local governance programmes.

1.4. Evaluation Criteria and Key Evaluation Questions

The purpose of the evaluation is to conduct a contribution research to provide an assessment on the added value of the Search-Yemen project in targeted districts, and understand how and why the project reached the defined outcomes. The research collects different stakeholders’ perspectives on the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of the implemented project. Results of the evaluation and lessons learned will reflect on if and how the CDA prevents inter-communal conflict and promotes local social cohesion that can be replicated on a larger scale beyond this specific project. It will also reflect on Search-Yemen’s approach for similar project implementation. This internal evaluation will be formative and will specifically focus on the following three core evaluation criteria and relevant key questions:

Relevance

- How relevant are the community interventions as perceived by beneficiaries and stakeholders?
- How relevant were the project activities including (Insider Mediators Capacity Building, Responsive Governance, Conflict Scans, Project Design & Management Training, Local Level Dialogue Processes, Community Initiatives, Feedback Mechanisms, Cooperative Community Committees) to transform the conflict or the drivers of the conflict?
Effectiveness

- To what extent was the project successful in achieving its stated goal as per the outputs and outcomes in the project’s logical framework?
- From a stakeholder perspective, to what extent was the project successful in achieving its stated objective to increase trust between local communities and governance structures.
  1. Are community members willing to address local conflicts to CRCs?
  2. Are local CRCs empowered enough to prevent and respond to local conflicts?
  3. Have the needs of marginalised groups and different community groups, including Women, youth, and the elderly, etc been addressed during the community intervention phase?
- From a stakeholder perspective, to what extent was the project successful in achieving its stated objective to empower communities and governance using the CDA to address local conflicts?
  1. How were community members' needs addressed in the local dialogues? and to what extent were different community groups' needs addressed in the dialogues?
  2. Are local authorities and community leaders willing to actively contribute to the local dialogue to constructively resolve local disputes?
- To what extent and why was the project effective in providing IMs with the skills and capacities needed to enhance youths’ engagement to transform conflict without violence?
- What are the major challenges influencing the achievement of the objectives?

Sustainability

- What actions were planned or have been taken by the project’s stakeholders to create long term processes or structures that support the resolution and prevention of local conflicts?
- Have the communities been able to independently address the local conflicts and conflict drivers and respond accordingly? What makes that work in the long run?
• What could have been done differently for the project to be more sustainable in the future?

2. Methodology
This formative internal final evaluation employed mixed quantitative and qualitative methods to assess the project activities. Data collection was conducted with the support of Search-Yemen’s local implementing partners in respective governorates between the period of January 27th and March 5th, 2020.

2.1 Evaluation scope of work
The evaluation investigates principal target groups: local authorities, local community representatives and members, IMs, local council members, and women in the target governorates. As the project was still in the finalisation process and has not been completed, the evaluation sample covers only the districts where community initiatives have already started, and community CRCs have been formed. For this reason, Abyan governorate was excluded from the research, as neither the interventions nor the CRCs had been completed. The delays were caused by a fluctuating security situation, which interrupted several project activities, specifically the smooth implementation of community dialogues within the designated timeline. As a result of this, our implementing partner in Abyan was tasked with conducting the dialogues without direct physical oversight from the Search-Yemen team (solely WhatsApp and phone follow-up and guidance), before starting with the implementation of the selected interventions.

The below table indicates the districts participating in the research:
### Governerate | District | Evaluated
--- | --- | ---
Lahj | Tuban | Yes
Aden | Al Mansoura | Yes
Abyan | Lawder | No

The below table provides information on the type of interventions implemented during the project’s timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governerate</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Description of Intervention</th>
<th>Type of Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>Providing electricity fuses &amp; cables</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>Purchasing rickshaw &amp; garbage bags to collect garbage and remove it from streets</td>
<td>Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>Purchasing and installing a solar power system for a water well that provides water to population</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al Mansoura</td>
<td>Purchasing garbage containers to remove garbage from the streets of Abdulqawi neighborhood</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al Mansoura</td>
<td>Purchasing garbage containers to remove garbage from the streets of Abdulaziz neighbourhood</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al Mansoura</td>
<td>Purchasing covers for sanitation manholes in Kubota</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al Mansoura</td>
<td>Replacing an electricity cable in Aldurain</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Lawder</td>
<td>Provide materials &amp; refurbishment for Nagi School</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Lawder</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of the health unit</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Data Sources and Sample Design

The research applied the purposive sampling technique to collect the necessary information and the M&E team designed the data collection tools in consultation with our Institutional Learning Team (ILT) and Project Manager, then provided the tools to the data collection team. Paper-based questionnaires were utilised after problems were experienced with the internet connection while using KOBO forms, because the internet went out of service in Yemen during February due to damage to two offshore cables.

The sample size was determined to be very small compared to the sample size used in the baseline research, as this evaluation was conducted internally by Search with a very limited budget and timeframe. The following table presents the planned sample size when the evaluation was designed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Community members survey</th>
<th>Community leader &amp; governance actor KIIs</th>
<th>Insider Mediators KIIs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al mansoura</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Lawder</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the context of the multiple challenges mentioned before, including the limitations in budget and time, and other challenges that will be clarified later in this report, the data collection team managed to reach the following number of respondents in each governorate:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Community members survey</th>
<th>Community leader &amp; governance actor KIIls</th>
<th>Insider Mediators KIIls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>5 Men 5 Women 3 Men 2 Women 3 Men 3 Women</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al mansoura</td>
<td>5 Men 5 Women 3 Men 2 Women 3 Men 3 Women</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Lawder</td>
<td>0 Men 0 Women 0 Men 0 Women 3 Men 2 Women</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Desk Review**

The M&E team reviewed all related project documents, including the project proposal and implementation plans, already familiar to them, as the M&E team has been supporting M&E activities for the project, in addition to the monitoring reports and pre & post training tests. The desk review supported the verification of the progress of activities and documenting achievements against the project indicators.

**Community Members Survey**

The designed survey assisted in verifying and quantifying the project’s relevance, effectiveness, and the level of satisfaction among participating community members in the localities where interventions had been implemented. The survey questionnaire included questions about the types of conflicts that surveyed communities are currently experiencing and the conflicts that have been resolved, or are in the process of being resolved, and details of the interventions that contributed to these solutions. Furthermore, the survey asked the participants about the inclusivity of the interventions, whether or not they match the needs of certain vulnerable or marginalised groups in the community. Additionally, the survey addressed community members’ ability to raise issues and conflicts with the aim of solving them, and what made that possible for them, as well as their opinions of the CRCs and their perception of their effectiveness. Finally,
Community members were asked to share stories about any intervention they know of or heard about that contributed to improving their lives or other people's lives.

The survey was designed to be short and to assess the main project activities, especially intervention-related activities, according to the community members’ perspectives. The following table shows the number of community members reached in this research, disaggregated by district, gender, and residency status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>IDPs</th>
<th>Marginalised (Mohamasheen)</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansurah</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Leader and Local Authority KIs**

Short and activity-oriented KIs were employed as a qualitative tool to gather more comprehensive information regarding the project’s relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability according to community leaders and local authorities in the targeted localities. These tools targeted local authorities as well as community leaders to provide evaluative information concerning their impressions of project implementation, challenges arising, success stories, and the perceived impact of interventions on the targeted communities.

From each district, three community leaders and two local governance actors were targeted to participate in the KIs. The number of local governance actors reached was less than anticipated due to the difficulty in reaching officials within a limited timeframe. The below table shows the number of people reached in Aden and Lahj and their positions and gender:
Insider Mediator KII

As this evaluation represents an internal contribution research to feed into the programme approach, the M&E team found that the contribution of IMs was essential for reflecting on the project activities and the full process. This tool supported the IMs to reflect on their experience in mediation, and the role they played in conducting conflict scans and managing community dialogues. It aims at providing lessons learned from their experience, and identifying the challenges they faced during the whole process. Additionally, it asks them to provide suggestions to improve the mediation role and amplify the impact of the project in the targeted communities.

From each district, six IMs were required to participate in the KII, three men and three women, and the following table shows the number of IMs reached, disaggregated by district, gender, and residency status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>IDPs</th>
<th>Marginalised (Mohamasheen)</th>
<th>people</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. Study Sample Characteristics

The overall designed sample of this internal evaluation was 63 individuals: 30 women and 33 men. During the data collection, only 47 individuals were reached, of whom 22 were women, 47% of the reached sample size.

2.4 Data Analysis

Raw data was entered into a database that was designed based on the questions and the structure of the data collection tools. Quantitative data was analysed using excel sheets and supported with graphs and charts for more illustration, and qualitative data was analysed manually, divided on main themes derived by the answers provided, then main results were highlighted in the findings section.

2.5. Constraints and Limitations

The final evaluation encountered some challenges, specifically during the data collection phase, due to the following:

1. The evaluation was conducted while the project was not finalised yet in one of the governorates due to the security situation. In August 2019, clashes erupted in Abyan governorate between STC forces and GoY Forces. This deteriorating security situation caused delays in conducting community dialogues, and, consequently, in implementing the interventions. To solve this problem, Search trained the implementing partner in Abyan to conduct conflict scans and facilitate the community dialogues in order to...
proceed with the project activities. The final community interventions were still in their early stages during the data collection.

2. Budget limitations led to the evaluation being conducted internally, relying on Search’s resources only, which led to restricting the sample size and scope of the evaluation.

3. Time limitations: it was decided for the evaluation to take place while the project was still in the early stages of implementing community interventions, and while interventions had not yet started in Abyan. This timeline may affect how community members express their opinions towards the interventions, as they may think their views could affect the progress or completion of interventions. In addition, beneficiaries did not have the required time to assess the real impact of the project intervention and provide feedback based on real experience and, further to this, time limitations affected the scope of the evaluation as it did not include evaluating the impact of the project.

4. Due to poor mobile coverage in Aden and Lahj, it was hard to reach local leaders and local governance actors, and so it took more than the anticipated timeline to complete the data collection. This poor coverage also affected the M&E team’s connection with field enumerators.

5. The internet in Yemen went out of service during the data collection period, which severely affected the data collection methodology as the data collectors initially used an online data collection method (Kobo). Data collection changed to paper-based tools following the internet service shutdown, which caused delays in data collection in addition to consuming more time and effort from the M&E team to do required arrangements to shift to paper-based data collection. Also, this shifting caused the loss of some information from data collected using Kobo, and the team did not manage to reconduct data collection in the areas where data was missing.
6. The security problems and tense situation in Aden influenced people’s responses as they did not feel free to express everything they had in mind. Enumerators noticed some respondents being reserved and conservative in their feedback.

7. Enumerators reported difficulties reaching some community leaders and local governance actors due to their busy schedules, both being unable to schedule appointments for interviews and receiving negative responses to partake in research due to workload. Therefore, enumerators had to look for other members.

8. Sampling was not very representative and mainly restricted to gender and district disaggregation due to time and budget limitations, this should be enhanced to include more disaggregation to the sampling to include proportionate disaggregation based on residency status and other required disaggregation to secure more representative sampling.

9. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) were excluded from this research because of time and budget limitations. However, IMs were asked about the effectiveness of CSOs during project implementation.

3. Evaluation Findings

This section presents the evaluation results by answering the questions probed under the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of the project.
3.1. Relevance

This section discusses the extent to which the project was relevant to the priorities of the target groups in each intervention location. The evaluation findings show that the project activities and interventions were timely and technically relevant to the communities’ needs and existing issues. When compared to the results revealed in the baseline one year ago for the same project, the interventions implemented during the project were very relevant, however they did not match the most pressing issues raised during the time of the baseline. Despite this, the interventions were agreed on during the community dialogues process after conducting the conflict scans and validation workshops in respective localities.

3.1.1 Relevance of the project interventions

According to the community members, 90% of them know of at least one intervention that is currently being implemented to solve problems in their communities, and 73% of them directly benefited from these interventions. When asking the community members who solved the problems, 43% of them stated that these problems were solved, or attempts were made to solve them, by local community council members, and 30% stated that they had been solved by CSOs or NGOs. In total, 12% of respondents stated that solutions were implemented by Sheikhs and dignitaries, the same percentage applies for community members, and 2% stated that they did not know.

When asking the community leaders and local authorities, all of them were informed about the project’s interventions in their respective communities and participated in the project activities. Overall, 60% of them participated in the community dialogue process, in addition to their participation in IM selection, training targeted community council members, and their supervisory role in the intervention implementation. All respondents stated that the interventions made a positive contribution to people’s lives, and on a scale from 1 to 10, 8.7 out of 10 was given to evaluate the usefulness of the interventions in the targeted communities.
Additionally, IMs stated that interventions were relevant to community needs. However, there were a large number of unresolved disputes and community issues that still to be addressed that were unable to be considered within the scope of the project.

"What is remarkable about the electricity project in Al-Aziziyah neighbourhood, is the interaction of citizens with the electricity workers and the supervising mediators of the project, by facilitating and making their work easier, and supporting them hand in hand with the executing team of the project, which gave a spirit and a flawless work. Even they contributed in supporting the team and providing them all the needed additional things to the team; where they supplied with food and drink from their own houses, in addition they were working in building the area with the staff to relieve the pressure on the team where they shared the spirit of love for work"

- Women insider mediator, Lahj

3.1.2 Relevance of the project activities

All community members stressed the importance of this project and similar projects that aim to solve community disputes and address community issues by involving community members in conflict scan meetings and listening to their problems. Additionally, all of the participants supported the existence of the CRCs in their communities and seemed aware of their role in supporting stabilisation in their communities. They considered CRCs a linkage between their communities and local councils and authorities through which they could raise their different needs. Community leaders also indicated that community dialogues empowered vulnerable groups in the community, including women, youth, and IDPs, to raise their issues during this project.

Additionally, as reported by IMs, the training was very useful and the mediation experience equipped them with needed skills and knowledge to support their communities, and they became confident in their abilities to participate in similar mediation experiences.
3.2 Effectiveness

This section provides information regarding the extent to which the project has attained its stated goal and objectives. Results of this internal final evaluation have revealed that participating IMs obtained the necessary skills, knowledge, and tools needed to support the process of resolving local conflicts through conducting conflict scans and using dialogue processes. The main factors that led to this achievement were the effective capacity building training conducted, and their vital role in implementing the dialogue process to agree on community interventions that addressed the most relevant issues of target communities. Conflicts were identified through collaborative, inclusive, and locally-led conflict scans and analysis to identify conflict drivers, conflict dynamics, and conflict parties, in addition to exploring potential solutions. Although the CSOs did not participate in this research, IMs provided positive feedback about their role in supporting the project activities, and conducting necessary coordination between communities and local authorities.

3.2.1 Effectiveness of the Community Dialogue Approach

All of the participants in the community leader and governance actor KIIIs stated that they participated in the dialogue sessions. They all provided information about their contribution to the project up until the interventions stage. Local council members and Sheikhs talked about their contribution during the dialogue sessions and awareness raising about the project’s importance. IMs were asked about their ability to bring different stakeholders to the dialogues including local authorities, community leaders/Sheikhs, community members, and local community organisations. According to the 17 IMs, 69% of them agreed that it was easy or somewhat easy to bring all these categories to the dialogue process, 21% stated it was moderately difficult, and 10% stated it was difficult or very difficult.

The following chart provides more detailed information per stakeholder.
Additionally, surveyed IMs and community leaders praised the role that CSOs played in facilitating the dialogue process, the coordination role they handled to bring local authorities in the dialogue process and raising the awareness about project importance to their communities.

### 3.2.2 Effectiveness of Community Resolution Committees

Surveyed community members expressed appreciation for the CRCs’ role in their communities, and they characterised the CRCs’ as having a stabilising role, creating connections between them and local authorities to raise concerns and conflictual issues. Additionally, all respondents were able to clearly describe the different roles of the CRCs, meaning that the project was effective in raising awareness among community members about CRCs and embedding these within communities. Additionally, some of the participants mentioned the role of CRCs in reaching vulnerable and marginalised groups to support them in addressing their needs. All of the
participants in the community leader and local authority KIIIs claimed that CRCs have an effective role in the community and supported this claim by providing an explanation of the role CRCs are playing in their respective communities. Some of the roles mentioned by them are as follows:

- Raising community awareness by conducting awareness raising sessions in affected neighbourhoods and mosques.
- Identifying community issues and working on solving them with the support of local councils and CSOs/NGOs.
- Reaching vulnerable populations and addressing their needs.
- Communicating with local authorities to support community stabilisation.

The majority of IMs (88%) thought that CRCs were able to both mitigate and resolve local disputes because they are made up of actors able to influence community disputes and effectively resolve them (i.e. community leaders and local council members, in addition to trained IMs who are perceived as trusted and neutral local actors). According to them, community members have noticed the effectiveness of CRCs in solving issues, which in turn created trust in the CRCs’ role. Out of all respondents, only two of the KII participants stated that these CRCs were ineffective because of the lack of awareness about their role and because of the presence of weapons within the target areas.

When IMs were asked about how they perceive the level of trust from community members in the CRCs, 76% of them find it high or very high, as demonstrated in the chart below:
3.2.3 Effectiveness of IM Capacity Building

In describing their experience in mediation, IMs often mentioned the importance of the training modules both in terms of theoretical and experiential learning. For IM respondents, the most important part was the practical experience when conducting the conflict scans, alongside curating and facilitating the community dialogue processes. Furthermore, when analysing the training pre and post test for the IMs, 93% showed improvement in their level of knowledge for each training module.

“It was a new experience for me as an insider mediator, I benefited a lot from it as I learned new things in the training and acquired skills during the dialogue sessions with people in their various locations”

- IM from Lahj
According to interviewed community leaders, all stated that this project contributed to the empowerment and capacity building of different groups in the targeted areas, including vulnerable groups such as, women, youth, IDPs and marginalised segments of society (such as Mohamsheen). Respondents further stated that these vulnerable groups were able to contribute to discussions that addressed their immediate needs and concerns related to active community conflicts, and actively participated in finding solutions, as well as the ability to communicate effectively with local authorities.

Within the community members survey, respondents were asked about their willingness to take initiative to seek help and support in solving a problem that their families and/or neighbourhood might be facing. All survey participants answered the question positively, agreeing that they would take the initiative. Below are the list of common reasons that underpinned their positive responses:

1. The existence of a local council and local CSOs/ NGOs that have the ability and capacity to support the community in solving existing problems.
2. The desire to serve their communities and to decrease the level of tensions in their communities so they can live in a stable environment.
3. This project was successful in solving some of the problems in their communities, and they would like to replicate the experience with other emerging issues.
4. They are directly affected by community problems.

### 3.2.4 Challenges

As is common throughout programming in Yemen and elsewhere, this project faced several challenges that may have affected its effectiveness. Interviewed as the principal contributors to the project’s success, the surveyed community leaders and IMs outlined the following main challenges they faced throughout implementation:
1. Most interviewed community leaders referenced the lack of awareness from community members about the importance and linkages between each step of the project (especially during the conflict scan and dialogue processes) as a great challenge when implementing activities as it sometimes caused delays to implementation. Additionally, they did not have a strong understanding of the project activities and their purpose, which at times led to either (i) a lack of consistent commitment in attending the dialogue sessions, or (ii) resistance due to the perception that the identified conflicts related to development issues did not need to be addressed and wanted immediate interventions instead of dialogue. Additionally, the interviewed IMs raised the issue of differences in education levels between community members. This made it difficult to tailor the dialogue process to all levels of understanding, making it harder and lengthier to reach a consensus and ensure all had a voice, especially when some more educated participants impose their opinion or dominate a portion of discussion.

2. Community members can harbour a lack of trust in CSOs as previously-implemented projects may not have met community expectations. For example, previous experience of CSOs not completing interventions or promised interventions that did not materialise has damaged the confidence between local residents and local CSOs.

3. Project implementation faced some delays, mostly due to the evolving security situation between Aden and Abyan, and within Abyan governorate, and the delays affected the level of trust in Search-Yemen due to fears that the interventions would be cancelled (as residents had experienced in the past with other organisations).

4. Due to the ongoing prolonged war across Yemen, communities have become more vulnerable and unmet basic needs increase with instability, which makes it a challenge for the IMs to identify the most urgent needs to include in the intervention.

5. Linked to the reason above, insufficient allocated budget for interventions relative to the interventions needs or the scale/amount of interventions identified during the dialogue process posed challenges to overall impact and community satisfaction.
### 3.2.5 Logframe Results

This section will report on the project's achievements against its stated targets with explanations on each indicator, shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
<th>Comments on % of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Overall Goal:</strong> To support inclusive and accountable local level governance structures in Abyan, Aden and Lahj (one district per governorate, total 3 districts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This indicator was only measured in the baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of inclusive and accountable local level governance structures who have the ability to resolve local disputes by peaceful means</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1:</strong> Empower communities and governance structures to constructively address conflict through the use of locally-led dialogue processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1: # of CSOs and Local NGOs mapped</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>52 Local NGOs were mapped. These NGOs are located as follows: <strong>Lahj:</strong> 14 Local NGOs <strong>Aden:</strong> 23 Local NGOs + Two study Centres + One microfinance foundation (total 26) <strong>Abyan:</strong> 11 Local NGOs + One youth forum (total 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2: # of active local governance actors identified</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>All active local governance actors identified are local governance structures. These structures are located as follows: <strong>Lahj:</strong> 6, <strong>Aden:</strong> 5, <strong>Abyan:</strong> 14 However, these structures were not disaggregated by type in the baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1: # of IM selected</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td><strong>This indicator is partially met.</strong> The actual number of insider mediators selected to be trained in the project is 88 disaggregated as follows: <strong>Lahj:</strong> 17 men and 12 women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3.1: # of Insider Mediators trained on conflict scan, design and facilitate dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Mediators</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>17 men and 12 women</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>20 men and 10 women</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>21 men and 8 women</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator is partially met. The actual number of insider mediators selected to be trained in the project is 88 disaggregated as follows:

- Lahj: 17 men and 12 women
- Aden: 20 men and 10 women
- Abyan: 21 men and 8 women

### 1.3.2: % of Insider Mediators who score 40% increase in knowledge in conflict analysis, mediation, design and facilitate dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Increase in Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator surpassed the target. The level of increase in knowledge in the three districts is as follows:

- Lahj: 93%
- Aden: 100%
- Abyan: 86%

### 1.4.1: # of participants from local government bodies, IM participants and of local community leaders/members trained on consultation, citizen engagement and mechanisms of communication directly with the authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>25 men and 2 women</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>16 men and 8 women</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>21 men and 3 women</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator surpassed the target. The number of participants disaggregated by location as follows:

- Lahj: 25 men and 2 women
- Aden: 16 men and 8 women
- Abyan: 21 men and 3 women

### 1.4.2: % of participants who scores 40% increase knowledge in responsive governance mechanism, information feedback loop system, consultation and civic engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Increase in Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator surpassed the target. The pre and past tests for the responsive governance training showed that upon self-evaluation, we can conclude that 100% of participants achieved more than 40% increase in knowledge (% of increase between the average of the first interval (0-4) and the (4-8) is 225%).

### 1.5.1: # of community-level conflict scan meetings held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Meetings</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>98 men and 50 women (total 148)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator met the target

### 1.5.2: # of stakeholders who participate in conflict scan meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>98 men and 50 women (total 148)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>10 - 12 per session</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>10 - 12 per session</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator 93% met of the target

The actual number of people participated in conflict scan meetings is supposed to be 450-540. The number of participants in the conflict scan sessions is disaggregated as follows:

- Lahj: 98 men and 50 women (total 148)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target 1</th>
<th>Target 2</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5.3: # of conflict analysis reports produced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This indicator met the target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.4: # of attendees at validation meeting who validate results of the report</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>This indicator surpassed the target. This indicator measures how many people validated the results of the conflict scans out of the total number. However, the collected data is about the overall number of people who validated the results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1: # participants hold project design and management training.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>This indicator 93% met the target. The number of people attended the project design and management training is disaggregated as follows: Lahj: 17 men and 12 women (total 29) Aden: 20 men and 10 women (total 30) Abyan: 21 men and 8 women (total 29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2: % of participants who score 40% increase knowledge in project design and project management</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>This indicator surpassed the target. The level of increase in knowledge in the three districts is as follows: Lahj: 55% men and 45% women Aden: 65% men and 35% women Abyan: 54% men, however, women participants in Abyan did not take the pre &amp; post tests. The project reported holding gender segregated training in Abyan and the women participants did not take the tests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 2: Increase trust between local communities and governance structures through inclusive and participatory decision-making mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target 1</th>
<th>Target 2</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1: # of dialogue processes held</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>This indicator met the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2: # of action plan produced</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>This indicator met the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3: # of stakeholders that participated in dialogue processes</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>10 - 12 per session</td>
<td>This indicator surpassed the target. The actual number of people participated in the dialogue processes is 44 disaggregated by gender and location as follows: Lahj: 99 men and 76 women (total 175) Aden: 123 men and 49 women (total 172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4: % of community members who believe the dialogue processes were effective</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This indicator was not measured during the baseline study. The effectiveness of the dialogue process was measured through an evaluation form that was filled by the participants of the dialogue meeting, where they provide feedback on the effectiveness of the process in the 5 following areas: i) provided more information about the conflict ii) if they think of it as an effective way to resolve community conflict iii) contributing to social cohesion iv) lead to consensus on agreements and solutions to disputed issues. Following is the result of the evaluation per governorate, noting community members who believe the dialogue processes were effective: Aden: 98%, Abyan: 100%, Lahj: 94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.1: # of community-led initiatives addressing conflicts identified during community dialogues</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This indicator 67% met the target. The actual number of interventions is 10. According to the project, this is due to the small budgets allocated for every intervention, and this in return made the project double some budgets or shift them in order to have bigger interventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.2: % of surveyed stakeholders who believe Local disputes have decreased as a result of implementing the project.</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This indicator was measured during the project evaluation and we can conclude that the project supported the communities targeted with the intervention in reducing the local disputes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.1: # of feedback mechanisms established</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This indicator met the target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4.1: # of cooperative community committees established</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This indicator met the target.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5.1: # of cooperative community summits held</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This indicator is met. However, the summit included only Lahj and Aden governorates. Abyan was not included in the summit due to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
travel restrictions related to security and instability in Lawder district, from whence participants would have had to travel from.

### 3.3 Sustainability

Sustainability for this project has been measured by its ability to continue its conflict resolution mission beyond the project timeline within the targeted communities. Asides the physical outcomes produced in the target communities that the project has generated through its interventions, the project has produced a long-term technical impact by substantiating a new set of skills at the local level among local authorities, IMs, community leaders, and CSO staff. These new skills include the ability to convene and work collaboratively to both lead and partake in dialogue processes to solve local-level conflicts aiming at stabilising their communities. The physical interventions themselves rely on the maintenance of new materials and structures for their sustainability over time. Participants in the community members' survey showed low levels of optimism towards the sustainability of the current interventions implemented during the project; only 13% think that the current interventions will be maintained over a longer period of time. Reasons given for this include that some interventions may not have solved the root cause of the development issue. For example, the project was unable to renovate the entire sewage network, therefore the unblocking and cleaning of affected sewage pipes and installation of new manhole covers may only provide temporary solutions to the larger sewage network problems. Other reasons include the need for regular maintenance, and need for more financial support to ensure upkeep or further reparations. However, all of respondents believed that CRCs could have an essential role in monitoring and maintaining interventions, thereby supporting the communities to improve their stability. While all the community leaders and local authorities believe that the project could be sustainable with longer term impact if community members, local councils, and local authorities cooperated to support maintaining the current interventions especially if communities have increased awareness about collective practices that help to
maintain physical project outcomes. The IMs identified that sustainability could be maintained through supporting the CRCs, so that they can continue their work of solving local community issues; meeting community needs through fostering cooperation between local councils and local authorities; listening to communities’ issues and concerns and handling them with high credibility; keeping neutral when handling conflicts; and continuing to offer financial support. Although only a portion of the intervention follow-up falls under the direct responsibility of local council representatives (themselves part of the CRC formed in their district), the remaining portion will be reviewed by each respective CRC to ensure endurance and upkeep.

Concurrently, the process of initiating collaboration and two-way communication between these actors, through the conflict scan process, dialogue process, intervention process, CRC creation, and the final joint summit, has effectively started to normalise these forms of community-wide partnership that will continue beyond the lifetime of the project. Moreover, all research participants confirmed the importance of the CRCs as effective conflict resolution mechanisms in their communities, indicating the vital role these CRCs can play in the coming months and years. Their ability to continue conflict scan processes in the communities, mobilise trained IMs to design and lead dialogue processes, and ensure collaboration across local civil society, local authorities, and constituents is a legacy that will ensure target communities can rely on embedded and normalised nonviolent conflict resolution practices.

4. Conclusion

This internal evaluation report concludes that the Cooperative Communities project has achieved its goal and objectives as stated in the project log-frame. The following summarises the main conclusions and lessons learned, according to the evaluation criteria:

Relevance:
The evaluation proves that the Cooperative Communities project was relevant to the targeted communities’ needs and existing conflict issues. IMs clearly stated that the capacity building workshops were relevant to their capacity building needs and their assigned roles leading the mediation process, and ultimately enabled them to effectively facilitate the dialogue process in their communities. Community members also confirmed the relevance of the implemented interventions and indicated that these interventions tangibly improved their living conditions and solved pressing community level conflicts. Additionally, surveyed community leaders reiterated the importance of the dialogue process in bringing different conflict parties together to find common ground that solves community disputes for the benefit of the whole community.

**Effectiveness**

Although the project confronted some challenges including major security risks that caused delays in the implementation of project activities, particularly interventions in the targeted governorates especially Abyan, the project effectively accomplished its planned objectives. Capacity building is considered to have a great impact on scaling up the level of skills for the IMs in conflict scanning and managing dialogue processes in addition to providing them with the necessary knowledge to support them in carrying out the mediation role.

As for the dialogue process, it was effective in bringing together the conflict parties to discuss the different community disputes and come up with sound solutions to the most pressing ones. As a result of this dialogue process, a list of community interventions was selected to be implemented in respective localities. However, the project did not manage to implement the planned number of interventions as per the project logframe since the budget was insufficient, as a result some communities were asked to reduce the number of interventions to be implemented.

**Sustainability**

Although community interventions need to be maintained by local councils in each community to ensure a sustainable impact, according to the community members those interventions have
made positive changes to their lives that could stand the test of time. IMs indicated that the knowledge and skills they gained through the capacity building activities empowered them to continue supporting their communities by facilitating dialogues and mediation.

All of the research participants confirmed the importance of the CRCs in supporting stabilisation in their communities through identifying conflicts, raising them to local authorities and solving them. However, they also stated the financial support for these CRCs is vital to enable them to continue their role in community conflict resolution.

5. Recommendations

The internal evaluation findings led to the following sets recommendations to improve the project outcomes and enrich the country programme strategy when conducting similar projects.

Programmatic Recommendations:

1. Due to the interventions’ impact on the targeted communities, it is recommended to replicate the project in the same and neighbouring communities to further capacitate new IMs and further CSOs, and support the process of solving other pressing needs and to have more integrated impact by implementing different interventions in the same localities. This will also serve to continue rebuilding the trust of the communities in the CSOs, IMs, and local authorities. Furthermore, replication should consider reaching new communities, to widen the impact of the project on the national level and reach more vulnerable communities.

2. Institutionalising the CRCs and giving the members and IMs identification cards so they can introduce themselves to the communities as IMs who are trained to conduct conflict scans and lead dialogue processes to solve community conflicts. This could increase their credibility in the communities and increase trust in their role.
3. Improve awareness raising around project activities to ensure active interaction from community members with the different project activities, and enhance early understanding of the connection between dialogue and intervention implementation.

4. Conducting refresher and follow-up training to previously employed IMs in different communities will update their knowledge and skills to fit new contexts and will motivate them to continue their mediation role within their communities.

5. Interventions utilised around 14% of the overall project budget and given the importance and direct impact of the community interventions in improving residents’ lives, it is recommended to increase the amount of budget allocated in a way that keeps the same quality of other project activities. CDA projects need to find the right balance between the emphasis on adopting dialogue for nonviolent conflict resolution within communities and the physical interventions that often act as an entry point with communities in need. Based on the feedback from participants and beneficiaries, this balance has not yet been optimised.

**Project Management Recommendations:**

1. Utilising the baseline study findings to feed into the conflict scans process, as the baseline research identified the different pressing conflicts in each district. This way and during the conflict scans the IMs will focus on the most pressing conflicts as per the baseline research. In doing so, the time difference when conducting the research and the conflict scans must be taken into consideration. Additionally, baseline findings should be utilised to update the baseline for some of the outcome indicators so progress could be measured when conducting the evaluation.

2. The evaluation should be planned ahead with budget allocated to ensure reaching all project stakeholders with a bigger sample size.
3. Given the volatile security situation in Yemen, projects should have more detailed contingency planning documents that propose a back up plan/s to be activated when unforeseen situations disrupt the progress of the project, both for overall project work plan but also M&E-related activities such as baselines and final evaluations. Contingency plans should be shared with implementing partners so they can act accordingly if any risks arise. In Yemen, the conflict situation and the unforeseen changes in lines of controls are possible at any time, contingency plans will be a backup to avoid project delays or at least reduce them.
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Annex 1

Cooperative communities: Internal Evaluation Tools

1. Survey Questionnaires for Community Members

Governorate: ----------------- District ------------------ Sub-district -------------- Village: -----------------
Date: ---------------------
Position: -----------------------------------------------
Gender: O Male, O Female
Age Range: O (18 - 34), O (35 - 50), O + 51
Category: O Host    O IDPs    O Mohamasheen   O other: ..................

Introduction: My name is ______ and I work for SFCG to make interviews with the community members in the communities that have been targeted by the project implemented by SFCG. I would like to ask you some questions to collect information about your community and the project implemented by SFCG. This questionnaire contains 6 questions and will take a maximum of 10 to 15 minutes from your time.

Do you agree to go forward? O Yes   O No

Questions:

Section 1: Measure the Current Level of Violent Conflict

1) Are there any current community conflicts in your village/area? if yes, what are these conflicts? How intense are these conflicts? Put” X” in the appropriate option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
<th>Very intense</th>
<th>Moderate intensity</th>
<th>Low intensity</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Management (and distribution) of drinking water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Management (and distribution of irrigation water)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Land ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Provision of education Services,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Provision of health services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Public roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Others: -------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Do you know of any conflicts that have been recently solved or in the process of being solved? If yes, use the table below to answer the questions. If No, skip question number 4 (answer using the table below, check the box that applies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
<th>Who solved it?</th>
<th>Directly benefiting from the solution? (yes, No)</th>
<th>Do you think the solution will be maintained for a long time? (Yes, No, I don’t know)</th>
<th>How likely is it for the same conflict to go back? (very likely, possible, unlikely)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Management (and distribution) of drinking water</td>
<td>☐ CSOs (e.g. NGOs)</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, how are you satisfied with the solution? ☐ Very satisfied ☐ satisfied ☐ Not satisfied, why? ----------------- ----------------- ----</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ I don’t know</td>
<td>☐ Very likely ☐ Possible ☐ Unlikely ☐ I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Management (and distribution of irrigation water)</td>
<td>☐ CSOs (e.g. NGOs)</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, how are you satisfied with the solution? ☐ Very satisfied ☐ satisfied ☐ Not satisfied, why? ----------------- ----------------- ----</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ I don’t know</td>
<td>☐ Very likely ☐ Possible ☐ Unlikely ☐ I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land ownership</td>
<td>CSOs (e.g. NGOs)</td>
<td>Political parties</td>
<td>Local council/local authorities</td>
<td>Sheikhs and social dignitaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of education Services,</td>
<td>CSOs (e.g. NGOs)</td>
<td>Political parties</td>
<td>Local council/local authorities</td>
<td>Sheikhs and social dignitaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of health services</td>
<td>CSOs (e.g. NGOs)</td>
<td>Political parties</td>
<td>Local council/local authorities</td>
<td>Sheikhs and social dignitaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3) Do you think such projects that are solving community disputes are addressing the needs of certain groups in the community, for example, marginalized groups, IDPs, Women, Youth, Adolescent girls, etc? “check the answer that applies”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please explain the conclusion.
4) If your family or neighborhood is facing daily difficulties as a result of a community dispute, would you take the initiative to seek help for solving it? “check the answer that applies”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>o Yes</th>
<th>o No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What made that possible for you?</td>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) one of the project activities is to support the establishment of a community resolution committee that supports conflict resolution mechanisms. Do you think such committees could help in stabilizing communities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>o Yes</th>
<th>o No</th>
<th>o I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) would you like to share a story that you know or you heard of about an intervention or initiative that contributed to improving the lives of people in your community or other communities?

---

Name of Interviewer: ___________________ Signature: _____________ Date: __ / __ / 2020

Checked by Field Supervisor: ___________________ Signature: _____________ Date: __ / __ / 2020
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2. Community Leaders & Local Authorities KII

Governorate: ------------------ District ----------------------------- Sub-district ------------------ Village:---------------------

Name: (optional)

Position: ________________________________________________________________

Gender: O Male, O Female

Age Range: O (18 - 34) O (35 - 50) O + 51

Social Position:

- Head of Local Authority
- Deputy Head of Local Authority
- Local Council Member
- Community Leader / dignitary
- Sheikh (tribal / religious)
- Date of interview: ------------------

**Introduction:** Hello my name is ___________ and I work for SFCG to conduct this interview with Local authorities/community leaders in the communities that have finalised the implementation of SFCG project. This is a follow-up questionnaire targeting the communities that have been involved in the project donated by the Netherlands Government and implemented by SFCG aims at collecting perspectives about the project activities and gather information about the project outcomes in the targeted districts.

The questionnaire contains 11 questions, and it might take 15 – 20 minutes.

Do you agree to move forward with the questions? O Yes O No

**Questions:**

As a local authority:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did you know about the implementation of this project? If yes, what information do you have about it? If No, please find another person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Have you been involved in this project? If yes, at what stages? And how did you contribute to it?

3. Do you think this project had an impact on the community? If yes, what type of impact (adverse or positive)?
   on a scale from 1 – 10 where 10 represents the highest impact. How much did you give this project’s impact on the community? Please explain your answer

4. Based on the nature of this project, if you have been asked to categorize this project or put it under a headline, under what category or headline you put it?

5. According to you, what are the main challenges that may be contributed to hindering this project?

6. Do you think this project has affected the ability of different groups in the community (including women, marginalised groups, youth, etc.) to contribute to the process of conflict resolution at the local level? please explain your answer

7. Do you think this project will have a longer-term impact on the community? please explain your answer

8. This project and other SFCG projects support building Community resolution committees that are made up of community council members, local authorities,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>community leaders and others to support the process of preventing and resolving community disputes. Do you think such committees are effective? please explain your answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In case this project is replicated or extended, what suggestions do you have that might amplify the positive impact of the project in the targeted communities and make it more sustainable?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In general, what do you think of this project?</td>
<td>The general perception of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Do you have any interesting stories from your experience in this project and would like to share with us?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name of Interviewer:** ____________________ **Signature:** ____________ **Date:** __/__/ 2020

**Checked by Field Supervisor:**
**Name:** ________________ **Signature:** ____________ **Date:** __/__/ 2020
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3. IMs KII
Governorate: ------------ District ------------------ Sub-district ------------------ Village: ------------------
Name: ( optional)
Date:
Gender: O Male, O Female
Age Range: O (18 - 34), O (35 - 50), O + 51
Category: O Host O IDPs O Mohamasheen O other: .................

Introduction: Hello my name is ______ I work for SFCG to conduct surveys with the IMs that have participated in the implementation of the project funded by the Netherlands governorate.

We are targeting IMs who worked in the communities where the project was finalized.

Do you agree to move forward with the questionnaire? O Yes   O No

Questions:

1) How do you describe your experience in mediation? and what was the most challenging part of your role as IM?

2) on a scale of 1 to 10, where 10 is the highest. How do you think meditation is important in the process of community-level conflict resolution and national peacebuilding processes?

- The community-level conflict resolution process

- National level peacebuilding process
3) out of your experience in mediation, and using a scale from 1 – 5, how do you describe the level of participation for community members in the communities affected by different types of conflicts in any conflict resolution initiatives and community dialogue sessions in the following areas?

- Information provision (they inform each other about the existed or proposed dialogues, conflict scans, and interventions) [ ]/5

- Consultation process (community members are exchanging information between themselves and politicians, community leaders, local authorities and send feedback) [ ]/5

- Involvement (community members feedback is being incorporated in decision making and designing of interventions to resolve conflicts as well as being parts of community dialogues) [ ]/5

- Collaboration (community members are directly making decisions with local authorities, community leaders and other stakeholders to solve their community disputes) [ ]/5

4) in the community dialogue process, please describe the ability to bring different stakeholders to the dialogue.

- Local authorities
  - Easy
  - Somewhat easy
  - Moderate
  - Difficult
  - Very difficult

- Community leaders/sheikhs
  - Easy
  - Somewhat easy
  - Moderate
  - Difficult
  - Very difficult

- Community members
  - Easy
  - Somewhat easy
  - Moderate
  - Difficult
  - Very difficult

- Local community organisations
  - Easy
  - Somewhat easy
  - Moderate
  - Difficult
  - Very difficult

5) from your experience, do you think the existence of community resolution committees practically provides more access for community members to communicate about local disputes?
6) Do you think the CRC’s are empowered to prevent or address community disputes? Explain your answer.


7) What do you think the level of trust the community members have in these conflict resolution committees to support resolving local disputes?

- very High
- high
- moderate
- low
- Very low
- I don’t know

8) How do you think conflict resolution committees could be sustained to serve the communities in the long run?

9) What are the main challenges that you think affected the progress of the project activities, specifically the conflict scans and community dialogue?
10) During the conflict scans and community dialogues, do you think there were specific disputes that have been raised concerning special groups of people, e.g, marginalized groups, women, girls, youth or elderly? please explain.


11) What do you think about the role of CSOs in different project activities?


12) Do you have any suggestions to improve the mediation process and to amplify and sustain the project impact?


13) Do you have any interesting stories from your experience in this project and would like to share with us?


Name of Interviewer: ___________________ Signature: ________________ Date: __/__/2020
Checked by Field Supervisor:
Name: _______________________________ Signature: ________________ Date: __/__/2020
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Context

Organisational Background:
Search for Common Ground (SFCG) works to prevent and end violent conflict before, during, and after a crisis to come by working with all sides of a conflict, providing the tools needed to work together, and finding constructive solutions. Our mission is to transform the way the world deals with conflict away from adversarial approaches and toward cooperative solutions. Instead of tearing down an existing world, we focus on constructing a new one. We do this through a type of peacebuilding which is called “conflict transformation.” We shift the everyday interactions between hostile groups of people, so they can work together to build up their community, choosing joint problem-solving over violent means. SFCG’s mission in Yemen is to promote the culture of dialogue and diversity through the involvement of all the components of the society, and while reinforcing their capacities. SFCG-Yemen is working during the ongoing conflict to help members of Yemeni society approach conflicts and differences in a constructive manner, through cooperation and dialogue. SFCG-Yemen is currently operational in six governorates and maintains a wide and robust relationship network of local civil society organizations.

Project Summary:

Description
Search will launch an initiative to reestablish trust between communities and governance structures through inclusive dialogue and cooperative action. This will enable communities to advance effective governance structures to revitalise social services, public order, and the local economy.

The overall goal of this project is to support inclusive and accountable local level governance structures in Abyan, Aden, and Lahj (one district per governorate, total of three districts). the project started in July, 1st 2018 and should end January 2020, however the project is still ongoing especially in Abyan Governorate as a result of the deteriorating security situation especially after the starting the practical steps to implementing the “Riadh agreement”. The project is expected to be finalised by the end of February 2020.

The objectives for this project as follows;

1. Empower communities and governance structures to constructively address conflict through the use of locally led dialogue processes
2. Increase trust between local communities and governance structures through inclusive and participatory decision-making mechanisms

This project will leverage Search’s Community Dialogue Approach (CDA), engaging local communities and targeted stakeholders (e.g. municipal government representatives, tribal and religious leaders, and other “social dignitaries” – informal leaders such as prominent businesspersons, educators, and civil society advocates) to identify local trusted actors from within the community to act as “Insider Mediators” (IMs). IMs are empowered to lead community-focused stabilization activities through Search’s capacity-building training on topics such as conducting conflict scans, designing community dialogue processes, and effective facilitation skills. Through Search’s CDA approach, IMs will obtain the skills and experience to enable them to work closely with governance structures to build inclusive and accountable governance processes, build trust between both parties, and resolve local-level conflicts using non-violent means. Following the workshops, IMs and governance actors will lead inclusive community dialogue processes to identify and prioritise conflict issues at the local level and develop action plans for community initiatives to resolve identified issues in collaboration with local governance structures to establish a precedent of positive interaction. Additionally, sustainable mechanisms for continued cooperation and inclusive decision-making processes will be instituted to ensure the long-term impact of this initiative.

The project activities are:

1- Mapping Exercise
2- Insider Mediator Selection
3- Insider Mediator Capacity-Building
4- Responsive Governance Training
5- Conflict Scans
6- Project Design and Management Training
7- Local-Level Dialogue Processes
8- Community Initiatives
9- Feedback Mechanisms
10- Cooperative Community Committees
11- Cooperative Community Summits

In Lahj and Aden, 6 community interventions were completed 3 in each governorate. moreover, 3 more community interventions will be completed in Abyan in the coming period. The table below shows more information on the community interventions:

Objectives of the evaluation:
SFCG as an organization is committed to conduct evaluations for projects in order to maximise the effectiveness of its programming and engage in continuous improvement and learning within programs
and across the organizations. The SFCG approach to evaluations is grounded in the guiding principles of its work: participatory; culturally sensitive; affirming and positive while honest and productively critical and valuing knowledge and approaches from within the context. SFCG will apply this approach to the evaluation of this project, which will be carried out by the SFCG team superheaded by the M&E department and supported by project staff. In addition to the participation of the key relevant stakeholders, community groups and key civil society individuals. The evaluation objectives will focus on the following:

1. Evaluate the project’s performance in terms of achieving its objectives and expected results;
2. From a community perspective, evaluate the contribution of the community interventions in improving local peacebuilding processes.
3. Understand and learn from successes and challenges encountered during the realisation of the project.
4. Documenting lessons learned, drawing conclusions and making recommendations for the improvement of the Yemen country programme.

**Evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions:**

The purpose of the evaluation is to conduct a contribution research to provide an assessment on the added value of the SFCG intervention in districts targeted with community interventions and understand how and why the project reached the defined outcomes. The research is collecting different stakeholders perspectives of the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of the implemented project.

Results of the evaluation and lessons learned will reflect on the CDA approach preventing inter-communal conflict and promoting local social cohesion that can be replicated on a larger scale beyond this specific project. Also, it will reflect on the SFCG approach for similar project implementation. This internal evaluation in its research will be formative and will specifically focus on the following three core dimensions of the project and their key questions:

**Relevance:**
- How relevant are the community interventions as perceived by beneficiaries and stakeholders?
- How relevant were the project activities including (Insider Mediators Capacity Building, Responsive Governance, Conflict Scans, Project Design & Management Training, Local Level Dialogue Process, Community Initiatives, Feedback Mechanisms, Cooperative Community Committees) to transform the conflict or the drivers of the conflict?

**Effectiveness:**
- To what extent was the project successful in achieving its stated goal as per the outputs and outcomes in the project logical framework.
- From stakeholders perspectives, to what extent was the project successful in achieving its stated objective to increase trust between local communities and governance structures.
  1. Are community members willing to address the local conflicts to Community Resolution Committees?
  2. Are the local CRCs empowered enough to prevent and respond to local conflicts?
  3. Are the needs of marginalised groups and different community groups including Women,
adolescents, youth, elderly, etc been addressed during the community intervention phase?

- from stakeholders perspectives, to what extent was the project successful in achieving its stated objective to empower communities and governance using the Community Dialogue approach to address local conflicts.
  1. How do community members need to be addressed in the local dialogues? and to what extent different community groups’ needs have been addressed in the dialogues?
  2. Are local authorities and community leaders willing to actively contribute to the local dialogue to constructively resolve local disputes

- To what extent and why was the project effective in providing Insider Mediators Trainings with the skills and capacities needed to enhance youths’ engagement to transform conflict without violence?
- What are the major challenges influencing the achievement of the objectives?

**Sustainability**

- What actions were planned or have been taken by the project stakeholders to create long term processes or structures that support the resolution and prevention of local conflicts?
- have the communities been able to independently address the local conflicts and conflict drivers and respond accordingly? What makes that work on the log run?
- What could have been done differently so the project becomes more sustainable in the future?

**Scope:**
The final evaluation will investigate principal target groups: local authorities, local community representatives and members, insider mediators, local council members and women in the target governorate listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al-mansoura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>Tuban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Lawder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the project is still in the finalization process and has not been completed yet, the evaluation sample will only cover the districts where community initiatives have already started and community conflict resolution has been formed.

Below is the list of interventions in each governorate:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Description of Intervention</th>
<th>Type of Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>Providing electricity fuses &amp; cables</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>Purchasing rickshaw &amp; garbage bags to collect garbage and remove it from streets</td>
<td>Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahj</td>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>Purchasing and installing a solar power system for a water well that provides water to population</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al Mansoura</td>
<td>Purchasing garbage containers to remove garbage from the streets of Abdulqawi neighborhood</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al Mansoura</td>
<td>Purchasing garbage containers to remove garbage from the streets of Abdulaziz neighborhood</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al Mansoura</td>
<td>Purchasing covers for sanitation manholes in Kubota</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>Al Mansoura</td>
<td>Replacing an electricity cable in Aldurain</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Lawder</td>
<td>Provide materials &amp; refurbishment for Nagi School</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Lawder</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of the health unit</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyan</td>
<td>Lawder</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of Abu Obeida Girls School</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methodology:**
The formative internal evaluation will employ both quantitative and qualitative participatory methods. Data will be analyzed with a gender, age, and location disaggregation. The qualitative and quantitative findings are expected to be synthesized in accordance with the project indicators.

The sampling methodology for the tools and/or instruments will be designed by the M&E unit, referring to the project’s RMP and in coordination with Search-Yemen’s Project Manager and the Regional DME Specialist. The evaluation will use the purposive sampling technique so it could collect the related information as follows:

- **Desk review** utilizing existing project documentation, key documents and reports, qualitative and quantitative monitoring data collected by the project;
- **Key informant interviews** will be conducted with 2 local authorities in the districts were community interventions started and CRCs formed, targeting 2 local authority personnel to collect their feedback on the project to measure the level of contribution they have made and to what extent they believe such projects could be effective in solving community disputes.

- **The same key informant interviews tool used with local authorities**, will be used with 3 community leaders in the same districts, anticipating that community leaders should be well informed about the running interventions resulting from the project implementation. their feedback on the dialogue process and CRC mechanism and other project activities will provide critical information to measure the relevance, effectiveness as well as the sustainability of the project. In addition to addressing the challenges the project activities faced from their position.

- **Surveys with community members** in the districts targeted with community interventions and community resolution committees will be conducted. 10 surveys per district 5 with men and 5 . The surveys will be done through home visits or the way the data collection partner sees more suitable. These surveys will gather information about the project interventions and CRCs and to what extent community members think they could support the local stabilization, and to capture how the project contributed to their willingness to address conflicts and be actively participating in solving local community disputes.

- **Questionnaires with insider mediators** in the districts were community interventions started and CRCs established. 5 in each district, to reflect on the overall experience of the mediators in the mediation process, including identifying challenges and suggestions to improve the mediation and the CDA. Also, the insider mediators will be able to bring their thoughts about the sustainability part of the project.

All of the questionnaires with the audience will be using one to one interviews. the FGDs were excluded because of the time and budget limitations of the evaluation activity, given that the coordination process of the FGDs and gathering people needs more time and money.

The table below will explain more the sampling tools and sample size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>sample size per district</th>
<th>gender segregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>KII (survey)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 woman if available and 1 man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders</td>
<td>KII (survey)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>at least 1 woman if available, 2 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 women 5 men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Data Analysis:
Microsoft Excel will be used for quantitative data analysis, and manual analysis will be applied for qualitative data.
During the data collection and analysis processes, SFCG evaluation team will respect the following ethical principles:

- **Comprehensive and systematic inquiry:** making most of the existing information and full range of stakeholders available at the time of the review. The evaluation team should communicate the methods and approaches accurately and in sufficient detail to allow others to understand, interpret and critique the work. Also should clarify the limitations of the review and the results.

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

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

- **Culture Sensitivity:** Evaluation team respect the security, dignity and self-worth of respondents and program participants and have the responsibility to be sensitive to and respect differences amongst participants in culture, religion, gender, disability, age and ethnicity.

- All the data produced by this study belongs exclusively to Search and all remaining copies of the data will be

**Deliverables:**
A final evaluation report that consists of:
- Table of contents
- Executive summary of key findings and recommendations – no more than 3 pages.
- Research findings, analysis, with associated data presented, where appropriate in clear graphs or charts.
- Conclusion and Recommendations for future project implementation.
- Appendices, which include a detailed description of the methodology with research instruments, list of interviewees, bibliography, and evaluator(s) brief biography.

An internal reflection session will be used to finalize the evaluation. The DME Manager will work in close collaboration with ILT to identify opportunities to share the learning at regional level and possibly globally.

**Team Members:**
The evaluation will be conducted by SFCG project team spearheaded by the M&E unit with the support of the M&E staff in Sana’a supervised by MENA DM&E specialist.

the following Implementing agencies in each governorate will support in the data collection process:

- Basma Foundation in Lahj
- To Be Foundation in Aden
- Women Association Development in Abyan