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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEFEM</td>
<td>Association de Lutte contre l’Exploitation des Femmes et des Filles dans les Mines (translates as ‘Association to Fight Against the Exploitation of Women and Children in the Mining Sector’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSP</td>
<td>Conseils Locaux pour la Sécurité de Proximité</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYJIBAD</td>
<td>Organization of Baraka's young intellectuals for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPEFMR</td>
<td>Together for peace and supervision of women in rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espoir Horizon</td>
<td>Association for the promotion of peace and the defense of human rights and socio-economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETD</td>
<td>Territorially decentralized entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARDC</td>
<td>Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJN</td>
<td>Association Karibu Jeunesse Nouvelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNC</td>
<td>Congolese National Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODES</td>
<td>Social Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

I.a Project Background

In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) insecurity, in the form of violence against civilians, has been a protracted crisis for decades, with the security forces perpetrating human rights violations and abuses. Between 1 June 2020 and 31 May 2021, 46 percent of human rights violations and abuses documented by the Joint Office were committed by State officials, primarily members of the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (FARDC) and officers of the Congolese National Police (PNC). Despite clear documentation of these violations, and some efforts by the authorities to hold accountable and prosecute the perpetrators of these abuses among the police and the army, impunity prevails and further exacerbates the population’s mistrust of the security forces.

In this context, Search for Common Ground (Search) implemented the project “Together For Security,” which aimed to foster sustainable, inclusive, and accountable civilian protection efforts in security operations in DRC. The project supported local CSOs to develop and deepen relationships and trust with security forces, cooperate with them to improve accountability, and foster the sustainability of civil protection efforts through shifting norms linked to the roles of civilians and security forces around security issues.

I.b Evaluation Purpose and Use

In October 2021, Bodhi Global Analysis was contracted by Search to undertake a final evaluation of the project Together for Security. In particular, the evaluation focuses on the three following criteria: 1) effectiveness; 2) gender mainstreaming; 3) sustainability.

To address these criteria, the evaluation team implemented a mixed-methods evaluation structured along the five evaluation questions proposed by Search:

- (1.1) Did the project bring about the expected changes in accordance with the theory of change and logical framework?
- (1.2) To what extent have the expected results of the project been achieved against the benchmarks? (Set of 13 quantitative indicators)
- (1.3) What changes, intended and unintended, positive and negative, have occurred with the targets? Are there social security and human rights changes that are being observed in the community?
- (2.1) In line with the project's gender strategy, were the project activities accessible to men and women in the same way? Have special measures been taken to ensure that barriers to women's participation are reduced?
- (3.1) To what extent has the project contributed to fostering inclusive, accountable and collaborative civil protection efforts in security operations in South Kivu in a sustainable manner?

I.c Evaluation Methodology

The team conducted several forms of primary and secondary data collection, involving the following:

- **Desk review** - including activity reports, baseline documents, reflection meeting notes, etc.
- **Key Informant Interviews** - 17 interviews with implementing partner (IP) staff;
- **Focus Group Discussions** - 8 focus groups were conducted in Minova, Nyabibwe, Bagira, Luvungi, Kiliba, and Baraka, with participants.
- **Quantitative survey** - 513 respondents, including 409 community members, and 104 agents of the National Police. This endline covered the 8 project locations: Bagira, Baraka, Kamituga, Kiliba North and South, Luvungi, Minova and Nyabibwe.

These data sources were analyzed against the evaluation matrix, which served as this report’s analytical framework. That is, analysis was structured to address the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The evaluation team conducted qualitative analysis, mapping key themes and content onto a findings, conclusions and recommendations matrix. Data analysis utilized triangulation throughout, to verify consistency of findings across different respondent types and sources.

I.d Limitations

**Response bias** - Informants may have formed their responses based on personal motivation rather than the most accurate information. The evaluation team mitigated this challenge through triangulating findings, as well as employing an informed consent and anonymization protocol.

**Limited data available** - Due to limited data available, the evaluation team decided not to include the outcome harvesting methodology into this evaluation. However, in order to still reflect the changes that have occurred since the project began, outcomes are discussed in the findings under EQ 1, 2 and 3.

**Limited comparability to the baseline** - The evaluation was limited in its ability to draw comparisons from the baseline data due to shifts in programmatic focus from baseline to endline.

I.e Key Findings and Conclusions

I.e.i Level of achievement of expected changes in accordance with the theory of change and logical framework

Search provided CSOs with a range of support, including financial support, training, and advocacy, and networking opportunities which reinforced their capacities to address human rights and security issues. In particular, the project improved CSOs knowledge of human rights, the common ground approach, advocacy with the PNC, and other authorities, and improved CSOs’s capacity to engage and collaborate with security forces. Survey findings demonstrate that perceptions of CSOs’ ability to coordinate with the security forces to increase the responsibility of the security forces to protect civilians improved. Specifically, this belief amongst civilians increased by 8 percentage points, from 53 percent in the baseline to 61 percent in the endline; amongst PNC it increased from 66 percent (of security forces) to 81 percent. Moreover, 100 percent of respondents say that CSOs are able to influence security sector policy and practice, representing a substantial increase from the 37 percent of civilians and 32 percent of security...
forces who reported such in the baseline. These results offer concrete evidence of increased trust, amongst the target population, in the CSOs’ ability to advocate for greater accountability in the security sector and improved policies and practices related to human rights, hence validating the relevance of this project’s focus on CSOs as agents of change. Interviews with Search staff, CSOs, community members and PNC staff suggest that this improvement is attributable to the project; however, the evaluation team was unable to quantify the impact.

The project also reinforced cooperation between key stakeholders, as existing CSO networks were reinforced, and regular meetings brought together CSOs, community leaders and members of the PNC.

In addition, the project contributed to initiating a change of perception on the relevance of security issues for women and the role of women, with concrete examples of women’s empowerment in a conservative local context. Findings from the survey show that perceptions about the relevance of safety issues for women and the role of women are positively transformed as: 90 percent of respondents (security actors, civilians - men and women, authorities) believe that women have an important role to play in improving security in their communities and 95 percent of community members agree that safety issues are also a concern for women.

I.e.ii  Level of achievement of expected results against the benchmarks

The objective of advocating for greater accountability in the security sector was achieved, with concrete evidence of increased trust in the CSOs’ ability to collaborate with security forces and influence them, hence validating the relevance of this project’s focus on CSOs as agents of change.

However, data collected for this final evaluation show mixed results at the outcome and impact level. Half of the indicator targets were not met, and no impact indicator targets were achieved overall or for the civilian population, suggesting limited project achievement in driving change, especially in transforming communities’ perception of the security forces and the police.

M&E tools and methods used at the project and activity levels are adequate and sufficient to evaluate progress against the benchmarks (output level), but do not allow the measurement of the impacts of the activities undertaken.

I.e.iii  Extent of social security and human rights changes that are being observed in the community

The project had a limited effect on the overall security situation, given the context in which it operates. Some evidence from KII and FGDs exists to support some improvement in the communities’ perceptions of the human rights situation, with a perceived decrease in human rights violations by the police.2 However, survey findings show that over 40 percent of civilians are still witnessing instances of human rights abuses by the police in the project locations.3 The majority of civilian respondents reported that such human rights abuses by the police have either stayed the same or increased in number, compared to
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2 KII and FGDs. Bukavu, August 2021
12 months ago. In addition, the project resulted in limited positive changes on the overall level of feelings of insecurity and the perception of the human rights situation in the communities.

I.e.iv Gender-sensitivity and accessibility of activities
Engaging with CSOs working on women’s rights is a good practice that shows Search’s willingness to integrate a gender perspective in the project. However, the lack of ownership of the gender strategy at the project level, and of mechanisms to ensure equal representation of men and women in the activities (including special measures to reduce barriers to women's participation), negatively impacted the project’s ability to foster meaningful engagement of women. Indeed, across all project activities, only 38 percent of civilian participants were women.

I.e.v Sustainability of project’s results
The project created a culture of collaboration between civil society actors and police units and raised the awareness of individuals from both parties who are likely to nurture a long term relationship. Moderate evidence of continuing activities and new initiatives exists to support sustained results for the communities.

However, newly built relationships with police units are fragile and will need further strengthening given that external factors such as frequent transfers of police staff and flaws in the management of the police at the national level can threaten these relationships.

Despite some advocacy efforts with regional stakeholders, the project had limited impact at the institutional level due to limited engagement with a wider range of stakeholders at different levels.

I.f Select Recommendations
These recommendations are aimed at Search staff for consideration for future programming.

1) Effectiveness:
- In the project design phase, Search and donor should identify necessary prerequisites for implementation, including through conducting context assessment at onset to assess feasibility and inform targeting.
- Search’s MEL team should refine M&E systems to better account for impacts, including through adopting community-based monitoring.
- Search should conduct formal and comprehensive capacity-assessment of new police partners as evidence suggests that police partners may not have the requisite baseline internalization of human rights principles to adopt the project at the point in causal pathways that the project operates at.
- Search and external stakeholders should strengthen the work with Conseils Locaux pour la Sécurité de Proximité (CLSPs), including through increased engagement with the relevant government agencies to clarify the role of the CLSPs at the level of ETDs (territorially decentralized entities).
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• Search should reinforce and refine capacity-building for CSOs and CLSPs, to increase relevance of training content and empower them to implement larger scale initiatives.
• Search should broaden the engagement with civil society and consider engaging in partnerships with youth groups, faith-based groups, women’s groups, etc.

2) Gender mainstreaming:
• Search management staff should ensure ownership and application of the gender strategy throughout implementation, including through a gender-sensitive monitoring plan.
• Search, government stakeholders and implementing partners should increase efforts to reduce barriers to women’s participation, including through barrier assessment and inclusion of women at all stages of the project cycle.

3) Sustainability:
• Search should adopt a change agent model for capacity building in order to overcome the challenge of frequent transfers of police staff which threatens the sustainability of the project.
• Search, CSOs, CLSPs and governmental stakeholders should engage with issues related to the management (recruitment and training) of the PNC in order to overcome structural issues which hinder project’s efforts in building long-term relationships with police units.
• Search MEL team and management team should incorporate a more robust learning process to avoid late realizations, such as a lack of ownership of the gender strategy and to do modifications along the way.
• Search, CSOs and CLSPs should strengthen advocacy efforts with a wide range of stakeholders, including at the national level, in order to increase project impact at the institutional level.
II. Introduction

II.a Project Background

In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) insecurity, in the form of violence against civilians, has been a protracted crisis for decades. Between 1 June 2020 and 31 May 2021, in South Kivu Province, 631 human rights violations and abuses have been documented, including 176 people killed (120 men, 38 women and 18 children) and 395 victims of violations of the right to physical integrity (200 men, 157 women and 38 children), including 135 victims of sexual violence. During this period, 46 percent of human rights violations and abuses documented by the Joint Office were committed by State officials, primarily members of the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (FARDC) and officers of the Congolese National Police (PNC). Despite clear documentation of these violations and repeated commitments by the president to address insecurity and hold suspected perpetrators of human rights violations and abuses accountable, insecurity and impunity continue to threaten human rights progress in the DRC. Government security forces in DRC continue to commit human rights abuses and international humanitarian law violations against their citizens, including in North and South Kivu and the Central Kasai region. These include summary executions, disappearances, torture, extortion, recruitment of children, arbitrary arrests, and sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) on internally displaced refugees and local populations. These human rights abuses are exacerbating the population’s mistrust of the security forces.

In light of the above context, and building on 13 years of continuous experience working with the FARDC and the PNC, Search implemented the project “Together For Security - Improving Civilian Protection through Civil Society in DRC,” which put Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) at the center of a strategy to drive constructive engagement and advocacy for security sector accountability. This project was originally planned to be implemented over 18 months, although it was extended for another 9 months (total duration of 27 months). Project activities were implemented in 8 locations, namely: Bagira, Baraka, Kamituga, Kiliba North, Kiliba South, Luvungi, Minova and Nyabibwe. The project supported local CSOs to develop and deepen relationships and trust with security forces, cooperate with them to work on the issue of accountability, and foster the sustainability of civil protection efforts through shifting norms linked to the roles of civilians and security forces around security issues, and inducing change in security forces’ behavior. In particular, the project targeted civil society actors (CSOs and members of the communities), CLSPs and the PNC, with the overall objective of fostering sustainable, inclusive and accountable civilian protection efforts in security operations in DRC. Below are the objectives of the
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6 Ibid. p.2.
project, with the associated expected results and the activities that were planned and implemented to achieve them:

Table 1: Objectives, results, and activities of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
<th>Corresponding activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Advocating for greater accountability in the security sector</td>
<td>R1: CSOs have knowledge of human rights, common ground approach, advocacy with the PNC and other authorities.</td>
<td>A1.1 Common Ground Advocacy and human rights trainings for CSOs A1.2 CSO “Security and Human Rights” Forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Professionalizing civil society’s ability to engage and develop relationships and trust with security forces.</td>
<td>R2: Platforms between local authorities, civilians, CSOs and security sector actors are created or strengthened.</td>
<td>A2.1 District authorities organize and convene CLSP with civil society support A2.2 Closed-door “CSO-security forces” Retreats A2.3 Town Hall meetings and Scorecard sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Improving civilian-security engagement in the DRC.</td>
<td>R3.1: The civilian population perceives the positive models of security forces and their own role in encouraging these behaviors</td>
<td>A3.1 Mobile Cinema A3.2 Joint solidarity activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3.2: Civilian population and PNC elements recognize the relevance of security issues for women and the role of women</td>
<td>A3.2 Radio production and broadcast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.b Purpose and Use

In October 2021, Bodhi Global Analysis was contracted by Search to undertake a final evaluation of the project Together for Security. In particular, the evaluation focused on the three following objectives:

1) effectiveness,
2) gender mainstreaming, and
3) sustainability.

II.c Evaluation Methodology

This mixed-methods evaluation was structured along Search’s evaluation questions (EQs). Each evaluation question has corresponding sub-questions and indicators, logically arranged to ensure all elements of the evaluation objectives were addressed. The full evaluation matrix is found in the attached Annex A, with top level questions presented in the table below.
**II.c.i Evaluation Criteria**

Table 2: Evaluation questions and data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Did the project bring about the expected changes in accordance with the theory of change and logical framework?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 To what extent have the expected results of the project been achieved against the benchmarks? (Set of 13 quantitative indicators)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 What changes, intended and unintended, positive and negative, have occurred with the targets? Are there social security and human rights changes that are being observed in the community?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 In line with the project's gender strategy, were the project activities accessible to men and women in the same way? Have special measures been taken to ensure that barriers to women's participation are reduced?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 To what extent has the project contributed to fostering inclusive, accountable and collaborative civil protection efforts in security operations in South Kivu in a sustainable manner?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To answer these research questions, the evaluation team implemented a multi-phased evaluation employing desk review, qualitative and quantitative primary data collection and secondary analysis of the documents and monitoring data provided by Search. This triangulation of multiple sources of data ensures robustness and reliability to the findings of the evaluation.

**II.c.ii Data Collection**

Using a mixed methods approach, the evaluation drew on data collected through:

- In-depth document review
- Key Informant Interviews (KII) with stakeholders
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with participants and stakeholders
- Quantitative survey with participants

The data collection team in the field was composed of 14 enumerators, recruited from a list of Search-provided enumerators and supplemented by the National Consultant. Bodhi provided the data collectors with one day of training at Search’s office. Training included a review of the study background, methodology and instrument(s), including practice interviews. KIIIs were predominantly conducted remotely by Bodhi’s team members, while FGDs were conducted in person by the National Consultant.
In-depth document review
Search provided project documents (listed in Table 3, in Appendices), which were reviewed. Evidence from the documents were entered into a desk review matrix against the study EQs. These documents included baseline tools and the corresponding report, MEL data collection instruments, activity reports, monitoring outputs, etc. The findings from the desk review also informed the development of the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with stakeholders
KIIs were conducted in French with key stakeholders identified with input from Search. Discussion guides were developed based on the desk review, and were approved by Search following an iterative review process. Core discussion guides were tailored to stakeholder type and specific respondents.

KIIs were conducted with 17 stakeholders (see table 4 in Annex), including:
- Search project staff: 6 KIIs
- Partner CLSPs staff: 5 KIIs
- Partner CSOs staff: 6 KIIs

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with participants
A total of eight FGDs were conducted across 6 locations; Minova, Nyabibwe, Bagira, Luvungi, Kiliba and Baraka. The FGDs’ aim was to assess participants’ and stakeholders’ perspectives on the project’s relevance, impact and sustainability. FGD participants were chosen from target profiles (i.e., respondent types) using convenience sampling. FGDs were conducted with the following respondent types:
- Civilians: Bagira (men), Kiliba (women), Kiliba (men)
- CSOs: Nyabibwe (women), Baraka (men)
- Community leaders and local authorities: Nyabibwe (men)
- Police: Minova (men), Luvungi (women)

Quantitative survey with community members and National Police
The evaluation team implemented a face-to-face quantitative survey (implemented using mobile data collection) with residents of eight target communities, as well as members of the National Police in those communities. The eight project locations include: Bagira, Baraka, Kamituga, Kiliba North and South, Luvungi, Minova and Nyabibwe. Specifically, the team surveyed a total of 513 participants, including:
- 409 community members (47 percent women and 53 percent men)
- 104 members of the National Police (12 percent women and 88 percent men). While the team originally planned to survey 200 members of the PNC, this could not be accomplished. PNC members were reluctant to participate without compensation, which Bodhi does not provide to state employees. The low rate of achieved female respondents is likely a reflection of the PNC’s general composition.

The baseline study sampling approach could not be replicated for several reasons. Foremost, the baseline sample locations included Mboko, Bunyakiri, Kitutu and Sange. These were eventually not selected as intervention locations, and therefore were not included in the endline survey. Similarly, Bagira was not included in the baseline survey, but was integrated in the endline as it was chosen as an intervention
location. Additionally, the baseline survey included FARDC members as part of the ‘security forces’ sub-sample; this was not replicated in the endline, as FARDC members were not targeted for the intervention. The team did not have access to baseline raw data, and therefore could not disaggregate between the achieved PNC and FARDC samples, to set targeting for the endline.

Table 3: Survey sample allocation by location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>PNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipated</td>
<td>Final endline figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagira</td>
<td>12.5% (n=50)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baraka</td>
<td>12.5% (n=50)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamituga</td>
<td>12.5% (n=50)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiliba Nord</td>
<td>12.5% (n=50)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiliba Sud</td>
<td>12.5% (n=50)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luvungi</td>
<td>12.5% (n=50)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minova</td>
<td>12.5% (n=50)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabibwe</td>
<td>12.5% (n=50)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (n=400)</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.c.iii Data Analysis

These data sources were analyzed against the evaluation matrix, which served as this report’s analytical framework. That is, analysis was structured to address the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The evaluation team conducted qualitative analysis, mapping key themes and content onto a findings, conclusions and recommendations matrix. The team also produced descriptive statistics of the quantititative data. Data analysis utilized triangulation throughout, to verify consistency of findings across different respondent types.

II.c.iv Limitations

Response bias - Informants may have formed their responses based on personal motivation rather than the most accurate information. Certain respondents (e.g., right holders) may be implicitly incentivized to offer positive responses because they benefit from Search’s support. The evaluation team mitigated this
challenge through triangulating findings, as well as employing an informed consent and anonymization protocol.

**Limited data available** - The outcomes harvesting evaluation technique relies on a complex process of substantiation based on a large amount of data and the participation of all stakeholders. However, the planned outcomes harvesting approach was compromised due to a limited data collection phase and restrictions on respondent engagement. Specifically, the team was unable to engage with external stakeholders (community leaders and government authorities at local level) and donor respondents. Facing this challenge, the evaluation team decided not to include the outcome harvesting component into this evaluation. However, in order to still reflect the changes that have occurred since the project began, outcomes are discussed in the findings under EQ 1, 2 and 3.

**Limited comparability to the baseline** - The evaluation was limited in its ability to draw comparisons from the baseline data due to shifts in programmatic focus from baseline to endline, including a change in target locations. Some locations covered in the baseline were not included in the final survey, as these locations were not used for implementation of project activities. The baseline indicators, discussed under EQ 2, were written to reflect Search’s planned inclusion of the FARDC in programming; that is, questions explicitly mentioning FARDC and ‘security forces’ were used as an umbrella term for both the FARDC and PNC. As the project did not target FARDC members, mentions of such (and in one case, an indicator) were dropped from the endline. For consistency in wording, the term ‘security forces’ was used in the endline, which technically comprises the FARDC and other security actors, in addition to the police. Therefore, indicator results cannot be interpreted as solely representing change in attitudes and behaviors related to the project-targeted PNC.

**Limited willingness of PNC to participate in the survey** - While the team originally planned to survey 200 members of the PNC, this could not be accomplished. PNC members were reluctant to participate without compensation, which Bodhi does not provide to state employees.

**II.c.v Ethical considerations**

Measures were taken to adhere to ‘Do No Harm’ principles to ensure the safety of the participants. Participants were informed of the purpose of the study, and that they may end participation at any time. They were encouraged to ask any questions that they may have about the study before giving consent. They were informed that they may skip any questions that they did not feel comfortable answering, and in the case of KIIIs, they were given the choice not to have the interview recorded.
III. Findings

III.a Level of achievement of expected changes in accordance with the theory of change and logical framework

Search provided CSOs with a range of support, including financial support, training, and advocacy and networking opportunities. Participating CSOs were identified through a mapping exercise and selected based on a range of criteria. These criteria were defined through a participatory approach, in collaboration with the local authorities. Inclusion criteria included capacity, having the necessary legal documents, and working on youth, women, and peacebuilding. Selection was undertaken in consultation with the donor. This rigorous selection process facilitated identification and subsequent engagement with a diverse set of CSOs, with different relevant focal areas, including youth and women’s rights. Further, Search maximized pre-existing resources in the target communities by selecting and building additional capacity of CSOs already working in the human rights and development spaces. Participating CSOs were provided with training on organizational management, the role of the project, project implementation, techniques for monitoring human rights violations, and data collection tools. In total eight capacity-development sessions were organized by Search staff for CSOs, CLSPs and community leaders in the target locations. The training sessions for CSOs and CLSPs were delivered by a consultant trainer over five days in each location. Additionally, one two-hour session on the organization of community forums was delivered to community leaders in Bagira. Search initially supervised the implementation of activities on the ground, with CSOs subsequently implementing activities autonomously, including town hall meetings, mobile cinemas, scorecard sessions, local security diagnosis and solidarity activities. Search would accompany the partners for the aforementioned activities, and directly implemented the advocacy forum and retreat to encourage collaboration between the CSOs and PNC. In addition, Search provided CSOs with USD 5,500 in financial support, disbursed in four installments, and supplemented by office supplies.

Limited evidence exists to assess the extent to which the project contributed to increased capacity of locally-managed CSOs to recognize rights. Data from pre- and post-test for the training of CSOs on the Common Ground Approach, advocacy and human rights show only 14 percent of improvement across all locations.10 In one location, there was no improvement. CSO respondents were inconsistent on the attribution of training to increased capacity. One CSO KII respondent stated that the project only strengthened pre-existing knowledge on human rights.11 However, two CSO KII respondents explained that both the technical and thematic training they received was valuable, and allowed their organization to evolve and improve as they acquired new skills, knowledge and ways of working, including tools and templates that they can continue to use.12

Existing CSO networks were reinforced and regular meetings brought together CSOs, community leaders and members of the security forces. Network strengthening activities increased understanding among CSOs of the programming landscape - which CSOs are undertaking which types of activities, in
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10 Data found in: STD 056 Réunion de réflexion Octobre 2021_présentation
11 KII. CSO. Remote, [Kiliba], November 2021
12 KII. CSO. Remote [Bagira], November 2021
which locations. The project also indirectly resulted in the creation of informal communication channels. Specifically, CSO members independently created WhatsApp groups to maintain contact between CSO peers and provide an avenue for sharing ideas and good practice, among other forms of collaboration. All CSOs respondents confirmed that this WhatsApp group was still active and that they continue to use it to communicate and coordinate between themselves. According to respondents, similar means of communication between CSOs did not exist before the project, attesting to Search’s success in strengthening linkages between stakeholders. Nonetheless, three CSO respondents mentioned that they would have benefitted from more concrete opportunities for collaboration and active forms of networking, including observational visits in other locations to meet other partner CSOs.

A total of 23 percent of surveyed community members reported participating in an activity in the last nine months, in which they discussed sensitive topics with the security forces. While this is below the project’s target of 60 percent, the achievement level indicates that platforms and opportunities for sustained and constructive dialogue between local authorities, civilians, CSOs and security actors are being utilized. However, participation of women civilians was particularly low, as only 9 percent of the surveyed women civilians participated in an activity, against 21 percent of the surveyed male civilians. In addition, the survey highlighted substantial differences in the level of participation in activities in the project locations. For example, only 3 percent of the surveyed respondents participated in an activity in Kamituga, against 34 percent in Baraka, 30 percent in Luvungi, and 29 percent in Nyabibwe.

Figure 1: Participation in project activities by location

[Bar chart showing participation rates by location]

Participation was lower amongst surveyed civilians, at 15 percent, compared to PNC members, at 52 percent.
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13 KII. CSO. Remote [all project locations], November 2021
14 Ibid.
15 KII. CSO. Remote [Kiliba], November 2021
Positively, 94 percent of surveyed PNC say cooperation with CSOs is good or very good, representing substantial progress from the baseline (63 percent), and exceeding the project’s 65 percent target. These findings suggest that participating PNC members faced fewer barriers to developing positive relationships, or a willingness to collaborate with civilians and civil society. However, there remains room for improvement amongst the latter group.

This disparity is also present when assessing perceptions of civil society cooperation with the security forces to strengthen protection. At the baseline, a total of 52 percent of surveyed civilians and 63 percent of security forces reported that civil society organizations cooperate with the security forces to strengthen protection. This level of perception functionally did not substantially increase for civilians (55 percent at endline), while it increased substantially amongst PNC respondents (92 percent). While the target for this indicator was not reached, and improved perceptions amongst the civilian population is minimal, evidence suggests that project participation is related to strengthened perceptions. Specifically, 68 percent of the respondents who were exposed to the project believe that civil society organizations cooperate with the PNC to strengthen the protection of civilians, compared to 56 percent of who were not reached by the project.

However, if perceptions of civilian-PNC engagement remain mixed as per the findings above, survey results indicate a more positive perception of CSO’s willingness and capacity to advocate for greater accountability in the security sector. Indeed, 100 percent of respondents say that CSOs are able to influence security sector policy and practice, against 37 percent of civilians and 32 percent of security forces who said so before the project. In addition, 65 percent of community members believe that CSOs have the capacity to coordinate with the security forces to increase the responsibility of the security forces to protect civilians, suggesting that civil society organizations have more knowledge about unopposed advocacy, conflict transformation and human rights. However, the survey results highlight substantial differences between locations as in Kamituga only 54 percent of the respondents reported a belief that CSOs have the capacity to coordinate with the security forces, compared to 73 percent of respondents in South Kiliba, and 72 percent of respondents in Luvungi. These figures suggest that in some locations, barriers to coordination between the CSOs and the police may be relatively persistent. Data from qualitative interviews highlighted lack of training of police members and high turnover of police staff as potential barriers to coordination.

Figure 2 - Perception of CSO coordination with security forces by respondent type and location
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19 The project reached a respondent if the respondent reported either attending an activity (e.g., mobile cinema) or listening to the program’s radio program. Bodhi Global Analysis. (2021). TFS community survey, November, 2021. Q
22 FGD. CSO. Nyabibwe, November 2021
Evidence on increased PNC accountability is inconsistent. There is a general consensus among FGD participants that the project improved the relationship between civil society and PNC around acknowledging, preventing, addressing and denouncing security sector abuses. FGD participants highlighted an increased willingness to acknowledge security sector abuses among the police; several respondents reported that several police officers publicly admitted, during the town hall, to perpetrating abuses.\textsuperscript{23} KII and FGD respondents also gave examples of police commanders in their respective communities who took action to hold a member of their unit accountable, following reports of abuse given during town hall meetings or solidarity activities.\textsuperscript{24} Another respondent reported that a local police commander committed to accountability monitoring, by stating he would engage with CSOs through regular meetings to monitor the number of police officers accused of arbitrary arrest.\textsuperscript{25}

These anecdotal reports do not align with survey results, suggesting the existence of a remaining gap of perception around acknowledging, preventing, addressing and denouncing security sector abuses. Moreover, perceptions differ substantially between civilian respondents and security forces, indicating a gap that could negatively impact the relationship between the two parties. Survey data suggests that civilians perceive security forces as reluctant to admit committing abuses, and are not fully willing to address wrongdoing.

Figure 3 - Perceptions of security forces’ accountability, by respondent type

\textsuperscript{23} FGD. CSO. Baraka, November 2021
\textsuperscript{24} KII. CSO, CLSP and IP Search staff. Baraka, Luvungi and remote [Bukavu], November 2021
\textsuperscript{25} KII. IP Search staff. Remote [Bukavu], November 2021
Specifically, only 27 percent of civilian respondents believe that the security forces are willing to acknowledge any wrongdoing, and less than half, or 46 percent, believe security forces are willing to address wrongdoing.\textsuperscript{26} Positively, of those who believe the security forces are willing to acknowledge wrongdoing, 52 percent of respondents attribute such to the project activities. PNC respondents hold comparatively more positive perceptions; most PNC respondents believe that security forces are willing to acknowledge (82 percent), prevent (91 percent) and address wrongdoing (92 percent).

\textbf{The project resulted in the revitalization of existing CLSPs, as well as in the formation of new ones.}\n
Prior to the project, CLSPs, which had been established by presidential decree as part of the police reform process in DRC, were not operational. These coordination platforms were set up at the level of the ETDs, with a mandate to manage local security issues. They are composed of representatives from the administration, police, justice and civil society who should meet regularly to discuss the security context and concerns in their communities. Search provided training for existing CLSPs in Kamituga and Bagira, and involved them in project activities. They also helped them to collaborate with CSOs and local authorities. In areas where CLSPs did not exist, Search helped set these up. CLSPs received training alongside CSOs, and were also provided with 200 USD per month to convene meetings. FGD and KII respondents stated that CLSPs benefited from the capacity building support provided by Search.\textsuperscript{27} Despite these achievements, CLSPs continue to face a range of external challenges, which hinder their ability to operate effectively. These include lack of coordination of decentralized services, including CLSPs, lack of funds, capacity and leadership, and the absence of a clear understanding of their role.\textsuperscript{28} Moreover, one group of police FGD participants stated that the support provided was not sufficient to enable the CLSPs to operate effectively, due to its short-term nature.\textsuperscript{29} A group of CSO FGD respondents highlighted the same issue, adding that CLSPs still lack the means required to function, including means to communicate/airtime.\textsuperscript{30} A Key Informant from Search also highlighted the fact that engagement with

\textsuperscript{27} KII and FGD. CLSP and PNC. Minova, Luvungi, Nyabibwe, November 2021
\textsuperscript{28} Rapport d’activité - BS OSC et CLSP Axe Fizi et Uvira, p.6.
\textsuperscript{29} FGD. PNC. Baraka, November 2021
\textsuperscript{30} FGD. CSO. Nyabibwe, November 2021
CLSPs is not sustainable as, while they are meant to be permanent structures, they need government support to give them legitimacy and authority.\textsuperscript{31} 

**The CSO-PNC retreat led to actionable change in relation to accountability.** FGD and KII respondents who answered questions related to the retreat stated that it led to a greater understanding of police responsibilities and the drawing up of a strategic action plan for Security Sector Reform in DRC.\textsuperscript{32} The action plan identified 16 main challenges, and outlined concrete actions to address them, the resources needed for implementation, as well as targets, the time frame, success indicators and the expectations/recommendations for each actor.\textsuperscript{33} Police FGD respondents also stated that they no longer use intimidation and violence and that the retreat led to collaboration between community members and the police.\textsuperscript{34} However, one group of CSO respondents stated that not enough police received the training, and that many of those that did were subsequently redeployed to other areas.\textsuperscript{35} They highlighted the fact that new untrained police officers who come to the area are often violent.

**Scorecards and town hall meetings have resulted in actionable change.** FGD and KII respondents who answered questions related to these activities stated that the scorecards and town hall meetings enabled community members and the police to have open dialogue.\textsuperscript{36} This was corroborated by the survey findings which show that 88 percent of the people who have participated in the scorecard sessions and townhall meetings (11 percent for these two activities combined) said that it contributed to actionable change.\textsuperscript{37} Citizens were able to highlight issues with the police, and the police were able to respond. Issues debated during the town hall meetings were the sanitary conditions in prison cells, arrests, popular justice, production, sale and the consumption of strong alcoholic drinks and drugs. Activity reports list a number of recommendations resulting from the discussions, which have been disseminated to relevant actors. In some cases a special committee has been established to follow-up on the implementation of the recommendations.\textsuperscript{38} Two KII respondents stated that where police were scored poorly, the commander would rebuke/reorganize them.\textsuperscript{39} Despite these achievements, one group of police FGD respondents highlighted the fact that complete change is difficult as structural drivers of corruption remain.\textsuperscript{40} They stated that they are demotivated due to low salaries and having insufficient money to care for their families.

**Joint solidarity activities contributed to building trust between local communities and the police but some level of hostility persists between the two groups.** FGD and KII respondents were very positive about these activities and stated that they resulted in unprecedented interaction between citizens and the police.\textsuperscript{41} However, one group of police respondents stated that the activities led to an improvement in trust, but 'not completely,' and that more longer term activities are needed.\textsuperscript{42} Moreover, one KII
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\textsuperscript{33} Provided document: Plan d'action Stratégique des OSC et Acteurs de Sécurité  
\textsuperscript{34} FGD. PNC. Minova, November 2021  
\textsuperscript{35} FGD. PNC. Nyabibwe, November 2021  
\textsuperscript{36} KII and FGD. CSO and IP Search Staff. Bukavu, November 2021  
\textsuperscript{38} Activity report, town hall meeting, Baraka 27 August 2021, p.5  
\textsuperscript{39} KII. CLSP. Remote [Bukavu], November 2021  
\textsuperscript{40} FGD. PNC. Luvungi, November 2021  
\textsuperscript{41} FGD and KII. All types of respondents. All project locations. Bukavu, November 2021  
\textsuperscript{42} FGD. PNC. Luvungi, November 2021
respondent states that while trust has increased, most people still consider the police to be ‘robbers’. Similarly, three other respondents from CLSPs mentioned that there are still signs of hostility towards the police in the communities, as some civilians continue to fear approaching police officers and still perceive them as being violent. A total of 12 percent of all survey respondents participated in the joint solidarity exercises, of which 92 percent of the respondents said that they contributed to building trust between communities and security forces. However, there is a considerable difference of perceptions between women and men participants to solidarity activities, as 70 percent of the civilian women who participated in this activity say that it contributed to building trust, compared to 95 percent of men participants from the community. This may suggest that building trust between women and the police could take longer, partly due to a higher initial level of fear of the police. This was supported by findings from the FGDs, where women explained that they were afraid to approach police officers.

Figure 4 - Contribution of activities to trust building, by sex and respondent type

The mobile cinema activity had limited reach during the time of the project’s implementation. However, since the end of the project some police commanders are using the film Ndagisa for training purposes, which confirms the relevance of the activity and supports evidence of sustained commitment to positive change. Key Informants state that the activity resulted in attitudinal change at the individual level by showing communities what the role of the police is meant to be, and the benefits of collaboration. Discussions following the screening of the video provided a space for community members and police to speak openly about key issues, and for the police to highlight some of the challenges they face in fulfilling their role. However, only 14 percent of survey respondents participated in the mobile cinema activity, with none of these being members of the PNC. Activity reports also
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46 FGD. Civilians. Kiliba, November 2021
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highlight low attendance levels among the police and restrictions on audience size due to the COVID-19 pandemic.\textsuperscript{49} Limited resources also meant that the mobile cinema activity did not reach remote audiences. The impact of the activity was therefore limited, especially given lack of engagement by the police as reflected in the activity reports and the survey findings. According to one respondent from Search, this can be explained by the very limited number of police agents in some locations, meaning that they could not leave their desk to attend activities.\textsuperscript{50} However, since the end of the project, CSO respondents have indicated that some police commanders are using the film for training purposes within their police units, which shows that despite limitations faced during the implementation of the project, the police’s interest in the film \textit{Ndakisa} is growing.\textsuperscript{51}

**Radio programs spread accurate information about the roles and responsibilities of civilians and the police, and induced positive change in how community members perceive the security forces.** All FGD and KII respondents viewed the radio programs as positive.\textsuperscript{52} 35 percent of survey respondents had listened to \textit{Tuungane kwa Usalama}.\textsuperscript{53} All were community members, with no police respondents having listened to the program. 90 percent of survey respondents who had listened to the program felt that the program reflects the truth, and 82 percent felt that the program positively influenced how they view the security forces.\textsuperscript{54}

The project induced positive change in how community members perceive their role in security issues. Survey findings show that 80 percent of the respondents who were reached by the project think they play a role in promoting positive behavior among security actors, while 71 percent of respondents who were not reached by the project think so.\textsuperscript{55} This suggests that exposure to project activities contributed to empowering community members to play an active role in security issues. However, only 62 percent of female civilians think they play a role in promoting positive behavior among security actors, compared to 78 percent of male civilians, which highlights the need for continued efforts to empower women to take part in security issues alongside security actors.

**The project contributed to raising awareness on the relevance of security issues for women and the role of women.** Findings from the survey show that perceptions about the relevance of safety issues for women and the role of women are positively transformed as 90 percent of respondents (security actors, civilians - men and women, authorities) believe that women have an important role to play in improving security in their communities and 95 percent of community members agree that safety issues are also a concern for women.\textsuperscript{56} FGD and KII respondents highlighted that this project challenged local traditions and beliefs as it valorized and promoted the role of women in security issues and positioned women as men’s equal.\textsuperscript{57} For women respondents of three FGDs, through their participation in the activities, this project was for them an opportunity to realize that security also concerned them and that they had a role to

\textsuperscript{49} Rapport KNJ Mois de Juin 2021, Rapport KNJ Juillet et Août 2021
\textsuperscript{50} KII. IP Search staff. Remote [Bukavu], November 2021
\textsuperscript{51} KII. CSO. Remote [Kamituga, Baraka], November 2021
\textsuperscript{52} KII. All types of respondents. All project locations, November 2021
\textsuperscript{53} Bodhi Global Analysis. (2021). TFS community survey, November, 2021. QRA1 RA1
\textsuperscript{57} KII and FGD. All types of respondents. All project location, November 2021
play in building peace and security. In one group, respondents specifically attributed this change to the radio programs which addressed the issue of women’s rights through inviting women on shows and covering gender specific topics. While there is limited evidence on the extent to which radio programs amplified unheard or marginalized voices, including women's voices, one Key Informant said that hearing women's voices on the radio increased women's willingness to participate in other project activities. All respondents in men’s FGDs also reported that women participated in the activities alongside men, which represents an achievement in a conservative environment usually excluding women from security matters. Women respondents from one FGD said that they are now less afraid to approach the police and that this project encouraged them to start their own initiatives for security and women’s rights. This was corroborated by a KII respondent who reported that thanks to the project, in Baraka women mobilized to create a women’s club for peace and security, taking the lead on identifying insecurity sources and alerting the police. One Search staff member also gave the example of women in Kiliba who mobilized to advocate with police stations for the rights of incarcerated women. In addition, two key informants stated that the engagement and partnership with several women-led and women-serving CSOs contributed to promoting the role of women as key agents of change.

However, six respondents, from CLSPs, CSOs, and Search staff argued that while the project sets an example of how women can be included in decision-making, it was too limited in length and scope to overcome cultural barriers, and women remain marginalized. In the case of the women’s club for peace and security, the respondent further noted that they received some criticism, thus illustrating the point on persisting limiting customs and beliefs despite efforts to break the taboo. Nonetheless, one key informant from Search mentioned that in continuation of the project, two CSOs have been taking the initiative of organizing awareness-raising sessions specifically targeting women and girls to encourage them to report cases of abuse, sexual violence, and feelings of insecurity, which gives an indication on the momentum created by the project.

III.b Level of achievement of expected results against the benchmarks.

Data collected for this final evaluation show mixed results at the outcome and impact level. Search achieved 6 of its 12 targets (note that 13 targets were originally set, but that progress against indicator 1.2.1.9a was not evaluated in the endline for the reason detailed below) (Table 5). The three impact indicators and three other result indicators (1.2.1.6 / 1.2.1.8 / 1.2.1.9b) were not achieved. For impact indicator 11 and indicator 1.2.1.8, the figures for both civilians and PNC were worse than in the baseline. For indicator 1.2.1.9b, the figure for civilians also decreased from the baseline.
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None of the targets for impact indicators were achieved, overall and for civilians.\textsuperscript{70} For the first impact indicator, endline figures exhibited regression. While before the project 74 percent of the civilians said their population believed that the security forces were committed to protecting civilians/willing to protect them, only 63 percent did so after the project.\textsuperscript{71} PNC respondents exhibited no substantive change, declining from 86 to 84 percent.

Figure 5 - (I1) Perception of security forces’ willingness to protect civilians, by respondent type and project phase

For impact indicators two (I2) and three (I3), the endline results also failed to meet targets, overall and for civilians. Against a target of 85 percent, only 65 percent of community members agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: "the relationship between the police and communities is positive".\textsuperscript{72} Compared to the baseline, civilians’ perception of the relationships between the police and communities did not change, as both before and after the project 59 percent of civilians agreed with the aforementioned statement.

Figure 6 - (I2) Perception of the relationship between communities (civilians) and the police, by respondent-type and project phase

\textsuperscript{70} Note - endline targets were not set by respondent-type
\textsuperscript{71} Bodhi Global Analysis. (2021). TFS community survey, November, 2021. QIR1
While the target for I3 was set at 75 percent, only 63 percent of community members said that CSOs cooperate with the security forces to strengthen the responsibility of the security forces to protect civilians. However, while set targets were not met, in some instances there was still improvement from the baseline, which suggests realized impact; further, for some indicators, underachievement could be partly explained by unrealistic targets (see indicator 1.2.1.3).

Figure 7 - (I3) Perception of CSO cooperation with security forces, by respondent-type and project phase

---

Search’s objective of advocating for greater accountability in the security sector was achieved. However, the objective of professionalizing civil society’s ability to engage and develop relationships and trust with security forces was only partially achieved. Participation of community members in an activity in which they discussed sensitive topics with the security forces in the last 6 months fell short of the target. However, 94 percent of PNC say cooperation with CSOs is good or very good, which is a significant improvement on the 63 percent in the baseline, and exceeds the target of 65 percent.74

The third objective of improving civilian-security engagement in the DRC was partially achieved. Only one indicator target for objective 3.1 “Citizens have a new awareness of the different positive models of security forces and their own role in encouraging such behavior “ was met, with 76 percent of citizens stating that they believe they play a role in promoting positive behavior among security actors.75 Indicator 1.2.1.9b, in particular, falls short of the target with only 52 percent of total respondents believing that the PNC are a positive role model to use, and only 42 percent of civilians.76 This figure indicates a worsening of the civilians’ perception of the police, as this is lower than at the baseline when 47 percent of civilians believed that the PNC are a positive role model to use. These findings indicate that while civilians’ perception of their own role has changed, their perception of the police remains mostly negative, with potential unaccounted for external factors even worsening this perception. In addition, survey findings indicate substantive differences of civilians’ perceptions of the police across project locations as only 18 percent of civilians in Bagira, and 33 percent in Kamituga believe that the PNC are a positive role model to use, against 54 percent in Baraka, or even 59 percent in North Kiliba. These

differences can be partly explained by different levels of commitment to change by the commissioners of each location, projecting an image more or less positive of the police.

Figure 8 - Perception of police as a positive role model, by respondent type and location

Both targets related to the relevance of safety issues for women, and the role of women were met. However, it is worth noting that while there was a slight improvement, the targets were already met in the baseline.

Some inconsistencies in the setting of the targets need to be highlighted. On one hand, the fact that only half of the targets were met, can partially be explained by overambitious targets which were not adapted to the limited scope of the project and revisions to programming approaches. Overestimation is especially relevant for the targets set for impact indicators. On the other hand, for some indicators, including those related to objective 3.2, the set targets were very high and close from the baseline figures, leaving little room for improvement and thus revealing that the situation before the project was already satisfying, hence calling into question the relevance of these indicators.

Table 4: Progress against indicators for baseline and endline phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIV</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>CIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.1</td>
<td>% of community members who say their population believes that the security forces are committed to protecting civilians / willing to protect them</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.2</td>
<td>% of community members who agree or strongly agree with the statement: &quot;the relationship between the police and communities is positive&quot;.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.3</td>
<td>% of community members who say that civil society organizations cooperate with the security forces to strengthen the responsibility of the security forces to protect civilians</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.4</td>
<td>% of community members who say that CSOs have the capacity to coordinate with the security forces to increase the responsibility of the security forces to protect civilians</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.5</td>
<td>% of respondents who say that CSOs are able to influence security sector policy and practice</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.6</td>
<td>% of community members who participated in an activity in which they discussed sensitive topics with the security forces in the last 6 months</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.7</td>
<td>% of respondents who say cooperation with CSOs is good or very good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.8</td>
<td>% of community members who consider the security forces to be the main legitimate source of security</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.9a</td>
<td>% of community members who believe that FARDC security is a positive role model to use</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.9b</td>
<td>% of community members who believe that PNC are a positive role model to use</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.10</td>
<td>% of citizens who think they play a role in promoting positive behavior among security actors</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.11</td>
<td>% of respondents (security actors, civilians - men and women, authorities) who believe that women have an important role to play in improving security in their communities</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.12</td>
<td>% of community members who agree that safety issues are also a concern for women</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M&E systems are adequate at the output level, but do not provide information on the impact of activities. As per the M&E plan, Search established a rigorous system for monitoring the implementation of the activities, with specific tools designed for each type of activity. A range of M&E tools were provided by Search to its partners, these include participant lists, activity reports (monitoring sheets) compiled by partner organizations within 5 days of the completion of an activity, feedback sheets and pre/post tests for the trainings, and monthly reports, including narrative reports, pictures, etc. For some activities, Search also provided quality control checklists, and made visits in the field to monitor adherence to timelines, procedures, and COVID measures by the partners. A specific type of monitoring was also in place for media activities, with broadcasting grids provided to CSOs in different areas to monitor broadcasting of radio programs and spots as per the agreed schedule. At the project level, Search

77 In the endline, the question was changed to: Do you consider that the PNC is the main source of security in your community?
78 The question was not asked in the survey
kept a database based on the monitoring sheets updated, and also organized regular reflection meetings. One respondent from Search highlighted that these tools offer limited insight into the extent of the impacts of the activities implemented, and another mentioned that monitoring missions in the field after each trimester would have facilitated a better understanding of the impacts.79

III.c Extent of social security and human rights changes that are being observed in the community

The project resulted in limited positive changes on the level of insecurity in the communities. A decrease in popular justice, and the organization of mixed patrols at night, bringing together members of civil society, including youth, with the police, are among the positive changes reported by KII and FGD respondents.80 One Key Informant said that police, during a radio show, committed to closing all establishments selling strong alcoholic beverages, which was expressed as relief to the community, which perceived this activity as a primary driver of insecurity in their area.81 Participants of several FGDs also reported that people now feel more comfortable being out at night and they are less afraid of the police.82

However, those changes are hindered by external factors. Participants in one FGD stated that the presence of armed groups means that their community is still completely insecure.83 Another group highlighted the fact that unemployment is a structural driver of insecurity, and that in order to address insecurity, unemployment needs to be addressed.84 Survey findings further highlight limited improvement in the social security situation in the project locations, as for all the ten types of violence and disruptions of social security (including street crime, looting, destruction of property, intercommunal violence, etc.) included in the questionnaire, more than 40 percent of the civilians reported witnessing them.85

The project resulted in limited positive changes on the human rights situation in the project locations, according to the communities. The majority of KII respondents stated that the number of arbitrary arrests and incidents of torture has gone down.86 Findings from the FGDs and KIs show that, in project locations, some improvements were observed in the behaviors and practices of the police, including less arbitrary arrests, better adherence to official procedures (presentation of a charges document and unconditional release after 2 days if no plaintiff), decrease in excessive fines, improvement of detention conditions (including a separate cell for women), less harassment during patrols, and less torture of prisoners.87 However, survey findings show that over 40 percent of civilians are still witnessing instances of human rights abuses by the police, including: use of force (46 percent), theft (48 percent), arbitrary detention (49 percent), corruption (59 percent), threats and intimidation (59 percent), torture (36 percent).88 The majority of civilian respondents reported that human rights abuses by the police have either stayed the same or increased in number, compared to 12 months ago.89 While the percentage of
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civilians witnessing instances of killings, abduction and sexual violence is significantly lower, it still happens, across all project locations.

Moreover, two separate respondents provided anecdotal evidence that human rights abuses, particularly extrajudicial punishment, had been inadvertently facilitated by the project. Specifically, one respondent alleged that TFS events allowed for communities and police to build connections, such that the communities felt comfortable engaging the police to support ‘popular justice’; the respondent provided photo and video evidence of an extrajudicial killing, and directly attributed it to the connection established through a mobile cinema event. A separate respondent reported that ‘popular justice’ in their community had been facilitated by the police, but did not directly establish a connection to the project. The evaluation did not establish a causal relationship between the project and increased incidences of ‘popular justice.’

During KIIIs and FGDs respondents described their respective locations’ security context interchangeably with the state of human rights, or human rights abuses. Respondents view these as inextricably connected. This connection presents a challenge for this project if focusing solely on the latter concept. Given the high levels of insecurity in the project locations, mostly due to the activity of armed groups, this attempt to isolate and address only one source of insecurity and of human rights violations is unlikely to have a significant impact in the broader context. Specifically, this finding calls into question the feasibility of achieving positive change in terms of human rights, in a context where security depends on a wide range of external factors putting pressure on all stakeholders. For greater impact, prerequisites must potentially be in place, including a certain level of stability in the security context, as well as a strong police presence. One KII respondent from Search indicated that there were inequalities between zones, with some having a sufficient number of police agents, including some female police officers, while others had only two officers for a whole neighborhood, in turn affecting project efficacy.

**III.d Gender-sensitivity and accessibility of activities**

Due to the lack of a clearly defined gender strategy, the project’s ability to foster meaningful engagement of women was limited. As explained in Search’s internal reflection meeting notes, although a gender inclusion strategy was developed by an external consultant in early 2021, the recommendations from this document were not formally integrated in the design of project activities or monitoring mechanisms. The lack of ownership of this document by the project team, and the absence of a barrier-needs assessment negatively impacted the participation rate of women in project activities.

The partnership with CSOs working on women’s rights and with some CSOs directed by women, and prompting these partners to invite an equal number of men and women were good practices that enabled women to participate in all the activities. All respondents in men’s FGDs reported that women participated in the activities alongside men, which represents an achievement in a conservative

---
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environment where women are usually excluded from security matters.\textsuperscript{94} Radio shows proved to be particularly efficient in encouraging women to participate as one Key Informant said that hearing women's voices on the radio increased women's willingness to participate in other project activities.\textsuperscript{95}

However, across all project activities, only 38 percent of civilian participants were women\textsuperscript{96}. The table below further details women participation, by type of activity:

Table 5: Participation of women in some key activities\textsuperscript{97}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activities</th>
<th>Women’s participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training sessions</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorecard sessions</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhall meetings</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity activities</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile cinema</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures reveal that the aforementioned measures were insufficient to achieve equality in terms of number, and to guarantee the quality of their engagement. This was further explained by one key informant from Search who highlighted a lack of consideration for women’s particular needs and context-specific barriers to participation in the design and planning of the activities.\textsuperscript{98} For example, several KII respondents noted that a key barrier to participation was the reluctance to speak freely in front of men, although this seemed to improve during the course of project implementation.\textsuperscript{99} The respondent from Search noted that more efforts need to be made to identify and develop content that is of interest to women, to find activity times that are compatible with their daily life activities (e.g., work in the fields or market day), and to build a safe space for participation and expression, through organizing women only activities for example.\textsuperscript{100}

\textbf{III.e Sustainability of project’s results}

The newly built relationships with police units are fragile and will need further strengthening. Out of the survey respondents who participated in a project activity, 86 percent believe these have contributed to strengthening the relationship between communities and security forces. And out of these 86 percent, 82 percent believe that this relationship will remain strong in 12 months, which suggests the presence of trust in the durability of the new collaborative links between communities and security forces.

\textsuperscript{94} FGD. Civilians. Bagira and Kiliba, November 2021
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Police respondents are generally more optimistic than civilians, as 92 percent of police respondents who participated in an activity, and who believe that they contributed to strengthening the relationship between communities and security forces, also believe that this relationship will remain strong, compared to 72 percent of civilians.

**Figure 9 - Perception of sustainability of positive relationship, by respondent type**

These findings are corroborated by four CSO respondents who mentioned that collaboration with police units is ongoing, with the relationship working successfully both ways.\(^1\) For example, in case of arrest, the CSO can contact the police to get further information, and sometimes the police contact the CSO to refer a case for which informal mediation is needed, rather than a police decision (eg. small debts, social conflict). CSO respondents and CLSPs reported that this relationship was facilitated by direct communication lines, as commanders in different locations gave CSOs their own phone numbers and encouraged them to visit the unit’s office.\(^2\) However, women civilians reported in a FGD that they lacked means of communication with the police.\(^3\) They said that they struggled to stay in permanent contact with the police, which had a negative impact on their ability to collaborate with them directly. For future projects they suggested the inclusion of a component focusing on communication with security actors.

KII and FGD respondents indicated that positive relationships with the police are based on the goodwill of current commanders, who participated in project activities and are committed to change, but that this relationship can weaken or disappear if the commander leaves.\(^4\) In one FGD, civilian respondents highlighted several issues threatening the sustainability of the relationships with police units.\(^5\) These included frequent transfers of police officers, resulting in the loss of those sensitized by this project, and
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\(^1\) KII. CSO. Remote [Kiliba, Bukavu, Bagira, Baraka], November 2021

\(^2\) KII. CSO and CLSP. Remote [Kiliba, Bagira, Baraka], November 2021

\(^3\) FGD. Civilians. Kiliba, November 2021

\(^4\) KII and FGD. IP Search staff, CLSP and Civilians. Luvungi, Bagira and remote [Bukavu], November 2021

\(^5\) FGD. Civilians. Bagira, November 2021
the arrival of untrained officers who would not have the trust of the community. FGD respondents from civil society and from the police, as well as two KII CSO respondents, also mentioned that unaddressed flaws in the management of the police would inevitably hinder the project's efforts to build long-term relationships with police units. They explained that as long as there was no advocacy at the governmental level to reform the police, including improving recruitment and increasing their capacity and resources in terms of training, transportation means, communication means, infrastructure equipment and salary, the police would continue to feel abandoned and forgotten. This would in turn continue to fuel cycles of violence and corruption. Another limitation raised by a KII respondent from Search is that the project only directly involved a limited number of police agents, most of whom were officers and commanders. It therefore ignored lower ranking agents, although they are often the ones responsible for human rights abuses.

The project had limited impact on security forces’ institutional culture, as engagement was primarily done at sub-national levels. At the advocacy forum on security and human rights organized by Search in Bukavu, from 13 to 15 September 2021, CSOs developed an advocacy booklet that was disseminated to the provincial governorate of South Kivu, the provincial Ministry of the Interior, the provincial police station of the PNC, the FARDC command, the Defense and Security commission of the Assembly Provincial, the General Directorate of Migration, and the National Intelligence Agency. This document presented the main issues that were identified during the forum: proliferation of houses producing strong alcoholic drinks and drugs, armed robbery, looting, kidnapping and targeted killings, poor detention conditions, arbitrary arrests and illegal detention, providing associated recommendations, actors and timeframes. While this activity was a positive step towards engaging with institutions, there is limited evidence that mechanisms are in place to follow-up on the progress made towards established objectives. Anecdotally, one CSO respondent claimed that follow-up meetings are being held every three months; however, Bodhi was unable to verify. It is also unclear if the prerequisites for the success of reform initiatives were present, such as awareness-raising for these institutions on the importance of the identified reform topics, as well as institutional reform willingness, operational links between institutions and CSOs, monitoring methods, etc. In addition, two respondents from Search, and two others from CSOs, noted that advocacy at the provincial level was insufficient and that similar advocacy initiatives would need to occur at the national level to secure institutional and systemic change, including legislative change.

One respondent from Search mentioned that the radio programs, including interviews with members of provincial authorities, were a first step towards involving institutions. Another respondent from Search mentioned that the work with the CSLPs was also an example of the institutional approach taken by this project. In the context of setting up the CLSPs, Search made an effort to build a relationship with the Ministry of Interior and thus anchor the project within the confines of the decentralization law. However, another CSO respondent mentioned that given the gray area of the decentralization law, and the weak
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management and leadership of decentralized territorial entities, the institutional impact of the project remains limited.\textsuperscript{113}

FGD respondents from civil society highlighted that a key limitation of the project was the exclusion of other stakeholders such as FARDC, and justice institutions (eg. prosecutors).\textsuperscript{114} Furthermore, KII respondents from Search expressed the need to intensify engagement with higher levels of decision-making, through creating platforms and dialogue opportunities with institutions, including with intelligence services (ANR), and the Migration Ministry (DGM).\textsuperscript{115}

Some evidence of continuing activities and new initiatives (especially media activities) exists to support sustained results for the communities, increased capacities, and improved relationships between the police and the civil society. All respondents across FGDs and KIIIs highlighted the lack of sustainability of the project due to its limited duration.\textsuperscript{116} A recurrent statement by respondents was that change just started to be visible by the time the project ended. Sustainability appears not to have been sufficiently incorporated in the initial logic of the project respondents from Search attributed this to the limited duration of the project, which negatively impacted the depth of the engagement with various actors.\textsuperscript{117} Despite time constraints, efforts to ensure sustainability were made when possible. For example, one KII respondent from Search explained that the original plan to support partner radio stations to produce the programs had to be abandoned, with Search producing the programs instead.\textsuperscript{118} However, journalists benefited from the CSOs and CLSPs training, which increased their knowledge of security and human rights, with a view to potentially producing their own radio programs on these issues. This respondent reported that three journalists have been given a production space by their manager to produce their own program on security issues. This effort to mainstream sustainability in the design of media activities is reported to have been successful by several CSO respondents.\textsuperscript{119} Local radio stations continue to contribute to project activities, as one CSO has agreed with three local radio stations to broadcast a program on security once a week with each, including on the topic of the role of women. The film projected in the context of the mobile cinema also continues to be projected in or beyond the project locations it has been shared with all CSOs by Search, they continue to further disseminate it to other stakeholders, such as police commanders who want to use it to train officers. One CSO respondent reported that a committee of artisanal diggers asked for the film because they are harassed by the police.\textsuperscript{120} They felt that the film would serve as a basis for them to request the police give the reason for arrest and to provide a duly completed document when they come, namely written summons or arrest warrant. This continuous engagement with the film and the development of new radio programs emphasizes the relevance of media activities to foster inclusive, accountable and collaborative civil protection efforts in security operations in South Kivu in a sustainable manner.

CLSPs and CSOs are attempting to build on the momentum created by the project. The project introduced some good practices that are being reproduced by civil society actors, who are committed to securing
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change. For example, for activities requiring few resources, civil society actors mobilize to ensure their continuity. Security forums continue to take place within some CLSPs, the monitoring of human rights violations also continues, and a CSO is now organizing a coordination meeting every month with local leaders, CSLP members, and other organizations, to discuss cases of human rights violations that occurred that month. In some locations, joint solidarity activities between civilians and the police are being organized. Some new activities are also taking place: one CSO led awareness raising sessions specifically targeting women and girls, mixed patrols including members of civil society and the police are being implemented, and one CSO led a vulgarization campaign on the ten golden rules of the police. One key informant from a CSO also reported that its staff were thinking about forming a working group with three other local organizations to create synergy in the security and human rights sector. Another indicator of sustained results is the mobilization of other civil society actors, such as youth and women’s groups. One respondent from Search reported that in Luvungi, a youth group was inspired by the action of the local CSO and decided to organize community work with the police (Salongo). However, one CSO respondent warns that this initial buzz is likely to fade if no additional support and resources are provided.

IV.a Conclusions

IV.a.i Level of achievement of expected changes in accordance with the theory of change and logical framework

Concrete evidence of increased trust in the CSOs’ ability to collaborate with security forces and influence security sector policies and practices related to accountability and human rights validates the relevance of this project’s focus on CSOs as agents of change. In addition, through inclusive and participatory activities, the project brought together members from civil society and from the PNC for the first time resulting in increased mutual understanding, although some level of hostility persists between the two groups.

The project particularly improved the relationship between civil society and the PNC around acknowledging, preventing, addressing and denouncing security sector abuses, with some concrete examples of changes in the PNC’s practices. It also contributed to initiating a change of perception on the relevance of security issues for women and the role of women, with concrete examples of women’s empowerment in a conservative local context.

IV.a.ii Level of achievement of expected results against the benchmarks

Half of the indicators to measure progress against the objectives were not met, revealing limited success of the project to create change, especially in transforming communities’ perceptions of the security forces and the police. The mixed results of the survey also indicate that the set targets were overambitious and not adapted to contextual realities.

M&E tools and methods used at the project and activity levels are sufficient to evaluate progress against the benchmarks, but do not enable the measurement of the impact of activities undertaken.

---
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IV.a.iii  Extent of social security and human rights changes that are being observed in the community

Some evidence exists to support a decrease in human rights violations by the police. However, the project had a limited effect on the overall security situation, given the context in which it operates.

IV.a.iv  Gender-sensitivity and accessibility of activities

Engaging with CSOs working on women’s rights is a good practice that shows Search’s willingness to integrate a gender perspective in the project. However, the absence of a clearly defined gender strategy at the project level, and of mechanisms to ensure equal representation of men and women in activities, prevented meaningful participation of women in this project.

IV.a.v  Sustainability of project’s results

The short-term nature of the project means that the long-term impact of the activities implemented may be limited. The project created a culture of collaboration between civil society actors and police units and raised the awareness of individuals from both parties who are likely to nurture a long term relationship. However, external factors such as frequent transfers of police staff and flaws in the management of the police at the national level can threaten these relationships.

Indeed, despite some advocacy efforts with regional stakeholders, the project had limited impact at the institutional level. Civil society actors are building on the momentum created by the project at the local level by ensuring the continuation of some activities, and by starting their own initiatives. However, in the long-term, without additional resources and continuous support, these activities are likely to reduce in scope and number.

V.a Recommendations

Considering the findings and conclusions above, the recommendations to take forward in the design and implementation of future projects are:

V.a.i Effectiveness

In the project design phase, Search management team and donor should identify necessary prerequisites for implementation. This recommendation derives from findings nested under the keyphrase “Given the strong level of insecurity in the locations of the project, mostly due to the activity of armed groups, the attempt to isolate and address only one source of insecurity / and of human rights violations is unlikely to have a significant impact on the overall situation.” Evidence suggests that the overall security context in project locations, as well as low presence of the PNC in some areas, limit the project’s ability to achieve positive change. Bodhi recommends to:

- Conduct context assessment at onset to assess feasibility and inform targeting.
- Identify enabling factors/structural barriers, etc. and then carefully select communities/partners that do not have insurmountable barriers.
Search’s MEL team can refine M&E systems to better account for impacts. This recommendation derives from findings nested under the keyphrase “M&E systems are adequate at the output level, but do not provide information on the impact of activities”.

- Follow-up on initiatives organized by the partners, on the changes directly resulting from activities like scorecard sessions and town hall meetings, and on long term goals set by the advocacy forum.
- Further investigate testimonies reported by partners such as examples of commanders taking action to discipline an officer that committed abuse, etc. through formally documenting these cases and gathering evidence.
- Better including community members’ views through community-based monitoring to track progress over the course of the implementation, and ensure continuous project improvement and adjustment.

Search operational team to conduct formal and comprehensive capacity assessments of new police partners. This recommendation derives from the following finding: “new untrained police officers who come to the area are often violent.” Evidence suggests that police partners may not have the requisite baseline internalization of human rights principles to adopt the project at the point in causal pathways that the project operates at. That is, further capacity building on human rights principles and policing may be required before moving through the change logic to building reporting mechanisms with conflict-affected communities.

Search and external stakeholders should strengthen the work with CLSPs, including through increased engagement with the relevant government agencies to clarify the role of the CLSPs at the level of ETDS (territorially decentralized entities). As permanent structures, CSLPs have the potential to act as change agents in communities. However, their lack of legitimacy and influence in the context of competing local structures weakens their ability to act. To address this recommendation, Bodhi recommends taking the following actions:

- Therefore, clarifying the mandate of the CLSPs toward themselves and the communities, their responsibilities and their level of authority, and providing them with adequate resources will be key in solidifying their capacity for action.
- Allocating them a more substantial financial support would also allow them to implement larger scale initiatives, including advocacy campaigns.

Search should reinforce and refine capacity-building for CSOs and CLSPs. This recommendation derives from findings nested under the keyphrase “Limited data prevents from assessing the extent to which the project participated to build the capacity of locally-managed CSOs to recognise rights.” Findings showed that the training of CSOs on the Common Ground Approach, advocacy and human rights only led to a small knowledge improvement, which can reflect pre-existing knowledge on these topics. Bodhi recommends:

- Conduct formal and comprehensive capacity assessments of new partners to identify training needs and design capacity-building sessions accordingly, based on the gaps identified.
- To better strengthen the links between project inputs, outputs, outcome and impact, additional training sessions should be incorporated. This could include regular and continuous training on
ad vocacy and common ground approach to improve CSOs’ capacity to design their own set of activities and apply this new knowledge.

**Search operational team to broaden the engagement with civil society.** As findings show both limited engagement with marginalized groups, and evidence of mobilization from the youth, it indicates that there is a need and that the potential exists for a wider civil society engagement. Bodhi recommends: considering working with less formal entities:
- Mapping formal and informal civil society actors and groups at the local level
- Considering working with less formal entities: engaging in partnership with youth, faith-based groups, women groups, local leaders, etc.

**V.a.ii Gender Mainstreaming**

**Search management staff to ensure ownership and application of the gender strategy.** This recommendation derives from the findings nested under the keyphrase “With a lack of clearly defined gender strategy, the project’s ability to foster meaningful engagement of women was limited.” Developing a shared vision and explicit consensus on gender equality objectives relevant to the project strategy is key to ensure adherence to the gender strategy throughout implementation. Bodhi recommends:
- Ensuring that the gender strategy is practical, and based on quality gender analysis as well as barrier assessment.
- Ensuring that responsibilities for implementing the gender strategy are explicit in job descriptions, Scopes of Services and Terms of Reference, for all personnel at every stage throughout the project cycle.
- Developing mechanisms to assess adherence to the gender strategy, such as gender-sensitive monitoring to ensure that gender-mainstreaming objectives are being achieved.
- Considering integrating in-country gender experts to the project team to undertake analysis and support the implementation and review of all strategies.

**Search, government stakeholders and implementing partners should increase efforts to reduce barriers to women’s participation.** This recommendation derives from the following finding: “one key information from Search staff highlighted a lack of consideration for women’s particular needs and context-specific barriers to participation in the design and planning of the activities.” Bodhi recommends to:
- Conduct barrier assessment to assess the barriers to women participation in the context of target locations, and to inform design (to develop content that is of interest to women, to find activity times that are compatible with their daily life activities (eg.work in the fields or market day), to build a safe space for participation and expression, through organizing women only activities for example.
- Include women at all stages of the project cycle to integrate their needs and priorities For example, several KII respondents noted that a key barrier to participation was the reluctance to speak freely in front of men, although this seemed to improve over the course of the implementation.

**V.a.iii Sustainability**
**Search to adopt a change agents model for capacity building with the police.** This recommendation derives from findings nested under the keyphrase “The new build relationships with police units are fragile and will need further strengthening”. In order to overcome the challenge of frequent transfers of police staff which threatens the sustainability of the project, Bodhi recommends investing more time and resources in contributing to the diffusion of good practices:

- Identify ‘champions’ within the police, elements with a certain level of influence that can act as role models, and provide them with Training of Trainers so that they can share knowledge and practices with their peers, in their original location or in new duty stations.

**Search, CSOs, CLSPs, and governmental stakeholders to engage with issues related to the management (recruitment and training) of the PNC.** This recommendation derives from findings nested under the keyphrase “FGD respondents from the civil society and from the police, as well as two KII CSO respondents also mentioned that unaddressed flaws in the management of the police would inevitably hinder the project’s efforts in building long-term relationships with police units.” Bodhi recommends:

- Increasing efforts to intervene directly in police units and engaging members of the police at all levels, including lower rank agents (not only officers and commanders), including through police-specific capacity-building sessions.
- Engaging in advocacy at the governmental level to reform the police and address issues related to recruitment, capacity-building, resources (transportation means, infrastructure, equipment) and remuneration.

**Search’s MEL and management teams to incorporate a more robust learning process.** The reflection meeting that happened at the end of the project is a good practice that needs to be implemented throughout the implementation of the project to avoid late realizations such as the lack of ownership of the gender strategy, and to take necessary actions, do modifications along the way. Bodhi recommends:

- Systematized process to contextualize learning and redesign accordingly.

**Search, CSOs and CLSPs to increase advocacy efforts, including at the national level.** This recommendation derives from the following challenge identified “Despite some advocacy efforts with regional stakeholders, the project had limited impact at the institutional level.” Bodhi recommends:

- As mentioned in previous recommendations, strengthen the capacity of partners to implement larger scale advocacy campaigns.
- Intensify engage with higher levels of decision-making and a wider range of stakeholders. Beyond the PNC and regional actors, future projects should aim to increase engagement with national stakeholders such as intelligence services (ANR), the Migration Ministry (DGM), justice institutions (eg.prosecutors), etc., through creating platforms and dialogue opportunities with these institutions.
VI. Appendices

VI.a Provided documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document type</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>• Proposal Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>• Baseline Report&lt;br&gt;• Baseline Tools&lt;br&gt;• Presentation Baseline Results (French and English versions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Documents</td>
<td>• Qualitative analysis/data set - Baseline&lt;br&gt;• Quantitative analysis/data set - Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>• Reflection Meeting Report&lt;br&gt;• Reflection Meeting Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
<td>• TOR Baseline Consultancy (French and English versions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Reports</td>
<td>• Activity Reports for Implemented Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Sheets</td>
<td>• Monitoring Sheets for Implemented Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Tools</td>
<td>• Template of Checklist for Quality Control of Activities&lt;br&gt;• Template for Activity Reports&lt;br&gt;• Template for Broadcasting Sheets&lt;br&gt;• Template for Activity Monitoring Sheets&lt;br&gt;• Template for Presence lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence Lists</td>
<td>• Presence Lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Data</td>
<td>• Database of activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI.b KII sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search staff</td>
<td>• Regional Grant Manager&lt;br&gt;• Project Manager&lt;br&gt;• M&amp;E Assistant&lt;br&gt;• Media Assistant&lt;br&gt;• Project Officer&lt;br&gt;• Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners (CSOs and CLSP)</td>
<td>• CLSP Luvungi&lt;br&gt;• CLSP Bagira&lt;br&gt;• CLSP Baraka&lt;br&gt;• CLSP Kiliba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI.c Evaluation Workplan

The table below provides an overview of the project’s key activities.\footnote{Table reflects target dates as of 26/10, rather than initial target dates per the project proposal, or subsequent workplan revisions.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Wk1</th>
<th>Wk2</th>
<th>Wk3</th>
<th>Wk4</th>
<th>Wk5</th>
<th>Wk6</th>
<th>Wk7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception report submitted</td>
<td>11 Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork Training</td>
<td>20 Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork Pilot</td>
<td>21 Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork initiated</td>
<td>22 Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork completed</td>
<td>3 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary findings</td>
<td>7 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft evaluation report submitted</td>
<td>10 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final evaluation report submitted</td>
<td>15 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Findings</td>
<td>15 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VI.d Instruments**

**V.d.i Key Informant Interview Guide - IP/Sub staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Informant Interview Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview mode:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent organization:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed consent obtained:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hello, [name], thank you for agreeing to speak with me.

My name is [name] and I work with Bodhi Global Analysis. Bodhi is an independent British research company that has been engaged by Search for Common Ground to evaluate the project ‘Together for Security” or “Pamoja kwa usalama”. We want to understand how the project has helped foster sustainable, inclusive and accountable civilian protection efforts in security operations in DRC.

Your participation in the interview is completely voluntary, and you may stop the interview at any time if you don't want to answer one or several questions. If you agree to be interviewed, we will make written notes of your responses, which will not be discussed or shared with any project staff. Your name will not appear in connection to any information you give us.

This interview should take between 45 and 90 minutes. Are you willing to participate?

**Thank you for agreeing to participate. Can you first briefly describe your role in managing the project Together for Security?”**
1. (1.1) Did the project achieve its objectives, in accordance with the expected changes (dialogue is sustained so that CSOs influence the security sector relating to accountability and human rights, and the civilian population and the PNC? have a transformed perception of their role in safety)?

1. (1.1.1) To what extent does the project improve CSOs knowledge of human rights, the common ground approach, advocacy with the PNC and other local authorities?
   a. (Probe):(1.1.1.1) To what extent have specific project activities contributed to the improvement of CSOs knowledge?
   b. (Probe):(1.1.1.2) How have relevant CSOs been identified and selected?
   c. (Probe):(1.1.1.3) What was the nature and degree of project support to CSOs?
   d. (Probe):(1.1.1.4) To what extent has the project facilitated the creation of or maintenance of networks between CSOs?

2. (1.1.2) To what extent does the project strengthen platforms between local authorities, actors from the civilian society and security sector actors?
   a. (Probe):(1.1.2.1) To what extent have specific project activities contributed to strengthening relationships between these actors?
   b. (Probe):(1.1.2.2) In which ways has the project improved the relationship between civil society and security forces around:
      i) acknowledging security sector abuses?
      ii) preventing security sector abuses?
      iii) addressing security sector abuses?
      iv) denouncing security sector abuses?
   c. (Probe):(1.1.2.3) To what extent has the project identified relevant CLSPs and contributed to their revitalization?
   d. (Probe):(1.1.2.4) To what extent have CSO-security forces retreat led to actionable change regarding accountability?
   e. (Probe):(1.1.2.5) To what extent have scorecard and town hall meetings led to actionable changes?
   f. (Probe):(1.1.2.6) How have relevant joint solidarity activities been selected?
   g. (Probe):(1.1.2.7) To what extent have joint solidarity activities contributed to build trust between local communities and security forces?

3. 1.3. (1.1.3) To what extent does the project change the civilian population's perception of the security forces' role and of their own role?
   a. (Probe):(1.1.3.1) To what extent have specific project activities contributed to changing perceptions?
   b. (Probe):(1.1.3.2) To what extent have media-based activities reached a large audience and led to a shifting of norms?
   c. (Probe):(1.1.3.3) To what extent has mobile cinema allowed the project to reach remote audiences?
To what extent has mobile cinema and following discussions led to attitudinal change at the individual level?

To what extent were radio projects perceived as spreading accurate information about roles and responsibilities of civilians and security forces?

4. 1.4 To what extent does the project contribute to raising awareness on the relevance of security issues for women and the role of women?
   a. (Probe:)1.1.4.1 To what extent have specific activities contributed to raising awareness on gender issues in security?
   b. (Probe:)1.1.4.2 To what extent have radio projects amplified unheard or marginalized voices, including women's voices?
   c. (Probe:)1.1.4.3 To what extent have marginalized groups (women, persons with disabilities and members of remote communities) been included in town hall meetings and scorecard sessions?
   d. (Probe:)1.1.4.4 To what extent was gender mainstreaming incorporated into CSO and CLSP training modules?

2. (1.2) To what extent have the expected results of the project been achieved against the benchmarks?
   1. (1.2.2) What mechanisms are in place to monitor and evaluate progress against benchmarks?
      a. (Probe:)1.2.2.1 What M&E systems/tools are in place at the project level?
      b. (Probe:)1.2.2.2 What M&E systems/tools are in place at the activity level?

3. (1.3) What changes, intended and unintended, positive and negative, have occurred with the targets? Are there social security and human rights changes that are being observed in the community?
   1. (1.3.1) To what extent did the project produce changes on social security within the community?
      a. (Probe:)1.3.1.1 What was the qualitative nature of social security changes?
      b. (Probe:)1.3.1.2 To what degree were social security changes intentional or expected?
   2. (1.3.2) To what extent did the project produce changes on human rights in the community?
      a. (Probe:)1.3.2.1 What was the qualitative nature of human rights changes?
      b. (Probe:)1.3.2.2 To what degree were human rights changes intentional or expected?
   3. (1.3.3) Did the project produce any unintended changes besides social security and human rights?
      a. (Probe:)1.3.3 What was the qualitative nature of the unexpected changes?

4. (2.1) In line with the project's gender strategy, were the project activities accessible to men and women in the same way? Have special measures been taken to ensure that barriers to women's participation are reduced?
   1. (2.1.1) To what extent did the project adhere to the gender strategy?
a. (Probe:)(2.1.1.1) How was the gender strategy determined?
b. (Probe:)(2.1.1.2) What mechanisms exist to assess adherence to the gender strategy?

2. (2.1.2) How did the project include gender mainstreaming into monitoring to ensure that the project benefits men and women equally at all stages?
   a. (Probe:)(2.1.2.1) Existence of gender monitoring plan

3. (2.1.3) What mechanisms were in place to ensure equal access to activities for men and women?
   a. (Probe:)(2.1.3.1) What measures were taken to ensure adequate representation of women in the project's activities?

4. (2.1.4) Through which mechanisms does the project recognise specific barriers to women's participation and take action to reduce it?
   a. (Probe:)(2.1.4.1) Existence of barrier-needs assessments

5. (3.1) To what extent has the project contributed to fostering inclusive, accountable and collaborative civil protection efforts in security operations in South Kivu in a sustainable manner?

   1. (3.1.1) What has been the impact/if any of the project in civil protection efforts in security operations, on a systemic level?
      a. (Probe:)(3.1.1.1) To what extent has the project contributed to building long-term relationships with police units?
      b. (Probe:)(3.1.1.2) To what extent has the project led to institutional change?
      c. (Probe:)(3.1.1.3) To what extent has the project participated in building the capacity of locally-managed CSOs to recognise rights?
      d. (Probe:)(3.1.1.4) What evidence exists to support sustained results for the communities?

6. Close out

   1. Were there any challenges/changes in the implementation of the project, at Search or partner level? Did they impact the results? How were they overcome? (Probe: duration of the project reduced to 9 months)
   2. Are there any other comments you would like to make at this time?
   3. Do you have any comments for the team of the project?

V.d.ii Key Informant Interview Guide - External stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Informant Interview Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project name:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher name:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello, [name], thank you for agreeing to speak with me.

My name is [name] and I work with Bodhi Global Analysis. Bodhi is an independent British research company that has been engaged by Search for Common Ground to evaluate the project ‘Together for Security”. We want to understand how the project has helped foster sustainable, inclusive and accountable civilian protection efforts in security operations in DRC.

Your participation in the interview is completely voluntary, and you may stop the interview at any time. If you agree to be interviewed, we will make written notes of your responses, which will not be discussed or shared with any project staff. Your name will not appear in connection to any information you give us.

This interview should take between 45 and 90 minutes. Are you willing to participate?

Thank you for agreeing to participate. Can you first briefly describe your role in implementing the project ‘Together for Security’?

1. (1.1) From your experience working with ‘Together for Security’, which activities worked and did not work? (Probe: Which activities had the most impact on the community? What is the biggest change?)

   1. (Probe:) (1.1.1.1) To what extent have project activities (training) contributed to improving CSOs’ knowledge on advocacy, common ground approach, etc?
   2. (Probe:) (1.1.2.1) To what extent have project activities (eg. townhall meetings, scorecard sessions, etc.) contributed to creating platforms between different security actors and civilians?
   3. (Probe:) (1.1.3.1) To what extent have project activities (eg. radio, mobile cinema) contributed to changing the perceptions of civilians on the role of security forces and on their own role?
   4. (Probe:) (1.1.4.1) To what extent have project activities contributed to changing perceptions on the relevance of security issues for women and the role of women in security?
2. (1.3) From your experience with the project, have activities produced any social security and human rights changes in the community?
   1. (Probe:)(1.3.1.1) What was the qualitative nature of social security changes? (probe: have you noticed a decrease or an increase in incidents such as looting, street crimes, violence against civilians, repression of protests, etc?)
   2. (Probe:)(1.3.2.1) What was the qualitative nature of human rights changes? (probe: have you noticed a decrease or an increase in abuses by the security forces, such as arbitrary detentions, thefts, use of force, sexual violence, murder, etc?)
   3. (Probe:) (1.3.3) Has the project produced other changes in your community? Which ones?

3. (2.1) From your experience with the project, was the project sensitive to gender issues and gender-specific needs?

4. (3.1) From your experience working with the project, to what extent has it contributed to fostering inclusive, accountable and collaborative civil protection efforts in security operations in South Kivu in a sustainable manner?
   1. (3.1.1) To what extent does the project complement other interventions / coordinates with other stakeholders to produce systemic change in civil protection efforts in security operations?
      a. (Probe:)(3.1.1.2) To what extent has the project complemented other interventions / coordinated with other stakeholders to achieve institutional change?

5. Close out
   1. Are there any other comments you would like to make at this time?
   2. Do you have any comments for the team of the project?

V.d.iii Key Informant Interview Guide - Donor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Informant Interview Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client: Search for Common Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name: Together for Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview mode:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent name:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello, [name], thank you for agreeing to speak with me.

My name is [name] and I work with Bodhi Global Analysis. Bodhi is an independent British research company that has been engaged by Search for Common Ground to evaluate the project “Together for Security”. We want to understand how the project has helped foster sustainable, inclusive and accountable civilian protection efforts in security operations in DRC.

Your participation in the interview is completely voluntary, and you may stop the interview at any time. If you agree to be interviewed, we will make written notes of your responses, which will not be discussed or shared with any project staff. Your name will not appear in connection to any information you give us.

This interview should take between 45 and 90 minutes. Are you willing to participate?

Thank you for agreeing to participate. Can you first briefly describe your role in managing the project Together for Security?

1. Did the project achieve its objectives, in relation to the expected changes (dialogue is sustained so that CSOs influence the security sector relating to accountability and human rights, and the civilian population and the PNC? have a transformed perception of their role in safety)?

   1. (1.1.1) To what extent does the project improve CSOs knowledge of human rights, the common ground approach, advocacy with the PNC and other authorities?
      a. (Probe):(1.1.1.1) To what extent have specific activities contributed to this?
         (Probe: activities with CSOs, trainings)

   2. (1.1.2) To what extent does the project strengthen platforms between local authorities, actors from the civilian society and security sector actors
      a. (Probe):(1.1.2.1) To what extent have specific activities contributed to this?
         (Probe: CSO-Police retreat, townhall meetings, scorecard sessions)

   3. (1.1.3) To what extent does the project change the civilian population's perception of the security forces' role and of their own role?
      a. (Probe):(1.1.3.1) To what extent have specific activities contributed to this change?
         (Probe: radio programs and mobile cinema)
4. (1.1.4) To what extent does the project contribute to raising awareness on the relevance of security issues for women and the role of women?
   a. (Probe:) (1.1.4.1) To what extent have specific activities contributed to this?

2. To what extent has the project contributed to fostering inclusive, accountable and collaborative civil protection efforts in security operations in South Kivu in a sustainable manner?
   1. (3.1.1) What has been the impact/if any of the project on civil protection efforts in security operations, on a systemic level?
      a. (Probe:) (3.1.1.1) To what extent has the project contributed to building long-term relationships with police units?
      b. (Probe:) (3.1.1.2) To what extent has the project led to institutional change?
      c. (Probe:) (3.1.1.3) To what extent has the project participated in building the capacity of locally-managed CSOs to recognise rights?

3. Close out
   1. Were there any challenges/changes in the implementation of the project, at Search or partner level? Did they impact the results? How were they overcome? (Probe: duration of the project reduced to 9 months)
   2. Are there any other comments you would like to make at this time?
   3. Do you have any comments for the team of the project?

V.d.iv FGD Guide - Participants (general lines of questioning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Discussion Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview mode:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1 details:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2 details:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3 details:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed consent obtained:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello all, thank you for agreeing to speak with me.

My name is [name] and I work with Bodhi Global Analysis. Bodhi is an independent British research company that has been engaged by Search for Common Ground to evaluate the project ‘Together for Security’. We want to understand how the project has helped foster sustainable, inclusive and accountable civilian protection efforts in security operations in DRC.

Your participation in this discussion is completely voluntary, and you may leave at any time. If you agree to participate, we will make written notes of your responses, and the discussion will be recorded, but the notes and recording will not be discussed or shared with any project staff. Your name will not appear in connection to any information you give us.

This discussion should take between 45 and 90 minutes. Are you willing to participate?

A. First, can you all please share with me how you have interacted with the Search for Common Ground project? What has been your role in implementation?

B. Overall, would you describe your interactions with Search as generally positive or negative? Why or why not?

1. (1.1) Overall, thinking about the activities you were involved with, what kind of impact do you think this project had on the protection of civilians and security operations in your community?

2. (1.1.4) Thinking about the activities you were involved with, what have been their impact on your perception of the role of women in security?

3. (1.3) Has the project produced any intended and unintended consequences in your community (positive and negative)?

4. (2.1) Overall, do you think the project activities were accessible to men and women in the same way? Why / why not?

5. (3.1) Beyond changes within your community, do you believe that the project produced deep and large-scale changes at the national level in civil protection efforts in security operations? Why/ Why not?

6. Close out
   1. Are there any other comments you would like to make at this time?
   2. Do you have any comments for the team of the project?
Hello all, thank you for agreeing to speak with me.

My name is [name] and I work with Bodhi Global Analysis. Bodhi is an independent British research company that has been engaged by Search for Common Ground to evaluate the project ‘Together for Security’. We want to understand how the project has helped foster sustainable, inclusive and accountable civilian protection efforts in security operations in DRC.

Your participation in this discussion is completely voluntary, and without remuneration. If you don't want to answer one or several questions, please let us know. Please be aware that all the answers are very important because in these kinds of discussions there are no right or wrong answers. So feel free to express your opinion. If you agree to participate, we will make written notes of your responses, and the discussion will be recorded, but the notes and recording will not be discussed or shared with any project staff. Your name will not appear in connection to any information you give us.

This discussion should take between 45 and 90 minutes. Are you willing to participate?

A. First, can you all please share with me how you have interacted with the Search for Common Ground project? What has been your role in implementation?

B. Overall, would you describe your interactions with Search as generally positive or negative? Why or why not?

1. (1.1) What kind of impact do you think this project had on the protection of civilians in security operations in your community?
1. (1.1.2) Overall, do you think that the project strengthened links between civilians and the national police?
   a. (Probe)(1.1.2.1) In your community, have there been changes around:
      i) acknowledging security sector abuses?
      ii) preventing security sector abuses?
      iii) addressing security sector abuses?
      iv) denouncing security sector abuses?
   b. (Probe)(1.1.2.6) Have scorecard and town hall meetings led to real changes?
   c. (Probe)(1.1.2.8) Have joint solidarity activities contributed to increasing your trust towards security forces?

2. (1.1.3) Thinking about the activities you were involved with, what has been their impact on your perception of the security forces' role and of your own role?
   a. (Probe)(1.1.3.3) Have mobile cinema and radio projects changed your perception of the security forces? Why?

3. (1.1.4) Thinking about the activities you were involved with, how have they contributed to changing your perception of the role of women in security issues?

2. (1.3) Has the project produced any intended and unintended consequences in your community (positive and negative)?
   1. (1.3.1) Have you noticed a change in social security within your community? (probe: avez vous noticed an increase or decrease of incidents such as looting, street crime, violence against civilians, repression of protests, etc)
      a. (Probe) (1.3.1.1) What were these changes? How do you explain them?
   2. (1.3.2) Has there been changes in the amount of violations of rights in your community, by the security forces (eg. violence, theft, corruption)?
      a. (Probe) (1.3.2.1) What are these changes? How do you explain them?
   3. (1.3.3) Did the project produce any other unintended changes?
      a. (Probe) (1.3.3.1) If so, what were they?

3. (2.1) Overall, do you think the project activities you were involved with were accessible to men and women in the same way? Why?

4. (3.1) Overall, do you believe that the project will have long-term effects in security operations and the protection of civilians in South Kivu? Why?
   1. (3.1.1) If any, what is the impact of the project at the national level in terms of security operations and the protection of civilians?
      a. (Probe)(3.1.1.1) Do you think that the relationship with the police will remain positive/will continue to improve?
      b. (Probe)(3.1.1.4) What are the long-term effects of this project for your community?

5. Close out
Hello all, thank you for agreeing to speak with me.

My name is [name] and I work with Bodhi Global Analysis. Bodhi is an independent British research company that has been engaged by Search for Common Ground to evaluate the project ‘Together for Security’. We want to understand how the project has helped foster sustainable, inclusive and accountable civilian protection efforts in security operations in DRC.

Your participation in this discussion is completely voluntary, and you may leave at any time. If you agree to participate, we will make written notes of your responses, and the discussion will be recorded, but the notes and recording will not be discussed or shared with any project staff. Your name will not appear in connection to any information you give us.

This discussion should take between 45 and 90 minutes. Are you willing to participate?

A. First, can you all please share with me how you have interacted with the Search for Common Ground project? What has been your role in implementation?
B. Overall, would you describe your interactions with Search as generally positive or negative? Why or why not?
1. **(1.1) What do you think has been the impact of the project on the protection of civilians in security operations in your community?**
   1. **(1.1.2) How have the relationships between local authorities, actors from the civilian society and security sector actors changed? Why?**
      a. (Probe) Do you see your role in protecting civilians differently? Why?
      b. (Probe)(1.1.2.2) Thinking about the activities you participated in (e.g. townhall meetings, retreat with CSOs, scorecard sessions) what has been their impact on the relationship between civil society and security forces changed? Has there been changes around:
         i) acknowledging security sector abuses?
         ii) preventing security sector abuses?
         iii) addressing security sector abuses?
      c. (Probe)(1.1.2.3) Do you think that the project identified relevant CLSPs and contributed to their revitalization?
      d. (Probe)(1.1.2.4) Has the CSO-security forces retreat led to concrete change?
      e. (Probe)(1.1.2.6) Have scorecard and town hall meetings led to concrete changes?
      f. (Probe)(1.1.2.8) Have joint solidarity activities contributed to build trust between local communities and security forces?

2. **(1.1.4) How has your perception of the relevance of security issues for women and the role of women changed? Why?**

2. **(1.3) Did the project produce intended and unintended consequences in your community (positive and negative)?**
   1. **(1.3.3) Has the project produced any changes in your police unit? In your community?**
      a. (Sonde) (1.3.3.1) What are these changes?

3. **(3.1) Overall, do you think that the project will have long-term effects in security operations and the protection of civilians in South Kivu?**
   1. **(3.1.1.1) Do you think that the relationship with the civilian population will remain positive/will continue to improve?**
   2. **(3.1.1.2) Has the project led to institutional change?**
   3. **(3.1.1.4) Have you changed certain practices / behaviors in your work? If so, do you think you will continue to implement these changes?**

4. **Close out**
   1. Are there any other comments you would like to make at this time?
   2. Do you have any comments for the team of the project?

---

**V.d.vii FGD Guide - Participants - CSOs**
Hello all, thank you for agreeing to speak with me.

My name is [name] and I work with Bodhi Global Analysis. Bodhi is an independent British research company that has been engaged by Search for Common Ground to evaluate the project ‘Together for Security’. We want to understand how the project has helped foster sustainable, inclusive and accountable civilian protection efforts in security operations in DRC.

Your participation in this discussion is completely voluntary, and you may leave at any time. If you agree to participate, we will make written notes of your responses, and the discussion will be recorded, but the notes and recording will not be discussed or shared with any project staff. Your name will not appear in connection to any information you give us.

This discussion should take between 45 and 90 minutes. Are you willing to participate?

A. First, can you all please share with me how you have interacted with the Search for Common Ground project? What has been your role in implementation?
B. Overall, would you describe your interactions with Search as generally positive or negative? Why or why not?

1. (1.1) What impact do you think the project had on the protection of civilians and security operations in DRC?
   1. (1.1.1) Thinking about the activities you were involved with (eg.trainings), how have they contributed to your knowledge of human rights, the common ground approach, advocacy with the PNC and other authorities?
      a. (Probe)(1.1.1.3) How did the programm support CSOs? Was this support adequate/sufficient support?
b. (Probe)(1.1.1.4) Has the project facilitated the creation of or maintenance of networks between CSOs? If so, how?

2. (1.1.2) How did the relationship between local authorities, actors from the civilian society and security sector actors changed?
   a. (Probe)(1.1.2.1) Thinking about the activities you were involved with (eg. townhall meetings, retreat with CSOs, scorecard sessions), have they improved the relationship between civil society and security forces around:
      i) acknowledging security sector abuses?
      ii) preventing security sector abuses?
      iii) addressing security sector abuses?
      iv) denouncing security sector abuses?
   b. (Probe)(1.1.2.3) Do you think that the project identified and helped the relevant CLSPs?
   c. (Probe)(1.1.2.4) To what extent have CSO-security forces retreat led to concrete change regarding accountability?
   d. (Probe)(1.1.2.6) Have scorecard and town hall meetings led to concrete changes? If so, what changes?
   e. (Probe)(1.1.2.8) Have joint solidarity activities contributed to build trust between local communities and security forces? How?

3. (1.1.4) How has your perception of the role of women changed? Why?
   a. (Probe)(1.1.4.2) Have radio projects amplified unheard or marginalized voices, including women's voices? Why?
   b. (Probe)(1.1.4.4) Was gender mainstreaming incorporated into CSO and CLSP training modules? How?

2. (3.1) Overall, do you think that the project will have long-term effects in security operations and the protection of civilians in South Kivu?
   1. (3.1.1) If any, what has been the impact of the project at the national level in terms of security operations and the protection of civilians? How?
      a. (Probe)(3.1.1.1) Do you think that the relationship with the police will remain positive/will continue to improve?
      b. (Probe)(3.1.1.2) Has the project led to institutional change? What changes?
      c. (Probe)(3.1.1.3) Has the project participated to build the capacity of locally-managed CSOs to recognise rights?

3. Close out
   1. Are there any other comments you would like to make at this time?
   2. Do you have any comments for the team of the project?
# V.d.viii Quantitative Survey Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Filter</th>
<th>Question text</th>
<th>Response options</th>
<th>Notes and instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro/sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS1</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>IS1. Enumerator name</td>
<td>[List]</td>
<td>Enumerator fill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IS2A | ALL | IS2A. Location | 1= Bagira  
2= Baraka  
3= Kamituga  
4= Kiliba Nord  
5= Kiliba Sud  
6= Luvungi  
7= Minova  
8= Nyabibwe | Enumerator fill |
| IS2B | ALL | IS2B. Respondent type | 1 = Community member  
2 = National Police | Enumerator fill |
| IS3A | IS2B = 1  
ELSE IS4 | IS3A. [Enumerator - attempt to contact respondents, following survey protocol.]  
If respondent is successfully contacted and available to interview, now or at a future appointment, record the first response option.  
If, after at least two attempts, the respondent is not available or cannot be reached, then record the second option. **Note - this will submit the survey and you will be unable to contact this respondent again.** | 1 = Respondent successfully contacted and is available to interview, now or at a future appointment  
2 = Respondent not contacted or is unavailable to interview, now and at a future appointment | Enumerator fill |
| IS3B | IS3A = 1  
ELSE END | IS3B. Thank you for speaking with me. We would like to randomly select an individual to speak with at the house. Is the adult with the nearest birthday available to speak?  
[If no] How about the second nearest? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No | Read out |
### IS3C
| IS3B = 1 ELSE END | IS3C. Original or replacement household | 1 = Original  
2 = Replacement | Enumerator fill |

### IS3D
| IS3C = 2 ELSE IS4 | IS3D. How many households, not including this one, were visited before finding an eligible respondent? | [Numerical] | Enumerator fill |

### IS4
| IS2B = 2 OR IS3B = 1 ELSE END | IS4. Hello, my name is [name]. I work as a data collector for Bodhi Global Analysis, a firm researching programs conducted by Center Lokole/Search for Common Ground. Bodhi is now conducting a survey in your area so they can learn about the state of security in the community, in response to a recent project by Search for Common Ground to address the relationship between the community members and national police. 

We would like to understand your perspectives, as they will be important for designing programs that meet the needs of community members. We therefore ask for your participation in a 20-30 minute interview. 

You do not have to agree to participate. If you agree to participate, your responses will be kept anonymous and confidential. You may refuse to answer any question that you do not want to answer, or stop the interview, without penalty. 

Do you agree to continue? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No | Read out |

### IS5
| IS4 = 1 ELSE END | IS5. Respondent sex | 1 = Female  
2 = Male | Enumerator fill |

### IS6
| ALL | IS6. What is your name | [Text] |

### IS7
| ALL | IS7. What is your highest level of education? | [Level] | Read out |

**RQ-Media questions - The questions you will be asked now are related to the media you use.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ1_R1</th>
<th>RQ1. What are your main sources of information on the local security situation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ1_R2</th>
<th>Radio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1_R3</td>
<td>SMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1_R4</td>
<td>Whatsapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1_R5</td>
<td>Other social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1_R6</td>
<td>Community meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1_R7</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1_R8</td>
<td>Other (to be specified)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ2</th>
<th>RQ2. What is the type of media that you use most often?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Written Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ3_R1</th>
<th>RQ3. If social media, what are they?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ3_R2</th>
<th>WhatsApp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ3_R3</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3_R4</td>
<td>Instagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3_R5</td>
<td>Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3_R6</td>
<td>Other (to be specified)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code to fit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ4</th>
<th>RQ1_R2 = 1 ELSE RA1</th>
<th>RQ4. Which radio station do you listen to the most?</th>
<th>Code to fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = RTNC (Radio Télévision Nationale du Congo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Radio OKAPI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Radio Maendeleo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = MAMAN RADIO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Radio MARIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 = RTNK : Radio télévision Ngoma Ya Kivu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 = Radio EL SHADAY,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 = Radio messagère du peuple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 = Radio Ondese FM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 = Radio Sauti ya amani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 = Radio ngoma ya amani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 = Radio vision Shala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 = Radio Bubandano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 = Radio communautaire de Nyabibwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 = Other (to be specified)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ5</td>
<td>RQ1_R2 = 1 ELSE RA1</td>
<td>RQ5. What type of program do you regularly listen?</td>
<td>Code to fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising spot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious program / preaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (to be specified)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ6</td>
<td>RQ1_R2 = 1 ELSE RA1</td>
<td>RQ6. What are your favorite times to listen to the radio?</td>
<td>Code to fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before 8am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 8am and 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Selected  
0 = Not selected
### RQ6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ6_R3</th>
<th>Between 12pm and 4pm</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ6_R4</td>
<td>Between 4pm and 8pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ6_R5</td>
<td>After 8pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RQ7

RQ7. How often do you listen to the radio?

- 1 = Every day of the week
- 2 = 3-6 days a week
- 3 = 1-2 days a week
- 4 = A few times a month
- 5 = Others to be specified
- 97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)
- 98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out)

### RA

The following questions are related to the radio programs broadcasted as part of the Search / Center Lokole project.

#### RA1

RA1. Have you heard the radio program named Tuungane kwa usalama?

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No
- 98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out)

#### RA2

RA2. Have you listened to the radio program Tuungane kwa usalama on one of those radio stations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radio Station</th>
<th>1 = Yes</th>
<th>2 = No</th>
<th>98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Maendeleo (Bukavu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Ngoma ya Amani (Baraka)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio vision shala (Kamituga)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Ondese FM (Kiliba)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio communautaire de Nyabibwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Bubandano (Minova)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio sauti ya Amani (Lubérizi/Luvungi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RA3

RA3. What topic was discussed in that program? [Text]
(1.1.3.3 / 1.1.3.6) RA4. I am going to read several statements about Tuungane kwa usalama. For each one, please tell me the extent to which you agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RA4_R1</th>
<th>RA1 = 1 ELSE PB1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The program provided you with information you had not had before. 1 = Completely agree 2 = Somewhat agree 3 = A little bit agree 4 = Not at all agree 97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The information on the program reflects the truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The radio programs have influenced how you regard the security forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would be positive for your community if more community members heard the programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PB. EQ1.3 The following questions are related to the security context in your community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB1_R1</th>
<th>(1.3.1 / 1.3.1.1) PB1. In the past 12 months, have you witnessed the following situations in your community?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crackdown on protests 1 = Yes 2 = No 97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercommunal violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beating and wounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Destruction of crops / fields and other goods or property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threats and intimidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harassment, racketeering, charge money illegally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB1_R11</td>
<td>Other (to specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R1</td>
<td>PB1_R1 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB2_R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R2</td>
<td>PB1_R2 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB2_R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R3</td>
<td>PB1_R3 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB2_R4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R4</td>
<td>PB1_R4 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB2_R5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R5</td>
<td>PB1_R5 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB2_R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R6</td>
<td>PB1_R6 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB2_R7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R7</td>
<td>PB1_R7 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB2_R8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R8</td>
<td>PB1_R8 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB2_R9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R9</td>
<td>PB1_R9 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB2_R10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R10</td>
<td>PB1_R10 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB2_R11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB2_R11</td>
<td>PB1_R11 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB3</td>
<td>PB2_R1 - 11 = 1&lt;br&gt;ELSE PB4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Reduced
2 = Stayed the same
3 = Increased
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out)
### PB4_R1

(1.3.2 / 1.3.2.1) PB4. In the past 12 months, have you witnessed the following situations or behaviors from the police?

1. Use of force
2. Theft
3. Arbitrary detention
4. Sexual violence
5. Corruption
6. Killing
7. Abduction
8. Torture
9. Threats and intimidation
10. Other (to specify)

#### IS2B = 1

**Read out**

**1 = Yes**

**2 = No**

**97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)**

**98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out)**

### PB5_R1

(1.3.2 / 1.3.2.1) PB5. To what extent do you feel such situations / behaviors have reduced or increased within your community over the past 12 months?

1. Use of force
2. Harassment, racketeering, charge money illegally
3. Arbitrary detention
4. Sexual violence
5. Corruption

#### PB4_R1 = 1

**Read out**

**1 = Reduced**

**2 = Stayed the same**

**3 = Increased**

**97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)**

**98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out)**
### PB5_R6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB4_R6 = 1</th>
<th>PB5_R7</th>
<th>Killing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELSE PB5_R8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PB5_R7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB4_R7 = 1</th>
<th>PB5_R8</th>
<th>Abduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELSE PB5_R9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PB5_R8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB4_R8 = 1</th>
<th>PB5_R9</th>
<th>Torture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELSE PB5_R10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PB5_R9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB4_R9 = 1</th>
<th>PB5_R10</th>
<th>Threats and intimidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELSE PB5_R10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PB5_R10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB4_R10 = 1</th>
<th>PB5_R10</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELSE PB6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PB6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PB5_R1 - 10 = 1</th>
<th>PB6</th>
<th>(1.3.2 / 1.3.2.1) PB6. What do you believe are the reasons for this improvement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ELSE PA1 | | 1 = Respondent names project activities  
2 = Respondent does not name project activities |

**PA. EQ1.1 The following questions are about the behaviors of security forces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA1</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>(1.1.2.2) PA1. Overall, how willing do you believe security forces are to <strong>acknowledge</strong> any wrongdoing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | | 1 = Very willing  
2 = Somewhat willing  
3 = A little bit willing  
4 = Not at all willing  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>(1.1.2.2) PA2. Compared to 12 months ago, to what extent has the recognition of wrongdoing by the security forces improved or worsened?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | | 1 = Improved  
2 = Neither improved, nor worsened  
3 = Worsened  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) |

**Read out**

[Enumerator: to facilitate the respondent’s understanding, probe by clarifying the meaning of “recognize”: the security forces admit that they behaved badly / committed inappropriate acts]
| PA3 | PA2 = 1 ELSE PA4 | (1.1.2.2) PA3. What do you believe are the reasons for this improvement? | 1 = Respondent names project activities  
2 = Respondent does not name project activities | Code to fit |
|-----|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| PA4 | ALL             | (1.1.2.2) PA4. Overall, how willing do you believe security forces are to prevent any wrongdoing? | 1 = Very willing  
2 = Somewhat willing  
3 = A little bit willing  
4 = Not at all willing  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out  
[Enumerator: to facilitate the respondent's understanding, probe by clarifying the meaning of “preventing”: anticipating abuse before it happens (eg through training, reforms, rules etc)] |
| PA5 | ALL             | (1.1.2.2) PA5. Compared to 12 months ago, to what extent has the prevention of wrongdoing by the security forces improved or worsened?  
1 = Improved  
2 = Neither improved, nor worsened  
3 = Worsened  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
| PA6 | PA5 = 1 ELSE PA7 | (1.1.2.2) PA6. What do you believe are the reasons for this improvement? | 1 = Respondent names project activities  
2 = Respondent does not name project activities | Code to fit |
| PA7 | ALL             | (1.1.2.2) PA7. To what extent has wrongdoing by security forces decreased or increased in the last 12 months?  
1 = Decreased  
2 = Didn’t increase nor decrease  
3 = Increased  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
| PA8 | ALL             | (1.1.2.2) PA8. Overall, how willing do you believe security forces are to address any wrongdoing?  
1 = Very willing  
2 = Somewhat willing  
3 = A little bit willing | Read out  
[Enumerator: to facilitate the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Possible Responses</th>
<th>Code to Fit</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PA9             | ALL        | (1.1.2.2) PA9. Compared to 12 months ago, to what extent has the treatment of wrongdoing by security forces improved or worsened? | 1 = Improved  
2 = Neither improved, nor worsened  
3 = Worsened  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out | |  
| PA10            | PA9 = 1 ELSE PA11 | (1.1.2.2) PA10. What do you believe are the reasons for this improvement? | 1 = Respondent names project activities  
2 = Respondent does not name project activities | Code to fit | |  

IR. Impact and Results Indicators (EQ1.2) The following questions are related to your beliefs about the role of civilians and the police in security, and then we will ask you about the activities of the Search / Center Lokole project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Possible Responses</th>
<th>Code to Fit</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| IR1             | ALL        | (1.1.2.1 - 11) IR1. Do you consider that the members of your community believe that the security forces are engaged in the protection of civilians? | 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out | [Enumerator instruction: this question seeks to assess the general perception of the role of the security forces at the community level] |
| IR2             | ALL        | (1.2.1.2 - 12) IR2. Do you see the relationship between the Police and the civilian population as generally positive? | 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out | |
| IR3A | ALL | (1.2.1.3 - I3) IR3A. Do you think that civil society organizations cooperate with the PNC to strengthen the protection of civilians?  
1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out)  
| Read out |
| IR3B | IR3A < 3 ELSE IR4 | IR3B. How do civil society organizations cooperate with PNC to strengthen the protection of civilians?  
[Text] |
| IR4 | ALL | (1.2.1.4 - R1.1) IR4. Do you think that CSOs have the capacity to coordinate their actions with the PNC?  
1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out)  
| Read out |
| IR5A | ALL | (1.2.1.5 - R1.2) IR5A Is there advocacy done by citizens for security sector accountability?  
1 = Yes  
2 = No  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don't know (Enumerator: do not read out)  
| Read out |
| IR5B | IR5A = 1 ELSE IR6A | (1.2.1.5 - R1.2) IR5B If Yes (1) to what extent is it effective in influencing security sector policies and practices?  
1 = Very effective  
2 = Fairly effective  
3 = Neither effective nor not effective  
4 = Not effective enough  
5 = Not effective at all  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don't know (Enumerator: do not read out)  
| Read out |
| IR6A | ALL | (1.2.1.6 - R2.1) IR6A. Have you heard of an activity that has been organized in this community in which actors of the civilian society have discussed with the security forces on sensitive issues during the last nine months?  
1 = Yes  
2 = No  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out)  
[Enumerator: probe on (eg. joint solidarity activities, scorecard session, townhall meeting, mobile cinema)]  
| Read out |
| IR6B | IR6A = 1 ELSE IR7 | (1.2.1.6 - R2.1) IR6B. If yes: have you already taken part? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No | Read out |
|------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------|
| IR6C_R1 | IR6A = 1  
ELSE IR7 | (1.2.1.6 - R2.1) IR6C. If yes, please name them:  
Joint solidarity activity | | |
| IR6C_R2 | IR6B = 1  
ELSE IR7 | Scorecard session | 1 = Selected  
0 = Not selected | Code to fit (with probing) |
| IR6C_R3 | IR6B = 1  
ELSE IR7 | Townhall meeting | | |
| IR6C_R4 |  | Popular expression platform | | |
| IR6C_R5 |  | Mobile cinema | | |
| IR6C_R6 |  | Other (to be specified) | | |
| IR6D | IR6B = 1  
ELSE IR7 | IR6D. Do you think that this activity has contributed to improving the relationship between civil society and the PNC? | 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
| IR6E | IR6B = 1  
ELSE IR7 | IR6E. Do you think that this activity has contributed to improving the protection of civilians? | 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
| IR7 | IR6C_R2 = 1  
OR IR6C_R3 = 1  
ELSE IR8 | (1.1.2.6) IR7. To what extent have the scorecard sessions and townhall meetings contributed to actionable changes? | 1 = Very much contributed  
2 = Somewhat contributed  
3 = A little bit contributed  
4 = Not at all contributed  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
| IR8  | IR6C_R1 = 1 ELSE IR9 | (1.1.2.8) IR8. To what extent have the joint solidarity exercises contributed to building trust between communities and security forces? | 1 = Very much contributed  
2 = Somewhat contributed  
3 = A little bit contributed  
4 = Not at all contributed  
97 = Refuse ( Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know ( Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
|------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| IR9  | IS2B = 1 ELSE IR11A | IR9. Have you participated in any mobile cinema activities by Search for Common Ground/Centre Lokole, such as the screening of the film Ndakisa? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
98 = Don’t know ( Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
| IR10_R1 | IR9 = 1 ELSE IR11A | (1.1.3.3 / 1.1.3.5) IR10. I am going to read several statements about the mobile cinema program. For each one, please tell me the extent to which you agree. The program provided you with information I had not had before. | 1 = Completely agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = A little bit agree  
4 = Not at all agree  
97 = Refuse ( Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know ( Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out topics and answers |
| IR10_R2 |  | The information on the program reflects the truth | | Randomize topics |
| IR10_R3 |  | The cinema has influenced how you regard the security forces | |  |
| IR10_R4 |  | It would be positive for your community if more community members saw the cinema | |  |
| IR11A | IS2B = 2 ELSE IR12 | (1.2.1.7 - R2.1) IR11A. Do you also feel comfortable interacting with CSO / civil society forces? | 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
97 = Refuse ( Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know ( Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
| IR11B | IR11A <=5 ELSE IR12 | IR11B. Why do you (not) feel comfortable interacting with CSO / civil society forces? | [Text] |  |
| IR12 | ALL | (1.2.1.8 - R3.1) IR12. Do you consider that the PNC is the main source of security in your community? | 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree | Read out |
| IR13 | ALL | (1.2.1.9b - R3.1) IR13. Do you think the Police are a positive role model to use? | 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
| IR14 | ALL | (1.2.1.10 - R3.1) IR14. Do you think you play a role in promoting positive behavior among security actors? | 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
| IR15 | ALL | (1.2.1.11 - R3.2) IR15. Do you consider that women have an important role to play in improving security in their communities? | 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
| IR16 | ALL | (1.2.1.12 - R3.2) IR16. Do you consider that security issues also concern women? | 1 = Strongly agree  
2 = Somewhat agree  
3 = Neither agree nor disagree  
4 = Somewhat disagree  
5 = Strongly disagree  
97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out)  
98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) | Read out |
**PC. EQ3.1** The last three questions we are going to ask you concern the sustainability of the changes related to the Search / Center Lokole project.

| PC1 | IR6C_R1 = 1 OR IR6C_R2 = 1 OR IR6C_R3 = 1 OR IR6C_R4 = 1 OR IR6C_R5 = 1 OR IR6C_R6 = 1 ELSE PC2 | (3.1.1.1 / 3.1.1.4) PC1. You mentioned you had participated in some activities with security forces. To what extent do you believe these have contributed to strengthening the relationship between communities and security forces? 1 = Very much contributed 2 = Somewhat contributed 3 = A little bit contributed 4 = Not at all contributed 97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out) 98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) Read out |
| PC2 | PC1 <= 3 ELSE PC3 | (3.1.1.1 / 3.1.1.4) PC2. To what extent do you believe this relationship will remain strong in 12 months? 1 = Completely will remain 2 = Somewhat will remain 3 = A little bit will remain 4 = Not at all will remain 97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out) 98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) Read out |
| PC3 | IS2B = 2 AND IR6C_R1 = 1 OR IR6C_R2 = 1 OR IR6C_R3 = 1 OR IR6C_R4 = 1 OR IR6C_R5 = 1 OR IR6C_R6 = 1 ELSE END | (3.1.1.2) PC3. To what extent did your engagement with [search] contribute to positive change within your community? 1 = Very much contributed 2 = Somewhat contributed 3 = A little bit contributed 4 = Not at all contributed 97 = Refuse (Enumerator: do not read out) 98 = Don’t know (Enumerator: do not read out) Read out |

Survey end