



Guiding Steps for Peacebuilding Design, Monitoring, and Evaluation

Many of us believe, very deeply, that peacebuilding is critical to reduce violence and build sustainable peace, but we still struggle to show evidence of the impact of our work. This lack of evidence is one of the greatest challenges we face as a field and it accounts, in part, for the limited funding available for peacebuilding projects. If we believe that what we do is important and that our work is effective, then we need to prove it, both to our donors and to the people who participate in our programs.

To respond to this challenge, with funding from the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY), the Alliance for Peacebuilding (AfP) leads the Peacebuilding Evaluation Consortium (PEC) in partnership with CDA Collaborative Learning Projects (CDA), Mercy Corps, and Search for Common Ground (SFCG), – The goal of this consortium is to change the culture of design, monitoring and evaluation by creating better learning for better results in the peacebuilding field as a whole. The initiative has brought together leading scholars, donors, and practitioners to encourage learning and build a stronger body of evidence for peacebuilding. It has also produced an online compendium of resources to help with this effort.

Good evaluation can only happen if we think about learning and evidence at the start of a program. This document, *Guiding Steps for Peacebuilding Design, Monitoring, and Evaluation*, details seven steps, outlined below, that are the minimum set of steps every peacebuilding program must adhere to in order to contribute to robust evidence and learning in the peacebuilding field. In the document that follows, each step is explained and the critical elements and their importance are outlined. We also provide an initial list of key resources for each step. The seven steps are the following:

- | | |
|---|--|
| Conflict
Sensitivity
and Do
No
Harm
Analysis | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Conduct a Conflict Assessment2. Peacebuilding Program Design3. Develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan4. Conduct a Baseline Study5. Monitoring and Adaptive Management6. Conduct an Endline Study and Final Evaluation7. Disseminate and Share Results and Key Learnings |
|---|--|

The seven steps cover ‘what’ you should do. They do not cover ‘how’ you should do it. The resources listed at the end of each step will begin to provide you with information on the ‘how’. We are also developing a webinar for our members that will provide training and additional resources on each step. These steps will help you build a better program. Not every program will succeed, nor should we expect them to. We work on some of the world’s toughest problems. But, succeed or fail, if you follow these steps, you will be contributing vital knowledge to the field as a whole. And that is a very worthwhile goal.



PEACEBUILDING EVALUATION CONSORTIUM

Overarching Step: Conflict Sensitivity and Do No Harm

Conflict Sensitivity or Do No Harm refers to a set of principles for operating in conflict environments. These principles should be applied to each of the 7 Guiding Steps and are not a standalone step. In simplest form, these principles call on organizations to: 1) understand the conflict dynamics in the areas in which they work; 2) understand how their interventions interact with those dynamics; and 3) take steps to ensure that their actions reduce negative outcomes and increase positive outcomes in conflict settings.

A conflict sensitive program is not the same as a peacebuilding program. Peacebuilding programs attempt to directly address the causes of conflict. A conflict sensitive program, on the other hand, attempts to understand the risks inherent in conflict environments and then minimize unintended negative consequences. Conflict sensitivity applies to *all* interventions in high-risk conflict settings, including development and humanitarian initiatives. Applying conflict sensitive principles is good practice, but by itself, conflict sensitivity rarely leads to peacebuilding outcomes.

There are four main elements to a conflict sensitivity analysis: 1) understanding dividers and connectors; 2) conducting an impact analysis to understand how organizational and individual actions and behaviors interact with conflict; 3) analyzing the details of programs, operations, and policies to ensure that they minimize divisions and reinforce connections; and 4) generating options for redesign if needed.

It is important to note that the first step, understanding dividers and connectors, shares many similarities with a good conflict analysis. If your conflict analysis includes a discussion of not only tensions, but also those factors that bring people together, then you will have already covered the first step. However, in order to understand how your program or intervention interacts with the context, you still need to work through the remaining steps on a regular basis, to ensure your program is not having unintended negative consequences.

Resources on Conflict Sensitivity and Do No Harm

Anderson, Mary B. 1999. *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace – Or War*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. 2016. *Do No Harm Workshop Participants Manual*. Cambridge, MA: CDA. <http://cdacollaborative.org/publication/no-harm-workshop-trainers-manual-2016/>

Woodrow, Peter, and Diana Chigas, 2009. "A Distinction with a Difference: Conflict Sensitivity and Peacebuilding." Cambridge, MA: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. <http://cdacollaborative.org/publication/a-distinction-with-a-difference-conflict-sensitivity-and-peacebuilding/>



PEACEBUILDING EVALUATION CONSORTIUM

Step 1: Conduct a Conflict Assessment

The first and most important step in designing a peacebuilding program is to understand the conflict you are trying to address. A conflict assessment can help you do that. A conflict assessment is a systematic examination of the political, economic, social, historical, and cultural factors that shape actual or potential conflict. It includes an analysis of the underlying causes of conflict as well as an assessment of the actors and institutions that either encourage or discourage violence.

Many practitioners, donors, and academics have developed their own conflict assessment frameworks. Each framework uses its own language and offers a slightly different conceptual approach. However, all of them draw on roughly the same body of academic research on conflict. The main difference is the emphasis they place on different causes and this is largely due to institutional priorities. For example, the World Bank stresses economic causes more heavily than DFID, which places more emphasis on causes linked to governance.

In deciding which framework to use, there are two important issues to consider. First, since these documents synthesize academic research, newer frameworks are more likely to capture recent advances than older ones. And in general, frameworks that are clearly grounded in research and evidence tend to be better than those that are not. Second, if you are conducting a conflict assessment because you plan to submit a proposal to a donor, then *use that donor's conflict assessment tool* since it will help you understand their priorities and how they think about conflict.

Conflict Assessment Resources

Many donors and practitioner organizations have developed their own assessment frameworks. All of the frameworks can be found here. For academic guidance on how to conduct conflict assessments, several good overviews include:

Levinger, Matthew. 2013. *Conflict Analysis: Understanding Causes, Unlocking Solutions*. Washington DC. United States Institute of Peace Press.

Ricigliano, Robert. 2012. *Making Peace Last: A Toolbox for Sustainable Peacebuilding*. New York. Routledge.

Schirch, Lisa. 2013. *Conflict Assessment and Peacebuilding Planning: Toward a Participatory Approach to Human Security*. Boulder, CO. Lynne Reiner.



PEACEBUILDING EVALUATION CONSORTIUM

Step 2: Peacebuilding Program Design

Good program design sets the foundation for effective peacebuilding. A well-designed project will identify the changes you hope to achieve and the activities that will get you there. Because conflict environments are complicated and constantly changing, thoughtful, *disciplined* program design will help you sift through the complexity, understand what you can and cannot realistically accomplish, and help you stay focused on your primary objectives.

Perhaps most important, good design will ultimately help you evaluate your program. Without good design, it is almost impossible to see whether your program worked as intended. In the peacebuilding field, evidence of success is scarce. The better our initial design, the more likely we will be able to gather clear evidence of success and learn where we still need to improve.

Good peacebuilding program design is clearly linked to your conflict analysis throughout. It involves four steps: 1) articulate clear goals, objectives, and activities; 2) develop plausible theories of change; 3) identify preliminary indicators, with at least one that is explicitly focused on peace or conflict; and 4) pull all of these pieces together into a logical framework, which serves as the overall blueprint for a peacebuilding project.

Resources on Peacebuilding Program Design

CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. 2012. "Evaluating Relevance in Peacebuilding Programs."

<http://cdacollaborative.org/publication/evaluating-relevance-in-peacebuilding-programs/>

Theories of Change and Indicator Development in Conflict Management and Mitigation

http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnads460.pdf

Ernstorfer, Anita et al. 2016. "Thinking Evaluatively in Peacebuilding Design, Implementation, and Monitoring." <http://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/thinking-evaluatively-in-peacebuilding-design-implementation-and-monitoring/>



PEACEBUILDING EVALUATION CONSORTIUM

Step 3: Develop a Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

One of the first things you need to do before you start implementation is develop a peacebuilding monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan. Think about your M&E plan as a work plan for your monitoring and evaluation activities. It helps you keep track of what to monitor and when, what to evaluate and when, who is responsible, targets, and the tools you will use.

Ultimately, monitoring and evaluation have learning and accountability at their core. Conflict is incredibly complex. As practitioners, we are still learning about how best to help people reduce violence and build sustainable peace. Your monitoring and evaluation plan is a way to pull all of your learning and accountability efforts together into one place, understand how each informs the other, ensure accountability to both donors and program participants, and contribute to a growing body of evidence and learning on what works and what does not in this field.

Most monitoring and evaluation plans include the following elements: 1) a summary of project goals, objectives, and activities; 2) a finalized list of indicators; 3) a preliminary list of data collection tools; 4) a proposed timetable for all M&E activities, including baseline, periodic monitoring, internal reviews, and any planned evaluations; and 5) an M&E matrix that pulls all of these elements together in one place.

Resources on Monitoring and Evaluation Plans

Search for Common Ground. "Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Module." Washington.

<http://dmeforpeace.org/sites/default/files/3.10%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20Plan%20Module.pdf>

Search for Common Ground. "Indicator Module." Washington.

[http://dmeforpeace.org/sites/default/files/3.9 Indicators.pdf](http://dmeforpeace.org/sites/default/files/3.9%20Indicators.pdf)

Mercy Corps. 2015. "Conflict Management Indicator List." TBD.

Catholic Relief Services. 2010. "GAIN Peacebuilding Indicators." Baltimore.

<http://www.crs.org/sites/default/files/tools-research/gain-peacebuilding-indicators.pdf>



Step 4: Conduct a Baseline

A baseline study or survey gathers qualitative and quantitative information before you begin an intervention. Change is then measured against this starting point in order to assess progress. There is an important relationship between a baseline and your conflict analysis. For instance, your analysis might identify local corruption as a cause of conflict. Your baseline would then ask people for their views on corruption, quantify those views, and disaggregate the data along important dimensions, such as age, gender, ethnicity, religion, and location. To continue with the example, your baseline might find that 60% of community members feel local government is very corrupt, with rates among young, Christian women being the highest at 95%.

A baseline study is one of the most important steps you need to take in order to determine whether your program has led to the changes you hope to see. Unless you know your starting point, you will not be able to see how far you have come. For instance, if your project seeks to increase a community's sense of security, then you need to understand how secure they currently feel. Without this information, it will be difficult to see if their sense of security has increased, decreased, or stayed the same after the program.

The baseline should be the first major activity you undertake, or at a minimum it should happen before you undertake any interventions – since it will help you see where you are *before* you try to bring about positive change through your program. There are four major steps to designing and implementing a baseline study or survey: 1) identify the goals of your study; 2) determine who you will interview, including both target and comparison or control groups; 3) draft and test survey questions; and 4) conduct data collection, entry, and analysis.

Resources on Baseline Surveys

Bentu, Sarah. 2014. "Notes from the Field: Conducting a Baseline Survey – Six Tips from Jos-Nigeria." <http://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/notes-from-the-field-conducting-a-baseline-survey-six-tips-from-jos-nigeria/>

Grangaard, Ruben. 2015. "Common Problems in Survey Design and Data Analysis." <http://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/common-problems-in-survey-design-and-data-analysis/>

OECD-DAC. 2010. "Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management." <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf>

Samji, Salimah and Mona Sur. 2012. "Developing a High Quality Baseline" <http://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/developing-a-high-quality-baseline/>

Survey System. n.d. The Steps in Designing a Survey Project. <https://www.surveysystem.com/sdesign.htm>



Step 5: Monitoring and Adaptive Management

Monitoring is the process of regularly collecting data in order to inform decisions about program implementation. A good monitoring system will provide you with the information you need to assess whether the conflict is changing in ways that will require you to adjust your program. It will tell you (and your partners) whether you are implementing the program as planned and are meeting key standards related to quality, timeliness, and budget. Finally, it will tell you whether you are on track to meet your overall objectives.

There are three main types of monitoring you need to include in your plan. The first is **conflict monitoring**, which is essentially a reminder to update your conflict assessment at regular intervals. This type of monitoring data will help you determine whether the context has changed enough that you need to adapt your program to address new risks or take advantage of new opportunities. The second main type of monitoring is **implementation monitoring**, which tracks whether your activities and are happening on time, on budget, in the right sequence, and are of high quality. Finally, you need to include **results monitoring**, which will help you determine whether you are on the right track for meeting your intended outcomes.

Conflict contexts are complex and it is critical to think about the systems in which projects operate. Peacebuilding programs must be highly responsive to this complexity, yet current monitoring and evaluation frameworks are often too rigid and linear to allow for adaptive learning and programming. Adaptive management, which is starting to be used in development, may be a good strategy for the peacebuilding field. Adaptive management can provide a flow of information about the context through conflict monitoring and other data. It also provides the space to problem solve, reflect, and respond to this learning, in order to continuously improve the relevance and impact of one's work.

Resources on Monitoring and Adaptive Management

Church, Cheyanne and Mark Rogers. 2006. "Chapter 6: Monitoring," *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Activities*. Search for Common Ground. <http://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/designing-for-results-integrating-monitoring-and-evaluation-in-conflict-transformation-activities/>

Church, Cheyanne and Mark Rogers. 2006. "Chapter 12: Methods," *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Activities*. Search for Common Ground. <http://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/designing-for-results-integrating-monitoring-and-evaluation-in-conflict-transformation-activities/>

Alliance for Peacebuilding. 2017. "Snapshot of Adaptive Management in Peacebuilding Programs." TBD.



PEACEBUILDING EVALUATION CONSORTIUM

Step 6: Endline Study and Final Evaluation

As you near the end of your program, there are two final, critical steps you need to take. First, you need to rerun your baseline study in order to compare your starting point with your end point. For your results to be valid, you need to use the same data collection tool and methods that you used for your baseline study. Ideally, you should use the same data collection and analysis team as well. This will give you robust data that you can then incorporate into your final evaluation.

Second, you should consider if you should conduct a final evaluation. Final evaluations generally focus on big picture questions about the overall value or success of a program. They look at the program as a whole and ask whether it met its intended outcomes and if not, why not. Final evaluations examine other important aspects of a program that affect outcomes, such as management issues or changes in the conflict context. Finally, a good evaluation will look at both intended outcomes and unintended outcomes – good and bad – that resulted from the program.

There are many different types of evaluations. You can hire an external evaluator or conduct an evaluation using internal staff. You can undertake a large, complex evaluation that looks at all the issues raised above or you can undertake a 'lighter' evaluation that convenes important project stakeholders for a process of reflection on what worked and what did not. Whatever type of evaluation you conduct, it is vital that you take the time to step back, reflect, and learn from what you have done, so that you can share these lessons with the field.

Conducting a final evaluation generally involves six main steps: 1) clarify what you most hope to learn through an evaluation; 2) decide on the type of evaluation you wish to conduct; 3) identify your key lines of inquiry; 4) determine your data collection methods and data source; 5) collect data and conduct analysis; and 6) **SHARE** the lessons you learn, both successes and failures, with the broader field.

Endline and Evaluation Resources

Peacebuilding Evaluation Consortium. 2016. "Thinking Evaluatively in Peacebuilding Design, Implementation, and Monitoring." <http://cdacollaborative.org/publication/thinking-evaluatively-peacebuilding-design-implementation-monitoring/>



Step 7: Dissemination and Sharing of Results and Key Learnings

A major responsibility of collecting data is disseminating and sharing results and key learnings. Responsible data collection and data sharing should be sensitive to the needs of the beneficiaries and practice good data protections. This responsibility includes removing personally identifying information, verifying the data you are sharing is generalizable enough that no single person or village is identifiable, and that you have the required permissions from all stakeholders prior to sharing data (this includes beneficiaries and donors).

Once you have analyzed, synthesized, and interpreted your findings you need to decide how you will communicate your results with your stakeholders – beneficiaries, organizations, donors, and the field. This may require different reporting processes for each potential stakeholder based upon their interests, capabilities, and requirements. You should coordinate with your various stakeholders to determine the easiest ways to share and represent your data beforehand, including discussing what they want to see and how they best wish to see it represented.

Most importantly, try and think creatively and move beyond heavy, and unwieldy reports as the only way to share findings. Translating knowledge is no simple task, however simplicity is key and data visualizations are easier to interpret and understand than text-based sharing. It is also important to make sure your data tells a story that is easily understood by a variety of individuals, not just those within the M&E space and addresses outcomes not simply outputs.

When you are ready to share your findings, creating a dissemination plan can facilitate this process. It should address the specific dissemination objectives (why are you sharing this research), the content (what are you sharing for each audience), the channels (how will you share), and the audience (with whom will you share this information). This will most likely require different dissemination plans for different audiences to target effectively.

Disseminating and sharing results is critical to facilitate whole-of-field learning. This includes **more than** final evaluation results only and should encompass successes and failures across the breadth of programming. Greater transparency engenders shared learning and improves the culture of evaluation in the peacebuilding field.



Additional Resources and Peacebuilding Indicators

General Resources

There are a number of excellent manuals and guides that include rich information on all of the steps described above. These documents should be an essential part of any peacebuilders library. They include:

Church, C. & M. Rogers. 2006. "Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs." <http://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/designing-for-results-integrating-monitoring-and-evaluation-in-conflict-transformation-activities/>

Corlazzoli, V. & J. White. 2013. "Back to Basics: A Compilation of Best Practices in Design, Monitoring & Evaluation in Fragile and Conflict-affected Environments." <http://www.dmeforpeace.org/resource/back-to-basics-a-compilation-of-best-practices-in-design-monitoring-evaluation-in-fragile-and-conflict-affected-environments/>

Mercy Corps. 2012. "Program Management Manual." <https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/programmanagementmanualpmm.pdf>

Peacebuilding Evaluation Consortium. 2016. Online Field Guide to Peacebuilding Evaluation. <http://www.dmeforpeace.org/learn/online-field-guide/>

Donor and Practitioner Conflict Assessment Frameworks

Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict & CDA Collaborative Learning. 2015. "Conflict Analysis Framework: Field Guidelines and Procedures." (76 pages) <http://cdacollaborative.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Conflict-Analysis-Framework-Field-Guidelines-and-Procedures-2016.pdf>

European Commission. "Conflict Analysis Framework." (11 pages) https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/guidance-note-on-conflict-analysis_en.pdf

German Development Agency. 2014. "Peace and Conflict Assessment Fact Sheet." (4 pages) https://www.bmz.de/en/zentrales_downloadarchiv/themen_und_schwerpunkte/frieden/Peace_and_Conflict_Assessment_Factsheet.pdf

Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2005. "Stability Assessment Framework." (80 pages) https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/20050200_cru_paper_stability.pdf

Swedish International Development Agency. 2006. "Manual for Conflict Analysis." (38 pages) http://www.dmeforpeace.org/peaceexchange/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/manual-for-conflict-analysis_1695.pdf



PEACEBUILDING EVALUATION CONSORTIUM

United Kingdom Department for International Development. 2002. "Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes." (52 pages) <http://www.conflictrecovery.org/bin/dfid-conflictassessmentguidance.pdf>

United Nations Development Program. 2016. "Conducting a Conflict and Development Analysis." (203 pages) https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/UNDP_CDA-Report_v1.3-final-opt-low.pdf

United States Agency for International Development. 2012. "Conflict Assessment Framework." (66 pages) <https://www.usaid.gov/what-we-do/working-crises-and-conflict/technical-publications>

United States Department of State. 2008. "Interagency Conflict Assessment Framework." (24 pages) <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/187786.pdf>

World Bank. 2005. "Conflict Analysis Framework." (33 pages) <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCPR/214574-1112883508044/20657757/CAFApril2005.pdf>



PEACEBUILDING EVALUATION CONSORTIUM

Peacebuilding Indicator Sheets

The Peacebuilding Evaluation Consortium is proposing a set of core peacebuilding outcome indicators. These peacebuilding outcome indicators focus on measuring **dispute resolution, good governance, perceptions of safety and security, resilience, social cohesion, trust, and violence reduction**. They are concerned with measuring those factors that make a peacebuilding program distinct from any other type of intervention in a violent environment. The indicators provided below are a snapshot of the work being completed to create an indicator database of core peacebuilding outcome indicators.

Suggested indicators include change in number of disputes resolved, percent of disputes resolved in a satisfactory manner, level of satisfaction with government's ability to provide security, level of corruption among government service officials, percent change in freedom of movement, percent of community avoiding dangerous areas at night, perceptions of community's ability to prevent violence, change in willingness to interact with members of other ethnic communities, strength in social ties, percent change in people reporting trust in members of other ethnic groups, percent change in levels of comfort going into business with a member of the conflicting community, change in number of violent incidents related to different types of disputes, change in community perceptions of levels of violence, respectively.

These generic indicators must be tailored to the local context. But they can offer a useful starting point for thinking through how you will measure the contribution your program makes to peace and conflict.



PEACEBUILDING EVALUATION CONSORTIUM

Dispute Resolution Indicator Description	
Indicator:	Change in # of disputes resolved
Definition:	Count of disputes resolved by program participants
Unit of Measure:	Individual dispute. Include each individual dispute that program participants resolve, including those nested within a larger dispute. For example, two communities may have a running dispute over land that has lasted two years and that involves: 1) two separate disputes over distinct boundaries; 2) the encroachment of one farmer on another farmer's land; and 3) a disagreement over who owns an access road. This means there were four disputes nested within one larger dispute.
Disaggregates:	Dispute location, start and end date (duration), type of dispute, and parties involved
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Program participant survey and dispute database
Data Source	Training recipients are given a pre-training survey asking them to identify: 1) how many disputes they attempted to address; 2) how many they successfully resolved; and 3) what types of disputes over the previous month. They are given the same survey six months after training until program end. Additionally, program staff should keep a database of all disputes program participants identify and attempt to address in their program area.
Frequency of Data Collection	Pre-training and at six-month intervals until program end
Person Responsible:	Dispute resolution trainer and mentors

Dispute Resolution Indicator Description	
Indicator:	% of disputes resolved in a satisfactory manner
Definition:	This indicator measures community members' satisfaction with dispute resolution.
Unit of Measure:	Reported frequency of disputes that were resolved to the effect that all sides were satisfied and did not voice complaints. Frequency choices included: never, rarely, sometimes, most of the time, always.
Disaggregates:	Age, Ethnicity, Location, Occupation, Religion, Sex
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Community or household survey
Data Source	Community members
Frequency of Data Collection	Baseline and endline
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator



Good Governance Indicator Description	
Indicator:	Level of satisfaction with government's ability to provide security
Definition:	This indicator measures community members' perceptions of whether the government improves citizen safety
Unit of Measure:	Difference between the estimated counterfactual case and the treatment group as determined by a Difference in Difference (DiD) estimator
Disaggregates:	Age, Education, Household wealth, Presence of youth in the household, Sex, Years of residence
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Community and household surveys
Data Source	Community members
Frequency of Data Collection	Baseline, midterm, and endline
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator

Good Governance Indicator Description	
Indicator:	Level of corruption among government service officials
Definition:	This indicator captures perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain
Unit of Measure:	% of respondents who indicated they had paid a bribe when they came into contact with a service official in the last twelve months
Disaggregates:	Country, Region
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Telephone and in-person household surveys
Data Source	Survey participants
Frequency of Data Collection	Annual
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator

Perceptions of Safety & Security Description	
Indicator:	% change in freedom of movement
Definition:	This indicator measures people's behavior related to travelling for daily activity such as going to work, school, the market, or accessing health services due to concerns about insecurity linked to violence.
Unit of Measure:	# of days an area is avoided due to insecurity over the past month
Disaggregates:	Age, Ethnicity, Location, Religion, Sex
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Community or household survey
Data Source	Community members
Frequency of Data Collection	Baseline and endline
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator

Perceptions of Safety & Security Description	
Indicator:	% of community avoiding dangerous areas at night
Definition:	This indicator measures peoples' perceptions of their ability to travel freely at night
Unit of Measure:	% of community members who avoided going to certain areas at night because of insecurity
Disaggregates:	Age, Ethnicity, Location, Religion, Sex
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Community or household survey
Data Source	Community members
Frequency of Data Collection	Baseline and endline
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator



Resilience Indicator Description	
Indicator:	Perceptions of community’s ability to prevent violence
Definition:	This indicator measures community members’ perceptions of how well the community is organized to prevent violence
Unit of Measure:	Difference between the estimated counterfactual case and the treatment group as determined by a Difference in Difference (DiD) estimator
Disaggregates:	Age, Education, Household wealth, Presence of youth in the household, Sex, Years of residence
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Community and household surveys
Data Source	Community members
Frequency of Data Collection	Baseline, midterm, and endline
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator

Social Cohesion Indicator Description	
Indicator:	Change in willingness to interact with members of other ethnic communities
Definition:	This indicator measures social cohesion through the change in the proclivity of ethnic groups to interact with one another
Unit of Measure:	% of survey participants indicating “yes” to the question: “Are you more willing to interact with members of other ethnic communities than you were two years ago?”
Disaggregates:	Age, Education, Ethnicity, Location, Program Participant/Non Program-Participant
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Household surveys
Data Source	Community members
Frequency of Data Collection	Baseline and endline
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator



Social Cohesion Indicator Description	
Indicator:	Strength of social ties
Definition:	This indicator measures the extent to which individuals feel their community is bonded and integrated
Unit of Measure:	% of respondents selecting 4 or 5 in response to the question “How strong or weak are feelings of togetherness in your community?” where 1= very weak/distant, 2=weak/distant, 3=neither strong or weak/distant nor close, 4=strong/close, 5=very strong/close
Disaggregates:	Age, Education, Ethnicity, Gender, Religion
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Household surveys
Data Source	Community members
Frequency of Data Collection	Baseline and endline
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator

Trust Indicator Description	
Indicator:	% of people reporting trust in people from (site specific: insert name of conflicting community)
Definition:	This indicator measures the inclination of community members to trust individuals from conflicting communities.
Unit of Measure:	Percentage of respondents reporting they trust members of the conflicting community mostly or always. Other options included sometimes, rarely, or never.
Disaggregates:	Age, Ethnicity, Location, Occupation, Religion, Sex
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Community or household survey
Data Source	Community members
Frequency of Data Collection	Baseline and endline
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator



Trust Indicator Description	
Indicator:	% change in levels of comfort going into business with a member of the conflicting community.
Definition:	This indicator measures community members' reported level of comfort going into business with a member of the conflicting community.
Unit of Measure:	Level of comfort on a scale of 1-5. 1 being very comfortable, 2 being a little comfortable, 3 being neither comfortable nor uncomfortable, 4 being a little uncomfortable, and 5 being very uncomfortable.
Disaggregates:	Age, Ethnicity, Location, Occupation, Religion, Sex
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Community or household survey
Data Source	Community members
Frequency of Data Collection	Baseline and endline
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator

Violence Reduction Indicator Description	
Indicator:	Change in # of violent incidents related to (fill in conflict topic) disputes
Definition:	Count of violent incidents in a specific program area, related to the topic being addressed by the peacebuilding program
Unit of Measure:	Individual instance of violence. Include violent incidents nested within larger disputes. For example, if a land dispute between two groups has lasted for 2 years and has led to five clashes a year, then this equals 10 violent incidents over a two-year period.
Disaggregates:	Incident location, start and end date (duration), type of violence, level of violence, and parties involved
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Varies depending on data source
Data Source	The data source will depend on how developed, professional and unbiased local security and media institutions are in the program area. Data sources can include: 1) police records; 2) media reports; and 3) direct data collection by trained community members, project staff, or partner organizations.
Frequency of Data Collection	Quarterly
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator



Violence Reduction Indicator Description	
Indicator:	Change in levels of violence in a community
Definition:	This indicator measures community members’ perceptions of how violent their community is relative to other communities
Unit of Measure:	Difference in percentage of respondents who responded, “very peaceful” or “somewhat peaceful” to the question, “In relation to levels of violence, where does your community belong?” at baseline and endline. Other response options include, “neither peaceful nor violent”, “somewhat violent”, and “very violent”.
Disaggregates:	Age, Ethnicity, Location, Occupation, Religion, Sex
Data Collection	
Data Collection Method	Community or household survey
Data Source	Community members
Frequency of Data Collection	Baseline and endline
Person Responsible:	M&E Officer, Program Officer, Enumerator