Integrated Conflict Prevention and Resilience Handbook
When communities are affected by conflict, they are more vulnerable to a wide range of other shocks and stresses, including natural hazards. Likewise, the ability of a community to manage tensions and withstand shocks, without a significant increase in conflict, can be seen as a key indicator of that community’s resilience. Poorly planned development or humanitarian interventions can also contribute to an increase in conflict. Therefore it is important that preventing conflict must form a key component of any intervention that genuinely seeks to build community resilience.

This guide will support agencies to strengthen community resilience more effectively in conflict-affected contexts. It does so by providing step-by-step guidance on how to integrate a conflict-sensitive approach into pre-existing and commonly-applied resilience-strengthening methodologies. It is, to our knowledge, the first time that specific guidance of this kind has been developed.

The guidance outlined here will be piloted in 10 communities in two countries (five in Kenya and five in Pakistan) over the course of the LPRR project (2015–2018). Lessons will be captured and the guide will be updated at the end of the project, based on findings from project implementation.
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Introduction

This guide provides practical support to development and humanitarian practitioners working in the field of resilience strengthening in conflict-affected contexts. It is written primarily for NGO staff working at project and programme-level and local implementing partners and is intended to serve as a flexible and practical resource for staff working in highly complex environments.

This guide brings together learning and best practices from nine leading agencies working on resilience building and combines this with practical conflict-sensitivity tools and knowledge. It aims to develop an integrated methodology focused on how to strengthen resilience in conflict-affected contexts. It should be used in conjunction with established resilience methodologies already in use by international NGOs and their partners (see page 6).

What are conflict-affected contexts?
Conflict-affected contexts refers to any context (at any level; local, sub-national, national or international) in which conflicts between certain groups have resulted in, or have the potential to result in, significant levels of violence or the fear of violence.

Where is this guide applicable?
This definition encompasses a huge range of contexts, spanning countries embroiled in high-intensity civil wars, to communities in which conflict remains much less obvious, but who nonetheless face persistent levels of insecurity or the risks of escalation in tensions and violence. However, not all of these contexts will be appropriate for the application of resilience-strengthening methodologies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts in which guide is applicable</th>
<th>Contexts in which guide is not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contexts with mid to low levels of persistent insecurity or conflict.</td>
<td>In the midst of humanitarian emergency response activities, or immediately following a humanitarian emergency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities in which the fear or threat of violence (including intra-personal violence) is a significant barrier to people’s well-being.</td>
<td>In contexts in which access is severely restricted by extreme levels of insecurity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to use this guide
This guide is not a stand-alone manual, but seeks to complement resilience-strengthening methodologies currently being used by humanitarian and development agencies. It seeks to supplement these methodologies, by suggesting specific approaches, additional steps or specific issues that should be considered at key stages across a typical project cycle.

Chapter 1 introduces some core concepts underpinning this guide (conflict, violence and resilience) and discusses how they are inter-related.

Chapters 2 and 3 introduce readers to cross-cutting considerations that are critical for promoting resilience in conflict-affected contexts; conflict sensitivity and building trust with diverse stakeholders.

Chapters 4 to 9 are structured around key steps within a typical project cycle. Chapter 4 focuses on macro-level conflict analysis. Chapter 5 outlines key considerations during preparation and planning phases for local-level activities. Chapter 6 describes a process for integrating conflict analysis into local level participatory vulnerability and capacity assessments (PVCA), whilst chapter 7 focuses on ensuring that action planning and implementation are
conflict sensitive. Chapters 8 and 9 provide guidance on how to integrate conflict-sensitive monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and advocacy across the project cycle.

These chapters include best practice and lessons learned as well as guiding questions for staff and partners. The questions are intended to highlight critical issues and considerations; they should not be read as a checklist, and there is not necessarily a right or a wrong answer. They are intended to act as a tool to help staff interrogate their own actions from a conflict-sensitivity perspective, and consider context-specific responses.

A series of annexes provide further practical tools and guidance on implementing specific sections of this guide.

Throughout, we have sought to signpost where and how guidance can be integrated into resilience methodologies, used by humanitarian and development agencies.

Boxes at the beginning of chapters 4 to 9 point the reader towards the relevant step within six methodologies. We hope that practitioners from other agencies will be able to adapt the guidance provided in this guide in order to apply it to a range of other methodologies also.
### Resilience-strengthening methodologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Aid Participatory Vulnerability Analysis: A step-by-step guide for field staff</strong></td>
<td>Participatory Vulnerability Analysis is a tool developed by ActionAid which involves communities, local authorities and other stakeholders in an in-depth examination of what makes them vulnerable. <a href="http://www.actionaid.org.uk/sites/default/files/doc_lib/108_1_participatory_vulnerability_analysis_guide.pdf">www.actionaid.org.uk/sites/default/files/doc_lib/108_1_participatory_vulnerability_analysis_guide.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christian Aid’s Good Practice Guide: Participatory Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (PVCA)</strong></td>
<td>PVCA empowers poor people to analyse their problems and suggest their own solutions. Part one of these guidelines explains what PVCA is, what the benefits of this approach are and when it can be applied. Part two describes a step-by-step approach to conducting the assessment and the main challenges that are likely to occur at each step. <a href="http://www.christianaid.org.uk/Images/Christian-Aid-good-practice-PVCA-guidelines-February-2013_tcm15-67264.pdf">www.christianaid.org.uk/Images/Christian-Aid-good-practice-PVCA-guidelines-February-2013_tcm15-67264.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern Worldwide’s Risk Analysis Guidelines</strong></td>
<td>Guidelines that present a way of doing risk analysis with communities by explaining a series of participatory methodology tools. They have been designed to allow risk analysis to be undertaken relatively quickly and efficiently, and to be easily accessible to staff and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Capacity Building Project (ECB) Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment Training Pack and Assessment Tools</strong></td>
<td>A guide for participative assessment of vulnerabilities and capacities with communities and population groups that facilitates analysis of vulnerability and capacity by members of communities themselves. In doing this, it applies participatory values, processes and methods to enable local people to articulate and enhance their own knowledge and understanding and to plan action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Conflict, violence and resilience

This chapter briefly outlines some of the key terms and concepts discussed in this guide, such as conflict, conflict prevention, violence and resilience, and discusses how they relate to each other. Anyone considering resilience-strengthening activities in conflict-affected contexts should familiarise themselves with these concepts before undertaking any programme or project activities.

It argues that conflict prevention must be considered an integral component of resilience-strengthening methodologies in conflict-affected contexts. Failure to do so risks exacerbating patterns of vulnerability within communities, and will ultimately undermine the very resilience these programmes seek to strengthen.

Conflict and conflict prevention

Conflict occurs when two or more parties find their interests incompatible and express hostile attitudes or take actions that damage the other party’s ability to pursue their interests.1

According to this definition, almost all contexts are affected by conflict in one way or another. Indeed conflict is, in itself not a bad thing. Almost any process of social change is likely to be contested by one or more groups within that society, which is a form of conflict. However, when conflicts spill over into violence, or threaten to do so, then the impacts on local people can be devastating.

For example, promoting education for girls often requires many conversations with parents as they might not immediately see why educating their daughters is relevant. In some contexts, for example in Nigeria, resistance to girls’ education has led to acts of abduction and violence by political armed groups.

Conflict prevention refers to interventions which seek to reduce tensions and/or prevent the outbreak or reoccurrence of violence.

Different types of violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct violence</td>
<td>Physical attack or harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural violence</td>
<td>Unjust systems and structures that hurt people through human-made causes, such as lack of access to food or medical care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural violence</td>
<td>Unconscious beliefs that cause people to overlook structural violence, such as bias against certain ethnic or social groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seeks to contribute to positive peace which is characterised by the absence of direct physical violence and also of structural and cultural violence, which are at the root of direct violence.

**Structural violence** can be understood as the unjust social, political or economic systems and structures that discriminate against certain individuals or groups, to the benefit of others. This might include factors such as unequal access to basic health care services, or the exclusion of certain groups from political decision-making processes based on ethnicity, gender or other social attributes.

Much structural violence is underpinned by cultural violence: cultural factors, beliefs or attitudes that can lead people to legitimise or overlook direct or structural violence. For example, ideas of what roles men and women should play and how they should behave can be used to legitimise gender discrimination and gender inequality.

Taken together, structural and cultural forms of violence can be considered to be underlying drivers of conflict. Any effort to sustainably prevent direct violence must take account of and seek to address these underlying drivers of insecurity.

Conflict prevention also requires the strengthening of contextually-appropriate mechanisms that allow individuals and groups to resolve their conflicts peacefully. These mechanisms can take many forms and include community-police liaison groups, mobile courts or other types of effective local-level dispute-resolution mechanisms, such as traditional or informal shuras or councils.

Genuine conflict prevention requires work that goes far beyond simply preventing direct physical violence. It must take active steps towards identifying and addressing the social, political and economic factors that make certain groups vulnerable to exploitation, while concurrently building the capacity and credibility of conflict-mitigating institutions. Failure to address these issues will, ultimately, manifest themselves in direct violence, even in contexts which appear to be relatively peaceful.

**Resilience**

Resilience refers to the capacity of a group of people – usually at the community level – to monitor, anticipate, respond to and manage both known risks and future uncertainties. It is the ability of a community or society, through incremental and transformational change, to absorb shocks, adapt to stresses and bounce back better from both. The concepts and terminology have largely derived from the DRR field, although the concept has in recent years been adopted by a much wider range of practitioners, most notably those working in the area of climate change adaptation.

The shocks and stresses that communities face can be extremely diverse. They include natural hazards (such as floods, droughts or hurricanes), as well as political, economic or social shocks (such as a financial crash, political upheaval or outbreak of a disease epidemic). Some agencies explicitly include conflict as a shock or stress factor. However, in practice the majority of resilience building programming has struggled to effectively address multi-hazard contexts.

**How does conflict prevention relate to resilience strengthening?**

Conflict can be a major shock that affects communities and undermines resilience. Conflict, particularly violent conflict, can directly undermine wellbeing through its impacts on physical and psychological health, basic service provision and livelihood security. It can increase people’s exposure to other hazards, for example, by displacing whole communities into unsafe areas, such as densely-populated camps. Conflict can drive individuals to sell assets, and undermine social networks that help people manage other risks, such as drought, disease, etc.

---

2 Definitions of resilience vary slightly among agencies working on resilience. The one used in this guide has been developed for the LPRR project, see Jones, E; Zanelloi, C; Atek, E; Ibreck, R and Namayanja, W; LSE Masters team (2015). Linking Preparedness, Response and Resilience, p21.
Conflict can also be experienced as a significant stress factor that can undermine community resilience. Relatively low levels of insecurity, or the fear of insecurity or violence, over a significant period of time, can undermine community capacities to coordinate efforts for resilience strengthening and adapt to changes, making them more vulnerable to other hazards or shocks. People are, for example, less likely to invest in new enterprises, send their children to school or develop and maintain crucial infrastructure when they fear for their security.

Conflict can also be seen as symptom of weak resilience. The strategies that vulnerable populations employ to manage or adapt to other shocks and stresses can increase the likelihood or intensity of violent conflict. Natural hazards can, for example, increase grievances (by increasing imbalances of access to scarce resources, for example) or create economic incentives for violent activities (for example by destroying livelihood opportunities, leading some people to join armed groups). Displacement as a result of an environmental hazard often goes hand in hand with increased levels of violence, including sexual violence. Local dispute resolution or conflict management systems can be overwhelmed, leading to higher levels of conflict which further undermine resilience. Communities that cannot manage shocks or stresses without recourse to violence can therefore be described as being insufficiently resilient to cope with conflict-causing stresses.

International organisations such as NGOs or donors can unwittingly exacerbate some of these conflict issues. For example, if efforts to help communities prepare for or adapt to hazards are carried out without an understanding of the underlying factors that can contribute to conflict, then they can contribute to local tensions. Tensions can increase the risks of violence, and ultimately undermine the resilience of local people. Conversely, interventions that are informed by an understanding of local conflict dynamics, for example through a conflict analysis (see chapters 4 and 6) may be able to identify creative ways of bringing people together across potential conflict lines, and addressing the tensions that can contribute to conflict, thereby making them more resilient to conflict.

Conflict can thus be seen as both a shock and a stress factor, as well as a symptom of a lack of resilience. In conflict-affected contexts therefore, it is imperative that conflict prevention should form a core component of resilience-strengthening methodologies. Failure to do so not only misses an important opportunity for interventions to reduce vulnerabilities of communities, but risks exacerbating these vulnerabilities and undermining the very resilience that they seek to build. Put another way, interventions that genuinely seek to build community resilience in contexts affected by conflict must go beyond simply working ‘in’ conflict, to working ‘on’ conflict. This guide seeks to provide practical guidance for development practitioners in integrating this awareness of conflict issues into existing resilience-building methodologies.
2. Conflict-sensitive approaches

This section introduces key concepts and principles underpinning conflict sensitivity. It includes a series of guiding questions to help staff and partners translate these principles into action.

What is conflict sensitivity and why is it important?

Any intervention in a conflict-affected context inevitably has an impact on the social, political, environmental or economic factors that influence the conflict in that context. These impacts may be positive (for example, reducing tensions or improving relationships between key stakeholders) or negative (for example, worsening tensions or maintaining a negative status quo); direct or indirect; intentional or unintentional. Conflict sensitivity is an umbrella term for approaches to managing these impacts.3

A conflict-sensitive approach (CSA) can contribute towards conflict prevention by helping agencies gain a sound understanding of the two-way interaction between activities and conflict context. It also requires that agencies act to both minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts of interventions on conflict, within an organisation’s or project’s objectives and priorities.

A conflict-sensitive approach (CSA) can contribute towards conflict prevention by helping agencies gain a sound understanding of the two-way interaction between activities and conflict context. It also requires that agencies act to both minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts of interventions on conflict, within an organisation’s or project’s objectives and priorities.

What is a conflict-sensitive approach?

Conflict sensitivity can be defined as:

- Understanding the conflict context (history, social and demographic composition, political system, economy and security)
- Understanding the potential interaction between any planned action and the context – how will interventions affect the context? How will the context affect interventions?
- Adapting planned interventions in order to minimise negative and maximise positive impacts on conflict and peace.

Adopting a CSA has many benefits for resilience programmes. A CSA can make programmes more effective and efficient by averting the negative consequences of conflict on programme objectives. When a project results in an increase in conflict or tensions within communities, any previous benefits or developmental gains associated with the project can rapidly be wiped out. It can take a very long time for implementing agencies to regain the trust of these communities, and to undo the damage that such conflicts can do to community wellbeing. A CSA can also help to make programmes more flexible and adaptable to the local context, for example, by identifying potential and emerging conflict risks, allowing staff to plan accordingly. This can also improve staff and beneficiary security. Finally, by actively seeking to prevent the emergence of conflict and contribute to long-term, sustainable peace, adopting a CSA can help programmes contribute to building the essential conditions under which long-term resilience to a whole range of shocks and stresses can be built (see chapter 1 for more detail on links between resilience building and conflict).

Principles guiding CSAs:

CSAs are guided by a number of principles that are relevant in all stages of project planning, implementation or monitoring, evaluation and learning. These include:

- **Responsibility**: All projects in conflict-affected contexts are a part of the conflict dynamics – whether they are focused on directly addressing conflict or not. Conflict-sensitive programmes accept the responsibility that comes with this and do their best to have a positive impact on peace – even if it means making fundamental changes to themselves and their approach.

- **Participation**: Using participatory processes in which a wide range of actor groups affected by the conflict – including those who are marginalised or vulnerable – are actively involved in every stage of programme design and implementation helps to ensure buy-in and ownership, whilst strengthening trust-building with and between different stakeholders.

---

3 Conflict sensitivity is closely related to, and incorporates, the core components of a Do No Harm approach. Whereas Do No Harm has largely been interpreted as focusing on avoiding negative impacts of interventions on peace and conflict, conflict sensitivity also implies taking steps to actively maximise potential positive impacts on peace.

Identified as a driver of conflict, adopting a CSA implies that women's equality. As unequal gender norms have been contributing to tensions as not everyone might agree with seeking to work on increasing gender equality run the risk of levels of discrimination against women, programmes that which unequal or repressive gender norms result in high difficult and conflictual topics. For example, in contexts in implying that programmes should not seek to engage on implementing at an inappropriate time. It is important that individuals or organisations engaged in the project are not perceived to be aligned with any one political, religious, ethnic, or other social group in a conflict. While it is natural for staff to have their own views and opinions, we should always seek to remain impartial.

Transparency: This is important for building trust with local people, and reducing the space for rumours to spread. We should ensure transparency regarding how money is spent and who is selected as partners or beneficiaries, and why. While transparency is important, we need to be careful that we don’t put anyone at risk by sharing sensitive information.

Accountability: We are accountable for our activities, attitudes and behaviour. We are not only accountable to donors, but to the communities and partners with whom we work.

Respect: We must have respect for people’s ownership of the conflict and their suffering. We should always remember that local people have to live with any impacts a project has on their society. Furthermore, we must be aware that as external actors, we cannot control the conflict and its dynamics. Conflict can only be lastingly resolved if the conflict actors themselves invest in peace. This means it is important to engage all actors in working towards fair, just and peaceful human development, especially those who are marginalised, so that they can develop solutions that they can sustain themselves.

Partnership, coordination and complementarity: It is important to agree on partnership principles, to coordinate activities across partners and to make efforts to complement each other’s interventions.

Timeliness: Being conflict sensitive also means doing the right thing at the right time. A specific activity might be very effective if carried out under certain circumstances, but might create problems when implemented at an inappropriate time. It is essential that our understanding of the local context is continuously updated, and project implementation plans continuously revised accordingly.

It is important to be clear that adopting a CSA does not imply that programmes should not seek to engage on difficult and conflictual topics. For example, in contexts in which unequal or repressive gender norms result in high levels of discrimination against women, programmes that seek to work on increasing gender equality run the risk of contributing to tensions as not everyone might agree with women’s equality. As unequal gender norms have been identified as a driver of conflict, adopting a CSA implies that such programmes should actively seek to work on these issues. However, they should do so in a way that accounts for the potential impacts on local conflict, and seeks to apply approaches that minimise negative impacts on the communities whilst maximising positive social change – for example by involving both women, men and sexual and gender minorities in the process and showing that gender equality can benefit everyone.

CASE STUDY: Conflict sensitivity in a livelihood project in Northern Kenya

A livelihood project in an area of Northern Kenya where there are deep divisions between tribal groups (Pokot, Turkana and Samburu) planned to provide goats to community members. Based on the findings of a local conflict analysis, this activity was adjusted so that the goats were allocated across community divides. Thus the project gave goats to five families in each community.

An agreement was made with those receiving goats that they would pass on the offspring to people in the other tribal communities. Because there was a local tradition saying ‘once I give you a goat, we are brothers’, the process of passing on baby goats across tribal lines brought communities closer together, as well as strengthening solidarity by creating a shared market that also increased acceptance and participation in the project.

Previously there was no communication between the different groups; now they are interacting; buying and selling milk and meat through their shared market. Community cohesion has improved as a consequence.

Why inclusion and diversity are important elements of conflict sensitivity

People from certain social or economic groups, including gender, age, ethnic, caste or religious groups, or people from different economic or social backgrounds, can be particularly vulnerable to the impact of shocks and stresses (including conflict as well as environmental hazards). This is often because the social norms, expectations and roles attributed to people from specific groups can have profound impacts on their social status, access to decision making and power, and access to resources (such as wealth, education, land, water, food, etc). For example:

- It is often the traditional responsibility of women to fetch water. Thus, in times of water shortage they

---

often have to walk further to find water, which can put them in danger if they have to walk at night or through insecure areas.

- People from marginalised (ethnic, tribal, caste, religious, etc) groups are often given land that is poorly accessible or with poor quality soil. Consequently, they may be more vulnerable to hazards such as flooding or landslides, or minor environmental challenges that wouldn’t affect high quality plots.

- Young men are frequently expected to be at the frontline of protests or uprisings, increasing their risk of becoming victims or perpetrators of physical violence.

At the same time, groups can also have specific capacities that can be useful in resilience-strengthening or conflict-prevention efforts: older people might be able to remember historical events or traditional means to increase harvests or reduce vulnerabilities that have been forgotten. Young people often show a lot of energy and commitment to become active agents of change.

Resilience strengthening requires an all-of-society engagement and partnership, as outlined in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030. Making sure that diversity is taken into consideration in resilience-strengthening and conflict-prevention projects is relevant in a number of ways:

- If we want to be effective in what we are doing we need to be able to understand and respond to the specific needs and vulnerabilities people from diverse backgrounds have, and take advantage of group-specific capacities and skills;

- For ethical reasons, we want to enable all people to transform their lives in a positive way, not only certain groups;

- Inequalities based on gender, ethnic, religious or caste background, age, disability, etc, are factors that can contribute both to conflict and vulnerabilities.

Thus, we need to ensure that:

- we capture this diversity in our analyses (including macro- as well as local-level analysis)

- we don’t reinforce inequalities, harmful norms or stereotypes attributed to certain groups

- wherever possible, activities contribute to reducing inequalities and improving relationships between diverse groups

- we are inclusive in who we engage as beneficiaries, other stakeholders, partners and staff

- we reflect respect for diversity and equality in our attitudes and behaviour.

### Gender, gender sensitivity and power

Gender is one of the most relevant markers of diversity. Often gender sensitivity is interpreted as ‘involving women’ or ‘empowering women’. This is very important as women are often excluded from important decision-making processes and access to resources and services. However, being gender sensitive also means that we take into consideration, and act upon, the characteristics that a society or culture defines as masculine or feminine, and attitudes and behaviour resulting from that; and what that means for a person’s life in terms of opportunities and challenges.

Unequal gender norms cement unjust power structures, which in turn can drive conflict. For example, in many societies attributes commonly associated with ‘masculine’ such as physical strength, domineering leadership styles or the aggressive pursuit of objectives are more highly valued than attributes considered as ‘feminine’, such as compromise, compassion and caring for others. Consequently, men who actively embody these attributes often find themselves in positions of power relative to women and other men. Gender also intersects with other dimensions of exclusion such as race, ethnicity, class, age and (dis)ability to create complex hierarchies and identities which interact with conflict dynamics.

As gender norms are socially constructed, they can be changed. Transforming unequal and harmful norms to create a more just and fair society can be a way to work on conflict and build resilience.

What we mean when we talk about:

- **Gender**: characteristics of men, women, boys or girls, and sexual and gender minorities that are socially constructed. They change over time. Gender norms and expectations can be different for people from different age groups, religions, levels of education, wealth, or ethnicity.

- **Sex**: Biological differences between men, women and sexual minorities.

- **Femininity/masculinity**: Attitudes, behaviours, appearance, interests, types of employment, roles within the family, etc, which are culturally associated with women and girls/men and boys.

---


7. This does not mean that all men are naturally strong, domineering and aggressive, or that all women are naturally compromising, compassionate and caring. Indeed, most of us display several of these characteristics to some extent in specific situations, regardless of whether we are male or female. Rather these are attributes that are often associated with men and women, across cultures.
Integrating CSA into project design and implementation: Guiding questions

These questions are intended to guide thinking. There is not a right or a wrong answer to these questions; rather they are intended to act as a tool to help staff to interrogate their own actions from a CSA perspective, and to consider context specific responses.

These questions are relevant to the whole programme cycle. Chapters 3–7 of this guide provide more detailed questions relating to specific stages in the programme cycle.

- Has a conflict analysis been conducted (at both the local and national level)? Does it include an assessment of underlying conflict factors and power dynamics as well as a stakeholder analysis? How has the design of the project been informed by this analysis?
- Have you considered whether and how project activities could make conflict worse, or spark conflict within or between communities? If so, how will risks be managed and monitored?
- Have you considered how your project would respond if there were to be an eruption of, or increase in, conflict within or close to the project sites? Are all staff and partners trained in how to respond in the case of an increase in conflict?
- Have you identified specific challenges faced by men and women, young people, boys and girls? Have you identified any underlying values and attitudes relating to gender that may be responsible for driving gender inequalities? How might these affect your project, and how might your project affect these values and attitudes?
- How have the project beneficiaries and partners been selected? Has this been informed by the conflict analysis (eg, accounting for any divisions along ethnic, political or social lines)? Were clear criteria for participant selection developed with the local communities (including both direct beneficiaries and surrounding communities)?
- Are communities involved in decision making and planning around the programme design, implementation and monitoring? What feedback and accountability mechanisms have been built into the programme implementation plans?
- Does your M&E framework reflect the ways in which the project interacts with conflict dynamics? Does it capture the effects that the project will have on conflict, and impacts that the conflict dynamics could have on the intervention?
- Do budgets include provision for updating the conflict analysis and building capacity of staff, partners or community members in conflict and gender sensitivity?
This chapter focuses on building trust between the lead agency, local partners, community members and other key stakeholders, including formal and informal security and justice actors. It identifies challenges and risks that need to be taken into account when building constructive relationships in conflict-affected contexts, and shares best practices and lessons learnt from experience.

Why building and maintaining relationships is important

As for any community-driven processes, good coordination and cooperation are crucial. Jointly identifying potential hazards as well as local capacities to address them, discussing ways to minimise risks with different stakeholders and putting them into action all rely on relationships between people, groups or organisations that are strong enough to allow discussing and working for a common cause. Ideally, relationships are such that difficulties that might emerge during a resilience-strengthening process – for example, if two individuals or groups have different views on how an issue should be addressed – can be overcome. Equally, a resilience-strengthening process can help build new and constructive relationships that will have an empowering effect in the future.

In conflict-affected contexts, relationships often deteriorate and break down; they are not strong enough to resolve differences constructively. Mistrust is often common, and can further contribute to the deterioration of relationships. This mistrust can stem from negative experiences with the other actor, or from the (perceived or real) allegiance of the other with an actor or group (political, ethnic, religious, etc) that is not trusted.

What components are important for good and constructive relationships?

- We should be conscious of relationships we want to build, improve or maintain. Taking some time to reflect about the relationships we currently have with certain actors, what we would like them to look like, and what we can do differently to get there can pay off.
- Trust is a crucial aspect of a good relationship. It develops over time through positive interaction. In conflict situations when people have had negative experiences with each other, this can take a long time and might require special investment.
- Showing respect towards each other’s experiences and views is critical. This doesn’t mean that there needs to be agreement on all issues; constructive feedback and criticism can be useful.
- Transparency is important. As much as possible, we should clearly communicate what we want to achieve, why and how, and update each other about any changes in the project plan. However where initial mistrust is high, we need to think carefully about how to communicate in a way that does not raise suspicions, aggravate tensions or put ourselves or others at risk.

Who to build relationships with

Over the course of a project you will engage with many different individuals and groups, particularly local communities and government stakeholders. From a conflict-sensitivity perspective, there are some important considerations to keep in mind when planning relationship building:

- Relationship building starts at the very beginning of the project. Even during the initial scoping activities, who you talk to, how you approach them and how you behave towards others can have positive or negative implications for relationships.
Relationship building is everyone’s responsibility: that of the lead organisation as well as any local partners. Local stakeholders and beneficiaries can play a crucial role in establishing and shaping relationships.

You need to be mindful of how relationships with certain stakeholders can be seen by others. In conflict-affected contexts mistrust is often high, and meeting with a group that is party to the conflict, or aligned with a political party, can be interpreted as taking the side of that group.

Being impartial, and being perceived as impartial, is particularly important. For example, if meeting with representatives from one political party, or one group engaged in a conflict, it is advisable to also meet with representatives from the other parties or groups. Make it clear that you are impartial and don’t take sides in political issues or conflicts.

While lead/partner agencies might be used to engaging with local government and influential groups within the community, they might have no experience and/or be reluctant to engage with formal or non-formal security providers. This needs to be addressed during the start-up period; for example, staff should have the opportunity to build skills on engaging with such stakeholders.

### Relationship between lead organisation and local partner organisation(s)

Local partner organisations should be impartial, accountable and representative, with good access to communities and government stakeholders, as well as having the technical capacities and skills required to effectively implement the project. Selecting these partners is not covered in detail in this guide; most organisations have detailed guidelines and best practices for supporting this process. However, some specific considerations from a conflict-sensitivity perspective are included, as follows:

- The role played by prospective partners in conflict...
dynamics could be controversial for some groups. Selecting local partners should therefore be informed by conflict/context analysis.

- It is important to assess a partner’s organisational values, processes and capacities in order to identify whether they apply conflict- and gender-sensitive approaches, and if not, whether they are willing to develop such skills.
- Local partners must be able to maintain sufficient independence from political actors; they should not be seen as aligned to any political or conflict parties.
- Local partners should be prepared to support communities in potentially sensitive engagement with authorities, including security providers. They must therefore be trusted by both communities and authorities.

**Bringing conflicting groups together**

When two or more actor groups are engaged in active and violent conflict, it is not advisable for resilience projects to directly seek to mediate peace between these groups. Doing so requires specific skills, knowledge and expertise. Indeed, seeking to engage in conflict mediation without those skills can make the situation worse and put staff and others at risk.

However, resilience interventions can bring groups together to engage constructively on issues of common interest, even if those groups have deep disagreements over other issues and high levels of mutual mistrust. In doing so, relationships can be improved in a way that then enables these groups to overcome prejudices, reduce tensions and prevent future conflict. This applies both to lower-level tensions (for example by helping men in a community see that women can play an equal role in local-level decision making when given the opportunity) and to situations that are more prone to violence (for example by bringing representatives from two groups which experience tensions with each other together to identify common priorities, thereby helping them see that many of the prejudices they have are not based on fact.) Often the process of bringing groups together to identify and prioritise hazards, vulnerabilities and local capacities and to develop and implement action plans is more important than the actual output of the action plan implementation.

We must however be mindful of the risk that interventions could lead to worsening of relations, or reinforce existing tensions or inequalities between groups. When planning to bring conflicting groups together, we need to think about what could potentially go wrong, and how that can be mitigated; for example, it might be good to have separate preparatory meetings with each of the two groups before bringing them together. We also need to ensure that by bringing people together, we don’t reinforce harmful power structures or discrimination, for example if two powerful groups engage in a project that benefits them but marginalises a third group, then conflict issues can be exacerbated rather than resolved.

**Government stakeholders and security and justice providers**

Relationships between NGOs, local partners and community members and government stakeholders in conflict-affected contexts are often highly strained. This is especially the case if government stakeholders are seen as uninterested in the community’s needs and concerns, unwilling or unable to address them, or corrupt. Likewise, government stakeholders might see communities as ‘difficult’, while in many contexts there can be a perception that communities need to be governed by the state rather than that government should act on behalf of the citizens.

In conflict-affected contexts, relationships with formal security and justice providers can be even more difficult. Often community members and NGOs are reluctant to interact directly with them. Many NGOs feel they do not have a role to play in the provision of security and justice, while security providers are often seen as potential security threats. Meanwhile, top-down approaches to security provision often mean that security providers are more focused on protecting the interests of the state, rather than seeing security as being in the common interest for all groups. In contexts where there is strong opposition to the government, and especially where there are armed movements, citizens can be viewed with mistrust by any government stakeholder but especially by security providers.
Who are security and justice providers?

Security and justice providers include all institutions, groups, organisations and individuals that have a stake in security and justice provision. This includes both formal state actors and informal non-state actors. Every country has different institutional set-ups; agencies might have different names, and not all actors are present in a single context. Security and justice providers can include:

- **Core security actors**: armed forces; police service; gendarmeries; paramilitary forces; presidential guards; intelligence and security services (both military and civilian); coast guards; border guards; customs authorities; and reserve or local security units (civil defence forces, national guards, militias).

- **Management and oversight bodies**: the executive, national security advisory bodies, legislative and select committees; ministries of defence, internal affairs, foreign affairs; customary and traditional authorities; financial management bodies (finance ministries, budget officers, financial audit and planning units); and civil society organisations (civilian review boards and public complaints commissions).

- **Justice and the rule of law**: judiciary and justice ministries; prisons; criminal investigation and prosecution services; human rights commissions and ombudsmen; customary and traditional justice systems.

- **Non-statutory security forces**: liberation armies, guerrilla armies, private security companies, political party militias.

Security and justice providers are often keen to improve relationships with local communities, not least because it helps them be more effective. In contexts of violence it can also reduce the risk of them becoming the target of attack. Likewise communities can benefit from more constructive relationships with security providers, since this can lead to improved local security and justice. From a resilience-strengthening perspective, security providers can be important allies in reducing threats and vulnerabilities related to conflict or insecurity. They can provide safety and security for the most vulnerable, for example by ensuring that displaced women or unaccompanied minors feel safe and don’t become victims of violence or harassment. Justice providers can play an important role when it comes to legal issues or questions of fairness, for example when access to land may need to be re-negotiated after flooding.

Constructive engagement with security and justice providers can also be a good starting point to address delicate challenges that often hamper community resilience, such as the guarantee of human rights, non-discrimination or participation. Last but not least, security providers may have access to knowledge, skills, equipment and manpower that can be useful for the implementation of resilience-strengthening action plans. Conversely, ignoring or failing to constructively engage with security and justice providers can result in antagonistic relationships that can seriously hamper the success of any project.

Engaging with informal security and justice actors

Informal security and justice actors are those that operate outside any formal government structure. They may include traditional dispute resolution or governance structures (for example Jirga, Shuras or Panchayats), political or religious leaders (in some cases with strong and possibly radical views), local militias, youth gangs or groups of warriors. Some of these can have considerable influence on local conflict dynamics and possibly access to resources. This makes them important stakeholders with the potential to positively or negatively affect resilience-building efforts. They could potentially encourage their members/ followers to constructively engage with projects, but could also severely obstruct initiatives if they feel left out or threatened by proposed activities.

CASE STUDY: Police-community relations in Nepal

After years of conflict, relationships between the police and local communities in Nepal remain strained, mistrust is high on both sides, and interaction is low. Communities often see the police as being ineffective, while the police often complain about communities’ lack of cooperation, particularly when it comes to reporting crime. This results in poor law enforcement and increased perceptions of insecurity.

Initiatives by international and local NGOs to bring the police and communities together to engage constructively on local security increased trust, communication and cooperation. At the end of the project, the police were better able to do their job as the community shared their security concerns with them. Furthermore, following the communities’ advocacy efforts, the police station was allocated a new female police officer. People felt safer and more secure because they knew who to turn to when they had security concerns. Women in particular felt more comfortable reporting incidents to a female officer rather than to a man.
The more these informal actors are part of the conflict, and particularly if they use, accept or encourage the use of violence, the more challenging it is to engage with them. It is important to ensure that you at least understand who they are, who they are aligned with and opposed to, what their interests are and what influence they have. This needs to be captured through the macro- and local level analyses (see chapters 4 and 6).

There can be obvious risks in directly engaging with some of these groups, not least the safety and security of staff, partners and beneficiaries. While there are no clear rules or guidelines available on whether or not to engage with them, or how, some of the key challenges are outlined below, along with examples of best practices and lessons learned from Saferworld’s and other organisations’ experiences of working across a wide range of conflict-affected contexts.

**Challenges when engaging with security and justice providers**

Engaging with security and justice providers, and especially with informal actors, can be challenging:

- It raises ethical questions if they are (or are perceived to be) conflict actors, or are accused of violating rights or of using excessive force.
- Their (perceived or real) alignment with one side of the conflict can put the lead and partner organisations’ impartiality into question. Just being seen interacting with some groups could be interpreted as providing support for one side.
- A project can empower conflict actors by giving them credibility and legitimacy, providing them with information (for example, sharing findings from analyses) or supplying them with equipment or skills.
- Community members or staff can be put at risk if they speak out about security actors, for example, they may be targeted to dissuade further criticism, or out of revenge for highlighting abuses.
- Implementing organisations’ or donors’ security guidelines might not allow engagement with informal and/or formal security and justice providers.

**CASE STUDY: Understanding informal security and justice providers: the Galweng in South Sudan**

The galweng in South Sudan are groups of armed Dinka men who originally worked to protect their communities’ cattle against attacks from other armed groups. Since 2005, they increasingly sought to take on the wider role of ‘community police’, without being part of or accountable to the formal security sector. In Lakes State, groups of heavily armed galweng from different clans also started to turn violent against each other, and against community members from other clans, including women, resulting in increased fear and insecurity in an already extremely challenging conflict context.

Acknowledging that they were an important informal security actor, an NGO working on community security and conflict prevention in South Sudan sought to understand the role the galweng play in the local context as well as their specific interests. This analysis allowed the NGO to consider whether and how to engage with the galweng in a constructive way that benefits local communities.

**Best practices and lessons learned**

There is no one way to build relationships with security and justice providers. Whether or not to engage with them, and how, needs to be decided on case-by-case basis. Organisational guidelines or codes of conduct should also be consulted. If you have decided to build these relationships, specific time and effort is required.

Best practices and lessons learned from Saferworld’s community security work include:

- Involve security and justice providers from the beginning of the project, eg, by having consultative meetings with them in the initial phase, and build relationships incrementally.
- Apply a consultative and constructive approach, rather than a confrontational one.
- Ensure that they are part of your conflict analyses, including in the actor analysis. This includes seeking to understand their positions and interests: Where do they stand in the local context (and potentially, in the conflict)? What are their relationships with other community stakeholders? What are their priority concerns regarding security and justice? Are there any overlaps or complementarities with key hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities identified in the local-level analysis? Are they involved in DRR or similar efforts at the moment?
- Understand the weaknesses and challenges they are facing: Do they have the equipment and budget they need to do their work? Do they have key skills

---

(including gender and conflict sensitivity training) to reach out effectively to community members? How diverse are staff (including women, ethnic or religious minorities, etc)? Are they non-discriminatory internally as well as in their external practices?

- Keep them engaged during the action plan development and implementation phases. For example, they could be part of an advisory committee that provides feedback and expertise. This can make activities more effective by ensuring that they are on board and supportive. If action plans address some of their own priorities, they may be particularly keen to make the project a success. With their expertise and influence, including their links to other stakeholders or institutions, they can also help overcome potential challenges.

- Assess whether security and justice providers are willing and capable to engage. In many cases, even those who want to play a role can be restricted by budget or capacity constraints. These need to be taken into consideration when making demands. For example, demanding more police presence in a remote village may require addressing challenges regarding local transport. Making demands without considering supply issues can lead to increased disappointment among community members, thus undermining security and justice providers, which in the end leads to a further deterioration of relationships.

Questions to ask:

- Who are the key actors for resilience strengthening and conflict prevention in the given context?

- Who are you building relationships with? How is this actor perceived by others? Is this actor seen as party to a conflict? Is this actor seen as part of/linked to an influential group (eg, a political party, religious group, etc)?

- If you meet with security and justice actors, might you be perceived as partial? How can you mitigate that risk?

- How can you use constructive relationship building to contribute to reducing conflict?
4. Macro-level conflict analysis

Integrate this step with your existing resilience-building methodology

- **Christian Aid PVCA Guidelines**: As part of, or prior to, Phase 0: Preliminary Work.
- **Concern Risk Analysis Guidelines**: Between secondary data collection and preparation stages.
- **World Vision Gerando**: Before step 1: set up LDRCM.
- **World Vision DRR toolkit**: Within Tool 1: Initial Risk Assessment.
- **ECB/ARPP**: During stage 2, secondary information gathering.

It is essential that interventions are based on a solid understanding of relevant conflict drivers at all levels. Yet resilience methodologies do not typically include a macro-level conflict analysis.

A macro-level conflict analysis is a tool for identifying conflict drivers, and stakeholders with an influence over them, at the state, national, regional or international levels. It should complement the local-level conflict analysis carried out later in this process (see chapter 6).

The macro-level conflict analysis can help programmes to identify and account for overarching issues that can affect conflict issues at the local level, while helping to ensure that local-level initiatives do not exacerbate higher-level conflict issues. Decisions about which part of a country to focus on, communities to work with or partners to engage can, for example, unwittingly reinforce or challenge perceptions of bias or patterns of exclusion at the national level.

A macro-level conflict analysis can be used to identify the relationship between potential conflict drivers and other shocks and stresses, such as environmental hazards. It may, for example, help to highlight particularly sensitive areas or topics, such as competition over access to natural resources, tensions between livelihood groups over land use, or patterns of displacement and their potential impacts on surrounding communities.

Many agencies will have already conducted national-level conflict, political economy, or gender analysis to inform national strategies. In these cases much of the relevant information is already available, but may not be properly integrated into project-level planning, or regularly updated.

Key steps for designing and implementing a conflict analysis

1) **Clearly identify objective and scope of analysis:**
   The objective should be to identify key conflict issues, stakeholders and opportunities for peace at the sub-national, national and international levels that are relevant to the proposed project.

   Ideally this analysis will be used to inform where in the country the projects will be focused. If areas of operation have already been identified, the analysis should still identify higher-level dynamics, but with a focus on how these interrelate with the programme area. Each programme will therefore need to decide on the appropriate level, and geographical spread, for the analysis. In some contexts, this may be national. In others, especially those with highly regionalised conflict issues (for example, in many federal systems), the focus may be at the state or provincial level. Where cross-border dynamics are particularly important, a regional analysis may be most appropriate.

2) **Preparation:** You need to decide how the analysis will be conducted, who will lead it, and ensure that sufficient time and resources are available to support the process.

   **How will analysis be conducted?** It is not always necessary or realistic to design and conduct a new piece of primary research. In many cases, organisations will have already conducted macro-level conflict analysis as
part of their national programme strategy or planning processes. In other cases, much relevant information will be available from other NGOs, donors or academic analysis. If sufficient data is not available, relevant or sufficiently current, it may be necessary to undertake a more substantive analysis process.

When assessing whether sufficient data is available from secondary sources, it is important to consider the following questions: How relevant is available analysis? Is it out of date? Does it provide a balanced review of the issues? Does it take into consideration aspects such as gender, ethnicity and other inequalities? Who has commissioned and conducted the analysis? What biases or imbalances might they suffer from? Are multiple sources of analysis available? Are there gaps in the available analysis? Are you confident that you can address the key questions outlined below based on existing analysis?

Who should lead, and who should be involved in the analysis? When analysis is available from existing sources, it is not sufficient for one person to simply read this analysis and use it to inform project design. Staff from across the organisation (and if relevant, local partners) should be included in a process of developing or interrogating the analysis, and agreeing on key implications for project parameters and design. This may take the form of a workshop for key staff, or a consultation exercise across relevant parts of the organisation. Either way, it is important to identify a suitable individual within the organisation to lead this process.

If new research is required, you will need to consider whether to conduct this research internally or use a consultant. It is preferable for the analysis to be carried out by the lead agency, in collaboration with local partners, rather than an external agency. This helps staff to develop a deeper understanding of the context, while making it more likely that findings will be translated into project design. When staff lack the expertise to lead such analysis, it is still important that they play a role in the analysis and data gathering, for example through the use of participatory conflict analysis tools, possibly with oversight from an external organisation or consultant.

Who to talk to? At this stage, it is normally preferable to limit community engagement in conducting the analysis. If the macro-analysis is being used to help determine which locations to work in, conducting extensive community engagement can raise expectations in communities where activities may not follow. Furthermore, conducting community engagement across a whole country or large geographical area is likely to be unrealistic logistically. It is, however, important to seek out the perspectives of a range of external stakeholders, such as other NGOs, civil society, UN agencies, donors, embassies, government representatives, academics and business leaders. As much as possible, you should consult people or organisations representing, and/or having expert knowledge on different gender, ethnic, age, etc, groups.

What resources do we have available? The resources available will impact on what is feasible in terms. A full macro-level conflict analysis can cost in the region of US$20,000 for example. Secondary data collection and analysis entails only minimal cost, although it is important to factor in sufficient resources for bringing relevant staff together to discuss findings and analyse implications. It is essential that sufficient staff time is allocated to undertake the analysis in a considered and comprehensive manner. It is equally important that sufficient budget and staff time are allocated to allow for the analysis to be revisited and updated throughout the life of the project.

3) Collecting data and conducting analysis: A wide range of methodologies and conflict analysis frameworks have been developed by NGOs, donors, governments and academics. While they differ in terms of emphasis and approach, most cover four distinct aspects: conflict profile, stakeholder analysis, drivers of conflict, and conflict dynamics. The diversity of conflict experiences needs to be taken into consideration: which specific groups (gender, age, ethnicity, caste, religion, wealth, education, etc) are involved? What roles do they play, and why do they play them (because of traditions, social norms, political pressure, etc)? If knowledge on gender, the situation of specific ethnic, caste, religious, etc, groups is not available, a specific analysis on those aspects might be required. A large number of participatory tools, many of which are common to resilience-strengthening methodologies, can be used to stimulate discussion, and gather data related to each of these aspects.

Annex 1 describes the different components of a conflict analysis, identifies some key guiding questions and includes some examples of participatory analysis tools you can use.

4) Analysing findings
Once you have completed your analysis, it is important to translate findings into practical recommendations for programme design. The project purpose and objectives should be revised to ensure that they build on any potential opportunities for peace and do not risk exacerbating any conflict drivers. The findings should inform programme site and local partner selection, staff recruitment processes, beneficiary selection criteria, communications strategies and many other aspects of project design (discussed in more detail in the following chapter).

It is important to include explicit analysis of how conflict issues may interrelate with environmental risk factors, as well as other shocks or stresses that may affect communities. Particular attention should be paid to the potential impacts of climate change on conflict drivers,
since this is often overlooked in conflict analysis. If the conflict analysis has been conducted in collaboration with a broader risk assessment, the findings from the two processes should be analysed alongside each other, and potential links between them identified.

**Integrating M&E considerations across the project cycle:** Macro-level conflict analysis can be used to identify higher-level indicators for incorporation into the M&E framework. For example, if a lack of economic opportunities is identified as a conflict driver, the M&E framework may include data on changes to employment rates, if possible disaggregated by social groups, both at the local and national levels. This can provide important information about emerging conflict trends, allowing the project to adapt accordingly. They may also provide information on the impact the project may have on these trends at the macro level.

**Advocacy considerations across the project cycle:** The findings from this analysis should be used to inform advocacy efforts at the national, and potentially international, level. If possible, the findings should be disseminated to relevant stakeholders, and key advocacy messages extracted. However, it is not always advisable to share conflict analysis widely. Issues discussed may be highly sensitive, and participants may not speak freely if the analysis will be publicly available.

**Further resources and tools**
5. Planning and preparation

Integrate this step with your existing resilience-building methodology: Most methodologies make reference to planning and preparation or include specific chapters. In addition, each consortium agency has internal processes and requirements that should be followed when planning and preparing for projects or project activities. Integrate this step with your existing resilience-building methodology:

- **Action Aid Participatory Vulnerability Analysis and Action**: p4–22; Scoping and Preparation stages (p26–29).
- **(p26–29).Christian Aid Good Practice Guide to PVCA**: Part 1, What is PVCA? (p3); also sections of Part 2, How to conduct PVCA? (p7). Also PVCA Tools: a short ‘how-to’ guide, Introduction (p4) and Conducting a PVCA: A step by step guide, Purpose and overview (p6-8); Chapter A (p9).
- **Concern Risk Analysis Guidelines**: Chapter 4, Planning and Preparation, p6; Annex 5.
- **World Vision DRR toolkit**: Tool 3: Assessment report and design document review.
- **World Vision Gerando**: Chapters 1–2 (p19–29).

Conflict sensitivity should be integrated into the planning and preparation for the programmatic focus, as well as operational considerations, such as recruitment and partnering strategies. Some key considerations include:

**Linking findings from conflict analysis to the purpose, objectives and activities of the project.** You need to plan and prepare for different activities throughout the project life. This should be informed by your conflict analyses, both at the macro and local levels, as well as by ongoing analysis. Linking analysis to the project design involves:

- reviewing all key parameters of a project in view of their link to the conflict context. This includes reviewing the overall project purpose and objectives to identify if and how it could contribute to conflict prevention. In some cases we might have to adjust or change our plans, especially if we see that the context has changed in a way that either opens new opportunities to build resilience and/or contribute to conflict prevention
  - assessing the risks of implementation being affected by conflict or contributing to tensions
  - identifying opportunities to reinforce peace outcomes (increased dialogue between divided groups, less violence, etc) through the planned intervention.

**Conflict-sensitivity analysis tools**

A number of tools are available to assess the potential impact of the project design against findings from the conflict analysis. Do No Harm/ Local Capacities for Peace is one of the most widely used. Guidance on conducting a conflict-sensitivity analysis of a project design is available in Chapter 2 of the How To Guide on Conflict Sensitivity, developed by the Conflict Sensitivity Consortium in 2012.

**Selection of location(s):** When selecting the project location you need to consider what impact your engagement will have on conflict dynamics, both within the project location and in surrounding areas. For example, there is a risk that the project might provide opportunities or advantages (including legitimacy or resources) to specific conflict actors. It could also put people from other locations at a disadvantage, for example by reducing flooding in one location by building dams, you might reduce water supply or increase the risk of flooding in other locations. There is also a risk that a decision to work in one area can lead to communities in other areas feeling disadvantaged, or fuelling perceptions of favouritism or bias. It is important therefore to engage stakeholders from surrounding communities during the design phase, and not just direct beneficiaries.

**Selection of beneficiaries:** You need to carefully consider which beneficiaries to focus on, and what your criteria
are for engaging with them. While vulnerability is an important criterion, the opportunity to bring conflicting groups together should also be considered. Wherever possible, marginalised groups should be engaged and empowered to reduce inequalities and vulnerability.

**Operational considerations**

It is important to consider the impacts of operational decisions, such as staffing, partnering and safety and security arrangements, from a conflict-sensitivity perspective.

**Staffing:** It is important to consider the composition of the project team, as well as the relationships and dynamics within the team. Diverse and inclusive teams, that include members from different genders, castes, ethnicities, religious and age groups, can have a greater potential to reach out and gain access to different groups, and to see situations and problems from different angles. At the same time, such teams need to be managed appropriately to avoid internal tensions related to cultural factors or context-specific conflict dynamics. Time needs to be allocated to ensure team members understand why diversity is valuable for everyone and that having younger people on board, or women, or people from marginalised ethnic or caste groups, should not be seen as threatening by other team members. Deeply-ingrained barriers might have to be overcome slowly and in a sensitive way, and constructive contact between different groups might have to be facilitated.

**Organisational capacities and skills:** Even the best thought-through intervention will fail if those implementing it do not have the required mandate or capacity. Organisations need to honestly assess their own, and their partner organisations’, capacity and mandate. Where capacity is insufficient, a capacity-building plan needs to be developed to bridge capacity gaps; and additional resources and time need to be allocated. Where that isn’t possible, the project’s goal, objectives and (geographic and/or thematic) scope need to be revised realistically to match the capacity available.

**Partnership agreements:** When negotiating contracts with partner organisations or when approaching local, district-level, or national authorities to get their permission to implement the project, it is important to be transparent about what the project seeks to achieve and how. Provisions for conflict sensitivity can also be included when negotiating contracts with partners. This will require allocating time to allow for conflict-sensitive planning, implementation and M&E, and proactive capacity-building to ensure staff and partner development.

**Safety and security:** Ensuring that beneficiaries, partners and staff are safe and secure is imperative when working in conflict-affected contexts. Risk assessments should be done regularly to assess potential safety and security risks for staff, partner staff and beneficiaries, taking into consideration risk that might particularly affect specific groups, such as sexual or gender-based violence. Organisations should have clear safety and security guidelines in place that staff are familiar with and that are applied in day to day work.

**Planning and preparation:**

**Guiding questions**

- Does the security situation allow you, your partners and beneficiaries to effectively engage with the project, without putting anyone at risk?
- Are there conflict implications associated with where you choose to work? For example, how will your site selection be seen by people, institutions and other stakeholders living in neighbouring areas (where your project doesn’t engage)? Will it put other communities at a disadvantage?
- Is the area a government priority? Will working in the geographic area result in tensions with the government or with communities living in other parts of the country?
- By working in this area, do you risk providing opportunities/advantages to certain conflict actors? Is there a danger that your intervention could provide
resources to one or several conflict actors? Can these risks be avoided or mitigated?

- Are there events or periods that might prevent or make it difficult for beneficiaries, or certain groups within communities, to participate in project design activities (such as analysis)? Are there certain times in the year or events when tensions are heightened or conflict more likely?

- How does the beneficiary selection relate to divisions within the community, and what implications might that have? Where do these groups/organisations/individuals stand in the conflict? Are you working only with one group, or all? What message will that send?

- Is your team diverse and balanced (eg, in terms of gender, age, language skills, ethnicity, and religion, etc)? Is it impartial and seen as impartial by local people, including over political views, religion or ethnicity? Do all team members understand and buy into conflict-sensitive approaches? If not, can this be managed (eg, through capacity building), or does the team composition need to change?

- Are your partner organisations impartial, and perceived as impartial? Do they have a good understanding of the local context? Do they embrace organisational or project-specific values? Are they willing to learn about and apply a conflict-sensitive approach?

- Do Memoranda of Understanding with partners highlight that you expect impartiality and conflict-sensitive behaviour and practice, and how you will work towards achieving that? Do you have measures in place to ensure that these are put into practice? Do you have internal conflict resolution mechanisms and procedures should problems between the lead and partner organisations occur?

**Integrating M&E considerations across the project cycle:** M&E frameworks and Theories of Change are usually developed during the planning stage. They should take into consideration and measure conflict sensitivity. Including some indicators looking at how the organisations that are involved in the project have adapted conflict-sensitive principles in their planning and preparation can be useful, especially if there is an interest in improving conflict sensitivity or the ability to work on conflict organisation-wide (or among partner organisations).

**Advocacy considerations:** At this stage you should think about whether there are events coming up that would provide good advocacy opportunities, for example, putting a topic on the agenda of an important parliamentary debate or election; big international conferences, etc. These require good planning and preparation. You may also expect to begin developing an advocacy strategy at this stage.

**Further resources and tools**

- CSC (2012), How to Guide on Conflict Sensitivity, Chapters 2 and 3.
6: Local-level conflict analysis and Participatory Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment

Integrate this step with your existing resilience-building methodology: Local participatory vulnerability and capacity assessments are a core component of most methodologies on resilience building. Most methodologies seek to gather similar types of information through the use of community-level participatory tools, complemented by secondary data. They can be adjusted to include questions on conflict and insecurity. A local-level conflict analysis should also be carried out, similar to the macro-level analysis described in chapter 3. Integrate this step with your existing resilience-building methodology:

• **Action Aid Participatory Vulnerability Analysis and Action**: Initial analysis and plan of action at village/district level stage (p30) and Participatory tools: Access and control matrix.

• **Christian Aid Good Practice Guide to PVCA**: Part 2, How to conduct PVCA? Phases 1 (p8) and 2 (p9), as well as PVCA Tools: a short ‘how-to’ guide, Chapters 2 (p5), 4 (p39) and Conducting a PVCA: A step by step guide: Chapters B (p14), C (p15); Annexes A–E.

• **Concern Risk Analysis Guidelines**: Chapters 5–16; Annexes 3, 4, 6, 7.


• **World Vision DRR toolkit**: Tool 2, linking in analysis to Tool 1.

• **World Vision Gerando**: Chapters 3–4 (p30–47).

Building resilience to hazards effectively and sustainably requires a good understanding of the specific local context. In order to gain a solid understanding of local-level conflict dynamics, we propose a two-step process: 1) Undertaking a local-level conflict assessment; 2) Integrating questions on conflict and insecurity into the PVCA. Both should be planned and carried out in a conflict-sensitive manner.

**NOTE:** conducting these two pieces of analysis requires additional time and effort. However, because of their different nature and purpose (for example, discussing sensitive issues in a discreet manner vs. having public conversations about hazards with as many people as possible) they should not be merged.

Being sensitive to inequalities and diversity

Whenever we conduct analysis, it is critical that we capture how different groups are affected by hazards and conflict. Only then will we be able to develop approaches that are tailored to the specific needs and capacities of people, and possibly to address some of the causes of hazards.
This means that at all stages of the analysis we need to:

| Disaggregate data to understand who has access to resources and services, decision-making and political power, and who hasn’t; who has the opportunities to reduce vulnerabilities and strengthen resilience; and why | Who has access to land in this community? Is it men and women alike? Can daughters inherit land from their parents, or will it go automatically to the son? Will all people have access to land of equal quality? |
| Disaggregate data to understand who is vulnerable to or affected by conflicts and hazards, and why. | Who will be most affected if they lose their land, and what are the wider consequences (e.g., children from impoverished families who have been expelled from their land won’t be able to attend school)? |
| Disaggregate data to understand who is vulnerable to or affected by conflicts and hazards, and why. | Which (ethnic, religious, caste, etc) groups are actively involved in land protests? Who uses, or suffers violence, and why? Who mobilises people to protest? |
| Understand how the underlying social and cultural norms and expectations (for example, gender norms, age norms, etc) interlink with resilience and conflict. | Are men supposed to be the sole breadwinners of the family, and what are the social consequences if a man can’t provide for the family any longer? If the male household head becomes ill, is it culturally acceptable for his wife to take up a job to sustain the family? |
| Capture (potential) change in norms/relationships between people of different gender, age, ethnicity, caste, tribe, religions, etc. | Are conflicts or other hazards reinforcing or transforming norms and relationships between gender, ethnic, caste, etc, groups? Are your resilience-building activities likely to transform norms and relationships in a positive way? |

**Step 1: Conducting a local-level conflict assessment**

The local-level conflict assessment can follow a similar structure and use similar tools to the macro-level conflict assessment described in chapter 4, adapted to the local context. Steps to follow when designing and conducting a local-level conflict analysis include:

1) **Clearly identify objective and scope of analysis:** The objective of the analysis is to identify key conflict issues, stakeholders and opportunities for peace at the level at which the project is anticipated to be implemented (for example, in the selected village, county, district, etc).

2) **Preparation:** You need to decide how the analysis will be conducted, who will lead it, and ensure that sufficient time and resources are available to support the process. The local-level conflict assessment should take place at early stages of the project, just before starting the PVCA.

**How, where and when will the analysis be conducted?** In most cases, there will not be an existing conflict analysis for the location you have chosen. If a local-level conflict analysis is available, it can be used as a basis. Unless it is very recent, of good quality and covers all aspects that are relevant, it is advisable to supplement it by collecting additional primary data. This will not only allow you to get first-hand accounts of local conflict dynamics, but also helps build relationships and enables staff to get to know the community. Desk research can be carried out from the main office to complement local data collection.

**Who should lead the analysis, and who should be involved?** The analysis should be led and facilitated by trained staff from the lead or partner organisations (who can be supported by an external expert/consultant if required). They need to be familiar with the tools, and know how to facilitate participatory discussions and exercises and to conduct interviews. Ideally they should have at least some knowledge of the location and speak local languages.

Skills the team of facilitators should have include:

- **Research and analytical skills**
- **Knowledge about DRR and/or conflict, and the different sectors** (such as livelihood, health, water) – to be able to focus the analysis and possible solutions
- **Knowledge of local languages and cultures** – to achieve better communication and trust
- **Facilitation of participative processes** – to keep the group focused and build a trusting and open environment
- **Gender and diversity** – to ensure that facilitation is

---

**Adapted from ARPP Manual. Risk Assessment and participative planning. A guide for participative assessment of vulnerabilities and capacities with communities and population groups. Emergency Capacity Building Project (ECB), 2012, p30.**
sensitive in regards to gender and diversity; and to analyse the different vulnerabilities

- **Conflict management** – in order to help the group to understand perspectives and different opinions; and to arrive at conclusions and/or agreements
- **Qualitative interviews** – to have a deeper reflection process to get additional information
- **Writing** – to present a convincing analysis.

**Who to talk to? For the conflict assessment, you need to talk to a range of community representatives (key informants), through discrete meetings with small groups of people or with individuals. The issues you will be discussing can be highly sensitive, and inclusive public discussions could spark fear, rumours and tensions.**

For the PVCA, you will involve as many people as possible – in order to get more information and to share information and insights about risks and how to address them.

Who you select for the group discussions and the key informant interviews depends on the local context. It should be a good representation of the people living in the community, including from marginalised and vulnerable groups, keeping in mind factors such as gender, age, ethnicity, caste, tribe, religion, economic and educational background, etc. Minority groups, internally displaced people and refugees should also be represented as they can be particularly vulnerable. For the key informant interviews, respondents with specific roles or knowledge and expertise should be selected. These can be from the local government, representatives of security providers, civil society representatives, or influential local persons such as local chiefs, representatives of women’s cooperatives, head teachers, medical staff, etc. Again, diversity aspects should be kept in mind.

Respondents can be brought together as a larger group (no more than eight people) or in smaller sub-groups (three to five people). It is often useful to talk separately to men and women as their experiences and concerns regarding the conflict and security situation might differ. It might be unusual for women to be asked their opinion about such topics, so you need good facilitators and sufficient time to build trust and give them the confidence to share. Likewise, you might want to have separate groups for young people as they might have specific insights into the situation; while older community members might have valuable information about historic events. If you need to engage with two groups that are in conflict with each other, you should talk to them separately, at least for the initial meetings.

How many groups can be involved depends on the time available. The more people representing sub-categories of the local population are involved, the better and more detailed information you will get. For key stakeholders such as government stakeholders, security and justice providers or traditional authorities, individual interviews or interviews in smaller groups (two or three people) might be more appropriate.

**Location and time requirements:** Because of the potential sensitivities, a venue should be selected that is safe and where the group can meet without others listening and interrupting. If you deal with conflicting groups you might have to choose two different venues to avoid tensions. For venue selection, see also chapter 7.

For each group discussion, depending on the number of tools you want to use, you might need to allocate at least a day, which you ideally split into two half-day sessions to keep concentration levels high and give participants some time to get other work done. For interviews with individuals, allocate one and a half to two hours. Depending on how many teams of facilitators you have, you can run several group discussions and interviews at the same time, or need to allocate a couple of days to carry out the conflict analysis.

**Financial costs:** You need to budget for staff and partner costs (and possibly consultancy costs) for preparation, data collection and analysis; local travel, food and accommodation; and some money to pay for tea, snacks and (for longer group discussions) lunch for the respondents, and possibly venue hire. If staff/partners haven’t done a conflict analysis involving primary data collection before, funds need to be allocated for training (depending on existing research and facilitation skills, this could be up to three or four days each).

3) **Conducting data collection and analysis:** Before you begin the data collection, ensure that you are familiar with the findings of the macro-level context analysis, and any other research that is relevant for the specific location, and discuss which findings might be particularly relevant for the specific local context(s) you’re working in.

Prepare your conflict analysis outline, select the tools you want to use, prepare facilitation notes and any stationery you might require. Ensure that tools are easy to understand, including for illiterate people or those who are visually impaired. For interviews, prepare your guiding questions, but ensure that there is enough flexibility to cover other issues of interest as well. Be creative, you can include a tool in an interview and ask the interviewee to draw an ABC triangle, for example.

You can use the same components and tools you used in the macro-level conflict analysis. Annex 1 describes the key components of a conflict analysis, identifies some key guiding questions and includes examples of participatory analysis tools than can be used. Module 1 of the Training of trainers manual: Transforming conflict and building peace, published by Saferworld and CAMP, also

---

13 The manual has been designed for the Pakistan context but can be easily adapted to other contexts.
leads you through a conflict analysis process and includes useful handouts. You may want to focus on session 1 and sessions 5–10.¹³

On the day(s) you do the data collection, ensure that you have a good note-taker who captures conversations in detail, and take pictures of anything that has been visualised (for example maps, conflict trees). Avoid taking photos of individuals in order to protect privacy.

For participants to respond openly, you will need to create an atmosphere of trust. This is easier if the facilitator is already known to the participants, for example from previous work in the location. Be transparent about the purpose of the analysis, and assure participants that their names will not be mentioned. Agree at the beginning of the group discussion that participants will not share with others what has been discussed.

4) Analysing findings: After the data collection, carefully analyse your findings (see below). It is important to pay attention to whether and how views of specific stakeholder groups differ. Are there groups whose views are strongly opposed to each other? Does this suggest a potential for conflict?

Step 2: Conducting a Participatory Vulnerability and Capacity Analysis (PVCA)

Different consortium partners use different terms to refer to the local-level analysis that is part of their resilience-building projects:

- Action Aid: Participatory Vulnerability Analysis (PVA)
- Christian Aid: Participatory Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (PVCA)
- Concern: Risk Analysis (RA)
- World Vision: Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA)

In this guide, we use Participatory Vulnerability and Capacity Analysis (PVCA). We propose that agencies implementing resilience-building projects carry out their PVCA using their organisation’s methodologies and tools. However, it will be necessary to add conflict-related questions (examples are provided in Annex 2), and to apply a conflict-sensitive approach throughout the PVCA.

A PVCA is carried out with communities to collect and analyse information about their vulnerability, risks and capacities in a structured way, which can later be used as a basis for developing solutions. Its main purposes are to:¹⁴

- identify the key vulnerabilities of a particular community
- understand how community members perceive risk and threats to their lives and livelihoods
- analyse the resources (capacities) and strategies available to them to address or reduce these risks
- help the community develop an action plan to address identified vulnerability and risk.

A well-conducted PVCA can empower the community as well as other stakeholders, and lead/partner organisation staff, to better understand the risks they are facing, what makes them vulnerable and which groups are most vulnerable, and what they can do to effectively reduce risks and vulnerabilities. If we ask the right questions, a PVCA can also help to identify existing or potential conflicts that could impact on a communities’ resilience-building efforts. This means that we need to integrate questions on conflict into some of the tools we have been using for the assessment. It is important to discuss with communities the ‘what if’ question, exploring how different risks interact dynamically. Examples for how tools can be adapted to include focus on conflict (alongside DRR and Climate Change Adaptation) are shown in Annex 2.

The findings from the local-level conflict analysis can and should inform the PVCA.

Step 3: Analysing findings from both analysis exercises

The two local-level analyses should be analysed separately, but then linked to each other and to the findings of the macro-level conflict assessment. This is important because otherwise relationships and dynamics between conflicts and environmental or other hazards, or between developments at the local and national level and how they are interrelated, might be overlooked. Thus, a good analysis will also help to address multiple risks in a coherent way.

Some of the conflict risks and vulnerabilities might be clearly spelled out as people might mention insecurity or tensions they have with others; other conflict issues might be more hidden and will only come out through your analysis (for example if the needs and interests of one community/group are in contradiction to those of another group). This requires a thorough comparison of findings from different groups and different local contexts.

In your analysis, ensure that you pay attention to how risks and vulnerabilities play out differently for different people/groups. For example, older people might be differently affected than younger, women from one ethnic group might be more vulnerable to a specific risk than women from another ethnic group, etc. Make sure this is...
spelled out clearly so the communities’ action plans are tailored accordingly, and don’t reinforce vulnerabilities.

Once that has been done, it is important to translate findings into practical recommendations for programme design. The project purpose and objectives should be reviewed and if necessary revised to ensure that they build on any potential opportunities for peace and do not risk exacerbating any conflict drivers.

**Who to engage**

Respondents to involve in the PVCA could include:

- local communities (taking an inclusive approach that is, as far as possible, reflective of the diversity within the community, e.g., ensuring that different gender, age, ethnic, religious, caste, social, political groups, minority and vulnerable groups are included)
- local/district level government authorities
- influential local leaders (such as elders, chiefs, religious leaders)
- local bodies/CBOs/NGOs such as women groups, youth clubs, older people’s organisations, local disaster risk management groups, etc
- both formal and informal security and justice providers (see chapter 3)
- local businesses and media.

**Best practices and lessons learned**

When planning and implementing the two pieces of local analysis, key issues to consider include:

- Resilience affects people in different ways, as does conflict. We need to be inclusive when selecting our respondents and get the views of those whose voices are usually not heard. We also need to find out who is most vulnerable in the current situation and when disaster happens, as well as how resilience-building or response activities could reinforce or change vulnerabilities.

- In conflict situations, who we talk to might be interpreted as who we are supporting politically, ideologically or in other ways. Specific groups could also use our interaction with them for strategic purposes. These risks need to be mitigated (see chapter 2).

- As much as possible, we need to be forward thinking: if tensions erupt, what implications will that have on the situation, conflict dynamic and specific groups of people in the community? How will that alter vulnerability? What local capacities support refugees or internally displaced people in the area?

- People’s experiences and grievances should be respected. Thus, we need to be sensitive towards what to ask, and how. Think about whether questions could put respondents at risk because they touch upon controversial topics, or whether they could cause upset. Try to avoid questions that ask about respondents’ personal experiences of violence (for example, ‘Have you ever been raped?; ‘Have you ever used violence against someone from this group?’) unless you know them well and feel that there is an atmosphere of trust. Instead you could ask questions in a more impersonal manner (for example, ‘Have you heard of rape cases in this community?’; ‘is violence used against people from this group?’). If you realise that people feel ashamed or afraid to continue talking, respect that.

- In many contexts, women feel more comfortable speaking with female researchers, and men might prefer a male researcher. Ideally the research teams will include both men and women. It can be an advantage if the researcher is from the local area as people might know her/him, but sometimes people prefer confiding in people they don’t know because it’s more anonymous.

**Integrating M&E considerations across the project cycle:** Before you start with the local-level analysis make sure you know whether the findings are supposed to contribute to your baseline for the project’s M&E. If that’s the assumption, you might need to add questions to get information relevant for a baseline. Keep in mind that conflict analysis and PVCA are not the same thing as a baseline assessment.

**Advocacy considerations:** It is important to remember that a solid analysis of the context is the basis for good advocacy. If your data is flawed or your analysis is weak, your advocacy won’t be successful. Furthermore, staff should bear in mind that some of those you are talking to in the analysis phase might later be allies or targets for your advocacy work.

**Further resources and tools**

- Saferworld (2014), Community security handbook, Chapter 5.1.
- Concern (2012), Risk Analysis Guidelines.
7. Action planning and implementation

Integrate this step with your existing resilience-building methodology: Most resilience methodologies include some guidance on developing and supporting implementation of community action plans. Integrate this step with your existing resilience-building methodology:

- **Action Aid Participatory Vulnerability Analysis and Action**: Initial analysis and plan of action at village/district level stage (p30); Implementation and monitoring of activities and follow up analysis stage (p33).
- **Christian Aid Good Practice Guide PVCA**: Part 2, as well as How to conduct PVCA? Phase 3 (p12) and Conducting a PVCA: A step by step guide, Chapters D (p17); Annex F.
- **Concern Risk Analysis Guidelines**: Chapters 17–19; Annex 8.
- **ECB/ARPP Manual**: Stage 5 (p88).
- **World Vision DRR toolkit**: Tool 3: Assessment Report and design document review.
- **World Vision Gerando**: Chapters 6–7 (p52–64).

During this stage, you are working with community members to help them to develop and implement community action plans. These should build on the findings from the local-level conflict analysis and PVCA, and pre-existing community capacities to help address key vulnerabilities. If carefully managed, the process of developing action plans as well as the planned resilience activities can contribute towards conflict prevention.

Some key considerations include:

**Action planning and implementation should be informed by both macro- and local-level conflict analysis:**

The conflict analysis should identify groups with the potential to engage in conflict or to overcome tensions, as well as issues, resources or events likely to contribute to increases or decreases in tensions between these groups. These findings should inform who to engage with and how, the formation of community groups to develop the actions plans, priorities to be addressed through the plans, and how to implement them.

For example, if the conflict analysis identifies certain groups that lack access to decision-making powers within the community (for example dalits, women, other marginalised groups), it is important to consider how to ensure that their interests are included within the community groups developing the action plans. The analysis can also help to understand how risks (including natural hazards and conflicts) are interrelated, and inform actions that can address multiple risks.

**Process of developing action plans can be a tool to empower people and build relationships**

The process of bringing representatives from diverse groups together to discuss key challenges and agree on priorities for resilience-building activities can be empowering and can help to break down barriers between groups. It is important that groups reflect the views of a wide range of groups from within the community, including the most marginalised and the more privileged. If action plan development is used as a tool for bringing members of conflicting groups together, it can be useful to have separate meetings first and increase joint interaction incrementally.

**Activities should reduce barriers and inequalities and promote greater community cohesion**

Wherever possible, resilience-strengthening activities should reinforce or contribute to community cohesion, which in turn is likely to contribute to greater resilience. What this will look like in any particular context will depend on the conflict analysis. For example, livelihood projects focusing on young people’s economic empowerment could include activities that allow young people from different ethnic, caste or religious groups to work and learn together while at the same time overcoming grievances, prejudices or cultural barriers between those groups. Activities should also reduce
inequalities and vulnerabilities rather than reinforcing or enhancing them. For example, if a resilience-strengthening project can convince men to contribute to household chores, this would free up women’s time to take an active role in the resilience-building project and would also contribute to reducing gender inequality and possibly to better family relationships.

**Work with community groups to help them think through how proposed activities could contribute to conflict or tensions**

It is important to help community groups think about any unintended implications planned activity might have on the context. For example, communities may identify the need to diversify their crops, including potentially starting to plant a crop that is more resilient to environmental hazards. However, if this crop is already a niche product grown by farmers in a neighbouring community, then it can lead to competition between the two communities, with potentially negative impacts on community relations. This doesn’t mean that the project activity can’t or shouldn’t be implemented; however, it will be important to consult with neighbouring communities to avoid tensions, and to find means to reduce the economic disadvantages they might face.

**The potential of an activity to contribute to reducing or preventing conflict should be a criteria for activity selection**

It is important to actively consider how activities can contribute to conflict prevention objectives as part of the prioritisation process. In practice, that might mean that staff have to do some groundwork to convince those who are more advantaged, powerful or less vulnerable that some activities might be designed to specifically benefit those most vulnerable.

---

**CASE STUDY: Including diverse stakeholders within community groups in Nepal**

Saferworld implemented a community security project in Nepal. As divisions based on caste are still strong in Nepal, the project put specific emphasis on ensuring that the groups the project engaged with were inclusive of the caste groups living in the project area. At the same time, the project sought to have a good representation of different gender and age groups.

**Consider where and when community meetings will be held:** The venue for community meetings should be in a safe location that can be reached easily. ‘Safe’ and ‘accessible’ mean different things for different people: for example, in contexts of gang violence, some venues might be unsafe for young men because the location is seen as the area of a competing group. Other places might be safe for men but women might not feel comfortable going there, or it might be seen as inappropriate for them to be there (for example a bar or tea shop). Older people or people with disabilities have specific needs.

Similarly, the timing of meetings needs to be appropriate. Some groups may have special needs, for example, some people might have certain responsibilities at different times, such as the planting, harvesting or rainy season. Meeting and activity schedules should be arranged accordingly.

**Review contextual developments and dynamics between the context and the project throughout the implementation stage**

It is important that both the conflict context and the impact of the project on this context are continuously monitored, and changes are made as necessary (see Chapter 8). There may be moments when it is particularly important to review conflict dynamics, for example if there are holidays or events, such as elections, that can spark tensions between groups. Macro- and local-level conflict analysis should help you identify these events.
**Best practices: How can the project contribute to conflict prevention?**

Simple processes and activities that change how people interact with each other can contribute to conflict prevention. For example:

- Drawing upon findings from your macro- and local-level analysis, identify the sorts of issues that can contribute to conflict prevention. For example, meaningful participation of diverse stakeholders in decision-making processes can be a powerful tool for building greater social cohesion. Your analysis should help you to identify which groups of stakeholders are most critical to include in these processes.

- Ensure meaningful rather than just nominal participation of groups that are usually marginalised and excluded from decision-making processes. This might require building participants’ capacity to constructively negotiate positions and articulate their views. Training in negotiation skills could be an action plan point in itself.

- Enable people from conflicting groups to work together in livelihood or similar programmes addressing common priorities. For example, projects in water-scarce contexts might encourage people from conflicting groups to work together in water user committees.

- Enable conflicting groups to share their local expertise and risk-mitigation mechanisms.

- Design activities in which security and justice providers coordinate and cooperate with communities to build trust and improve relationships: for example, through participation in meetings, having them as advisors, consulting them on prioritisation of issues, getting their buy-in for action plans, giving them a role in implementation of action plans, but also holding them to account for the successful implementation of action plans, and celebrating successes together.

**Integrating M&E considerations across the project cycle:** It is important that M&E systems capture changes in relationships between conflicting groups, as well as changes in levels of insecurity. As different groups are affected differently by the context, you need to ensure that you disaggregate data. Do not assume that groups such as ‘community’, ‘women’, and ‘men’ are homogenous.

**Advocacy considerations:** An advocacy strategy for the project might be developed during this stage in the project cycle (see chapter 9 for more detailed discussion). It might be useful to involve advocacy targets in the development or implementation of the plan to increase their level of ownership and possibly support. Organising go-and-see visits for key advocacy targets can also be an effective advocacy tool.

**Further resources and tools**

- Saferworld (2013), Community security handbook: Chapter 5.1; Chapter 4.3.
- CSC (2012), How To Guide on Conflict Sensitivity, Chapter 2.3, Chapter 3.
Integrate this step with your existing resilience-building methodology: M&E should be integrated across all stages of the programme cycle. The guidance provided in this section should inform implementation at all stages within consortium members’ methodologies (although some methodologies also have specific sections on M&E):

- **Action Aid Participatory Vulnerability Analysis and Action:** No specific M&E section included.
- **Christian Aid PVCA Guidelines:** No specific M&E section included.
- **Concern Risk Analysis Guidelines:** No specific M&E section included.
- **ECB/ARPP:** Within stage 7: Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning.
- **World Vision DRR toolkit:** Within Tool 4: Risk Monitoring & Evaluation.
- **World Vision Gerando:** Within chapter 8: Monitoring and Evaluation.

Conflict-sensitive monitoring includes reflecting on the interaction between the intervention and the context as part of the broader intervention monitoring plan. It involves three key elements:

- monitoring the conflict context
- monitoring the effects of the conflict context on the intervention
- monitoring the effects of the intervention on the conflict context.

It also means that the monitoring itself is carried out in a conflict-sensitive way. A key objective of conflict-sensitive monitoring is to help adapt the implementation plans where necessary. Monitoring findings may for example reveal that:

- resilience-strengthening activities are unintentionally triggering tensions or reinforcing divisions in the community, and that there is a need to revise the implementation strategy to minimise these effects
- underlying tensions in the target groups are hindering participation in activities and that there is a need to better understand and address those tensions to achieve progress
- opportunities for reinforcing community cohesion or dialogue between divided groups through project activities exist and could be capitalised on.

**Conflict-sensitive indicators**

Different types of indicators can be used to monitor conflict sensitivity. These can be classified as ‘intervention’, ‘conflict/context’ and ‘interaction’ indicators. Indicators should draw upon quantitative and qualitative data. Perception-based indicators can be especially useful, since it is often people’s perceptions about the context, and their position within it (rather than any ‘objective’ truth) that drive conflict.

**a) Intervention indicators:** These provide information on the extent that the intervention is moving towards achieving its objectives. They include the indicators that any project monitoring and evaluation system, such as the logframe, would normally include. In some instances these indicators will provide relevant information for conflict sensitivity. They can also be unpacked or disaggregated to provide pertinent information. For example, if the conflict analysis has identified conflict or potential conflict between groups A and B in a community, data could be disaggregated to assess how impacts are distributed between these groups.

*Example:* Proportion of households from group A and group B reporting year-round access to sufficient food for their family’s needs.

**b) Conflict/context indicators:** These provide information on whether there are significant changes in the context, and whether and how tensions and conflict issues are evolving. They can help the project team to keep the conflict analysis updated. Conflict issues are dynamic and being able to recognise, and take into account, evolutions in the context is a key element of conflict sensitivity.

---

This section draws on CSC (2012) How To Guide for Conflict Sensitivity, Chapter 2.4.
Example: Frequency of incidents of violence between communities A and B in a designated area in a three-month period.

c) Interaction indicators: These provide information on the ways in which the intervention may be having an effect on the conflict and how. They provide information on the direct interaction between the project and its context. Gathering such information often requires reflection on qualitative aspects of project implementation and exploring questions linked to staff and communities’ perceptions of the project. This data is fundamental to enable a conflict-sensitive approach, but can be very sensitive. An organisation or project team may decide to use such information internally rather than for external reports, to enable greater openness and better quality responses to monitoring questions.

Example: Proportion of people in communities A and B who perceive the resilience project as benefiting both communities equally or one community over the other.

Capturing unintended impacts

In addition to capturing expected impacts of a resilience intervention, it is important to leave space within M&E frameworks to capture information on unintended or unforeseen impacts. You should take note of both positive and negative unintended impacts.

Measuring change at different levels

Effective conflict-sensitive programming and best practice from resilience-building methodologies point to the need to address change at multiple levels including the local, sub-national and national levels. It is therefore important to measure impacts and changes in the context at these levels. At the local level, this can be done through the use of participatory M&E processes and exercises, as well as the integration of different indicator types into M&E frameworks, as outlined above. Local-level indicators might seek to capture changes in attitudes or behaviours of key actors, relationships between actor groups, level of vulnerabilities of different groups within the community, etc.

At the sub-national or national level, indicators are more likely to be focused on capturing changes in the policies or practices of institutions responsible for disaster preparedness or security provision. They may, for example, look to measure the level of change in institutionalising consultation processes or mechanisms with the community, the timeliness of consultation, changes in the way budgets are defined and used, progress toward greater transparency and information sharing, and changes in operational guidelines. They may also look for changes in capacities by communities or civil society to undertake research and advocacy for policy-level change, the quality of evidence used, and the capacity of civil society organisations to do that work.16

Examples of indicators to show evidence of change within community security programming

Behaviour of security providers towards communities:
- number of attacks by security providers on individuals and/or communities
- willingness of security providers to visit communities
- adherence to proper protocols and procedures by security providers for community engagement
- the extent to which security providers see themselves as a service to the community, rather than a force for control.

Community behaviour towards security providers:
- number of attacks by communities on security providers
- number of meetings with security providers requested by communities
- willingness to report crime or security issues to relevant authorities
- willingness of community to hand over suspects/culprits.

Relationships between the community and security providers:
- level of attendance at meetings, from community and police staff (rank, seniority, relevant community representatives)
- level of own resources community willing to invest in solutions
- space given to security providers to exercise their roles
- level of continued reliance by communities on non-state, informal security providers.

Feelings of safety/security:
- the proportion of women who feel confident walking in the community after dark
- people’s perceptions of security and safety and trust in authorities to deliver responsive and accountable services
- effectiveness and capacities of consultation mechanism.

Sub-national and national level:

- the quality and delivery of services to marginalised groups
- the number of reported cases of domestic violence and gender-based violence and the responses to these
- people’s trust in sub-national and national authorities to deliver responsive and accountable services

How to ensure project monitoring is conflict sensitive

In addition to capturing the ways in which a resilience intervention and local conflict dynamics affect each other, it is important to ensure that the process of monitoring change is itself conflict sensitive. Failure to include all relevant groups in the process of setting indicators and monitoring progress against achieving objectives can, for example, result in projects that are skewed towards certain groups, which can reinforce patterns of exclusion within communities.

Participatory monitoring is important in any context. This is particularly the case in conflict contexts. Very often, conflict is driven as much by people’s perceptions about the nature or causes of vulnerability or marginalisation, and the motivations of different stakeholders, as it is about agreed ‘facts’. Applying a participatory approach can be an essential means of helping to build widespread community ownership of an intervention. Genuinely participatory processes should ensure that the voices of all groups, especially the most marginalised and vulnerable, are included in the design and implementation of the project. They can also be a powerful tool for bringing different groups together to discuss and agree on common priorities, and the changes they would like to see.

Monitoring best practices and top tips

In your monitoring plan, you should:

- Consult with non-targeted groups as well as direct project participants. This will help generate data on changes in the broader context in which the project is taking place and on possible effects of the project on tensions or divisions between targeted and non-targeted groups.
- Provide feedback to people consulted as part of the monitoring. This will reduce the risk of the process being perceived as purely extractive.
- Review the risks and assumptions included in the project design.
- Use informal processes to keep the conflict analysis up to date and to monitor conflict sensitivity. It can be helpful to include a discussion on conflict dynamics and how they relate to project implementation as a regular feature of team meetings. This should lead into a consideration of whether the project needs adjusting in light of any changes in the conflict dynamics.
- Include questions on conflict and on the effects of the project on the context in reporting formats, even where it is not required by the donor.
- Create safe spaces for staff and communities to encourage open dialogue on the project and conflict issues, and any tensions faced.

Conflict-sensitive evaluation

Conflict-sensitive evaluation introduces a detailed understanding of actors, profile, causes and dynamics into traditional evaluation activities and processes. Conflict-sensitive evaluations are used to understand the overall impact a given intervention has had on its context, and the context on the intervention. These evaluations can be used to adjust subsequent phases of an initiative, and/or provide lessons for future initiatives.

Many of the conflict-sensitive monitoring points above are equally relevant for evaluation. It is important to ensure that as well as covering the direct project outcomes, evaluations also review the interaction between the intervention and the context, particularly the impact of the intervention (both positive and negative; intended and unintended) on the wider context. You should consider whether or not adaptations were needed and made as a result of conflict-sensitive monitoring.
Evaluation best practices and top tips

Consider the following as part of your evaluation plan:

• An evaluator can themselves contribute to conflict/tensions depending on how they are viewed by the targeted communities.

• If using an external evaluator, be aware that their presence could raise expectations in the community for future activities.

• Ensure that both direct and indirect participants are included in the evaluation process.

• Ensure that the outcome of the evaluation is fed back to the community and all stakeholders, and that they have an opportunity to comment on the findings.

• Identify how learning on conflict sensitivity emerging from the evaluation can be shared with others (e.g., by developing a public summary of key lessons learned) and inform future practice.

• Explicitly include a focus on assessing conflict sensitivity in the evaluator’s terms of reference.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Guiding questions:

Key questions to consider when designing and conducting M&E activities include:

• Who is leading the process? How are they perceived by the people being consulted and how could this affect the data? Are responsibilities spread across different members of staff?

• Who is being consulted? How diverse are the groups being consulted (caste or ethnic groups, gender, in positions of power or marginalised)? Are both direct beneficiaries and surrounding communities included?

• When is the monitoring and evaluation being conducted? Does this account for any potentially sensitive times (for example, harvesting season or elections)?

• How will analysis from monitoring and evaluation be used to influence relevant decision-making processes (project design, staff security planning, etc)?

Further resources and tools


• CSC (2012), How To Guide on Conflict Sensitivity, Chapter 2.4.

• Saferworld and CAMP (2014), Training of trainers manual: Transforming conflict and building peace, Module 5.
Affecting change at different levels is a core characteristic of resilience-strengthening programming. Integrating advocacy into programmes is therefore critical. Advocacy should not be seen as a separate step within programme design and implementation, but as an integrated component of good programme cycle management. This guide should inform implementation at all stages within resilience methodologies. The reviewed methodologies did not have specific sections on advocacy.

Conflict-sensitive advocacy is a strategic process of seeking to improve the policies and practices of actor groups, often authorities, in such a way as to minimise negative and maximise positive impacts on peace. Sharing evidence of success (as well as failures) from conflict-sensitive programmes with targeted individuals, groups and institutions can help inform and accelerate the uptake of conflict sensitivity across other programmes, policies and practices. Ultimately, this can contribute to conflict prevention and sustainable resilience building at the local, sub-national and national levels.

Conflict-sensitive advocacy

There are many types of advocacy activity, ranging from public campaigns and lobby meetings to seminars, workshops and report launches. The type that is most appropriate in your given context is determined by a range of factors, primarily which approach is likely to have the greatest impact. Advocacy activities may focus on:

- bringing communities together to articulate their needs and concerns to decision makers
- using the experience of working on the ground to draw evidence-based arguments about the way national and international level actors can best prevent conflict and build resilience for local people
- engaging directly with government officials and international institutions to influence policy
- ‘go-and-see’ visits, where officials or political leaders are invited to visit project sites and meet affected communities, can be particularly useful.

It is important to always consider the potential impact of advocacy activities on the safety and security of programme staff and beneficiaries, as well as any unintended consequences they may have. For example, public campaigns can be highly effective in drawing attention to critical issues (such as gender inequalities, corruption or human rights abuses). But they can also expose community members or activists to becoming targets of intimidation by groups whose interests may be challenged by such activities.

It is equally important to pay attention to the implicit messages that advocacy can convey. For example, who is seen to be leading advocacy activities can have a significant impact on how legitimate or representative the messages are seen to be. In contexts in which conflict occurs along ethnic or social lines, careful consideration should be given to the background, ethnicity, gender, etc., of the messengers. Likewise, how your organisation is perceived by local people, authorities or other target groups can have profound impacts on how messages are interpreted; advocacy that is seen to be primarily driven by western organisations, or those with a political or ideological affiliation, can result in important messages being ignored or seen as serving a foreign or self-serving agenda. The timing of advocacy activities should also be considered. Lobbying meetings in the run up to elections, for example, can be effective in some contexts, but may also expose organisations to perceptions of political bias.

Such challenges do not mean that advocacy in conflict-affected contexts is impossible. Rather, it is critical that challenges are identified and acknowledged and the most suitable means of advocating for change are adopted. This may, for example, imply private lobbying over public campaigning, or establishing informal partnerships with other agencies with a strong advocacy focus. Engaging in constructive and targeted relationship building with influential actors can also be critical in helping to mitigate against some risks (see chapter 3).
In the Aqbet Jaber refugee camp in the Jericho Governorate of the West Bank in Palestine, the YWCA supported community members to make an advocacy film to highlight their experience of flooding. The film emphasised the need for flood prevention and preparedness activities, for better waste management to avoid waste blocking drains, and for better management of digging and construction in the valley to prevent flooding and land destabilisation.

The camp’s technical committee, set up through the PVCA, coordinated advocacy with the YWCA to get the film shown at a high-level Jericho Governorate meeting. This resulted in an agreement between the technical committee, the community and the UN Relief and Works Agency (responsible for provision of many core services) to improve rubbish collection and disposal in the camp. Significantly, the Governorate also allocated funds to improve the retaining wall to prevent flooding.

### Designing and implementing an advocacy strategy

Successful advocacy is a process rather than an event. It requires creativity, flexibility and regular monitoring of progress. Advocacy should be seen as an integral component of conflict-sensitive programming, and has implications at each stage in the programme cycle (see chapters 4-7). A key to conducting successful advocacy is the development of an advocacy strategy that is implemented over the life of the programme (and beyond).

There are six key stages to developing a conflict sensitive advocacy strategy. These are:

- **Step 1 – Assessing the situation:** It is important to understand the context and identify factors that might affect success. This should draw upon both the macro- and local-level analyses conducted during project design and preparation (chapters 4 and 6).

  **Tools to use:** SWOT analysis.

- **Step 2 – Establishing the goals:** Map and clarify the problems that need addressing to prioritise solutions and advocacy objectives. This should draw on the local-level PVCA and conflict analyses (chapter 6) and the macro-level conflict analysis (chapter 4).

  **Tools to use:** Problem tree, Solutions table, Ranking exercise.

- **Step 3 – Developing an influencing strategy:** Capture the changes you seek, who will make the changes happen, and how to influence them to do so. Consider potential risks for communities and staff, and identify any potential unintended consequences of advocacy during this stage. Stakeholder and conflict mapping conducted during local-level analyses (chapter 6) and macro-level conflict analysis (chapter 4) should be particularly useful here.

  **Tools to use:** Stakeholder analysis, Influence mapping, and Channels of influence.

- **Step 4 – Planning your activity:** Activities should be tailored to the target audience to best influence their decision-making, and be based on a solid theory of change. It is important to consider any messages that may be implicitly conveyed by how we conduct advocacy activities, and who leads such activities.

  **Tools to use:** Developing Theory of Change, Influence ladder, Being SMART.

- **Step 5 – Implementation:** Including timelines, clarity on responsibilities and developing indicators to track changes. This should form part of project implementation (chapter 7).

  **Tools to use:** Gantt chart, setting indicators.

- **Step 6 – Monitoring and evaluation:** assess whether activities are having the intended impacts, as well as continuously monitoring the context to ensure that activities remain relevant and are not exacerbating tensions or putting communities or staff at risk. This should form an integral part of the overall M&E framework of the project (chapter 8).

  **Tools to use:** Participatory M&E tools (see chapter 7).

Steps 1–4 above are likely to form a part of the action planning and implementation phase of the programme cycle (chapter 7). Steps 5–6 should form part of the project implementation phase. More detailed guidance on each step, including guidance on using specific tools, is included in Saferworld and Conciliation Resources’ Advocacy capacity building training toolkit.
Advocacy: Guiding questions

- How might advocacy activities impact on local people and programme staff? Are there dangers that they may be put at risk by such activities? If so, how can these risks be mitigated?

- How is your organisation and its staff viewed by local people/security providers/authorities? How do you ensure that you are perceived as impartial and legitimate actors in this context? How do you ensure you are not seen to be aligned to any one group engaged in conflict?

- Who is best placed to convey key advocacy messages? What are the implicit messages that your advocacy activities convey?

- Are there any potentially sensitive events during the advocacy strategy period (such as contested religious holidays, elections or memorials)? What might be the implications for what advocacy takes place, and how it is conducted?

Further resources and tools


**Glossary**

**Conflict:** occurs when two or more parties find their interests incompatible, express hostile attitudes or take actions that damage the other party’s ability to pursue their interests.

**Conflict dynamics:** the social, political, environmental or economic factors that influence a conflict.

**Conflict prevention:** interventions that seek to reduce tensions and/or prevent the outbreak or reoccurrence of violence. They seek to contribute to positive peace.

**Conflict sensitivity:** the ability of an organisation or project to:
- understand the conflict context (history, social and demographic composition, political system, economy and security)
- understand the potential interaction between any planned action/intervention and the context – how will interventions affect the context; how will the context affect interventions?
- act upon this understanding in order to minimise negative and maximise positive impacts on conflict and peace.

**Cultural violence:** cultural factors beliefs or attitudes that can lead people to legitimise or overlook direct or structural violence.

**Femininity:** attitudes, behaviours, appearance, interests, types of employment, roles within the family, etc, which are culturally associated with women and girls.

**Gender:** characteristics of men, women, boys or girls, and sexual and gender minorities that are socially constructed. They change over time. Gender norms and expectations can be different for people from different age groups, religions, levels of education, wealth, or ethnicity.

**Gender sensitivity** means that during activities such as assessments or resilience building, the expectations, needs and particular circumstances of women, men and sexual and gender minorities are carefully thought about and engaged with. It might be that because of social inequalities, vulnerability, discrimination or violence, particular attention should be given to individuals or a group.

**Masculinity:** attitudes, behaviours, appearance, interests, types of employment, roles within the family, etc, which are culturally associated with men and boys.

**Negative peace:** a situation where there is no current physical violence, but where structural and cultural violence is present that could lead to violent conflict.

**Positive peace:** a situation characterised by the absence of physical, structural and cultural violence.

**Resilience:** the capacity of a group of people – usually at the community level – to monitor, anticipate, respond to and manage both known risks and future uncertainties. It is the ability of a community or society, through incremental and transformational change, to absorb shocks, adapt to stresses and ‘bounce back better’ from both.

**Security and justice providers:** all institutions, groups, organisations and individuals that have a stake in security and justice provision.

**Sex:** biological differences between men, women and sexual minorities.

**Structural violence** refers to the unjust social, political or economic systems and structures that discriminate against certain individuals or groups, to the benefit of others.
### Annex 1. Components of conflict analysis, guiding questions and related participatory analysis tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core components of conflict analysis</th>
<th>Key guiding questions: These questions help to guide conflict analysis. They should be adapted for use in any particular context, and may not be exhaustive</th>
<th>Examples of relevant tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Conflict profile:** including an overview of the historical, economic, political, social, demographic and environmental context. This may also include an analysis of gender dynamics within the context. | • What are the historical, political, economic, social, cultural, demographic and environmental issues that define the overall context?  
• Is the focal area prone to natural disasters or other types of shocks? What impacts have these had on social, political and economic dynamics in the past? Are they more frequent, or do they have greater impact in some parts of the focal area?  
• Do men and women play different roles in causing, sustaining, preventing or resolving conflicts? In what ways? Why do you think this is – are there specific traditional norms, social expectations or external pressures pushing people into/out of these roles? | • Historical timeline  
• Seasonal calendar |
| **Stakeholder analysis:** identification of key actor groups with influence over the conflict. This might include actors such as government, security actors (eg, police, military), non-state armed groups, traditional authorities, private business, donors, religious or political networks, civil society, neighbouring states, etc. It should analyse the positions, interests and needs of the most significant actor groups, as well as assessing how different groups relate to each other. | • Which actor groups have the most influence over conflict and security issues in the context?  
• How do these groups relate to each other? How homogenous/cohesive are these groups? Do they involve marginalised or minority groups?  
• What are their interests, goals, and capacities to influence the conflict positively or negatively? Do any of these groups have incentives or disincentives to promote peace, or any existing or potential motivation to take up violence?  
• Which groups tend to be the biggest perpetrators or victims of violence? Are different sub-groups affected by violence differently (eg, along gender or age lines)?  
• Which groups are more vulnerable to the effects of environmental hazards or other shocks? Why? Which are most resilient? Why?  
• Do women, men, girls and boys experience conflict or insecurity differently? In what ways? Why is this? | • Power mapping  
• Conflict mapping  
• The pyramid |

1 Note that several tools can be applicable to multiple components within the conflict analysis.
### Core components of conflict analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers of conflict: identification of the underlying issues that can drive or contribute to conflict. This means moving beyond identifying visible signs of conflict, towards identifying ‘proximate causes’ (shorter-term factors that can contribute to conflict, such as availability of firearms, high unemployment, etc) and ‘structural causes’ (the underlying structural and cultural forms of violence that are built into the fabric of society, such as narratives of clan superiority or competition for scarce resources).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key guiding questions: These questions help to guide conflict analysis. They should be adapted for use in any particular context, and may not be exhaustive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of relevant tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the root causes of conflict or instability in the context? (These can be grouped under different types of conflict causes, eg, political, governance, economic, security, environmental, gender, social, cultural, etc. These categories can be grouped and named in whatever way makes sense in the context.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the structural, proximate and trigger causes of conflict?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC triangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree is competition over access to resources a driver of conflict? Which resources? Where are they concentrated? Which groups have and which lack access to these resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The iceberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict dynamics: analysis of the relationship between conflict causes and the key actor groups. It is also important to identify key trends relating to conflict, as well as trigger events, such as elections, environmental hazards or other potential shocks or stresses, that could contribute to the escalation or ignition of violent conflict, or open up windows of opportunity to promote peace. In resilience-building programmes, it can be important to include analysis of the interrelation between conflict drivers and environmental hazards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship between the overall context (profile), key stakeholders and underlying drivers of conflict? Are there any factors that might contribute to an increase in conflict in the future (eg, competition over resources, predatory security providers, etc)? How do they differ between different groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the factors that make communities more resilient to violence and conflict (eg, economic growth, progressive religious leaders, etc)? Do they differ between specific groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the most likely future scenarios for the country? What are the likely impacts of these scenarios on peace and conflict dynamics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are climate change projections for the focus area? How might these impact on the conflict drivers? Who is likely to be most affected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of key threats to peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are environmental hazards likely to increase in frequency and severity? What are the likely impacts of these on relations between stakeholders? Which groups are likely to be most affected? Which are most resilient?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


2 These questions should not be taken as an exhaustive list, but as an indication of key questions that could be asked when using these tools.
Annex 2. Integrating questions around conflict and security into the PVCA

This table is from World Vision’s Policy and Practice paper ‘Participatory learning approaches for resilience: Bringing conflict sensitivity, disaster risk reduction, and climate change adaptation together’ and has been slightly adapted for the purpose of this guide. It complements chapter 6.

You are not expected to use all the tools suggested in this table, but only a selection (depending on the specific scope of the assessment and time and resources available). However, you are likely to find tools in the list that you are using already, and can add new ones that you find useful. If you do not yet analyse one of the larger areas at all (for example, you don’t do any Hazard and Trend Analysis), you might consider adding this type of analysis to your PVCA.

The questions are guiding questions rather than survey questions. This means that they need to be broken down and adapted by the facilitation team. They are supposed to spark a more in-depth conversation, and the team is not expected to ask all of them. However, in order to understand how hazards and vulnerabilities inter-relate with conflict dynamics it is important to include at least some of the more specific conflict-related questions.

Even where not specifically indicated, it is critical that you capture how different groups are affected by hazards and conflict, so tools and questions should seek to get as much information as possible specific to different gender, age, ethnic, caste, tribal, religious, etc, groups. Only then will you be able to develop approaches that are tailored to the specific needs and capacities of people, and possibly to address some of the causes of hazards.

Examples of tools and guiding questions for PVCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Objective of tools</th>
<th>Suggested guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hazards and Trends Analysis  | Explore types of shocks that have affected the community in the past; identify patterns or trends. Assess level of preparedness for future hazards. | • What major (political, social, disaster, conflict, etc) events have affected the community in the past?  
• Are there any trends or patterns between events (are they becoming more frequent)?  
• Do different types of events occur at similar times?  
• Are different types of events related (local, national, international)?  
• How does the community cope with difficult events?  
• How have these coping strategies changed over time?  
• What events do you expect to happen in the future?  
• How do you plan for these events?  
• What changes have happened to make your life harder?  
• How has your environment changed?  
• What is different today compared to 20 years ago?  
• Is your community more or less peaceful than 5, 10 or 20 years ago? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Objective of tools</th>
<th>Suggested guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing magnitude and impact</td>
<td>Identify shocks or events with biggest impact on the community.</td>
<td>• What shocks or events have had the greatest impact on the community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do certain shocks or events have a greater impact on certain groups within the community (for example, ethnic, religious, tribal, caste or other social groups)? Which groups and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Of those people affected, is it mostly men, women, children, disabled, any other groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood analysis tools</td>
<td>Explore spatial dimensions of people’s realities based on their own perceptions. They help us to understand the social dynamics of the community, and how and which people are able to access resources and are vulnerable to a range of hazards.</td>
<td>• What are the approximate boundaries of the (village, community)? How many households are found in the community and where are they located? Is the number of households growing or shrinking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Where are the main landmarks, important buildings, natural features (churches, mosques, rivers, government buildings, water pumps, etc)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapping tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>• What (religious, ethnic, social) groups are found in the community? Where in the community are the different groups living?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Outside the house, are community members regularly exposed to dust, smoke or other air pollution? Are any specific groups more exposed than others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Is there enough water to drink, wash and grow food? Is the water good to drink, wash and grow food?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Who is responsible for fetching water or food?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td>• What resources are abundant? What resources are scarce? Does everyone have equal access to resources? Do (women, the poor, certain groups, etc) have access? Who makes decisions on resource allocation? Are there cultural factors that might limit one group’s access to resources (for example, girl children get more food than boy children)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Where do people go to access resources (collect water, firewood, graze livestock etc)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What kind of development activities do you carry out as a community? Where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Which areas have been affected by different types of hazards? (natural hazards, conflict, malaria, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Where are NGO project sites, community meeting places, important common spaces? Are these places accessible to all groups? Is there anyone who feels uncomfortable in these places? If so, why? Are there any spots where insecurity is particularly high? Why, and who is affected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Objective of tools</td>
<td>Suggested guiding questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transect walk | To gather information about the geography of the community and complement findings from mapping exercises. | Ask questions about the geographic features, natural resources, infrastructure, livelihood activities, flora and fauna that you observe during the transect walk. For example:  
- Has the number of trees changed in the past 5, 10, 20, 30 years? Are there trees on most hill tops and slopes? Are there trees along most water banks?  
- What is the state of the soil? Is soil consistently kept covered?  
- Has the number of birds and insects changed in the past 5, 10, 15, 20 years?  
- Is there rubbish lying around or in waterways?  
- Are sources for drinking water nearby? Are they safe to reach? Have water sources dried out? |
| Seasonal timeline | To gather information on changes in seasonal activity. This can help identify perceptions of long-term changes to the climate and the degree to which climate data is used in community planning. It can identify regular events associated with conflicts. |  
- What are the most important livelihood strategies employed at different times of the year?  
- What strategies do different groups within the community currently use to deal with difficult times? Are they working?  
- Are there differences in timings of wet or dry seasons now compared to 5, 10, or 20 years ago? Have livelihood coping strategies changed as a result?  
- How are decisions made on timing of livelihood strategies?  
- When are the major festivals and celebrations? Does the community celebrate together, or only certain groups?  
- Are there certain events that cause tension between different groups? Does this ever result in violence? When are these? Who is involved in the violence, and why? How have these tensions been dealt with in the past? |
| Food calendar | To map out the production and availability of foods over a 12-month period. |  
- What food types are available at different times in the year? (including native and wild foods)  
- What do you eat when your gardens are not producing enough food?  
- How have these patterns changed over the years?  
- Are there links between food production, food availability, the price of food and tensions within the community? For example, have there been any riots or unrest during times of food scarcity? Who was involved? What happened? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Objective of tools</th>
<th>Suggested guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identify impacts and vulnerabilities      | Identify the most vulnerable groups within the community, and understand how they might be affected by shocks or events. | • What events or changes over time are the biggest threats to the community? Why? Which group(s) will be most affected, and how?  
• What will be the impact on the community (infrastructure, livelihoods, people, animals, relations between different groups, availability of food, etc)? Are there any practices that make communities more or less vulnerable to the impacts of these hazards? Which group(s) will be most affected, and how?  
• What are the most important livelihood resources, and the greatest hazards the community faces?  
• How prepared is the community if this event were to happen tomorrow?  
• What practices generally make community members more vulnerable to shocks and hazards? What practices make different groups (women, children, elderly, etc) particularly vulnerable?  
• What will the physical, environmental, social, economic impacts of the shocks be on the community? How will different groups experience these impacts?  
• Are there systems or structures that exclude groups of people or make them suffer? Who benefits from these structures? |
| Identify coping mechanisms, capacities and resources | Understand mechanisms and strategies that have been employed in the past to mitigate against the impacts of shocks. | • Who and which groups are most affected by the threat, and how are they affected? Are certain groups more vulnerable to the impacts of the threat, based on location, livelihood, age, etc?  
• How do different groups cope with these threats? How do they change the way they live in order to survive?  
• What could they do differently to ensure that they have a better future?  
• What happened the last time this event happened? How did the community cope?  
• What coping strategies are currently used to deal with hazards? How well do they work?  
• Are there different coping strategies that could be used to adapt to these hazards? What resources would you need to adopt them? What prevents you from adopting them?  
• What resources do the community and different groups have access to to help them to cope with the threat?  
• Who can the community seek help from? (resources can be tangible – something that people can hold – or groups that exist within the community)  
• How did the community resolve conflicts in the past? Are there certain groups, institutions, events that help bring groups in conflict together? Are there individuals or structures that have had a traditional peacemaking role? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Objective of tools</th>
<th>Suggested guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identification of existing resources and socio-economic characteristics | Understand who controls resources and who has access to them. | • What are the main livelihood activities undertaken by the community?  
• What resources (natural, physical, financial, human, social, etc) are used or needed for these livelihoods?  
• What are the most valuable natural resources in the area? Are they movable or fixed? Who controls access to them? Who benefits from exploitation of them?  
• Who owns or controls access to these resources? Are they communal or privately owned? Are certain groups excluded from the benefits of accessing these resources?  
• Have there been instances where people could not access these resources? Why? What happened as a result?  
• Are there non-violent means to challenge control and access over the resources? |
| Actor group and power analysis | To identify the most influential actors and power brokers in the community and how they relate to one another and the community. | • Who are the most influential groups, organisations and institutions within the community? Which ones from outside the community have the greatest influence on the community? Which of these have the closest relationship with the community, and to whom specifically within the community?  
• How do these groups relate to one another? Is there any conflict or alliance between them? If so which ones?  
• Which ones stand to gain from conflict in the community? Which have the most to lose?  
• Are any people excluded from service or engagement with these groups, organisations, institutions? For example, are any open to only men or women?  
• Which groups, organisations, institutions offer support in times of crisis? Do any of these help bring people from groups in conflict together to interact peacefully? (eg, through sports, cultural activities or markets?) How do you access information about these groups?  
• What level of community participation exists in NGO projects in the community? Who in the community supports the projects? Does anyone dislike them? Why?  
• How would you describe NGO staff working with the community (ethnicity, age, gender, etc)? What is their relationship like with the community? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Objective of tools</th>
<th>Suggested guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of underlying drivers</td>
<td>To identify the causes of key threats, and why a threat impacts the community.</td>
<td>• Why does this impact occur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root cause analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Why is an event a threat to the community? Why does (this particular event) affect the community? How are groups affected differently, and why? What role do gender norms and roles play?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Problem tree</td>
<td></td>
<td>• What could the community do to stop it from occurring? What then is the reason the impact occurs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ABC triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Causes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Symptoms of instability analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems mapping</td>
<td>To identify how multiple factors interact with each other to form a system. It is useful for understanding how different factors relate to key vulnerability factors, and for identifying strategic entry points for influence over an entire system.</td>
<td>• What are the main factors that impact on the key vulnerabilities for this community? (To test how important each factor is, you can ask ‘what would be the impact on community vulnerabilities if this factor were to disappear or change radically?’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• World Vision LENS methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td>• How are these factors related to one another? How does a change in one factor impact others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USAID systems mapping in conflict analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there mutually reinforcing feedback loops within this system? (For example ‘an increase in levels of arms in group A will lead to group B feeling less secure. As a result, group B seek more arms, making group A feel more insecure, thereby creating a vicious cycle). How can these cycles be broken and virtuous circles be supported?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there some factors that are more or less influential over the whole system (leverage points)? What are they? How could they be influenced? Which actors have a high degree of influence over them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there certain factors where development agencies can have a high influence? What are they? How will influencing these factors affect the wider system and the key vulnerability factors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Objective of tools</td>
<td>Suggested guiding questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Scenario and Action Planning**    | To explore potential future changes and the associated impacts and develop locally relevant action plans | • What possible future trends or events would have the biggest impact on the vulnerability factors in the communities? How likely are they to happen? 
(After selecting trends or events likely to have a major impact on vulnerability and creating specific scenarios)  
• Which areas and sectors are viewed as most vulnerable? What are the key drivers contributing to that vulnerability?  
• Where in the region are the impacts most likely to be felt? Who are the vulnerable groups?  
• What impact would these scenarios have on the relationships between different groups, on the relative influence of different groups, on access and control of groups over resources, on the underlying causes of conflict and symptoms of instability?  
• What current mitigation or adaptation strategies and actions do the community currently use; on an ongoing basis and at different times of the year?  
• Are these strategies working? Are there any lessons learned that could be incorporated?  
• Are any sectors of the community negatively impacted by the strategies currently in place? |
| Scenario planning                    |                                                                                     |                                                                                   |
| • World Vision scenario planning     |                                                                                     |                                                                                   |
| • Participatory scenario planning    |                                                                                     |                                                                                   |
| • Conflict triggers and scenario analysis |                                                                                   |                                                                                   |
| **Early warning signs**              | To identify early warning signs that a hazard, shock or stress is approaching, and find ways to strengthen community responses to them. | • What signs or indicators do you receive before a threat arrives? What indicators do you use to forecast weather patterns?  
• How much time is there between getting the signal and the threat arriving?  
• What do you do when you see the sign? What do you do in response to the sign? What do you do to protect yourself? Or use the information to benefit your livelihood? How do you share this information with others?  
• What can you do to improve the signals or responses? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Objective of tools</th>
<th>Suggested guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General** | **Key informant interviews and focus group discussions** | Key informant interviews are an opportunity to discuss key issues in depth with individuals with particular knowledge or key perspective on certain issues. Focus group discussions bring a small group of individuals together to discuss particular topics. Conversation should be guided but natural. The facilitator may choose to include specific tools, or simply introduce key questions or topics for discussion. | • Which are the different groups in your community? (gender, ethnic, tribal, caste, religious, lifestyle, political affiliation, class, status, and so on) Are some groups excluded, ignored, hurt or suffering? If so, how, and which are they?  
• Are there tensions between these groups? are tensions visible or invisible? What causes these tensions? Do groups compete over resources/economic benefits/political power, etc? How can tensions and conflicts be resolved?  
• Do tensions result in violence? What kind of violence (physical, psychological, sexual, etc)? Is the violence perpetrated in public or private (such as domestic violence)?  
• What activities/institutions/interests/events bring groups together? What helps some people avoid violence or resolve conflicts without violence?  
• Are there safe places to seek refuge from violence, for example safe houses for survivors of domestic violence?  
• Are there weapons in the community? Who controls them? Where do they come from?  
• Can you tell me about NGOs or CBOs in the community? What do they do? Do you know what their goals are? How do people describe the NGOs/CBOs?  
• Are you familiar with the NGO project? Does this project affect people’s security? Does it make the community safer or less safe? Why? What could the NGO do to make the community more secure?  
• Does the project affect social relations? Does it help promote harmony? Or tension? Why? How could it help promote harmony?  
• Who benefits most from the NGO projects? How are participants selected? Which community members do the staff spend most time with? |
Introduction

This annex acts as a field guide for staff implementing the guidance laid out in the Integrated Conflict Prevention and Resilience Handbook. It summarises key points from the handbook and lays out a series of top tips and guiding questions for project and programme staff working in conflict-affected contexts. It aims to help staff to integrate a conflict-sensitive approach into key stages of programme design and implementation.

Where is this guide applicable?

This guide is intended to be applicable in contexts in which conflicts between groups have resulted in, or have the potential to result in, significant levels of violence or the fear of violence. However, not all such contexts will be appropriate for the application of resilience-strengthening methodologies.

How to use this annex

This annex should be read in conjunction with the complete guidance laid out in the Integrated Conflict Prevention and Resilience Handbook. It summarises key issues and best practices associated with integrating conflict sensitivity into resilience projects. These are elaborated in the full handbook.

A series of guiding questions for staff are also included. These are intended to highlight critical issues and considerations; they should not be read as a checklist, and there is not necessarily a right or a wrong answer. They are intended to act as a tool to help staff interrogate their own actions from a conflict-sensitivity perspective, and consider context-specific responses.

Sections 1, 2 and 3 introduce staff to cross-cutting considerations that are critical for promoting resilience in conflict-affected contexts. Sections 4 to 9 are structured around key steps within a typical project cycle. A series of annexes provide further practical tools and guidance on implementing specific sections of this guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts in which guide is applicable</th>
<th>Contexts in which guide is not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contexts with mid to low levels of persistent insecurity or conflict.</td>
<td>• In the midst of humanitarian emergency response activities, or immediately following a humanitarian emergency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communities in which the fear or threat of violence (including intrapersonal violence) is a significant barrier to people’s well-being.</td>
<td>• In contexts in which access is severely restricted by extreme levels of insecurity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Conflict** occurs when two or more parties find their interests incompatible, express hostile attitudes or take actions that damage the other party’s ability to pursue their interests.

Almost all contexts are affected by conflict in one way or another: Almost any process of social change is likely to be contested by one or more parties. But when conflicts turn violent, or threaten to do so, then the impacts on local people can be devastating.

**Conflict prevention** activities seek to reduce tensions and/or prevent the outbreak or reoccurrence of violence. They seek to contribute to **positive peace** which means the absence of direct physical violence and also of structural and cultural violence that can be the root causes of conflict.

Conflict prevention also requires the strengthening of mechanisms, appropriate for the context, that allow individuals and groups to resolve their conflicts peacefully.

**Resilience** refers to the capacity of a group of people – usually at the community level – to monitor, anticipate, respond to and manage both known risks and future uncertainties. It is the ability of a community or society to absorb shocks, adapt to stresses, and bounce back better from them.

Violent conflict can be a significant shock and stress factor. It undermines a community’s well-being through its impacts on physical and psychological health, basic service provision and livelihood security. It can increase people’s exposure to other hazards, for example by displacement, and undermine their capacity to adapt to change. Conflict is also a symptom of a lack of resilience.

In conflict-affected contexts therefore, it is imperative that conflict prevention forms a core component of resilience-strengthening methodologies. Failure to do so not only misses an important opportunity for interventions to reduce vulnerabilities of communities, but risks exacerbating these vulnerabilities and undermining the very resilience that they seek to build.

**Different types of violence**

- **Direct violence**
  - Physical attack or harm

- **Structural violence**
  - Unjust systems and structures that hurt people through human-made causes, such as lack of access to food or medical care

- **Cultural violence**
  - Unconscious beliefs that cause people to overlook structural violence, such as bias against certain ethnic or social groups
Any intervention in a conflict-affected context has an impact on the social, political, environmental or economic factors that influence the conflict in that context.

These impacts may be positive (reducing tensions or improving relationships between key stakeholders) or negative (worsening tensions or maintaining a negative status quo); direct or indirect; intentional or unintentional. ‘Conflict sensitivity’ is an umbrella term for approaches to managing these impacts.

A conflict-sensitive approach involves gaining a sound understanding of the two-way interaction between activities and the conflict context, and acting to minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts of interventions on conflict.

Adopting a conflict-sensitive approach makes resilience-building programmes more effective and efficient as it contributes to improving conditions that can otherwise undermine resilience-building efforts. It makes programme implementation safer and more secure for staff and beneficiaries.

Conflict-sensitive approaches are guided by principles that are relevant in all stages of project planning, implementation or monitoring, evaluation and learning:

- Responsibility
- Participation
- Inclusiveness
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Accountability
- Respect
- Partnership, coordination and complementarity
- Timeliness.

Resilience strengthening requires an all-of-society engagement and partnership that takes diversity into consideration and seeks to overcome structural inequalities and discrimination. This includes aspects such as gender, age, ethnicity, religion, caste, disability, and level of education or wealth.

Key questions to guide programme design and implementation include:

- Have you conducted a conflict analysis? Does it include an assessment of underlying conflict factors? How has the design of the project been informed by this analysis?
- Does your analysis capture the diversity of local actors and groups? Does it consider how they are affected by, and affect the conflict? What are the implications for your project?
- How can you ensure that your actions do not reinforce inequalities, harmful norms or stereotypes attributed to certain groups?
- How can processes and activities help to reduce inequalities and improve relationships between diverse groups? How can marginalised and vulnerable groups be empowered?
- Are you inclusive in who you engage as beneficiaries, other stakeholders, partners and staff?
- Do you reflect respect for diversity and equality in your attitudes and behaviour?
Resilience-strengthening processes rely on trust, coordination and cooperation between beneficiaries, key stakeholders and staff. This can be challenging in conflict-affected contexts and requires good planning. Some key considerations to keep in mind include:

- Relationship building starts at the very beginning of the project. Even during the initial scoping activities, who you talk to, how you approach them and how you behave towards others can have positive or negative implications for relationships.
- Relationship building should be based on a good analysis of the key actor. It should include a diverse range of stakeholders, including marginalised and vulnerable groups, and groups from both sides of the conflict.
- Lead organisations and partners are equally responsible for establishing and maintaining relationships.
- Be mindful of how relationships with certain stakeholders can be seen by others, especially in conflict-affected contexts, where mistrust is often high.
- Being impartial, and being perceived as impartial, is particularly important. This needs to be reflected in the relationships that are built and maintained.

Bringing conflicting groups together to strengthen resilience

Resilience programmes should not be used to mediate between groups in the midst of active and violent conflict. This requires specific skills, knowledge and expertise, and must be approached with great caution.

However, resilience programmes can help to build bridges between groups where tensions are high, and mistrust rife. This can make an important contribution towards conflict prevention, but requires careful planning.

Here are some key questions to help guide you:

- What grievances exist between conflicting groups? What are their common interests?
- How can you build on any common interests between groups to help build trust and reduce conflict?
- Are groups open to interacting? What are the risks of increasing tensions by bringing them together, and how can they be mitigated?
- Is the location perceived as neutral? Is the timing right?
Building relationships with government and security and justice actors

Relationships with government stakeholders or security and justice actors can be especially challenging, especially if they are seen as being a party to the conflict. Yet they are crucial for effective resilience building and conflict prevention. Key questions to consider include:

- What roles do government stakeholders or security and justice actors play in the conflict context? What are their interests?
- Do they have priorities that are in line with your resilience-building and conflict-prevention goals? What capacities do they have, and what challenges are they facing?
- Are there specific legal or bureaucratic requirements to engage with them?
- If you engage with them, might you be perceived as partial? How can you mitigate that risk?
- Are there potential risks for beneficiaries or staff if you engage with them?

Engaging with informal actors

Informal security actors have a lot of influence in many conflict contexts, but engaging with them can be challenging. This is especially the case when they use or encourage violence.

- Do you understand the role of informal actors in the conflict?
- Can they play a constructive role in resilience building and conflict prevention?
- Do you give them legitimacy, resources or other advantages if you engage with them?
- If you engage with them, might you be perceived as partial? How can you mitigate that risk?
- Are there potential risks for beneficiaries or staff if you engage with them?
Interventions need to be based on a solid understanding of the conflict context at all levels. A macro-level conflict analysis is a tool for identifying conflict drivers, and stakeholders with an influence over them, at the state, national, regional or international levels. It should complement the local-level conflict analysis (see chapter 6) and guide all aspects of the intervention.

Steps to follow, and guiding questions to consider when designing and conducting a macro-level conflict analysis, include:

1) Clearly identify the objective and scope of your analysis
   • Does the analysis cover key conflict issues, stakeholders and opportunities for peace at the sub-national, national and international levels that are relevant to the proposed project?

2) Make preparations to conduct the analysis
   • How will the analysis be conducted? Will desk and field research be used? Can you access a wide range of information from different sources (including from government agencies, NGOs, academia)? Is sufficient information available to understand how factors such as gender, age, ethnicity, etc, relate to the conflict dynamics?
   • Who will lead and be involved in carrying out the assessment? Will partners play a role? Is there sufficient local expertise? How about conflict and gender expertise?
   • Who should you talk to? Can you talk to a wide range of actors to get a nuanced view?
   • What resources are available? What can you realistically do with the time and funding available?

3) Collect data and conduct analysis
   • Are key aspects of the conflict (such as conflict profile, stakeholder analysis, drivers of conflict and conflict dynamics) considered?
   • Are you taking into consideration the diversity of conflict experiences: which specific groups (gender, age, ethnicity, caste, religion, wealth, education, etc) are involved? What roles do they play, and why do they play these specific roles (because of traditions, social norms, political pressure, etc)?

4) Analyse findings
   • Are your findings translated into practical recommendations for programme design and implementation?
   • Is the analysis explicit about how conflict issues may inter-relate with environmental risk factors, as well as other shocks or stresses that may affect communities?
   • Are your recommendations specific enough to address the needs and vulnerabilities specific groups are facing?

Annex 1 of this handbook provides guidance on the key components that should be included in a conflict analysis, as well as guiding questions and tools that can help you gather the data and analyse the findings.
Conflict-sensitivity should be integrated into the planning and preparation for your programme work, including into operational considerations, such as recruitment and partnering strategies. Some key considerations include:

**Linking findings from conflict analysis to the purpose, objectives and activities of the project**

Your planning and preparation should be informed by your conflict analyses, both at the macro and the local levels, as well as by ongoing analysis.

- Do you need to adjust or change key parameters of the project (including its purpose, objectives and activities) based on the conflict analysis findings?

- What are the risks of implementation being affected by conflict or contributing to tensions?

- What opportunities for peace exist, and how can you reinforce them through your intervention (for example, increased dialogue between divided groups, less violence)?

**Selection of location(s)**

- Are there conflict implications associated with where you choose to work? For example, how will your choice of site be seen by people, institutions and other stakeholders living in neighbouring areas? Will it put other communities at a disadvantage?

- Is the area a government priority? Will working there result in tensions with the government or with communities living in other parts of the country?

- By working in this area, do you risk providing opportunities for certain conflict actors? Is there a danger that your intervention provides resources to one or more conflict actors? Can these risks be avoided or mitigated?

**Selection of beneficiaries**

- How does the beneficiary selection relate to existing divisions within the community, and what implications might that have? Where do these groups/organisations/individuals stand in the conflict? Are you working only with one conflict group, or all? What message will that send?

- Staffing, organisational capacities and skills:

- Is your team diverse and balanced (for example in terms of gender, age, language skills, ethnicity, etc)? Are they impartial and seen as being impartial by local people? Do all team members, including senior management, understand conflict-sensitive approaches? If not, can this be managed (eg, through capacity building), or does the team composition need to change?

**Partnerships**

- Are your partner organisations impartial, and perceived as impartial? Do they have a good understanding of the local context? Do they embrace organisational/project-specific values? Are they willing to learn about and apply a conflict-sensitive approach?

- Do Memoranda of Understanding with partners highlight that you expect impartiality and conflict-sensitive practice? Do you have measures in place to ensure that these are put into practice? Do you have internal conflict resolution mechanisms and procedures in place should problems between the lead and partner organisations occur?

**Safety and security**

- Does the security situation allow you, your partners and beneficiaries to effectively engage with the project, without putting anyone at risk? Are you considering vulnerabilities of specific groups, such as sexual and gender-based violence?

- Are there events or periods that might prevent or make it difficult for beneficiaries, or certain groups within communities, to participate in project design activities? Are there certain times in the year when tensions are heightened or conflict more likely?
Strengthening community resilience to hazards requires a good understanding of the specific local context, including local conflict dynamics.

You can gain this understanding through a two-step process:

1) A local-level conflict analysis
2) A local-level Participatory Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (PVCA) that includes questions on conflict and insecurity.

Conducting these two pieces of analysis takes time and effort. However it is advisable not to merge the two, as they are different in both nature and purpose.

Step 1: Conducting a local-level conflict assessment

The local level conflict assessment can follow a similar structure and use similar tools to the macro-level conflict assessment (see chapter 4), adapted to the local context. Annex 1 provides useful guidance on structuring and conducting this analysis.

1) Clearly identify the objective and scope of the analysis: The objective is to identify key conflict issues, stakeholders and opportunities for peace at the level the project is anticipated to be implemented in, for example, in the selected particular village, county or district.

2) Prepare to conduct the analysis:

   • How, where and when will the analysis be conducted? Can a participatory approach be applied? Will complementary desk research be carried out? Have locations been identified? What is a good time for the data collection?

   • Who should lead the analysis, and who should be involved? Are trained staff from the lead or partner organisations available who know how to facilitate participatory discussions and conduct interviews? Is the team diverse, including female and male researchers, and reflecting the composition of society in the research location?

   • Who should you talk to, where and when? Can you talk to a wide range of actors to get a nuanced view? How can you get views of vulnerable or marginalised groups, without putting them at risk? What venues and times are appropriate and safe for respondents? How much time do you need?

   • What resources do you have available? Are costs included in the budget? Do you need funds for partner/staff capacity building?

3) Data collection and analysis:

   • Before you start, make sure you are familiar with the findings of the macro-level context analysis.

   • Have the right tools been prepared to collect the data you require? Are they easy to understand, including for illiterate people or those who are visually impaired? Do you have clear guiding questions for interviews? How can you create an atmosphere of trust in which people will share their views? Have you ensured the respondents’ safety and security?

4) Analysing findings:

   • Are there groups whose views are opposed to each other? Does this suggest a potential for conflict?
Step 2: Conducting a Participatory Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (PVCA)

A PVCA helps communities and implementing organisations to identify and understand existing risks, vulnerabilities and opportunities. It can help to identify existing or potential conflicts that could affect a community’s resilience-building efforts.

- Have questions on conflicts and tensions been integrated into PVCA tools? Have staff been trained on those adjusted tools?
- Are diverse experiences of risks and vulnerabilities taken into consideration?

Annex 2 provides guiding questions that can be integrated into a wide range of tools to help capture key conflict issues, alongside questions related to disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.

Step 3: Analysing findings from both analyses exercises

The two local-level analyses should be analysed separately, and then linked to each other and to the findings of the macro-level conflict assessment.

- Do your findings show how risks and vulnerabilities play out differently for different people/groups?
- How will you translate the findings into practical recommendations for programme design? How can you build on any potential opportunities for peace, and avoid the risk of exacerbating any conflict drivers?

1 Adapted from World Vision (2012), Participatory learning approaches for resilience: Bringing conflict sensitivity, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation together. World Vision UK; London.
If carefully managed, the process of developing your action plan – as well as the resilience activities themselves – can contribute towards conflict prevention. Key considerations include:

**Action planning should be informed by both macro- and local-level conflict analysis:** The conflict analysis should identify groups with the potential to engage in conflict, as well as issues, resources or events that are likely to contribute to tension between groups. These findings should inform who you engage with and how, and what issues to prioritise.

- Is your action planning and implementation informed by both macro- and local-level conflict analysis?

**The process of developing action plans can empower people and build relationships:** Bringing representatives from diverse groups together to discuss key challenges and agree on priorities can be empowering and help to break down barriers between groups.

- Does the action planning and implementation process actively empower marginalised and vulnerable groups? Can these groups take an active role in decision making, alongside with those who are more privileged?
- Does the process provide opportunities to bring conflicting groups together through resilience building? Is trust between the groups high enough to have joint meetings or activities from the start, or should there be separate meetings with each of them first?
- Are there opportunities to involve security and justice providers in resilience-building activities?

**Activities should reduce barriers and inequalities and promote greater community cohesion:**

- Do your activities contribute to conflict prevention? If not, can they be redesigned to include conflict prevention aspects?
- Are you addressing and seeking to overcome inequalities and discrimination through your work processes and activities?

**It's important to help community groups think through how proposed activities could contribute to conflict or tensions:**

- Do staff have the capacity to guide community members through this process?
- Could resilience-building activities reinforce inequalities in the community? Could activities lead to tensions with other communities? How can activities bridge divides between conflicting groups or empower marginalised people?

**The potential of an activity to contribute to reducing or preventing conflict should be a criteria for activity selection:** Consider where and when community meetings will be held. The venue for community meetings should be in a safe and easily reached location. Remember that ‘safe’ and ‘accessible’ might mean different things for different people.

- Is the timing appropriate for different groups in the community? Is it too late for some people (such as women or young people) to be out? Does it interfere with other chores and responsibilities (such as work, household chores, school)?
- Is the venue safe and appropriate for everyone? Will women and vulnerable people feel comfortable? Is it accessible for everyone, including the elderly and people with disabilities?

**Review progress throughout the implementation stage:** It is important that both the conflict context and the impact of the project on this context are continuously monitored, and changes made as necessary (see chapter 8).

- Is there continuous monitoring of the process (ensuring that it is inclusive and conflict sensitive) and progress of the activities (ensuring that they contribute to resilience building and conflict prevention)? Are community members involved in monitoring and reviewing?
- Do plans need to be adjusted because of changes in the conflict, social, environmental etc. context?
Conflict-sensitive monitoring involves three key elements:

- monitoring the conflict context
- monitoring the effects of the conflict context on the resilience intervention
- monitoring the effects of the intervention on the conflict context.

Types of indicators that are frequently used include:

- Intervention indicators, measuring whether the intervention is moving towards achieving its objectives
- Conflict/context indicators, measuring changes in the conflict/context
- Interaction indicators, measuring whether and how the intervention is having an impact on the conflict/context.

Conflict-sensitive evaluation introduces a detailed understanding of actors, profile, causes and dynamics into traditional evaluation activities and processes. Such evaluations are used to understand the overall impact a given intervention has had on its context, and the context on the intervention, and can inform future initiatives.

Key questions to consider when designing and conducting monitoring and evaluation activities include:

- Who is leading the process? How are they perceived by the people being consulted and how could this affect the data? Are responsibilities spread across different members of staff?
- Who is being consulted? How diverse are the groups being consulted (caste or ethnic groups, gender, in positions of power or marginalised)? Are both direct beneficiaries and surrounding communities included?
- When is the monitoring/evaluation being conducted? Does this account for any potentially sensitive times (for example, harvesting season or around elections)?
- Are you capturing unintended impacts?
- Are you measuring change at different levels? And how change differs between diverse groups?
- Are outcomes of the evaluation fed back to the community and all stakeholders, and do they have an opportunity to comment on the findings?
- How will analysis from monitoring and evaluation be used to influence relevant decision-making processes (project design, staff security, planning, etc)?
- How can learning on conflict sensitivity emerging from the evaluation be shared with others (for example by developing a public summary of key lessons learned) and inform future practice?
Conflict-sensitive advocacy is a strategic process of influencing, and seeking to improve, the policies and practices of actor groups, often authorities, in such a way as to minimise negative and maximise positive impacts on peace.

There are many types of advocacy, (for example, go-and-see visits, seminars, street drama, campaigns on the radio, TV, social media). They type that is most appropriate in your context is determined by a range of factors; primarily which approach is likely to have the greatest positive impact, and least likely to put activities, beneficiaries or staff at risk or to create tensions.

Advocacy activities may, for example, focus on:

- bringing communities together to articulate their needs and concerns to decision makers
- using the experience of working on the ground to draw evidence-based arguments about the way national and international actors can best prevent conflict and build resilience for local people
- engaging directly with government officials and international institutions to influence policy.

Successful advocacy is a process rather than an event and should be seen as an integral component of programming. A key to conducting successful advocacy is the development of an advocacy strategy:

**Step 1: Assess the situation**, drawing upon both the macro- and local-level analyses conducted during project design and preparation (chapters 4 and 6).
- Which contextual factors and changes might affect success positively or negatively? Does this require a change of plans?

**Step 2: Establish goals**, drawing from the local-level PVCA (chapter 6) and the macro-level conflict analysis (chapter 4).
- What changes do you want to see? What are your advocacy objectives?
- Have community members been involved in prioritising advocacy goals and objectives?

**Step 3: Develop an influencing strategy**, drawing from the stakeholder and conflict mapping conducted during your local level conflict and PVCA analyses (chapter 6) and macro-level conflict analysis (chapter 4).
- Who can make the changes happen? How can they be influenced to do so?
- Who is best placed to convey advocacy messages? What are the implicit messages that your advocacy activities convey? (For example, what does it say if advocacy is conducted only by staff of one gender, or social or ethnic group?)
- What impacts might advocacy activities have on local people and programme staff? Are there dangers that they may be put at risk by such activities? If so, how can these risks be mitigated?
- How is your organisation and its staff viewed by local people/security providers/authorities? How do you ensure that you are perceived as impartial and legitimate actors in this context? How do you ensure that you are not seen to be aligned to any one group engaged in conflict?

**Step 4: Plan your activities**
- Are there any potentially sensitive events during the advocacy strategy period (such as contested religious holidays, elections or memorials)? What might be the implications for what kind of advocacy takes place, and how it is conducted?

**Step 5: Implement the strategy**

**Step 6: Monitor and evaluate** whether activities are having the intended impacts, as well as continuously monitoring the context to ensure that activities remain relevant and are not exacerbating tensions or putting communities or staff at risk.
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