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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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| LGA | Local Government Areas |
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| MERSOC | Mobile Emergency Response Support Operations Centre |
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| NAP | National Action Plan |
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| SMS | Short Message Service |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |
| UNHCR | United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| WANEP | West Africa network of Peacebuilding |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The “Early Warning/Early Response Mechanisms in Northern Nigeria” – Phase III, is a 24-month second cost amendment project, with overall aim to expand and strengthen early warning and early response processes to enhance community and state actors’ ability to protect citizens. The United States Department of State – Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) funds the project implementation in Adamawa and Borno States. The targeted beneficiaries and primary stakeholders have affected communities, security actors, CSOs, and government agencies at State and LGA levels. The project is intended to expand on the technology utilized during the initial phase of the project using a combination of an SMS platform, live reports, and a centralized “EW/ER Hub,” to create an integrated EW/ER system to ensure fast reception and processing of reports even if there is technology failure or network problems. The expected impact of the project is to enhance collaboration between key actors to identify and effectively respond to threats of violence, improve community security against Boko Haram threats and other sources of community insecurity, and build resilient communities and reduce the underlying factors driving violent extremism in North-East Nigeria. The specific objectives are to (1) reinforce and expand a community-based EW/ER system, (2) strengthen engagement between state and local actors to secure communities, and (3) strengthen partners’ capacity to support and monitor EW systems.

The purpose of the evaluation was to collect, analyze, and present the baseline information related to EW/ER systems that are not known, or only partly known to SFCG in Adamawa and Borno States. Additionally, as the project implementation has started, the evaluation also was to provide information to assess the progress made so far in the implementation of the project activities. The primary audience and users of the evaluation findings are: SFCG, United States Department of State – Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL); Civil Society Organizations (CSOs); security actors; participating Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDA) of government, at local, state and federal levels; the media; and communities.

Combinations of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, including desk review, surveys, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and in-depth interviews were employed for the evaluation. The data was gathered from 10 communities, in five Local Government Areas (LGA), across Adamawa and Borno States. The data collection covered all the communities that were participating in the project implementation in Adamawa and Borno States. Data collection was carried out between 19th April and 4th May 2017. Findings and conclusions of the evaluation are discussed in line with the baseline objective questions as follows.

***Early warning and early response systems***

The evaluation found that although ongoing efforts are yielding results for early warning and early response to conflicts, they nonetheless remain fragmented across multiple partners, who are operating in isolation with varying scopes and coverage, and under limited collaboration or coordination. The integration and coordination amongst multiple actors in the early warning and early response are still weak. Existing programs of community EW/ER systems found during the evaluation were not aware of each other’s interventions, and sometimes in the same community. The systems do not know that they often deal with common community monitors and stakeholders. Information sharing and networking in the EW/ER program area is inadequate. This is due to insufficient coordination among the critical actors. This has contributed unnecessary duplication of efforts, which has implications for the scope, coverage, and effectiveness of the EW/ER system in the targeted states and indeed the entire North-East Nigeria.

The situation of the EW/ER system suggests multiple areas of engagement for SFCG in its quest for building a strong and effective early warning system, which demonstrates its value in conflict prevention and peacebuilding in Nigeria. The diversity and multiplicity of current and potential actors indicate that the team needs to focus and invest in understanding the landscape of actors, their different capacities, and the mechanisms for building cohesion and cooperation amongst them, to be able to sustain the enthusiasm for EW/ER system.

***Traditional systems of dealing with early warning and early response***

The evaluation found that traditional ways of dealing with EW/ER are deeply rooted in the traditional and religious leadership systems of the communities. This system revolves around community leaders, ward heads, district heads, religious leaders, elders, and youth leaders, who often receive reports about conflicts and initiate actions on them. Issues are collectively addressed, sometimes in a meeting of community members. Aside community and religious leaders, men and youths are mostly involved with the system of dealing with conflicts in the community. Community EW/ER systems have somewhat integration of traditional mechanisms, but many communities still grappling with understanding the mechanisms of EW/ER and are not positioning for ownership and sustainability as much as expected.

***Involvement of communities in early warning and response systems***

The evaluation found that traditional leaders and selected community volunteers are included in the existing EW/ER systems, at community and LGA levels. The community respondents were not conversant with the exact mechanisms of the EW/ER system. This suggests a weak engagement with the general community by EW/ER system at the community level, and a gap in the mechanism of selection, deployment and coordinating the roles and functions of the EW/ER system. The EW/ER systems have not been fully integrated into community systems, and many traditional systems are not sufficiently informed of the EW/ER mechanism. Although the enthusiasm for the EW/ER mechanisms at LGA and State levels, they require further support in capacity building, operational efficiency, and effectiveness as well as sustainability.

***The Partners***

The evaluation found out that considerable progress has been made in the establishment of multilevel collaborative platforms for grooming a community-driven EW/ER system in Adamawa and Borno, but there is apparently limited private sector participation. The private sector is either not engaged in the existing EW/ER mechanism or insufficiently so. The situation is not different for private media (particularly social media), which despite several capacity building initiatives by SFCG, remains at the fringes of their full scope of the function in the EW/ER system. On the other hand, the education sector actors have also been seemingly left out of the system. Without a strategy for periodically landscaping critical actors and integrating emerging stakeholders through strategic partnership building into the existing EW/ER system, opportunities will be missed to ground a comprehensive, effective, multi-functional and sustainable EW/ER system in the region. Amongst the collaborators in the existing systems, there is also limited cohesion of mandates or strategy, affecting the effectiveness of the systems.

***The progress of implementation.***

The evaluation found that not much has been done in the project implementation, which has experienced delays in implementing the activities. The actors in the EW system did not demonstrate adequate skills for analyzing early warning information and to explore the trends in the EW system. Such critical analysis could help the actors to understand the dimensions of the risks faced by communities. The skills and experiences in the use of participatory techniques and tools, to unpack issues and develop concrete response plans that are actionable, are desirable. The feedback loop in the EW/ER systems weak and has created a gap between the levels of the EW system. Issues discussed on one end are not cascaded and fed into discussions going on at another level. Where it is done, feedback is seldom provided, down the levels. There is limited collaboration, joint analysis, and synthesis of trends in conflict, which require collaborative responses on multiple levels. The EW/ER officer in SFCG seems may be overburdened with the feedback-looping responsibility. Considering the workload of managing EW/ER activities, it could be difficult for one EW/ER officer to coordinate the feedback mechanism.

***Performance indicators***

The current percent of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information indicates less number of stakeholders interviewed are currently responding to conflicts based on early warning information. There is a large percent of stakeholders reporting coordination between communities, local government officials and security actors to analyze and respond to early warning information. Nearly all the respondents reported this both at baseline and currently in the project. The evaluation also found that all participating staff of government agencies with a peacebuilding mandate, who were interviewed, can respond to conflict, and except in Borno, all the respondents can analyze conflict. This finding in Borno may not be unconnected to the lack of analytical skills, which was also found by this evaluation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1:** **Project performance indicators at baseline and status** | | |
| **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Current** |
| Current percent of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information. | 87.5% | 79.2% |
| Current percent of stakeholders reporting coordination between communities, local government officials and security actors to analyze and respond to early warning information. | 91% | 91% |
| Current percent of participating staff of government agencies with a peace building mandate who are able to analyze and respond to conflict. |  |  |
| *Analyze* | 58.8% | 57.1% |
| *Respond* | 100% | 100% |

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

The evaluation suggests ways the project might benefit and SFCG use the learning from this baseline evaluation as follows:

* ***Strengthen integration and coordination of actors in the EW/ER systems.*** SFCG could undertake a mapping of existing EW/ER practices and mechanisms in Nigeria, with particular emphasis on the North-East, to build synergies of existing practices and avoid duplication of efforts and to ensure effective application of resources. There is no strategic advantage in building new EW/ER systems where they already exist, rather by applying its resources to strengthening and building upon existing models. It could contribute to grounding EW/ER in the programming landscape of the humanitarian community. It is obvious that there are multiple practices on-ground, albeit to varying scopes and needs. The most practical need as it seems is to support greater integration, better coordination, and learning between systems beyond the individual actors themselves. For example, the fact an army General or Commanding Officer participates in the PAD/CSAD or CRN forums does not necessarily translate to increased access to warning communications and threat analysis from the security agencies. A whole system integration approach could ensure that mechanisms are sharing and learning about risks and threats together and making a collaborative response decision.
* Improve on engagement with communities to deepen their understanding and integration of the mechanisms of the community EW/ER systems, ownership and sustainability as much as expected for the community ER/ER system.
* ***Strengthen analytical capacity and evidence-informed programming in the EW/ER system.*** As was said, the EW/ER system, particularly at the community level, is not engaging sufficiently in risk and trends analysis, as well as the analysis of drivers and determinants of conflicts. There is a gap in the skills, tools, and techniques for participatory analysis needed to support community-level analysis to build stronger community-level engagement, learning and practice through participatory approaches. EW/ER officers also need to be trained in participatory techniques for facilitating community risk, threat analysis, and action planning. Additionally, the capacity of EW/ER actors needs to be built in generating evidence, response data, and analysis for dissemination and policy influencing. This could improve the EW/ER practice, as the actors could see the link between their activities and the broad strategy and policy changes occurring through the phases of the conflict and beyond.
* ***Enhance feedback loops between levels of EW/ER systems.*** There is frustration at the community level about the weakness of the feedback loop in the EWER system. This frustration could lead to process fatigue because the communities increasingly feel isolated from the system. Issues emerging from the communities which require a broader response beyond the community capacity to resolve in collaboration with other collaborators at that level, need to be facilitated to escalate them upwards to the LGA and State levels. Equally is the importance of back-response and communication to the community level. Expectations can be very high for important concerns and SFCG needs to strengthen the feedback loop and follow through processes.
* ***Integrate all critical institutions and sectors in the EW/ER systems.*** Critical stakeholders in the education sector need to be better integrated into the EW/ER system as functional partners, because of their centrality to the issues of conflict in the first place. The same applies to the media, which seems more positioned to receiving than contributing to the EW/ER mechanism.
* ***Promote private sector participation.*** Related to strengthening coordination and integration is the need to expand participation in the EW/ER system to include emerging actors such as the private sector. The role of the private sector in the humanitarian response is increasingly visible as the conflict situation evolves through resettlement and disaster risk reduction phases. As mentioned earlier in the report, the private sector can provide the resources for sustaining and expanding the reach and scope of the EW/ER mechanism if strategically engaged. A private sector engagement strategy and constituency building framework may need to be integrated into the SFCG’s current coalition-building strategy.
* Include a follow-up qualitative research in subsequent evaluation design to understand the reasons for changes that may occur in the percent of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information.
* Giving that exploring conflict threats and trends enables actors to understand the dimensions of the risks faced by communities, it is important that actors gain skills and experiences in the use of participatory techniques including risk mapping, risk ranking, gender mapping, transect walks, seasonal calendars and power walk, to unpack issues and develop concrete response plans that are actionable. Participatory analysis process builds ownership of the response because communities learn by doing and adopt new learning into existing traditional mechanisms as the process evolves. Participatory techniques are also critical for ensuring that the voices and opinions of vulnerable groups contribute meaningfully to security and peacebuilding dialogues at the community level.
* Develop comprehensive and integrated monitoring framework for the EW/ER initiative, with multisectoral partners.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## **1.1 Background**

SFCG secured the “Early Warning/Early Response Mechanisms in Northern Nigeria – Phase III” to continue implementing an initial 12-month cost amendment for another 24 months in Adamawa and Borno States. The United States Department of State – Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) funds the project. The goal and objectives of the project remain the same as the initial phase (see section 2, project overview). Adamawa and Borno States have come under heavy Boko Haram terrorist attacks in the past years. The violence displaced tens of thousands of the communities, and Adamawa State was flooded with thousands of displaced persons fleeing the violence in Borno and from hot spots within Adamawa State. Most recently, the Nigeria military continued to record success in the fight against Boko Haram, liberating territories hitherto controlled and returning the communities that were sacked. Many Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) have been relocated to their communities, while more are still left in camps and host communities. Heavy military presence on the roads has made the territories to become safe than it used to be under heavy Boko Harm attacks.

As expected, the insurgency continued to launch suicide bomb attacks as well as raids on communities across Adamawa and Borno States. There are linkages between broader community security issues and vulnerability of communities to the insurgency, both as sites for attacks and grounds for recruitment and radicalization. These need to be addressed, giving the communities the ability to identify and develop concrete immediate and long-term responses to prevent Boko Haram attacks. To support this SFCG secured additional funding to continue and expand its EW/ER work in Adamawa and Borno States. The EW/ER system is to continue to report security and social threats to communities. It will continue to give key community actors the tools and information necessary to develop community-based responses to address the critical drivers and results of the insurgency, as well as general security risks in the region. The project is expected to help build mutual trust and a clearer understanding of the linkages between the systematic security risks and the insurgency, identify information that directly prevents attacks and builds resilient communities.

The purpose of this evaluation was to collect, analyze, and present the baseline information related to EW/ER systems that were not known, or only partly known to SFCG in Adamawa and Borno States. In addition, as the project implementation has started, the evaluation also was to provide information to assess the progress made so far in the implementation of the project activities. The specific questions that guide the evaluation are presented in the section on the evaluation methodology.

SFCG will use the evaluation findings primarily to establish the baselines and know the progress made so far in the implementation of the project activities in Adamawa and Borno States. The evaluation will help SFCG to set the target for the project performance indicators, to further inform the project strategy and approach to the project implementation. Other primary audiences and users of the evaluation findings are United States Department of State – Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL); Civil Society Organizations (CSOs); security actors; participating Local, State and Federal Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDA); the media; and communities.

In addition to this introduction, this evaluation report presents the overview of the project – including the design, objectives, proposed results, and activities, the theory of change, implementation and performance indicators. The evaluation methodology, key findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation are also presented in the report.

## **1.2 Overview of the Project**

### **1.2.1 Scope of the Project**

The “Early Warning/Early Response Mechanisms in Northern Nigeria – Phase III” is a 24-month cost amendment of an initial 12-month cost amendment, following the end of the pilot phase project, namely, “Gender-based violence emergency response and projection initiative: technical assistance project – Nigeria early warning system”. The U.S. Department of State – Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) funds the project. The targeted beneficiaries and primary stakeholders have affected communities, security actors, CSOs, and government agencies at State and LGA levels, in Adamawa and Borno States. Table 2 presents the population of the selected communities, LGAs across Adamawa and Borno states, where the project is now being implemented.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: State, LGAs, communities and population** | | | | | |
| **State** | **Population** | **LGA** | **Population** | **Community** | **Population** |
| Adamawa | 3,675,000 | Yola North | 230,830 | Jambutu | 21,000 |
| Damilu | 11,000 |
| Girei | 150,120 | BBC | 8,500 |
| Angwan | 9,000 |
| Borno | 4,994,000 | Maiduguri Municipal Council | 640,080 | Maisandari | 90,000 |
| Shehuri North | 13,000 |
| Gwange III | 9,000 |
| Jere | 247,860 | Mairi | 11,000 |
| Old Maiduguri | 12,000 |
| Mafa | 122,800 | Zannari | 10,000 |
| Total | 8,669,000 | Total | 1,391,690 | Total | 194,500 |
| *Source: Table created from SFCG project documentation, April 2017* | | | | | |

The project is intended to expand on the technology utilized during the initial phase of the project using a combination of an SMS platform, live reports, and a centralized “EW/ER Hub,” to create an integrated EW/ER system to ensure fast reception and processing of reports even if there is technology failure or network problems. This is to ensure that information reaches target individuals in “real time” and establishes plans for immediate response to urgent threats. The plan is to take a complete approach to proactively address both the direct threats and the critical drivers that fuel the Boko Haram insurgency.

The expected impact of the project is to enhance collaboration between key actors to identify and effectively respond to threats of violence; improve community security against Boko Haram threats and other sources of community insecurity, and build resilient communities and reduce the underlying factors driving violent extremism in North-East Nigeria. The long-term plan for the EW/ER system is to build sustainability through effective local ownership and implementation of the expanded system, alignment with existing initiatives, and the development of contingency plans to continue work despite increased security threats. The approach is to build a mechanism that is adaptive to changing conflict contexts and can continue after the end of the project activities. The target of the project is to institutionalize the EW/ER system, strengthening relationships with key state actors.

### **1.2.2 Objectives of the Project**

The phase III cost amendment continue the goal and objectives of the previous phase of the project. The overall objective is to expand and strengthen early warning and early response processes to enhance community and state actors’ ability to protect citizens.The specific objectives are:

1. Reinforce and expand a community-based EW/ER system;
2. Strengthen engagement between state and local actors to secure communities; and
3. Strengthen partners’ capacity to support and monitor EW systems.

### **1.2.3 Proposed Results and Activities**

The project is designed to achieve six key results across the States. Table 3 presents the list of expected results and activities against the project objectives above.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3: Project objectives, results, and activities** | | |
| **Objectives** | **Results** | **Activities** |
| Reinforce and expand a community-based EW/ER system. | Increased capacity of communities to identify and analyze early warning signs of violence. | Community observer trainings. |
| Creation of an integrated EW/ER system. |
| Feedback and follow-up meetings. |
| Increased collaboration between communities, local government officials and security actors to respond to early warning signs of violence. | Community Security Architecture Dialogues. |
| Production of Monthly Early Warning Analysis Bulletins. |
| Strengthen engagement between state and local actors to secure communities. | State government institutions with a peacebuilding or security mandate have an enhanced ability to respond to violence and threats to human rights. | Conflict sensitivity and human rights awareness training. |
| Trauma awareness, resilience, and transformative dialogue training with CSAs. |
| Human rights and conflict resolution training and refresher trainings with CSAs. |
| Civil society, communities, government and security have an enhanced mutual understanding of situations that make communities vulnerable to violence and human rights violations. | Common Ground advocacy training with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). |
| Peace Architecture Dialogue. |
| Strengthen partners’ capacity to support and monitor EW systems. | Civil society actors have an enhanced capacity to support communities to implement early warning systems. | Ongoing partner support. |
| Early warning and conflict analysis trainings |
| Integrated and rigorous monitoring and evaluation systems are established to ensure measurable impact of an EW/ER system in Northeast Nigeria. | Development and Implementation M&E plan. |
| *Source: Table created from SFCG project documentation, May 2017* | | |

The EW/ER system is to continue to report distinct security and social threats to communities, to address the critical drivers and results of the terrorism. This is by giving key community actors the tools and information necessary to develop community-based responses to the drivers as well as general security risks in the region. With more mutual trust, the clearer understanding of linkages between systematic security risks and the terrorism, and reports on identified information will help to prevent attacks and builds resilient communities. The project adopts a theory of prevention that if communities identify emerging risk factors linked to the Boko Haram terrorism in Northeast Nigeria and work with security and civilian actors to effectively respond, then security will be reinforced and reduce vulnerability.

## **1.3 Performance Indicators**

***F Indicators***

1. 1.6.3-6. Number of peace-building organizations receiving conflict analysis or conflict early warning reports from USG-supported early warning systems.
2. 1.6.3-7. Number of conflict/fragility early warning systems, conflict assessments, or response mechanisms supported by USG assistance.
3. 2.3.1-7. Number of stakeholder forums (multi-party, civil/security sector, and or civil/political) held.

***Other Indicators***

1. Current percent of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information.
2. Current percent of stakeholders reporting coordination between communities, local government officials and security actors to analyze and respond to early warning information.
3. Current percent of participating staff of government agencies with a peacebuilding mandate who are able to analyze and respond to conflict.

## **1.4 Project Implementation Plan**

The project management team comprised the Deputy Country Director, Senior Program Manager, State Coordinators, Project Coordinators, and Officers. The Deputy Country Director provides overall coordination, operational management and quality assurance of the project implementation. The Senior Program Manager supervises the State Coordinators in Adamawa and Borno States, respectively. The State Coordinators supervise the Early Warning Coordinator and Officer who lead the field level activities. These officers are supported by a program assistant (Adamawa State) and trained interns (o Borno State). A Monitoring and Evaluation Manager handles the entire field Monitoring and Evaluation activities.

The project implementation coordination on the field is done through Monday meetings and on-going pre- and post-activity meetings. This seems to occur more in Borno than Adamawa State. The Adamawa State project team was operating from outside of the State. The Monitoring and Evaluation Manager and Early Warning Officers rove between Borno and Adamawa states but live in Borno State. The pose a challenge with over 10 hours’ drive distance by road, with the hazardous terrain. The project developed elaborate monitoring and evaluation framework, which details the reporting and monitoring requirements. However, the reports have not been regular and lack in quality. For example, there were months during which no report was produced for the project. On quality, reports of follow-up dialogue meeting indicated that the CRN meetings in four LGAs in Borno were reported to have taken place on the same day, and were attended by the same SFCG staff, in the different locations. The contents of the reports were similar.

SFCG started the project implementation, first by seeking buy-in and collaboration through sensitization of stakeholders on the expanded project in Adamawa and Borno States. In September 2016, SCFG kick-started the project implementation, putting in place plans for the implementation. The project team developed an action plan to strengthen the systems for smooth implementation of the project. SFCG continued by coordinating early warning reports and responses with community observers and Community Response Networks (CRNs), established in all 10 communities involved in the project implementation. To create an integrated EW/ER system, the project supported community actions and responses to early warning signs of violence identified and reported. Two feedback and follow-up meetings were held with members of the CRNs in Borno State. The Community Security Architecture Dialogues were created across the states and started to hold meetings in Borno State, with relevant government officials, CSOs, security actors, traditional leaders and other players at State and LGA levels. The training on conflict sensitivity and human rights awareness with state and local government actors was conducted in Adamawa and Borno States. From the reports reviewed, other activities of the project were yet to commence across the states.

# 2. SECURITY CONTEXT

In 2016, the conflict in the North-East of Nigeria took a dimension which had implications for the ongoing efforts of Government and the multisectoral-led humanitarian response in the region. Substantial gains were made in the fight against Boko Haram by the Security Agencies including the Nigerian Armed Forces, the Police, Para-Military and community security groups – Community Joint Task Force (CJTF). Fifteen communities in Borno State and two LGAs in Yobe State were reclaimed from the Boko Haram. As the people returned to reclaim communities, more people were also displaced. The movement of the IDPs and returnees made it difficult to adequately track the security situation in the communities affected based on existing strategies. Access to scare land resources for farming and weak infrastructure in many host communities continue to raise fears of potential conflicts between IDP and the host communities.

The Government commenced resettlement plans to facilitate the safe return of displaced persons to their original communities which had been liberated by the Nigerian Armed Forces. However, there are security concerns of potential tensions and conflicts posed by a scramble for land ownership, housing, and property disputes. The traditional systems of governance which usually mediate in such matters, to sustain and maintain peace in the communities are still not stable. The evaluation also found concerns for inadequate security mechanisms in place to protect the lives and property of returnees in their communities. Over 300,000 IDPs have relocated and resettled in their communities, which still remained unsafe, with frequent reports of civilian deaths from sporadic Boko Haram attacks. In most affected parts of Borno State and east of Yobe State, there is still incidence of sporadic attacks from the fragmented groups of Boko Haram Sect. Since the split up of the group in 2016, security agencies have been confronted with the challenge of combatting the two differently led terrorist groups. Unlike previously, there are increased guerrilla-like attacks in recent times, raising further concerns about the capacity of the security agencies to effectively respond to the shifting tactics of the groups. In 2017 Humanitarian Response plan for Nigeria, which was released in December 2016, the rate of violent conflicts between the military and Boko Haram groups declined only marginally from 345 in 2015 to 340 in 2016.

Many IDPs, returnees, and vulnerable host communities remain highly vulnerable to hunger and starvation. This is because they lack safe access to land for farming and means for a livelihood. Most affected populations are predominantly engaged in farming, and with lack of access to land, there is the reduction in agricultural cultivation and yield to meet the needs of the millions of people who are food insecure. The 2017 Humanitarian Response Plan reported that as at October 2016, only 20% of IDP households have a source of income, with 5.1 million people in the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)[[1]](#footnote-1) Phases 3 to 5, amounting to increase of 50% severely food insecure since March 2016. The prolonged hardship from weak households coping strategies due to lost income has made many vulnerable youths to adopt negative coping mechanisms such as drug abuse, robbery and petty theft for survival. These practices are associated with violence and vulnerability to extreme radical idealization.

The respondents are reported increased insecurity and violence arising from tension and potential clashes between security agencies and communities in host communities and the recently liberated areas. Many communities continue to face incidences of human rights violations including death, injuries, sexual and gender-based violence, arbitrary detention, kidnapping and torture by security agencies. There is a low level of accountability for the behavior and practices of security personnel who commit human rights abuses. The people are frustrated by the poor access to human rights protection, enforcement, and justice. Further, there is increasing distrust and maltreatment of returnee populations by host communities and security agencies. This continues to be conflict and violence risk in the area. The 2017 Humanitarian Response Plan for Nigeria, indicates that people who were held by Boko Haram face disproportionate treatment by host communities and their families, exposing them to the risk of stigmatism, rejection, violence, abuse, and abandonment.

Whilst, the military response to insecurity in the region continues, the government in recent times have instituted mechanisms such as the Inter-Ministerial Task Force (IMTF) and Government Humanitarian Coordination Working Group (GHCWG) for coordinating a multisectoral response to the security and humanitarian crises in the region. The Government at National and subnational levels, in collaboration with UN agencies and humanitarian partners, have established sectoral working groups to handle different and emerging humanitarian security concerns. For example, the Federal Government and development partners collaborate under the auspices of the Presidential Committee for the North-East Initiative (PCNI) to implement a government led recovery, reconstruction and peacebuilding plan as well as the operationalization of the Recovery and Peace Building Assessment (RPBA) and other initiatives. Although collaboration is ongoing to forge strategic synergies across the sectoral humanitarian themes, these coordinating forums have suffered significantly from the poor participation of communities, other critical civil society actors and the media in government-led peace and security initiatives.

Through its previous initiatives particularly the Early Warning/Early Response Mechanisms in Northern Nigeria project, SFCG and other partners have instituted community-based and led mechanisms including the Peace Architectural Dialogue Forums, which have facilitated increased engagement, collaboration, and networking between communities and other key stakeholders in the peacebuilding process. However, there are capacity gaps and motivation of the established mechanism to foster an all-inclusive process and promote sustainable synergy for engaging in effective Security and Peacebuilding in the region.

The security situation may be reduced, but the associating challenges would require the innovative approach to strengthen the existing EW/ER strategies. There is an increase in sporadic guerrilla-like attacks and change in tactics by the Boko Haram terrorists. This is happening at the time that the Government has suddenly escalated resettlement programs, the upsurge in the rate of voluntary relocation of returnees, and an influx of additional numbers of displaced persons from newly liberated areas.

# 3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

## **3.1 Evaluation Design**

The evaluation employed a cross-sectional survey design, collecting both quantitative and qualitative data to provide baseline information and assess the progress made so far in the implementation of the project. To generate the baseline data, since the baseline evaluation was conducted while the project implementation was ongoing, the evaluation asked respondents to reflect nine months back – from the time of this evaluation. This represents the baseline of the time the project commenced implementation. On the other hand, the evaluation asked respondents to reflect on the present situation to generate the data for assessing the progress made so far in implementing the project activities. The evaluation provides information about EW/ER systems, traditional systems of EW/ER, community involvement in EW/ER, partners, the performance indicators, and the progress made so far in implementing the project in Adamawa and Borno States. The focal areas with specific questions that guide the evaluation are as follows:

1. EW/ER systems: Which current EW/ER systems are in place? Who are the actors involved? Which geographic areas do they cover? What types of cases do they report? To what extent are they functional? Which are their strengths and weaknesses? Since when have they been in place? How has SFCG been able to leverage on the current EW/ER systems and collaborate with actors involved?
2. Traditional Systems: Are there traditional ways of dealing with EW/ER? Which ones? How do these mechanisms work? Are there any trends with regards to involvement and gender? How does SFCG´s work on EW/ER support or hinder these traditional systems?
3. EW/ER and communities: What are the communities’ relation and involvement in current EW/ER systems? What type and level of interaction of communities with EW/ER? Are there any trends with regards to community involvement and in particular on gender? What gaps currently exist that could hinder community involvement in EW/ER? Which of SFCG current strategies is most effective in supporting community involvement in EW/ER?
4. Partners: In addition to current partners, are there other actors and partners that SFCG could be working with, and is not? Who are the most relevant for the projects?
5. Performance indicators: What is the current percent of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information? What is the current percent of stakeholders reporting coordination between communities, local government officials and security actors to analyze and respond to early warning information? What is the current percent of participating staff of government agencies with a peacebuilding mandate who are able to analyze and respond to conflict?

## **3.2 Evaluation Scope**

The evaluation covered 10 communities in five Local Government Areas (LGA) across Adamawa and Borno States. Table 4 presents the list of communities in the LGAs were data was collected in Adamawa and Borno States. The field data collection was conducted between 19th April and 4th May 2017.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4: States, LGAs and communities** | | |
| **States** | **LGAs** | **Communities** |
| Adamawa | Yola North | Jambutu, and Damilu |
| Girei | BBC and Angwan |
| Borno | Maiduguri Municipal Council | Maisandari, Shehuri North and Gwange III |
| Jere | Mairi and Old Maiduguri |
| Mafa | Zannari |

*Source: Table created from SFCG project documentation, April 2017*

## **3.3 Sample Size and Sampling**

The evaluation used a combination of purposive, cluster, quota and convenience sampling techniques. Since the project does have a database of households and individuals in the participating communities, community mobilizers helped to recruit and identify each respondent and participant at the communities. The community mobilizers are people conversant with the communities, project activities and the involvement of community members. All 10 communities across the five LGAs participating in the project in Adamawa and Borno States were included in the evaluation. The key informant interviews were based on the list of stakeholders and who was available during the field work. The sample size estimate for the survey was 384, which was determined using a sample size table, based on a sample size formula, with 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error. With a 10% provision for no response and inadequate responses, the total sample size estimate was increased to 422.

The sample size was allocated between Adamawa and Borno States proportional to the total population of the communities covered. The sample size allocation to communities was 70% of the total sample size and the remaining 30% was allocated equally to CSOs, security actors and government agencies. Table 5 presents the distribution of the survey respondents across the LGAs and States. Based on the number of LGAs covered in each State, 59% of respondents were in Borno State and 41% in Adamawa State.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5: Distribution of community respondents across LGAs and states** | | |
| **State and LGA** | **Count** | **Percent** |
| **Adamawa State** | **123** | **41.3** |
| Yola North | 59 | 19.8 |
| Girei LGA | 64 | 21.5 |
| **Borno State** | **175** | **58.7** |
| MMC | 86 | 28.9 |
| Jere LGA | 59 | 19.8 |
| Mafa LGA | 30 | 10.1 |
|  | **298** | **100.0** |
| Government Agencies | 26 | 47.3 |
| CSOs | 29 | 52.7 |
|  | **55** | **100.0** |

*Source: Table created for evaluation, May 2017*

## **3.4 Data Sources**

The respondents include CSOs, the relevant staff of participating government agencies, security actors, community members, media representatives, and SFCG project staff. The community respondents include community leaders; religious leaders; women leaders; youth leaders; groups of Community Observers and Community Security Architecture Dialogue (CSAD); and members of the community (men, women, youths, differently able, Muslims, Christians, traditional religious believers, other religious believers), whom SFCG involve directly and indirectly in the implementation of the project. The community respondents include both Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) and the host community members. A combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods was used, including surveys, desk review, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and in-depth interviews. Table 6 below summarizes the total participants and respondents against the sample size target by data sources.

***Desk Review.*** Several documents related to the project were reviewed to gain an understanding of the project design, goals and objectives, approaches and methods, the theory of change, expected results, strategy, and activities. The review also helped to generate the information on the implementation of the project, progress made so far and the contexts in which the project are implemented in Adamawa and Borno States. The key documents reviewed are the evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR), the project proposal, monitoring, and evaluation plan, previous baseline evaluation tools, and activity and quarterly reports. See desk review guide in Annex 2.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6: Data source by target, actual and response rates** | | | |
|  | **Targets** | **Actual** | **% Actual** |
| **Key Informant Interview** | **4** | **5** | **125%** |
| Search for Common Ground (SFCG) | 2 | 3 | 150% |
| Media | 2 | 2 | 100% |
| **In-Depth Interviews** | **40** | **26** | **65%** |
| Community Leader | 10 | 10 | 100% |
| Religious Leader | 10 | 6 | 60% |
| Youth Leader | 10 | 6 | 60% |
| Women Leader | 10 | 4 | 40% |
| **Focus Group Discussions** | **10** | **8** | **80%** |
| **Surveys** | **380** | **353** | **93%** |
| Community members | 300 | 298 | 99% |
| Government Agencies | 40 | 26 | 65% |
| CSOs | 40 | 29 | 73% |

*Source: Table created for evaluation, May 2017*

***Key Informant Interviews.*** Five key informant interviews (KII) were conducted for SFCG project coordinators and officers, and representatives of the media. The KIIs were used to elicit overview information about the conflict and security situations, EW/ER systems, traditional systems of dealing with EW/ER, the involvement of communities in the EW/ER systems, partnership, media involvement and progress made so far to implement the project. See KII guide in Annex 2.

***In-Depth Interviews.*** Twenty-six in-depth interviews (IDI) were conducted to elicit information from community leaders, religious leaders, women leaders, and youth leaders. The IDIs were used to elicit detailed information about conflict and security situations, EW/ER systems, traditional systems of dealing with EW/ER, the involvement of communities in EW/ER, partnership, and contributions made so far by the project. See IDI guide in Annex 2.

***Focus Group Discussions.*** Eight focus group discussions (FGD) were conducted with Community Security Architecture Dialogue (CSAD). The focus groups were used to elicit views of the participants about the conflict and security situations, EW/ER systems, traditional systems of dealing with EW/ER, the involvement of communities in EW/ER, partnership, and progress made to implement the project. See FGD guide in Annex 2.

***Surveys.*** The surveys were conducted with 353 respondents, eliciting their demographic information and views on EW/ER systems, traditional systems of dealing with EW/ER, the involvement of communities in EW/ER, partnership, communication channels and media programs. Three sets of questionnaires were designed and administered to sampled community members, the staff of CSOs and participating government agencies. See survey questionnaires in Annex 2.

## **3.5 Data Analysis Method**

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics with frequency counts, percentages, cross table, chart, and mean. Microsoft Excel package and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) were used to process and analyze the quantitative data. Data generated through the qualitative methods (desk review, FGD, IDI, and KII) were analyzed using content analysis and ethnographic summaries of salient views or opinions of the respondents and participants. Data presentation was mainly across the States (Adamawa and Borno), total respondents, and by the period (baseline and current).

## **3.6 Respondents’ Profile**

Table 7 presents the profile of the respondents of the CSOs. Most (72%) of the respondents were male. The number of male respondents was more in Borno, but female respondents were more in Adamawa. The CSOs interviewed were mainly Non-Governmental Organizations at 61% (Adamawa = 49%; Borno = 67%). The number of Community-Based Organizations represents 29% across the States. More than one-third (44%) of the CSO respondents claimed they are involved in security and peacebuilding.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7: Profile of CSO and the respondents across the states** | | | |
|  | Adamawa = 7 | Borno = 22 | Total = 29 |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |
| Male | 42.9% | 81.8% | 72.4% |
| Female | 57.1% | 18.2% | 27.6% |
| **Type of CSO** |  |  |  |
| Community Based Organization | 28.6% | 28.6% | 28.6% |
| Non-Governmental Organization | 42.9% | 66.7% | 60.7% |
| Faith Based Organization | 28.6% | 4.8% | 10.7% |
| **Legal status** |  |  |  |
| CAC Registration | 100.0% | 36.8% | 52.0% |
| State Registration | 0.0% | 42.1% | 32.0% |
| Local Government Registration | 0.0% | 15.8% | 12.0% |
| SEMA | 0.0% | 5.3% | 4.0% |
|  |  |  |  |
| **CSO in security and peace building** | 100.0% | 90.9% | 93.1% |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Number of years in security and peace building** |  |  |  |
| Less than one year | 0.0% | 5.0% | 3.7% |
| 1 – 2 years | 28.6% | 15.0% | 18.5% |
| 2 years plus – 5 years | 0.0% | 40.0% | 29.6% |
| More than 5 years | 71.4% | 35.0% | 44.4% |
| Don’t Know | 0.0% | 5.0% | 3.7% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

*Source: Table created from evaluation primary data, May 2017*

Figure 1 below shows that the primary focus of most of the CSOs across the States is humanitarian interventions, peacebuilding and security, community development and human rights and advocacy.

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

Table 8 presents the demographic characteristics of the community members who responded to the questionnaire. Although the sample allocation was designed with an equal number of male and female, the final response includes a slightly higher number of male (53%) compared to female (47%). There were more male respondents in Adamawa than in Borno, where female respondents were marginally more than male. The evaluation included 7% of respondents who are differently able, and non-displaced persons were a majority (75%). More than half (56%) of the respondents claimed they have lived in the communities for more than 10 years, and 84% were Muslims. On employment, 47% reported has worked in the last 12 months and 53% has not worked in the last 12 months. Of the proportion that reported has worked in the last 12 months, includes 42% in Adamawa State and 50% in Borno State. The overall average was 35 (±14) – Adamawa = 40 (±14) and Borno = 36 (±14).

| **Table 8: Demographic characteristics of community members across the states** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Adamawa = 123** | **Borno = 175** | **Total = 298** |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |
| Male | 72(58.5%) | 86(49.1%) | 158(53.0%) |
| Female | 51(41.5%) | 89(50.9%) | 140(47.0%) |
| **Differently able** |  |  |  |
| Yes | 9(7.3%) | 12(6.9%) | 21(7.0%) |
| No | 114(92.7%) | 163(93.1%) | 277(93.0%) |
| **Displacement** |  |  |  |
| Displaced person | 13(10.6%) | 61(35.3%) | 74(25.0%) |
| Non-displaced person | 110(89.4%) | 112(64.7%) | 222(75.0%) |
| **Length of living in the community** |  |  |  |
| Less than one year | 1(0.8%) | 3(1.7%) | 4(1.3%) |
| 1–2 years | 7(5.7%) | 13(7.4%) | 20(6.7%) |
| 2 years plus – 5 years | 30(24.4%) | 52(29.7%) | 82(27.5%) |
| 5 years plus – 10 years | 9(7.3%) | 16(9.1%) | 25(8.4%) |
| More than 10 years | 76(61.8%) | 91(52.0%) | 167(56.0%) |
| **Religion** |  |  |  |
| Christianity | 24(19.8%) | 21(12.1%) | 45(15.3%) |
| Islam | 96(79.3%) | 152(87.4%) | 248(84.1%) |
| Traditional | 1(0.8%) | 1(0.6%) | 2(0.7%) |
| **Worked in the last 12 months** |  |  |  |
| Yes | 52(42.3%) | 88(50.3%) | 140(47.0%) |
| No | 71(57.7%) | 87(49.7%) | 158(53.0%) |
| **Age** |  |  |  |
| Minimum | 19 | 18 | 18 |
| Maximum | 80 | 85 | 85 |
| Median | 36.5 | 32.0 | 35.0 |
| Mean | 39.7 | 35.9 | 37.5 |
| Std. Deviation | 14.1 | 13.5 | 13.9 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Total** | 123(41%) | 175(59%) | 298(100%) |

*Source: Table created for evaluation, May 2017*

Table 9 presents the distribution of the staff of government agencies who responded to the survey for the staff of government agencies. The total respondents were 58% female and 42% male. The respondents were represented equally in Adamawa State, but in Borno State, there were more female respondents than male. More than half (60%) of the agencies represented have a peacebuilding mandate and were all in Borno State. In Adamawa, half of the agencies represented have an emergency response mandate. This result suggests that more effort may be required to build the capacity of the agencies in Adamawa State in peacebuilding.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 9: Government agencies staff respondents and mandate across the states** | | | |
|  | Adamawa = 4 | Borno = 22 | Total = 26 |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |
| Male | 50.0% | 40.9% | 42.3% |
| Female | 50.0% | 59.1% | 57.7% |
| **Mandate** |  |  |  |
| Security | 0.0% | 5.0% | 4.2% |
| Peace building | 0.0% | 60.0% | 50.0% |
| Emergencies | 50.0% | 15.0% | 20.8% |
| Promotion and protection of human rights | 25.0% | 5.0% | 8.3% |
| Road maintenance | 0.0% | 5.0% | 4.2% |
| Youth empowerment awareness | 0.0% | 5.0% | 4.2% |
| Sensitize on government policies | 25.0% | 0.0% | 4.2% |
| Administration department | 0.0% | 5.0% | 4.2% |
| **Total** | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

*Source: Table created for evaluation, May 2017*

## **3.7 Evaluation Team**

The evaluation team comprised a core team of lead and associate evaluator to design, conduct, analyze and interpret the evaluation and its outcomes. The lead evaluator was responsible for overseeing the evaluation, including contract management, design of the evaluation methods and tools, training of enumerators, survey data collection, data management, analysis, reporting, review, quality assurance, and submission of final reports to SFCG. The associate evaluator supports the lead evaluator and was responsible for qualitative field data collection, reporting, and analysis. Other members of the evaluation team were two field research assistants and 25 enumerators who were responsible for implementing the surveys. The field research assistants supervised the enumerators, recording of qualitative interviews and FGDs.

## **3.8 Ethical Considerations**

The evaluation was conducted with adherence to informed consent, confidentiality, and anonymity. All individuals for the data collection were provided with information about the purpose, risks, and benefits of the evaluation so they could make an informed decision whether to participate in the evaluation. In addition, the information shared by the respondents was kept confidential. At no point, the names of any respondent or other identifying information used in the data analysis, presentation of findings and report of the evaluation. Training was provided to data collectors to ensure they understand the ethical principles.

Upon completion of evaluation activities in the field, the data were maintained in a way that adheres to ethical principles. The mode of analysis adhered to standards for survey research, the aim of which was to make general claims about the participant populations, not specific claims about identifiable individuals. Where qualitative analysis was used to provide further insight on the general claims, any individual or household identifiers and reference were excluded. Instead, the characteristics or factors that support or refute the general claim was addressed.

## **3.9 Limitations**

The limitation of the methodology of the evaluation is that two forms of evaluation were designed as one to assess the baseline and progress made so far to implement the project activities. Since the evaluation has more than one focus, the evaluation design became complex. While a baseline study was intended, the design included assessment of the progress made so far to implement the project activities.

The baseline evaluation was conducted after the project implementation has commenced for about nine months. Many questions were set to help the respondents to recall past experiences and knowledge to inform their views of human rights abuses, security situations, and other related topics of the evaluation. There could be questions for which some respondents found difficult to accurately recall the answers and provide the same answers in both time frames. To minimize this, the enumerators were trained on how to help the respondents to recall answers with respect to time in the local language.

Another major limitation of the methodology is the evaluation of two different projects, with different objectives, in one evaluation design. It was difficult to separate the project during the data collection with the respondents. The same tools and respondents were employed to generate the primary data. The tools were designed to streamline the data collection process. However, very many questions were set to cover both projects and the community questionnaire took a long time of the enumerators and respondents to complete.

The time set for the field data collection affected the number of security actors reached, particularly in Adamawa State. The evaluation design did provide adequate time to for the bureaucracy of the different security agencies, hence it was difficult for many of the targeted security actors to grant an interview within a short notice and without the approval of their designated superiors. However, the evaluators worked through their networks and existing relationship with SFCG to secure interviews with many, mostly in Borno State.

# 4. FINDINGS

## **4.1 Early Warning/Early Response System**

The existing EW/ER systems in the North-East are led mainly by the national government and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs). The mechanisms mentioned by many respondents are: (1) National level-government led security monitoring and response mechanism; (2) Nigeria Stability and Reconciliation Program (NSRP); (3) British Council Early Warning System and (4) Search for Common Ground (SFCG) Early Warning System.

***National Government-led security monitoring and response mechanism***

The government-led EW/ER architecture involved a number institution that receives and process signals of security threat through a central hub. From the available literature, the Institute of Peace, and Conflict Resolution (IPCR) plays a significant role in the national conflict early warning and response system. As a research, policy, and strategy institution, IPCR collates regular information from security agencies and other relevant agencies, code, analyze[[2]](#footnote-2), and transmit the results through strategy documents and periodic advisory on conflict warnings to the federal Stability Task Force / Joint Task Force. In turn, the Joint Task Force, convenes the military, the police, and relevant MDAs to analyze and deliberate on the appropriate conflict response, at the national level. The Task Force liaises with State-level counterparts for the State, and local level response decision-making. Similarly, there is an EW/ER mechanism in the National Action Plan (NAP) for implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 for the inclusion of women in the process of peacebuilding, peacekeeping, conflict resolution and management in Nigeria. The mechanism is led by IPCR, and works, in theory, to strengthen EW/ER mechanisms for protecting women in conflict situations. Other, key institutions involved in the mechanism are Federal Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (FMWA&SD); IPCR; CSOs; Federal Ministry of Youth (FMoY); and Community Leaders. However, the extent to which these systems are functional in the North-East was difficult to know during the evaluation due to the dearth of concrete evidence to validate their functioning, and the specific communities the structured have been established.

The security agencies a critical role in the collection of conflict signals and implementation of appropriate responses to the threat of Boko Haram armed attacks. The Nigerian Armed Forces use the “Operation Quick Response” as their central response to the conflict. The hybrid EW/ER response involves the Civilian Joint Task Force (CJTF), working with formal security agencies of the Military, Nigerian Police formations, intelligence services, paramilitary services, and informal state government, sponsored civilian local vigilante groups. Because of the cross-border scope of Boko Haram conflict, the system works in close collaboration with the regional Multi-National Joint Task Force (MNJTF), comprising of Armed forces of the neighboring conflict-affected countries of Chad, Niger, and Cameroun. Intelligent information is gathered through informants, counter-terrorism operatives and trained operatives posted in each LGA. The mechanism also relies on information generating from the communities and National Emergency Coordination Centre/Mobile Emergency Response Support Operations Centre (NECC) [[3]](#footnote-3). The NECC is led by NEMA as the official notification point of an impending or actual disaster or emergency. This mechanism was designed to maintain a 24-hour watch and monitoring of all sources of warning/disaster information, with other Federal agencies, NEMA zones, and the news media. NECC reports disaster events to NEMA key officials, NEMA zones, and other relevant agencies (such as the security agencies and humanitarian partners) involved in the response mechanism in the North-East. The EW/ER system collates and processes information on a wide-range of security issues, including crime and conflict reports (armed robbery, communal, ethnic and religious tensions, and conflicts), intelligence reports on suspicious movements, activities and other security concerns from State to community levels. Depending on the sensitivity, information received is shared among within the organization, with strict security guidance. Information generated is verified and the most feasible response is provided in line with the mandate and scope of participating institutions.

Most respondents in the qualitative process noted that the EW mechanism has worked fairly well. The mechanism contributed to the reduction in Boko Harm terrorist operations and to restore peace and security in some communities. However, some respondents noted that the detection and response to the impending conflicts were not early and prompt to provide timely warnings and response. There were inadequate engagement, lack of inclusion, and collaboration of the EW/ER system with other critical stakeholders, especially the Civil Society and affected communities. The prompt response was hindered by multiple layers of information processing, centralized decision-making process, inflexible institutional mandates, lack of synergy and coordination among the institutions.

***Nigeria Stability and Reconciliation Program (NSRP) early warning system***

In Borno State, the NSRP EW/ER system is in place. The system functions through multi-level, multi-sectoral dialogue platforms from the community to State level. Under the system, selected community volunteers collate security reports, threats and tensions, which are analyzed for severity and reported to the community traditional leaders and council. Actions that are within the remit of community volunteers are responded to promptly working closely with community vigilante groups and under the directives of the traditional leaders. Community leaders and volunteers liaise with frequently with security agencies including the Civil Defence Corps, the Police, and other security agencies to address emerging issues and concerns or threats. At the LGA level, there is a mechanism for taking forward issues which are beyond the remit of communities – “Community Peace Partnership Forum (CPP)”. The CPPs bring together monthly, various strands of stakeholders and interest groups including village heads (Bulama), security agencies, CSOs, community vigilante, volunteers and representatives of LGAs. Key issues arising from communities are discussed and collaborative decisions are taken to address community security concerns as well as other broader issues.

Similarly, at the State level, there is another mechanism called the State Conflict Management Alliance (SCMA), whose functions are tied to the issues emerging from the community, through the CPP, and which require higher levels of engagement or response. The SCMA is comprised of critical state-level security actors, government policy, and decision makers, CSO networks and partners. This EW/ER system is implemented through a local partner- “Herwa Community Development Organization”, who plays the vital role of community EW/ER systems facilitator, building capacities of volunteers and community leaders to promptly identify and discuss security concerns and responses. The organization also supports community sensitization, social solidarity building and advocacy actions at the community and CPP level. By participating actively at all levels of the EW/ER system, Herwa Community Development Organization also acts as an external link between the different levels and through this, it ensures that issues are adequately cascaded from one level to the other and decisions are disseminated back for appropriate collaborative responses. In the SFCG EW/ER system, a dedicated EW/ER officer plays this linking role.

***British Council early warning system***

The British Council funds an early warning mechanism in some communities in Borno State, which is also implemented through Herwa Community Development Organization. The project tagged “Know Your Neighbor”, has mobilized and trained 50 paid volunteers in Jere (25 civilian JTF and 25 volunteers), who collaborate to monitor the influx of people (particularly people displaced from previously Boko Haram held communities, cross-border returnees, wives and children of killed Boko Haram members, and former captives of Boko Haram). Volunteers are paid monthly stipends to facilitate prompt communication and reporting. The mechanism supports security agencies with proper profiling, verification, documentation of IDPs and returnees. The Volunteers work closely with community vigilantes and traditional leaders, while also providing regular advisory on security threats to aid prompt and effective action. A collaborative relationship also exists between the volunteers and the formal security agencies, to which identified or suspected threats are referred for further action.

***Search for Common Ground (SFCG) early warning system***

Search for Common Ground (SFCG), has an integrated community-based EW system for collecting data on violent incidents, tensions, and threats, at the different level of the community, LGA, and State. SFCG has facilitated the creation of collaborative platforms for affected communities and stakeholders of security agencies, civil society, government MDAs and the media. At the base of this system is the team of SFCG trained Community Volunteer Observers and a Community Response Network (CRN) of community and religious leaders, representatives of the security agencies at the community and LGA levels, the community observers and representatives of the local government authority and community vigilante groups. Selected and trained Community Observers representing women, men, youth and the differently abled, IDP settlements and host communities, collect information about conflicts and threats and report these either verbatim or through Short Message Service (SMS) to the CRN and the SFCG EW/ER officer. Reports received are discussed during monthly CRN meetings and appropriate responses are either delegated to community leaders, relevant institutions with the mandate to handle such issues or to special ad-hoc committees set up for the purpose. Reports from delegated briefs are presented during monthly meetings for follow-up. By design, the CRNs are facilitated to cascade security reports particularly those outside their remits to the LGA level for further analysis and response.

At the LGA level, a similar network established by SFCG comprised of community leaders, Observers and other critical stakeholders including Civil Society, Security Agencies at the LGA level, the Media and LGA authorities, meets monthly under the auspices of the Community Security Architecture Dialogues (CSADs). By intention, the CSADs were created to take forward unresolved security issues emanating from the CRNs as well as other broader security issues and concerns at the LGA level and are doing so but less than as aspiring. As with the CRNs, the monthly meetings of the CSADs are used for deliberations and decision-making, from which appropriate responses documented in monthly action plans, are delegated to the concerned institutions or ad-hoc committees.

At the apex of this system, is the Peace Architectural Dialogue forum (PAD), which operates at the State level. PAD, assembles critical stakeholders for month security dialogue at the state level. The key members include the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), a variety of CSOs and other security interest groups, Religious and Traditional Councils and groups at the State Level, Security Agencies, CJTF, Agencies of women, youths, transport unions and trade associations as well as the media. PAD discusses issues emanating from the CSADs and CRNs as well as the broader subnational security concerns. Monthly action plans collate, key decisions taken and the mechanisms employed to take them forward. PAD functions by design, include the provision of regular advisory to government and other critical stakeholders, opinion leaders and interest groups as well providing support for community security initiatives, public sensitization, policy advocacy, and influence.

There are close similarities in mechanisms and challenges between the EW/ER systems encountered in communities which are highlighted below:

* Information sharing, communication, reporting and processing utilize simple technology either via mobile phone calls and or SMS.
* Information, data, and reports received are not stored in organized and shared databases. At the most, security information and decisions are recorded in reports documented in MS Word or Excel applications. It is not clear how these are analyzed and synthesized for use by the security community.
* The EW/ER mechanisms also utilize trained community-based volunteers. Community Volunteer (Monitors or Observers) are usually paid a monthly stipend to facilitate communication, prompt information sharing, and mobilization. Whilst, these volunteer security observers are tasked with information communication and sharing, there are multiple reporting channels, not well coordinated. The same community volunteers, often report to two different projects, with different processing mechanisms at the same time. All the EW/ER systems engage with the same stakeholders and critical actors. However, the individual mechanisms, have their own independent channels of communicating with the critical actors and stakeholders. There is duplication of efforts and the system for cross-agency coordination is not well functioning.
* There is also a disconnection between actors working at the different levels of the existing EW/ER systems and just as well amongst the individual actors participating in each system. As opposed to the intended design, issues are not cascading across the levels. Actors mostly provide individual responses according to their mandates. The interagency collaboration within EW/ER systems seems weak and ineffectiveness. Although the existing links between the different levels of the EW/ER systems, information dissemination and response have not worked as intended. Many of the community observers interviewed do not get feedback from the LGA and State level rungs of the EW/ER systems.

## **4.2 Traditional Systems**

Traditional systems for conflict monitoring, prevention, mediation, and the response is firmly rooted in the cultures of communities in both Adamawa and Borno States. There are the hierarchy of structures and traditional institutions, highly revered and trusted by members of the community. Local Authority Figures particularly the traditional and religious leaders are vital elements of this system. In Borno State, the unit of conflict prevention and mediation is at the family level, where family or kindred heads play a crucial role in the identification, monitoring, and resolution of conflict threats, particularly those related to family tensions and feuds. Above this level are the Bulamas or Ward Heads, who unresolved cases of conflicts and threats at the family level are referred. The Bulamas in turn report to the Village Heads (Lawan). The Lawans operate with the support of a village council and different issues are discussed and addressed at this level, depending on the severity. Indications from interviews suggest that the Village level is a very effective and highly respected conflict management mechanism.

The community vigilante groups are community youth security organizations who are under the direct authority of the village heads. Higher up the spectrum are the district heads (Hakimi), Emirs and the Shehu who is the supreme leader of the system. In fact, every community member is a conflict monitor, tasked by social and cultural obligation to maintain peace, law, and order and to report threats promptly. Conflict threats and warnings of impending crises are reported to family heads or wards heads who are the first line of response. When these cannot be resolved at this level, or in situations of a larger scale with implications for the entire village, the village heads and vigilantes are notified. The Village head and councils play the vital role of analyzing threats and making decisions about appropriate responses. Village heads and council either mandate the vigilante to respond or report their concerns to security agencies in their domains. The District heads and Emirs or the Shehu, also play significant roles in managing intransigent issues but major play the most role in mediating and resolving larger-scale civil conflicts or threats. At the LGA there is a Traditional leaders’ council. A similar platform – the State Traditional Leaders’ Council also exists at the State level including a dedicated Ministry of Emirate Affairs. These mechanisms provide the setting for government to periodically interact with the traditional leaders to get information about security situations and provide response feedback and coordination. Additionally, the Shehu is a critical member of the State Security Council, and via this platform security reports, analysis and response communication is shared and monitored.

In Adamawa State, the system is similar, besides slight differences in nomenclature. Lamido is the head of the Traditional Rulers Council in the State and under the Lamido are the Hakimi (District Head) (Sarkin) Fulani Adviser to the Lamido, (Ardo or Jauro) Village Head respectively in decreasing order of prominence. As obtains in Borno State, the Village heads and their councils regularly hold meetings review the peace and security situation in their communities, based on public reports or signals from the community vigilantes. The District heads also meet periodically with the Village heads to review security and other domain governance pertinent issues as well as provide response communication from the Lamido. Difficult issues at the level of the District Head, particularly those with serious implications for the security and peace of the wider society, are referred to the Lamido for appropriate guidance, decision-making or referral to the State and Local Government Authorities, through the established channels such as the State Traditional Rulers Council and State Security Councils respectively.

In the traditional EW/ER systems, communication and information sharing is mostly by word-of-mouth or at best by phone or SMS. Security information and decisions are not stored in any systematic manner but collaboration across the levels is strong and based on trust. Response mechanisms operate through verbal delegation. Relationship and collaboration with other stakeholders are mutual, based on needs and infrequent.

In addition to the above, figure 2 below also highlights the traditional ways of dealing with conflicts in the communities, mentioned by more than half of the survey respondents across the states. The traditional and religious leader systems are primary mechanisms for dealing with conflicts and by extension, set the basis for EW/ER system in the community. This system revolves around community leaders, ward heads, district heads, religious leaders, elders, and youth leaders, who often receive reports about conflicts and initiate actions on them.

Additionally, figure 2 shows that 66% of respondents in Adamawa and 47% in Borno mentioned traditional leadership mechanisms of dealing with conflicts and ensuring peace in their communities. Members of the community can also be gathered together to address conflicts or issues threatening the community, the people can be sensitized through public enlightenment process to promote peace in the community.

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

With regards to the trends in gender and involvement in the system of dealing with conflicts in the community, Figure 3 also indicates that community leaders and religious leaders are the major actors involved in the system of dealing with conflicts in the communities in both Adamawa and Borno states. Other actors, due to recent conflicts and crises are Local Vigilantes, the Police, the Military, and Civil Defence Corps. In relation to gender, the results indicate that men (54%) and youth (53%) are more involved than women (27%) in the systems of dealing with conflicts in the communities across the states. This gender trend is not surprising, considering the religious and traditional settings which generally affect women participation in the communities across the north.

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

SFCG’s work on EW/ER is intended to support the traditional systems, and there was no report that it has hindered the traditional systems. As said above, SFCG has trained Community Volunteer Observers and a Community Response Network (CRN) comprising of community and religious leaders, representatives of the security agencies at the community and LGA levels, the community observers and representatives of the local government authority and community vigilante groups. Refer to SFCG early warning system under 4.1 above for details.

## **4.3 Early Warning/Early Response System and Communities**

In the existing EW/ER systems, communities are well represented, at least to the extent that traditional leaders and selected community volunteers are included in the functions of the system. Community inclusion is perhaps most conspicuous at the community and LGA layers of the EW/ER system. In theory, the involvement of community leaders is to ensure that community concerns and perspectives are visible in the Peace Building and Security agenda. At the community level of the EW/ER, deliberate attempts have made to ensure diverse representation and participation of the different sub-segments of most communities. In the SFCG EW/ER system, for example, the composition strategy for both the Community Observers group and the Community Response Network, was such that there is seemingly a balance or an attempt to, between men and women, IDPs and Host Communities, abled and differently abled. This has ensured, on the one hand, that pertinent concerns from every segment of the community feed into the EW/ER system and on the other hand, it has facilitated stronger relationships and collaborations between communities and other critical stakeholders than previously witnessed. According to one of the Juaros in Adamawa State:

*“We have a better relationship with the security agencies and other stakeholders who we did not know before. Unlike before, we can now directly call them and interact, share information as partners in peace building”.*

*IDI/Community Leader/Adamawa State*

In the general community, over 80 percent of respondents agreed that their communities were safer now than previously, despite being not conversant with the exact mechanisms of the EW/ER system. In most communities, community observers were known as community mobilizers and less for their roles as security observers. Similarly, the activities of the Community Response Networks are seemingly unclear to most of the community respondents. A situation which may be indicative of weak engagement with the general community by the EW/ER community layer as well as cracks in the mechanism for the selection, deployment, and coordination of roles and functions at that level.

Related to the above, is the fact that many of the community respondents who claimed to be aware of the EW/ER systems, mentioned that feedback was seldom provided to communities about security concerns reported to the CRN. Most decisions taken have not been with adequate consultations with community members. There are gaps in the mechanisms designed in the process to ensure continuous accountability of EW/ER systems to communities they are expected to serve. While it is true that community is integrated largely via representation in the EW/ER systems, there is no full integration of EW/ER into community systems as many traditional systems are not well informed of the EW/ER mechanism. Many wards and village heads still view the EW/ER systems as another external intervention by humanitarian partners, expected to phase off at the exit of the support. There is an opportunity to harness the difference between an EW/ER strategy working in parallel with an existing community mechanism and an EW/ER that is integrated into existing community mechanisms. The current approach of creating parallel processes which appear to replace existing community systems suffers from insufficient local enthusiasm to guarantee its sustainability. This may be an indication of the vacuum in the community engagement strategy for the establishment of community-based EW/ER.

Nevertheless, the programs have some benefits for the communities as figure 4 indicates that almost all the community respondents think that the programs have benefited the communities in one way and another. The main benefits mentioned by the respondents include maintaining peace and unity of the communities, knowledge of how to solve conflicts issues, making the communities to become more vigilant, and positive changes in attitudes of people, by enlightening them about violent conflicts in the communities, particularly in Adamawa.

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

## **4.4 Partners**

A detailed stakeholder analysis was beyond the scope of the work specified in the TOR, thus, it is difficult to either assess the range and scope of partners involved in EW/ER in Adamawa and Borno States or the partnership opportunities available for strengthening initiatives in the EW/ER. As mentioned earlier in the report, only two fully operational EW/ER systems (SFCG and NSRP) were found in the surveyed communities. Both systems created multi-sectoral and multi-level mechanisms, involving a long list of diverse actors, as the collaborators (invited to participate) rather than as strategic partners. Communities form the key element of the collaboration together with Civil Society actors, religious leaders, women groups, youth groups, differently abled groups, the media, security agencies and some government MDAs (Federal, State, and LGA). Despite the varieties of current actors, there was a consensus by the respondents that existing EW/ER systems are still far from being inclusive as there are numbers of critical actors who are not involved or participating in the process.

***Educational institutions/stakeholders.***

Across the levels of the EW/ER systems, schools and education institutions remain largely excluded, despite that the vital role these play in security risk monitoring, analysis, reporting and early warning communications and responses are well documented. Also, for the fact that education is central to the contentions of the insurgency and schools have been specifically targeted and remain vulnerable to repeated violent attacks. Neither the Ministries of Education or representatives of educational institutions were noted in the list of current collaborators in the existing EW/ER systems currently operational in the target communities.

***Collaboration with the Media.***

SFCG has invested resources in previous initiatives towards building media capacity for engagement in the EW/ER system including the establishment of media programs or a radio to promote its peacebuilding and security initiatives. However, across the levels of its existing EW/ER mechanism, media participation is seemingly less tangible than anticipated. The vacuum in media participation was mostly cited as one of the critical partnership gaps by the respondents. Although investing in media programs have the potential to reach large audiences, listeners, or readers, with accurate, reliable and timely information, it is not the same with the media partners in EW/ER system. Beyond organizing training workshops for media representatives, or investing in publicizing project interventions or creating visibility for SFCG in the EW/ER niche, more is required in building strategic partnerships with media organizations as the core partners and collaborators in the EW/ER system. This will ensure that EW/ER systems take full advantage of media infrastructure and resources for information sharing, social solidarity building and sensitization of the public. Media institutions can also technically support community-level EW/ER to develop and package conflict warning and response messages that are culturally appropriate and consumable. In Borno State, it was noted that SFCG has involved the network of young social media practitioners, which is a laudable accomplishment which needs further strategic exploration as social media particularly Facebook WhatsApp and Twitter is fast gaining grounds as a viable means of communication and information sharing amongst youths.

***Collaboration with the Private Sector.***

Related to media, information sharing and communication in the EW/ER system is the vital role of the private sector communications giants such as MTN, Etisalat, Globacom, and Airtel. These are currently not being strategically engaged although they are the biggest stakeholders in conflict prevention and peacebuilding. A huge part of the current mechanism for information sharing and response communication is through Phone calls and SMS which is via the infrastructure of the telecommunications companies. Strategic engagement will benefit the EW/ER system in many ways from free airtime to investment in the information and communication hardware to promote prompt information sharing and response communication. Of equal importance are the organized private businesses including Hotels, Banks, Traders and Transportation companies whose investment interests can be positively impacted by the effective functioning of the EW/ER system. Strategic partnership with these can give mileage to the EW/ER system or in the least help to reduce the transaction costs for EW/ER coordination.

***Collaboration with Humanitarian Actors/CSOs and NGOs.***

There are several humanitarian and development partners currently involved in the Disaster risk reduction arena who can play a vital role in the EW/ER system but are not currently engaged, at least visibly. Many of these organizations (International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), International Rescue Committee (IRC), Nigerian Red Cross, MercyCorps, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and Save the Children) are engaged in the frontlines of the conflict and have access to resources and information which can expand the scope and effectiveness of the EW/ER system particularly with regards to response planning and coordination. Moreover, there is a national inter-agency humanitarian response coordination forum, with sectoral working groups in both Adamawa and Borno, whose involvement is still inconspicuous in the EW/ER system. Similarly, there is a Nigeria INGO Forum whose place in the EW/ER system is yet to be ascertained, coupled with a plethora of local Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Faith Based Organization (FBOs) Community Based Organization (CBO) and Disabled People Organizations (DPOs) who can be engaged to advance the current scope, effectiveness and sustainability of the EW/ER system. Many of these grassroots organizations are already involved somewhat in other micro EW/ER systems as noted with HERWA Community Development Organization in Borno State. Additionally, Organizations like West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP) have a historical national and regional capacity in EW/ER, which can add immense value to on-going efforts, just as CSOs such as CLEEN Foundation in Adamawa State have made interesting advances in mobilizing for EW/ER in recent times.

Figures 5 and 6 below present additional information on the lists of actors, including CSOs, NGOs, INGOs, CBOs, community leaders and groups that are involved in peacebuilding work in Adamawa and Borno states, as reported by the CSOs who were interviewed across the states. The stakeholders may be relevant in one way and another to the EW/ER system, depending on the areas they operate across the states.

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

## **4.5 Key Performance Indicators**

***Current percent of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information.***

Figure 7 shows that current percent of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information is 79.2% and 87.5% at baseline. In Borno, it is currently 70.6% and 87.5% at baseline. In Adamawa, it is currently 100% and 71.4% at baseline. Overall, the current percent of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information indicates less number of stakeholders interviewed are currently responding to conflicts based on early warning information. This need investigated further to understand if this is truly so and the reason for it.

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

Figure 8 shows that current percent of the staff of government agencies reporting responses to conflicts facilitated by early warning information is 88% and 90% at baseline. In Adamawa, all the respondents of the staff of government agencies are reporting responses to conflicts facilitated by early warning information. In Borno, the current percent of the staff of government agencies reporting responses to conflicts facilitated by early warning information is 75% and 83% at baseline. This result suggests more staff of government agencies reporting responses facilitated by early warning information at baseline.

Figure 9 shows that almost the same percent (Baseline = 85%; Current = 86%) of CSO respondents are reporting responses to conflicts facilitated by early warning information. In Adamawa, all (100%.) the CSO respondents are reporting responses facilitated by early warning information, both at baseline and currently. In Borno, it is 80% at baseline and 82% currently. This result indicates a marginal 1.1% increase in the current percent of CSO stakeholders reporting responses to conflicts facilitated by early warning information.

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

***Current percent of stakeholders reporting coordination between communities, local government officials and security actors to analyze and respond to early warning information.***

Figure 10 shows that substantial proportions (Baseline = 91%; Current = 91%) of respondents reporting coordination between communities, local government officials and security actors to analyze early warning information. In Adamawa, it is 100% both at baseline and currently. In Borno, it is 89% both at baseline and currently. Current percent of stakeholders reporting coordination between communities, local government officials and security actors to analyze early warning information is similar in both States, at baseline and currently.

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

In response to early warning information, figure 11 indicates 91% of respondents (both at baseline and currently) reporting coordination with communities, local government officials and security actors to respond to early warning information. The result also indicates 100% of the respondents in Adamawa and 88% in Borno. The results show that current percent of stakeholders reporting coordination between communities, local government officials and security actors to respond to early warning information is the same at baseline and currently.

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

***Current percent of*** ***participating staff of government agencies with a peace building mandate who are able to analyze and respond to conflict.***

Figure 12 shows that at baseline and currently all respondents of participating staff of government agencies report that they respond to EW information, across the States. More than half (Baseline = 58%; Current = 57%) of the participating staff of government agencies reported that they are analyzing EW information. In Adamawa, all the respondents reported that they are analyzing EW information. In Borno, current 40% of the respondents reported that they are analyzing EW information compared to 46% at baseline. Overall, the results indicate that a substantial proportion of respondents of the participating government agencies are able to analyze and respond to conflict.

*Source: Chart created for evaluation primary data, May 2017*

## **4.6 Progress of Project Implementation**

***Reinforcing and expanding a community-based EW/ER system.***

Under this objective, the project pursues two key results: (a) increase in the capacity of communities to identify and analyze early warning signs of violence; and (b) increase in the collaboration between communities, local government officials and security actors to respond to early warning signs of violence. The activities leading to the achievement of these results include community observer training; creation of an integrated EW/ER system; feedback follow-up meetings; Community Security Architecture Dialogues; and production of a monthly early warning analysis bulletin.

The project implementation builds on the interventions carried out during the previous phases of the project. CRN and CSAD monthly meetings continued despite initial delays in Mafa LGA in Borno State. These forums continue to provide opportunities to forge stronger ties amongst forum members to increase the effectiveness of security risk reporting, monitoring, analysis, and response. Feedback and follow-up quarterly meetings have also continued, helping to refine community response networks activities and to support the development of adaptive strategies for engaging the rapidly evolving and dynamic security situations in the target states. Issues raised and discussed during meetings center around security threats and determinants as well as the upsurge of a social misdemeanor (sex work, drug abuse, and gangsterism). Action plans are being made and implemented by those assigned the task, including communities and participating organizations. However, the evaluation did not find clear evidence to show the production of a Monthly EW/ER bulletins.

There are weaknesses in the analysis and synthesis of evidence to guide programming and influence policy through the different levels of the EW/ER systems. A review of the CRNs, CSADs and PAD reports suggests that they have been mostly discussion forums, without analysis of security threats or exploration of threat determinants and dimensions. Interviews revealed that program officers lack the requisite knowledge and skills for the field application or mentoring of communities in participatory techniques. With the dearth in capacity, data on the trends of impending conflicts have not been synthesized systematically to generate evidence to strengthen the EW/ER programming or advocacy and policy influencing.

***Strengthening engagement between state and local actors to secure communities.***

The results intended to achieve this objective are (a) state government institutions with a peacebuilding or security mandate have an enhanced ability to respond to violence and threats to human rights; (b) civil society, communities, government, and security have an enhanced mutual understanding of situations that make communities vulnerable to violence and human rights violations. The activities to lead to these objectives including – conflict sensitivity and human rights awareness training, trauma awareness, resilience, and transformative dialogue training with CSAs, human rights and conflict resolution training and refresher training with CSAs, Common Ground advocacy training with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), and Peace Architecture Dialogue.

During this evaluation, Conflict Sensitivity training has been conducted. The training benefitted major media organizations, CSO and security partners in the EW/ER system. The other training planned, such as the advocacy and conflict resolution refresher training was yet to be conducted one year after the main training was also conducted. SFCG organized a Regional Youth Summit on Countering Violent Extremism in Maiduguri, during the first quarter of project. The summit, in part, responds to the objective, to strengthen youth networks and engagement, to reverse the trend of youths that are used to perpetuate conflict and insecurity, to one of the collaborators and partners in peacebuilding and conflict prevention.

Peace Architectural Dialogue Forums have been inaugurated in both States and monthly meetings have resumed. At the time of the evaluation, both Adamawa and Borno State have convened at least five PAD meetings each bringing together multi-sectoral collaborators and interest groups to dialogue and make collective decisions on conflict prevention and response. Several action plans have emerged from PAD meetings, around key issues of security and peacebuilding discussed during meetings. In Borno, it was reported that PAD action plans have led to the resolution of potential tensions and conflict between Tricycle riders and the security agencies. Issues around reduction in drug abuse have also featured prominently in the agenda of meetings. In Adamawa State, the action plan to reduce drug abuse made the Jamilu community to undertake self-initiatives to educate young people about harmful practices of drug and abuse and the decision to locate a community-based literacy program in one of the hotspots of drug users in the community. These initiatives were said to have contributed to reducing the spate of drug use and abuse amongst youths in the community.

***Strengthening partners’ capacity to support and monitor EW systems.***

Two key results measure this objective, (a) Civil society actors have an enhanced capacity to support communities to implement early warning systems, and (b) Integrated and rigorous monitoring and evaluation systems are established to ensure the measurable impact of an EW/ER system in North-East Nigeria. To achieve this, the project intends to provide ongoing partner support, early warning and conflict analysis training, and development and implementation M&E plan. Plans have reached advanced stages to select local implementing partners to support and monitor community EW/ER systems, even though delayed. Training on EW/ER for selected partners is expected to be conducted following the successful engagement of these prospective local partners. The EW/ER support**s** and monitoring are provided by the EW/ER officer, **who is** responsible for coordinating this component in both Adamawa and Borno States. SFCG has reviewed and updated the monitoring framework for the EW/ER project, but a comprehensive and integrated monitoring framework for the EW/ER initiative, led by the multisectoral partners needs to be developed.

# 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

## **5.1** **Conclusions**

This evaluation provides answers to the key questions in the context of early warning and early response systems, traditional systems of dealing with early warning and early response, the involvement of communities in early warning and response systems and partners that are involved in early warning and response to the conflict in Adamawa and Borno states. The evaluation also assessed the project key performance indicators and the progress of implementation.

***Early warning and early response systems***

The evaluation found that although ongoing efforts are yielding results for early warning and early response to conflicts, they nonetheless remain fragmented across multiple partners, who are operating in isolation with varying scopes and coverage, and under limited collaboration or coordination. The integration and coordination amongst multiple actors in the early warning and early response are still weak. The examples of community EW/ER systems (SFCG and NSRP) found during the evaluation, among other forms of EW/ER practices, such as the Military early warning systems, were not aware of each other’s interventions, and sometimes in the same community. The systems do not know that they often deal with common community monitors and stakeholders. Information sharing and networking in the EW/ER program area is inadequate. This is due to insufficient coordination among the critical actors. This has contributed unnecessary duplication of efforts, which has implications for the scope, coverage, and effectiveness of the EW/ER system in the targeted states and indeed the entire North-East Nigeria.

The situation of the EW/ER system suggests several areas that SFCG could engage to build a strong and effective early warning system, to demonstrate its value in conflict prevention and peacebuilding in Nigeria. The diverse nature of the actors indicates that the team needs to focus and invest in understanding the landscape of actors, including the capacities, and mechanisms for building cohesion and cooperation among the actors, to be able to sustain the enthusiasm for EW/ER system.

***Traditional systems of dealing with early warning and early response***

The evaluation found that traditional ways of dealing with EW/ER are deeply rooted in the traditional and religious leadership systems of the communities. This system revolves around community leaders, ward heads, district heads, religious leaders, elders, and youth leaders, who often receive reports about conflicts and initiate actions on them. Issues are collectively addressed, sometimes in a meeting of community members. Aside community and religious leaders, men and youths are mostly involved with the system of dealing with conflicts in the community. Community EW/ER systems have somewhat integration of traditional mechanisms, but many communities still grappling with understanding the mechanisms of EW/ER and are not positioning for ownership and sustainability as much as expected.

***Involvement of communities in early warning and response systems***

The evaluation found that traditional leaders and selected community volunteers are included in the existing EW/ER systems, at community and LGA levels. The community respondents were not conversant with the exact mechanisms of the EW/ER system. This suggests a weak engagement with the general community by EW/ER system at the community level, and a gap in the mechanism of selection, deployment and coordinating the roles and functions of the EW/ER system. The EW/ER systems have not been fully integrated into community systems, and many traditional systems are not well informed of the EW/ER mechanism. Although the enthusiasm for the EW/ER mechanisms at LGA and State levels, they require further support in capacity building, operational efficiency, and effectiveness as well as sustainability.

***The Partners***

The evaluation found out that considerable progress has been made in the establishment of multilevel collaborative platforms for grooming a community-driven EW/ER system in Adamawa and Borno, but there is apparently limited private sector participation. The private sector is either not engaged in the existing EW/ER mechanism or insufficiently so. The situation is not different for private media (particularly social media), which despite several capacity building initiatives by SFCG, remains at the fringes of their full scope of the function in the EW/ER system. On the other hand, the education sector actors have also been seemingly left out of the system. Without a strategy for periodically landscaping critical actors and integrating emerging stakeholders through strategic partnership building into the existing EW/ER system, opportunities will be missed to ground a comprehensive, effective, multi-functional and sustainable EW/ER system in the region. Amongst the collaborators in the existing systems, there is also limited cohesion of mandates or strategy, affecting the effectiveness of the systems.

***Performance indicators***

The current percent of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information indicates less number of stakeholders interviewed are currently responding to conflicts based on early warning information. There is a large percent of stakeholders reporting coordination between communities, local government officials and security actors to analyze and respond to early warning information. Nearly all the respondents reported this both at baseline and currently in the project. The evaluation also found that all participating staff of government agencies with a peacebuilding mandate, who were interviewed, can respond to conflict, and except in Borno, all the respondents can analyze conflict. This finding in Borno may not be unconnected to the lack of analytical skills, which was also found by this evaluation.

***Progress of implementation.***

The evaluation found that not much has been done in the project implementation, which has experienced delays in implementing the activities. The actors in the EW system did not demonstrate adequate skills for analyzing early warning information and to explore the trends in the EW system. Such critical analysis could help the actors to understand the dimensions of the risks faced by communities. The skills and experiences in the use of participatory techniques and tools, to unpack issues and develop concrete response plans that are actionable, are desirable. The feedback loop in the EW/ER systems weak and has created a gap between the levels of the EW system. Issues discussed on one end are not cascaded and fed into discussions going on at another level. Where it is done, feedback is seldom provided, down the levels. There is limited collaboration, joint analysis, and synthesis of trends in conflict, which require collaborative responses on multiple levels. The EW/ER officer in SFCG seems may be overburdened with the feedback-looping responsibility. Considering the workload of managing EW/ER activities, it could be difficult for one EW/ER officer to coordinate the feedback mechanism.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

Based on findings and observations above the evaluation suggests ways the project might benefit and SFCG learn from this baseline evaluation. Overall, it is important to evolve a more evidence-informed and sustainable EW/ER programming model that will proactively facilitate the pathways towards establishing a comprehensive and multisectoral EW/ER system in North-East Nigeria.

1. ***Strengthen integration and coordination of actors in the EW/ER systems.*** SFCG could undertake a mapping of existing EW/ER practices and mechanisms in Nigeria, with particular emphasis on the North-East, to build synergies of existing practices and avoid duplication of efforts and to ensure effective application of resources. There is no strategic advantage in building new EW/ER systems where they already exist, rather by applying its resources to strengthening and building upon existing models. It could contribute to grounding EW/ER in the programming landscape of the humanitarian community. It is obvious that there are multiple practices on-ground, albeit to varying scopes and needs. The most practical need as it seems is to support greater integration, better coordination, and learning between systems beyond the individual actors themselves. For example, the fact an army General or Commanding Officer participates in the PAD/CSAD or CRN forums does not necessarily translate to increased access to warning communications and threat analysis from the security agencies. A whole system integration approach could ensure that mechanisms are sharing and learning about risks and threats together and making a collaborative response decision.
2. Improve on engagement with communities to deepen their understanding and integration of the mechanisms of the community EW/ER systems, ownership and sustainability as much as expected for the community ER/ER system.
3. ***Strengthen analytical capacity and evidence-informed programming in the EW/ER system.*** As was said, the EW/ER system, particularly at the community level, is not engaging sufficiently in risk and trends analysis, as well as the analysis of drivers and determinants of conflicts. There is a gap in the skills, tools, and techniques for participatory analysis needed to support community-level analysis to build stronger community-level engagement, learning and practice through participatory approaches. EW/ER officers also need to be trained in participatory techniques for facilitating community risk, threat analysis, and action planning. Additionally, the capacity of EW/ER actors needs to be built in generating evidence, response data, and analysis for dissemination and policy influencing. This could improve the EW/ER practice, as the actors could see the link between their activities and the broad strategy and policy changes occurring through the phases of the conflict and beyond.
4. ***Enhance feedback loops between levels of EW/ER systems.*** There is frustration at the community level about the weakness of the feedback loop in the EWER system. This frustration could lead to process fatigue because the communities increasingly feel isolated from the system. Issues emerging from the communities which require a broader response beyond the community capacity to resolve in collaboration with other collaborators at that level, need to be facilitated to escalate them upwards to the LGA and State levels. Equally is the importance of back-response and communication to the community level. Expectations can be very high for important concerns and SFCG needs to strengthen the feedback loop and follow through processes.
5. ***Integrate all critical institutions and sectors in the EW/ER systems.*** Critical stakeholders in the education sector need to be better integrated into the EW/ER system as functional partners, because of their centrality to the issues of conflict in the first place. The same applies to the media, which seems more positioned to receiving than contributing to the EW/ER mechanism.
6. ***Promote private sector participation.*** Related to strengthening coordination and integration is the need to expand participation in the EW/ER system to include emerging actors such as the private sector. The role of the private sector in the humanitarian response is increasingly visible as the conflict situation evolves through resettlement and disaster risk reduction phases. As mentioned earlier in the report, the private sector can provide the resources for sustaining and expanding the reach and scope of the EW/ER mechanism if strategically engaged. A private sector engagement strategy and constituency building framework may need to be integrated into the SFCG’s current coalition-building strategy.
7. Include a follow-up qualitative research in subsequent evaluation design to understand the reasons for changes that may occur in the percent of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information.
8. Giving that exploring conflict threats and trends enables actors to understand the dimensions of the risks faced by communities, it is important that actors gain skills and experiences in the use of participatory techniques including risk mapping, risk ranking, gender mapping, transect walks, seasonal calendars and power walk, to unpack issues and develop concrete response plans that are actionable. Participatory analysis process builds ownership of the response because communities learn by doing and adopt new learning into existing traditional mechanisms as the process evolves. Participatory techniques are also critical for ensuring that the voices and opinions of vulnerable groups contribute meaningfully to security and peacebuilding dialogues at the community level.
9. Develop comprehensive and integrated monitoring framework for the EW/ER initiative, with multisectoral partners.

# ANNEX 1: SUMMARY TABLE OF KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

**Table 3: Key Performance Indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicators Type** | **Baseline August 2016** | **2017 Target** | **2017 Results** | **2018 Target** |
| **F Indicators** |  |  |  |  |
| 1.6.3-6: Number of peace-building organizations receiving conflict analysis or conflict early warning reports from USG-supported early warning systems | 0 |  |  |  |
| 1.6.3-7: Number of conflict/fragility early warning systems, conflict assessments, or response mechanisms supported by USG assistance. | 1 |  |  |  |
| 2.3.1-7: # of stakeholder forums (multi-party, civil/security sector, and or civil/political) held. | 0 |  |  |  |
| **Other Indicators** |  |  |  |  |
| Current % of stakeholders reporting responses facilitated by early warning information. | 87.5% |  | 79.2% |  |
| Current % of stakeholders reporting coordination between communities, local government officials and security actors to analyze and respond to early warning information. | 91% |  | 91% |  |
| Current % of participating staff of government agencies with a peace building mandate who are able to analyze and respond to conflict. |  |  |  |  |
| *Analyze* | 58.8% |  | 57.1% |  |
| *Respond* | 100% |  | 100% |  |

# ANNEX 2: SAMPLE SIZE DETERMINATION AND INSTRUMENTS

**Sample Size Determination and Allocation**

The sample size estimate for the survey was 384, which was determined using a sample size table, which is based on a sample size formula[[4]](#footnote-4), with 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error. Knowing that the indicative targeted total population size was 194,500 across Adamawa and Borno States, the sample size estimate was considered adequate. But with a 10% provision for no response and inadequate responses, the total sample size estimate was increased to 422. The sample size allocations were then based on 70% of the total sample size to community members and 30% to other respondents in the surveys (10% each to the security actors, CSOs and staff of participating government agencies). Table 5 presents the sample size allocations to the respondents by male and female gender. For even allocations, the final targeted sample size was 420, with equal number allocated across the communities.

**Sample size allocation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Locations** | **Community Members** | | | **Security Actors** | | | **CSOs** | | | **Government Agency** | | | | | **Total** |
| Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | | Female | | Total |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Adamawa** | **60** | **60** | **120** | **8** | **8** | **16** | **8** | **8** | **16** | **8** | **8** | | **16** | | **168** |
| **Yola North LGA** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jambutu | 15 | 15 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | | 42 |
| Damilu | 15 | 15 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | | 42 |
|  | 30 | 30 | 60 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | | 8 | | 84 |
| **Girei LGA** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BBC | 15 | 15 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | | 42 |
| Angwan Lambu | 15 | 15 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | | 42 |
|  | 30 | 30 | 60 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | | 8 | | 84 |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Borno** | **90** | **90** | **180** | **12** | **12** | **24** | **12** | **12** | **24** | **12** | **12** | | **24** | | **252** |
| **Maiduguri Municipal Council LGA** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maisandari | 15 | 15 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | | 42 |
| Shehuri North | 15 | 15 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | | 42 |
| Gwange III | 15 | 15 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | | 42 |
|  | 45 | 45 | 90 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 6 | | 12 | | 86 |
| **Jere LGA** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mairi | 15 | 15 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | | 42 |
| Old Maiduguri | 15 | 15 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | | 42 |
|  | 30 | 30 | 60 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | | 8 | | 84 |
| **Mafa** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Zannari | 15 | 15 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 4 | | 42 |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Grand Total** | **150** | **150** | **300** | **20** | **20** | **40** | **20** | **20** | **40** | **20** | **20** | | **40** | | **420** |
| *Source: Sample size allocation for the evaluation, April 2017. Note: This sample allocation table was used for the two projects evaluated. The same sample and sampling procedures were used to evaluate both projects. The sample size analyzed for this report is less than the total sample size estimates in the table above.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Evaluation Instruments**

**Desk Review Guide**

1. Design and implementation of the projects:

* What are the focus, objectives, and geographical coverage of the projects?
* What are the project strategies, approaches and methodologies?
* What are the progress, achievements, and results of the projects implementation?

2. Communication and decision makers:

* What are the traditional and formal channels of communication about security and human rights abuses?
* Who are the decision-makers?
* Which government agencies exist with a peace building or security mandate that is present in communities?
* How effectively do these peace building or security agencies work with communities?
* To what extent has SFCG´s formal and informal communication been effective in enhancing security and solutions to human rights abuses?

3. Traditional systems:

* Are there traditional ways of dealing with human rights abuses as well as EW/ER?
* Which ones?
* How do these mechanisms work?
* Are there any trends with regards to involvement and gender?
* How does SFCG´s work on human rights abuses and EW/ER support or hinder these traditional systems?

4. Relevant literatures:

* What are the existing facts about human rights abuses and EW/ER mechanisms in the North-East Nigeria?
* What are the existing initiatives and opportunities to addressing the challenges of human rights abuses and EW/ER in the North-East Nigeria?

*Types of documents*

* Terms of Reference (TOR)
* Pilot quarterly project reports
* Projects activities reports
* Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEAL) frameworks,
* Project concept narrative proposals
* Papers on peace and conflict analysis in Northern Nigeria.
* Other

**Qualitative Interview Guides**

**Introduction**

Hello, Good Morning/Afternoon/Evening. My name is ……. I am an independent Research Assistant. I am currently carrying out data collection to evaluate two projects: “*Expanding Initiatives to Reduce Human Rights Abuse in Northern Nigeria*” and “*Early Warning/Early Response Mechanisms in Northern Nigeria*”**.** These projects are implemented in Adamawa and Borno States by Search for Common Ground (SFCG), an international non-profit organization that promotes peaceful resolution of conflict. SFCG has hired a consultant to evaluate the projects and I am working with the consultant to carry out the survey data collection. And we have selected you to take part in the survey data collection process.

The purpose of the survey is to collect, analyze, and present information related to the projects that currently is not known, or only partly known to SFCG. It shall provide information of the situation in Borno and Adamawa States. Additionally, as the projects are already being implemented, it will also include information on the progress so far made in the implementation of the project activities. I would like to ask you some questions to get your views about human rights issues, early warning and response system and the relationships with the security actors, among the general population and other stakeholders, to understand the type of security actors operating at the community, systems for dealing human rights issues, early warning and early response, channels of communication and decision making, involvement of the community and the media. Some questions would also be asked to get your basic socio-demographic information and your views on the situations in the community.

**Confidentiality and Informed Consent**

This survey is confidential and anonymous. Information collected from you will be combined with information collected from others, and at no point would you be required to disclose your name. Findings will be used to help SFCG and its partners to implement the projects better. You are not under any compulsion to participate in this study and there will be no direct or indirect consequences if you decide not to participate. You should not hesitate to say you do not understand a question, or if you don't want to answer, just let me know and I will go on to the next question or you can stop the interview at any time. I will however be very grateful if you decide to willingly participate. It will take about 30 minutes to complete the interview. Would you be willing to interview? Yes [\_\_\_]No [\_\_\_]

Thank you.

Did the respondent consent to participate? 1. Yes [\_\_\_]Continue 2. No [\_\_\_] End (Move to another group)

**Key Informant Interview Guide for SFCG**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** |
|  | **Demographics** |  |
| a. | State | Adamawa – 1 Borno – 2 |
| b. | Name of organization |  |
| c. | Designation of respondent |  |
| d. | Employment status | Full-time – 1 Part-time – 2 Volunteer – 3 |
| e. | Sex of respondent | Male – 1 Female– 2 |
| f | Date and time of interview |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **No** | **QUESTION AND PROBES** |
| **General Questions** | |
|  | **Partners** |
| 1. | Who are the current partners that SFCG works with in rights and advocacy and security and peace building?   * *In addition to current partners, who are there other actors and partners that SFCG could be working with, and is not?* * *Who are the most relevant partners for the current projects by SFCG?* |
| 2. | What are the existing avenues for collaboration in place for human rights actors or stakeholders working in human rights and accountability in Adamawa and Borno State?   * *Describe any existing network or coalition* * *Who are the members of the network or coalition?* * *How do the network or coalition function?* * *If there is none should one be created and who should be the members?* |
|  | **Security Actors in Conflicts Communities** |
| 3. | Which security actors that SFCG currently engage with in the communities in Adamawa and Borno state?   * *Current formal security actors in the communities* * *Current informal security actors in the communities* |
| 4. | Where are the security actors present in the communities?   * *Current formal security actors in the communities* * *Current informal security actors in the communities* |
| **“Expanding Initiatives to Reduce Human Rights Abuse by Security Forces”** | |
|  | **Human Rights Abuses and Communication** |
| 5. | To what extent has SFCG’s **“Expanding Initiatives to Reduce Human Rights Abuse by Security Forces”** addressed human rights abuses or violations in the communities in Adamawa and Borno state?   * *List the forms of human rights abuses or violations addressed* * *Which communities have human rights abuses or violations been addressed in Adamawa and Borno state?* * *To what extent has SFCG’s formal and informal and informal communications been effective in enhancing security and solutions to human rights abuses or violations?* * *How does SFCG´s work on human rights abuses support or hinder the traditional systems of dealing with human rights abuses?* |
|  | **Media Coverage** |
| 6. | What is the reach of SFCG´s media programs and profiles of the audience?   * *Can the listeners/ viewers relate to and absorb the messages?* * *Have SFCG’s media programs contributed to any change in attitudes and perceptions of citizens and security personnel regarding human rights violations?* * *What are the strengths and weaknesses in the current programs?* |
|  | **Relationships and Collaborations on Human Rights** |
| 7 | Describe the relationship between the NHRC with relevant CSOs working in rights and advocacy, the Judiciary and Security in Adamawa and states.   * *Explain if NHRC receive reports of cases of human rights violations from CSOs working in human rights and advocacy from Adamawa and Borno state?* * *How many reports on an average per month?* * *What actions has the NHRC taken to address the cases of human rights violations reported by CSOs?* * *Explain if there are follow up meetings after report are filled with the CSOs* * *Explain if NHRC meet with CSOs working in rights and advocacy in Adamawa and Borno state?* |
|  | **Channels of Communications** |
| 8. | What programs has SFCG put in place in the communities to create awareness of human rights/judicial process and accountability in Adamawa and Borno state?   * *Who conducts the programs?* * *What are the traditional channels of communication about security and human rights abuses support by SFCG?* * *What are the formal channels of communication about security and human rights abuses use by SFCG?* * *What kind of programs should be done in the communities to promote human rights awareness and judicial processes, and by who?* |
|  | **HR Abuse Indicators** |
| 9. | What is the current performance level of the project?   * *What is the Current percent of radio listeners who understand judicial accountability processes?* * *What is the current number of inter-CSO meetings in existence in each state?* * *What is the frequency of inter-CSO meetings in existence in each state?* * *What is the current level of inter-CSO meetings and collaborations?* * *What is the current level of relationship between NHRC, CSOs and Judiciary?* * *What is the current level of relationship between relevant CSOs and other rights and advocacy CSOs?* * *What is the current level of allegations of human rights abuses pursued by the NHRC in target states?* |
| **“Early Warning/Early Response Mechanisms in Northern Nigeria”** | |
|  | **EW/ER systems** |
| 9. | Which current EW/ER systems are supported by SFCG in the communities in the states?   * *Since when have they been in place?* * *Which geographic areas do they cover?* * *To what extent are they functional?* * *Who are the actors involved?* * *What types of cases do they report?* * *What are their strengths and weaknesses?* * *How has SFCG been able to leverage on the current EW/ER systems and collaborate with actors involved?* |
|  | **EW/ER and Communities** |
| 10 | What is the communities’ relation and involvement in current EW/ER systems?   * *What type and level of interaction of communities with EW/ER?* * *What is the gender trend with regards to community involvement in EW/ER?* * *What gaps currently exist that could hinder community involvement in EW/ER?* * *How does SFCG´s work on EW/ER systems support or hinder the traditional systems of EW/ER systems?* * *Which of SFCG current strategies is most effective in supporting community involvement in EW/ER?* |

**END: Thank you for your time.**

*Conclusion: Do you have any question for me on the above topic?*

**Key Informant Interview Guide for NHRC**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** |
|  | **Demographics** |  |
| a. | State | Adamawa – 1 Borno – 2 |
| b. | Name of organization |  |
| c. | Designation of respondent |  |
| d. | Employment status | Full-time – 1 Part-time – 2 Volunteer – 3 |
| e. | Sex of respondent | Male – 1 Female– 2 |
| f | Date and time of interview |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **No** | **QUESTION AND PROBES** |
|  | **Security Situation** |
| 1 | Which LGAs or communities would you say are more prone to conflict or violence in the state? Why is this so?   * *Who are the perpetrators of the conflict or violence?* * *Who is/was responsible for stopping the violence or conflict and how?* |
| 2 | Which security actors are currently involved in peace building in the communities prone to conflicts or violence in the state?   * *Who are the formal security actors and informal security actors* |
|  | **Human Rights Abuses** |
| 3 | Tell us about the cases of human rights violations by security agencies in the state.   * *Which cases of human rights violations are most committed by security agencies?* * *Which security agency is most responsible for human rights violations in the state?* |
| 4 | How are the cases of human rights violations addressed?   * *Who addresses the cases of human rights violations?* * *Would you consider the measures of addressing human rights violations effective or ineffective and why?* * *What can or should be done differently by the actors addressing human rights violations?* * *What skills do you think will be required by the actors addressing human rights violations to make them effective in monitoring, documenting and reporting of human rights violations?* |
|  | **Relationship and Collaboration on Human Rights** |
| 5. | What is the current level of relationship and collaboration between the NHRC with relevant CSOs working in rights and advocacy, the Judiciary and security in the states? |
| 6. | Tell us about network or coalition or avenues for collaboration between stakeholders working in human rights and accountability in the state.   * *If there is one, who are the members of the network or coalition?* * *How do the network or coalition function?* * *If there is none should one be created and who should be the members?* |
| 7 | Does the NHRC receive reports of cases of human rights violations from CSOs working in the area of rights and advocacy in the state?   * *If so, how many reports of human rights violation on an average per month?* * *What actions has the NHRC taken to address the cases of human rights violations reported by CSOs in the state?* * *Explain if there are follow up meetings after report are made by relevant CSOs in the state* * *Does NHRC meet with relevant CSOs working in rights and advocacy in the state?* |
| 8. | Tell us about the programs put in place in the communities to create awareness of human rights/judicial process and accountability in the state.   * *Who conducts the programs?* * *What kind of programs should be put in place in the communities in the state to promote human rights awareness and judicial processes? By who?* |

**END: Thank you for your time.**

Conclusion: Do you have any question for me on the above topic?

**Key Informant Interview Guide for Judiciary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** |
|  | **Demographics** |  |
| a. | State | Adamawa – 1 Borno – 2 |
| b. | Name of organization |  |
| c. | Designation of respondent |  |
| d. | Employment status | Full-time – 1 Part-time – 2 Volunteer – 3 |
| e. | Sex of respondent | Male – 1 Female– 2 |
| f | Date and Time of interview |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **No** | **QUESTION AND PROBES** |
|  | **Security Situation** |
| 1 | Which LGAs or communities would you say are more prone to conflict or violence in the state? Why is this so?   * *Who are the perpetrators of the conflict or violence?* * *Who is/was responsible for stopping the violence or conflict and how?* |
| 2 | Which security actors are currently involved in peace building in the communities prone to conflicts or violence in the state?   * *Formal security actors* * *Informal security actors* |
|  | **Human Rights Abuses** |
| 3 | Tell us about the cases of human rights violations by security agencies in the state.   * *Which cases of human rights violations are most committed by security agencies?* * *Which security agency is most responsible for human rights violations in the state?* |
| 4 | How are the cases of human rights violations addressed?   * *Who addresses the cases of human rights violations?* * *Would you consider the measures of addressing human rights violations effective or ineffective and why?* * *What can or should be done differently by the actors addressing human rights violations?* * *What skills do you think will be required by the actors addressing human rights violations to make them effective in monitoring, documenting and reporting of human rights violations?* |
|  | **Relationship and Collaboration on Human Rights** |
| 5. | What is the current level of relationship and collaboration between the Judiciary with relevant CSOs working in rights and advocacy, the NHRC and security in the states? |
| 6. | Tell us about the network or coalition or avenues for collaboration between stakeholders working in human rights and accountability in the state.   * *Who are the members of the network or coalition?* * *How do the network or coalition function?* * *If there is none, should one be created? Who should be the members?* |
| 7. | Tell us about the programs you know are in place in the communities to create awareness of human rights/judicial process and accountability in the state.   * *Who conducts the programs?* * *What kind of programs should be put in place in the communities in the state to promote human rights awareness and judicial processes? By who?* |

**END: Thank you for your time.**

Conclusion: Do you have any question for me on the above topic?

**Key Informant Interview Guide for Media**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** |
|  | **Demographics** |  |
| a. | State | Adamawa – 1 Borno – 2 |
| b. | Name of organization |  |
| c. | Designation of respondent |  |
| d. | Employment status | Full-time – 1 Part-time – 2 Volunteer – 3 |
| e. | Sex of respondent | Male – 1 Female– 2 |
| f | Date and time of interview |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **No** | **QUESTION AND PROBES** |
|  | **Human Rights Abuses** |
| 1 | Tell us about the media program that promote human rights awareness in the state.   * *What is the content and focus of the media program?* * *Which stations airs the media program in the state?* * *What time is the program aired in the state?* * *Who are the producers of the media program?* |
| 2 | Tell us about the cases of human rights violations reported in the media.   * *Which cases of human rights violations are most common in the state?* * *Who are most affected in the community by human rights violations in the state?* * *Which cases of human rights violations are most committed by security agencies?* * *Which security agency is most responsible for human rights violations in the state?* |
| 3 | What are the measures in place to address cases of human rights violations in the state and by whom?   * *Tell us about a network or coalition or avenues for collaboration by human rights actors or stakeholders working in human rights and accountability in the state?* * *Who are the members of the network or coalition?* * *How do the network or coalition function?* * *If there is none should one be created? Who should be the members?* |
|  | **Early Warning/Early Response** |
| 4. | Tell us about media role in early warning and response system for conflict and violence in the state.   * *How has the media been able to identify early warning signs that can cause violence?* * *How has the media been able to analyze and respond to early warning signs that can cause violence?* * *How can the media better identify, analyze and respond to early warning signs that can cause violence?* |
| 5. | Tell us about the collaboration with media and other stakeholders to address early warnings signs that can cause violence in the state.   * *How does the collaboration functions in identifying, analyzing, and responding to EWS that can cause violence?* * *How many networks exist in the communities or state that you are aware of?* * *If there is no network, how can one be created in the state* * *Who should be part of the network?* |
| 6. | What programs (if any) on radio help dispel rumors which can lead to violence in the state?   * *Describe the target and reach SFCG’s media program in the state* * *Explain the relevance and appropriateness of messages in terms of awareness creation?* * *Contribution to change in attitudes and perceptions of citizens and security personnel regarding human rights violations and security?* * *What are the strengths and weaknesses of the media programs?* |

**END: Thank you for your time.**

Conclusion: Do you have any question for me on the above topic?

**In-Depth Interview Guide for Leaders in the Community**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** |
|  | **Demographics** |  |
| a. | State | Adamawa – 1 Borno – 2 |
| b. | Name of LGA | Yola North – 1 Girei – 2 MMC – 3 Jere – 4 Mafa – 5 |
| c. | Name of community |  |
| d. | Position of respondent in the community |  |
| e. | Sex of respondent | Male – 1 Female– 2 |
| f. | Age of respondent |  |
| g | Date and time of interview |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A. Security and Human Rights Context** | |
| 1. How would you describe the Security Situation in your community in general? | |
| 1. How have the security situation specifically affected your community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What do you consider the major factors/causes or drivers of the present state of security? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. How have the Security situation changed in the last 12 months? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What do you think have been the factors responsible for the change in the security situation? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What can you say about the role of SFCG in changing the security situation? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Have the SFCG program been effective? How? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Which of the interventions implemented by SFCG do you consider the most beneficial to changing the security situation in your community? (Give reasons). | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 2. How would you describe the Human Rights situation in your community? | |
| 1. Which are the main Human Rights problems you have observed in your community, in the last 12 months? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What do you think are the main factors/causes or drivers of the Human Rights problems in your community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. How have things changed regarding the Human Rights problems in the last 12 months? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What have been the major factors that contributed to the change in the Human Rights situation in your communities? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What can you say about the role of SFCG in changing the Human Rights situation in your community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Have the SFCG program been effective? How? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Which of the interventions implemented by SFCG do you consider the most beneficial to changing the Human Rights situation in your community? (Give reasons). | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **B. Human Right Context and Security Agencies** | |
| 1. What would you like to say about the role of Security Agencies in the Human Rights situation in your community? (Different types of Security Agencies currently operating in the Community) | |
| 1. How have the security agencies contributed to and/or reduced the Human Rights problems in your community? (Roles of each of the security agencies mentioned) | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What are the specific Human Rights related problems your community have encountered with Security Agencies in the last 12 months? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Which segment of the population in your community have been affected the most by the Human Rights issues associated with Security Agencies? why is this so? (How are women and girls specifically affected?) | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Describe the mechanisms by which Human Rights problems related to the Security Agencies are addressed in your community? (Who are the people involved in the community mechanism and what are their specific roles?) | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. How effective are these mechanisms? And what challenges exist? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What can you say about SFCG’s program contribution to addressing the Human Rights problems related with Security Agencies in your community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Have the SFCG program been effective? How? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Which of the interventions implemented by SFCG do you consider the most beneficial to changing the Human Rights problems specifically related to Security Agencies in your community? (Give reasons). | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What are your suggestions for improving SFCG’s programming in the area of Human Rights promotion and protection in your community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **C. Early Warning and Early Response Mechanisms (Community)** | |
| 1. How would you describe the Conflict Situation in your community in the last 12 months? (Boko Haram/Inter-communal Crises and other crises with herdsmen or tribal) | |
| 1. How have conflicts specifically affected your community? (Different types and timelines of conflicts-external/internal) | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What do you consider the major factors/causes or drivers of conflict in your community? (Drivers of external and internal conflicts for each type of conflict mentioned) | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Who are the most affected by conflicts in your community? and Why? [Different impact on men/women/girls/children and youths (males)] | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What are the mechanisms for Conflict containment and resolutions in your community? (Who is involved and the processes for conflict risk detection/reporting/monitoring/ resolution/response communication and monitoring) | Answers: |
| Risk detection/Awareness |
| Risk reporting/Communication channels |
| Risk Monitoring/Analysis |
| Risk response/resolution communication |
| Risk response planning/implementation and monitoring |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What are the other stakeholders outside your community that this mechanism collaborates with? [Explore the characteristics and roles of these external linkages] | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. How effective is this community conflict containment and resolution system? [Give concrete examples and the weaknesses or challenges). | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What can you say about SFCG interventions on Conflict resolution and Peace promotion in your community? (Awareness of project interventions, community participation and perspectives on effectiveness) | Answers: |
| 1. In what ways is SFCG project intervention in your community linked to and supportive of the existing community-based conflict resolution and peace building systems? | Interesting quote: |
| 1. What have been the major changes/benefits to the community in terms of the Conflict situation since the SFCG program started? | Frequency of conflicts |
| Prompt detection of conflict/security risks |
| Prompt reporting |
| Improved Monitoring |
| Prompt response feedback |
| Prompt Response Action |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What SFCG interventions do you think contributed the most to this change? and What did not benefit the community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What are your suggestions for improving SFCG conflict resolution and peace building programming in your community? (Give reasons). | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |

**END: Thank you for your time.**

Conclusion: Do you have any question for me on the above topic?

**Focus Group Discussion Guide for Community Members and Groups**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** |
|  | **Demographics** |  |
| a. | State | Adamawa – 1 Borno – 2 |
| b. | Name of LGA | Yola North – 1 Girei – 2 MMC – 3 Jere – 4 Mafa – 5 |
| c. | Name of community |  |
| d. | Name of Group/Members |  |
| e. | Sex of participants | Male – 1 Female– 2 |
| f. | Total number of participants |  |
| g | Age range |  |
| h | Date and time of discussion |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A. Security and Human Rights Context** | |
| 1. How would you describe the Security Situation in your community in general? | |
| 1. How have the security situation specifically affected your community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What do you consider the major factors/causes or drivers of the present state of security? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. How have the Security situation changed in the last 12 months? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What do you think have been the factors responsible for the change in the security situation? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What can you say about the role of SFCG in changing the security situation? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Have the SFCG program been effective? How? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Which of the interventions implemented by SFCG do you consider the most beneficial to changing the security situation in your community? (Give reasons). | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 2. How would you describe the Human Rights situation in your community? | |
| 1. Which are the main Human Rights problems you have observed in your community, in the last 12 months? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What do you think are the main factors/causes or drivers of the Human Rights problems in your community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. How have things changed regarding the Human Rights problems in the last 12 months? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What have been the major factors that contributed to the change in the Human Rights situation in your communities? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What can you say about the role of SFCG in changing the Human Rights situation in your community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Have the SFCG program been effective? How? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Which of the interventions implemented by SFCG do you consider the most beneficial to changing the Human Rights situation in your community? (Give reasons). | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **B. Human Right Context and Security Agencies** | |
| 1. What would you like to say about the role of Security Agencies in the Human Rights situation in your community? (Different types of Security Agencies currently operating in the Community) | |
| 1. How have the security agencies contributed to and/or reduced the Human Rights problems in your community? (Roles of each of the security agencies mentioned) | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What are the specific Human Rights related problems your community have encountered with Security Agencies in the last 12 months? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Which segment of the population in your community have been affected the most by the Human Rights issues associated with Security Agencies? why is this so? (How are women and girls specifically affected?) | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Describe the mechanisms by which Human Rights problems related to the Security Agencies are addressed in your community? (Who are the people involved in the community mechanism and what are their specific roles?) | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. How effective are these mechanisms? And what challenges exist? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What can you say about SFCG’s program contribution to addressing the Human Rights problems related with Security Agencies in your community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Have the SFCG program been effective? How? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Which of the interventions implemented by SFCG do you consider the most beneficial to changing the Human Rights problems specifically related to Security Agencies in your community? (Give reasons). | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What are your suggestions for improving SFCG’s programming in the area of Human Rights promotion and protection in your community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **C. Early Warning and Early Response Mechanisms (Community)** | |
| 1. How would you describe the Conflict Situation in your community in the last 12 months? (Boko Haram/Inter-communal Crises and other crises with herdsmen or tribal) | |
| 1. How have conflicts specifically affected your community? (Different types and timelines of conflicts-external/internal) | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What do you consider the major factors/causes or drivers of conflict in your community? (Drivers of external and internal conflicts for each type of conflict mentioned) | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. Who are the most affected by conflicts in your community? and Why? [Different impact on men/women/girls/children and youths (males)] | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What are the mechanisms for Conflict containment and resolutions in your community? (Who is involved and the processes for conflict risk detection/reporting/monitoring/ resolution/response communication and monitoring) | Answers: |
| Risk detection/Awareness |
| Risk reporting/Communication channels |
| Risk Monitoring/Analysis |
| Risk response/resolution communication |
| Risk response planning/implementation and monitoring |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What are the other stakeholders outside your community that this mechanism collaborates with? [Explore the characteristics and roles of these external linkages] | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. How effective is this community conflict containment and resolution system? [Give concrete examples and the weaknesses or challenges). | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What can you say about SFCG interventions on Conflict resolution and Peace promotion in your community? (Awareness of project interventions, community participation and perspectives on effectiveness) | Answers: |
| 1. In what ways is SFCG project intervention in your community linked to and supportive of the existing community-based conflict resolution and peace building systems? | Interesting quote: |
| 1. What have been the major changes/benefits to the community in terms of the Conflict situation since the SFCG program started? | Frequency of conflicts |
| Prompt detection of conflict/security risks |
| Prompt reporting |
| Improved Monitoring |
| Prompt response feedback |
| Prompt Response Action |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What SFCG interventions do you think contributed the most to this change? and What did not benefit the community? | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |
| 1. What are your suggestions for improving SFCG conflict resolution and peace building programming in your community? (Give reasons). | Answers: |
| Interesting quote: |

**END: Thank you for your time.**

Conclusion: Do you have any question for me on the above topic?

**Questionnaire for Participating Staff of Government Agencies**

**Introduction**

Hello, Good Morning/Afternoon/Evening. My name is ……. I am an independent Research Assistant. I am currently carrying out data collection to evaluate two projects: “*Expanding Initiatives to Reduce Human Rights Abuse in Northern Nigeria*” and “*Early Warning/Early Response Mechanisms in Northern Nigeria*”**.** These projects are implemented in Adamawa and Borno States by Search for Common Ground (SFCG), an international non-profit organization that promotes peaceful resolution of conflict. SFCG has hired a consultant to evaluate the projects and I am working with the consultant to carry out the survey data collection. And we have selected you to take part in the survey data collection process.

The purpose of the survey is to collect, analyze, and present information related to the projects that currently is not known, or only partly known to SFCG. It shall provide information of the situation in Borno and Adamawa States. Additionally, as the projects are already being implemented, it will also include information on the progress so far made in the implementation of the project activities. I would like to ask you some questions to get your views about human rights issues, early warning and response system and the relationships with the security actors, among the general population and other stakeholders, to understand the type of security actors operating at the community, systems for dealing human rights issues, early warning and early response, channels of communication and decision making, involvement of the community and the media. Some questions would also be asked to get your basic socio-demographic information and your views on the situations in the community.

**Confidentiality and Informed Consent**

This survey is confidential and anonymous. Information collected from you will be combined with information collected from others, and at no point would you be required to disclose your name. Findings will be used to help SFCG and its partners to implement the projects better. You are not under any compulsion to participate in this study and there will be no direct or indirect consequences if you decide not to participate. You should not hesitate to say you do not understand a question, or if you don't want to answer, just let me know and I will go on to the next question or you can stop the interview at any time. I will however be very grateful if you decide to willingly participate. It will take about 30 minutes to complete the interview. Would you be willing to interview? Yes [\_\_\_]No [\_\_\_]

Thank you.

Did the respondent consent to participate? 1. Yes [\_\_\_]Continue 2. No [\_\_\_] End (Move to another group)

*Note: Please,* ***Interviewer:*** *Fill out 100–107 before the interview proper.* ***Supervisor:*** *Fill 108–110 after review of questionnaire.* ***Data entry staff:*** *Fill out 111 –113 after entry the answers into the database*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module 1: Survey Summary and Identification** | | | | | | |
| **No** | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** |  | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** | |
| 100 | Name of Interviewer |  | 107 | State | Adamawa – 1 Borno – 2 | |
| 101 | Date of interview | \_\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 108 | Name of supervisor | |  |
| 102 | Interview start time |  | 109 | Complete questionnaire | | Yes – 1 No – 2 |
| 103 | Interview end time |  | 110 | Date of review | | \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 104 | Sex of respondent | Male – 1 Female – 2 | 111 | Name of data entry staff | |  |
| 105 | Community/village name |  | 112 | Data entry date | | \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 106 | Local Government Area |  | 113 | Data entry number | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module 2: Demographics** | | | | |
| No | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** | | **Skip** |
| 200 | Language used |  | |  |
| 201 | Tribe/Ethnicity |  | |  |
| 202 | Religion  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Christianity | 1 |  |
| Islam | 2 |
| Traditional | 3 |
| None | 4 |
| Other (specify): |  |
| 203 | Marital status  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Married (monogamous) | 1 |  |
| Married (polygamous) | 2 |
| Informal union | 3 |
| Divorced | 4 |
| Separated | 5 |
| Widowed | 6 |
| Never married | 7 |
| 204 | Age as at your last birthday | *Record the number of years:* | |  |
| 205 | Highest educational level completed  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | No qualification | 1 |  |
| Arabic education | 2 |
| Islamiya/Qur’anic | 3 |
| Primary school certificate | 4 |
| SSCE/WAEC | 5 |
| OND/NCE | 6 |
| HND/BSc | 7 |
| Postgraduate certificate/degree | 8 |
| Other (specify): | |
| 206 | What is the name of the government agency you work for? |  | | Write the answer |
| 207 | What is the mandate of your agency?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Security | 1 |  |
| Peace building | 2 |
| Emergencies | 3 |
| Other (specify): |  |
| 208 | What is your main role in the agency? |  | | Write the answer |
| 209 | What is your employment status? | Full-time – 1 Part-time – 2 Volunteer – 3 | |  |
| 210 | How many years have you worked in this Government Agency?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Less than one year | 1 |  |
| 1 – 2 years | 2 |
| 2 years plus – 5 years | 3 |
| More than 5 years | 4 |

| **Module 3: Involvement with Early Warning and Early Response System** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | **Question Filter** | **Answers and Coding** | **Skip** |
| 300 | Do you get conflicts, violence, or security warning information in the communities? | Yes – 1 No – 2 | 2⇨End |
| 301 | Did you receive conflicts, violence, or security warning information in the communities… | |  |
| a | during the last 1-9 months? | Yes – 1 No – 2 | 2⇨End |
| b | before the last 9 months? | Yes – 1 No – 2 | 2⇨End |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 302 | If yes to 301, how many conflicts, violence, or security warning information did you received… | | a. in the last 1-9 months? | | | b. before the last 9 months? | | | *Please write the number of cases or 0 under a & b for 1-5 respectively* |
| 1 | Boko Haram Attack | |  | | |  | | |
| 2 | Disasters (Flood/Drought) | |  | | |  | | |
| 3 | Intercommunal/other Religious crises | |  | | |  | | |
| 4 | Other (specify under each timeline) | |  | | |  | | |
| 5 | Total | |  | | |  | | |
| 303 | Did you analyze the conflicts, violence, or security warning information that you received? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | | 2⇨308 |
| 304 | Who were involved with you in the analysis of the conflicts, violence, or security warning information? | | | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No for 1-13 respectively* |
| 1 | My Agency staff | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 2 | Security actors | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | CSOs including CBO/NGO/FBO | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 4 | Community leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 5 | Religious leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 6 | Peace Committee | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 7 | Appointed Individuals | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 8 | EW/ER Network members | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 9 | LG Officials | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 10 | SEMA/NEMA | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 11 | UN Agencies | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 12 | WANEP/ECOWAS | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 13 | INGOs | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 14 | Other (specify): | |  | | | | | |
| 305 | Did you make any response to the conflicts, violence, or security warning information in the communities? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | | 2⇨308 |
| 306 | How did you make the decision to respond to the conflicts, violence, or security warning information in the communities? | | Based on the analysis of information | | | | | 1 | *Please cycle/tick one answer* |
| Instructed by superior official | | | | | 2 |
| Other (specify): | | | | |  |
| 307 | Who were involved with you in the response to the conflicts, violence, or security warning information in the communities? | | | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No for 1-13 respectively* |
| 1 | My Agency staff | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 2 | Security actors | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | CSOs including CBO/NGO/FBO | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 4 | Community leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 5 | Religious leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 6 | Peace Committee | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 7 | Appointed Individuals | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 8 | EW/ER Network members | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 9 | LG Officials | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 10 | SEMA/NEMA | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 11 | UN Agencies | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 12 | WANEP/ECOWAS | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 13 | INGOs | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 14 | Other (specify): | |  | | | | | |
| 308 | What are the mechanisms you use to get reliable conflicts, violence, or security warning information in the communities? | | | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No under a & b for 1–15 respectively* |
| **Channels of Information** | **a. Last 1–9 months** | | | **b. Before last 9 months** | | | |
| 1 | Neighbor or close friend | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 2 | Community leader | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 3 | Religious leaders | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 4 | Appointed individual/group | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 5 | Newspaper | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 6 | Television (TV) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 7 | Radio | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 8 | Internet on phone or other internet access | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 9 | CSO/CBO/FBO/NGO | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 10 | Text message | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 11 | Government Security Agencies | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 12 | Local Vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 13 | SEMA/NEMA | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 14 | Local Government Office/Official | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 15 | Private organizations | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 16 | Other (specify under each timeline): |  | | |  | | | |
| 309 | What are the mechanisms you use to give alerts on conflicts, violence, or security warning information in the communities? | | | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No under a & b for 1–15 respectively* |
| **Channels of Communication** | **a. Last 1–9 months** | | | **b. Before last 9 months** | | | |
| 1 | Neighbor or close friend | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 2 | Community leader | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 3 | Religious leaders | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 4 | Appointed individual/group | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 5 | Newspaper | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 6 | Television (TV) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 7 | Radio | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 8 | Internet on phone or other internet access | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 9 | CSO/CBO/FBO/NGO | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 10 | Text message | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 11 | Government Security Agencies | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 12 | Local Vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 13 | SEMA/NEMA | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 14 | Local Government Office/Official | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 15 | Private organizations | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | |
| 16 | Other (specify under each timeline): |  | | |  | | | |
| 310 | How effective are the mechanisms you use for conflicts, violence or security warning information and response in the communities? | | | a. Last 1-9 months | | | b. Before last 9 months | | *Please cycle one answer under a & b respectively* |
| Very effective | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Effective | | | 2 | | | 2 | |
| Okay | | | 3 | | | 3 | |
| Not effective | | | 4 | | | 4 | |
| Very ineffective | | | 5 | | | 5 | |
| Don’t Know | | | 98 | | | 98 | |

**END: Thank you for your time.**

*Conclusion: Do you have any question for me on the topic above?*

**Questionnaire for CSOs**

**Introduction**

Hello, Good Morning/Afternoon/Evening. My name is ……. I am an independent Research Assistant. I am currently carrying out data collection to evaluate two projects: “*Expanding Initiatives to Reduce Human Rights Abuse in Northern Nigeria*” and “*Early Warning/Early Response Mechanisms in Northern Nigeria*”**.** These projects are implemented in Adamawa and Borno States by Search for Common Ground (SFCG), an international non-profit organization that promotes peaceful resolution of conflict. SFCG has hired a consultant to evaluate the projects and I am working with the consultant to carry out the survey data collection. And we have selected you to take part in the survey data collection process.

The purpose of the survey is to collect, analyze, and present information related to the projects that currently is not known, or only partly known to SFCG. It shall provide information of the situation in Borno and Adamawa States. Additionally, as the projects are already being implemented, it will also include information on the progress so far made in the implementation of the project activities. I would like to ask you some questions to get your views about human rights issues, early warning and response system and the relationships with the security actors, among the general population and other stakeholders, to understand the type of security actors operating at the community, systems for dealing human rights issues, early warning and early response, channels of communication and decision making, involvement of the community and the media. Some questions would also be asked to get your basic socio-demographic information and your views on the situations in the community.

**Confidentiality and Informed Consent**

This survey is confidential and anonymous. Information collected from you will be combined with information collected from others, and at no point would you be required to disclose your name. Findings will be used to help SFCG and its partners to implement the projects better. You are not under any compulsion to participate in this study and there will be no direct or indirect consequences if you decide not to participate. You should not hesitate to say you do not understand a question, or if you don't want to answer, just let me know and I will go on to the next question or you can stop the interview at any time. I will however be very grateful if you decide to willingly participate. It will take about 30 minutes to complete the interview. Would you be willing to interview? Yes [\_\_\_]No [\_\_\_]

Thank you.

Did the respondent consent to participate? 1. Yes [\_\_\_]Continue 2. No [\_\_\_] End (Move to another group)

*Note: Please,* ***Interviewer:*** *Fill out 100–107 before the interview proper.* ***Supervisor:*** *Fill 108–110 after review of questionnaire.* ***Data entry staff:*** *Fill out 111 –113 after entry the answers into the database*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module 1: Survey Summary and Identification** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **No** | | | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** |  | | | | **Question Filters** | | | | **Answers and Coding** | | | | | | |
| 100 | | | Name of Interviewer |  | 107 | | | | State | | | | Adamawa – 1 Borno – 2 | | | | | | |
| 101 | | | Date of interview | \_\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 108 | | | | Name of supervisor | | | | |  | | | | | |
| 102 | | | Interview start time |  | 109 | | | | Complete questionnaire | | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | |
| 103 | | | Interview end time |  | 110 | | | | Date of review | | | | | \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | |
| 104 | | | Sex of respondent | Male – 1 Female – 2 | 111 | | | | Name of data entry staff | | | | |  | | | | | |
| 105 | | | Community/village name |  | 112 | | | | Data entry date | | | | | \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | |
| 106 | | | Local Government Area |  | 113 | | | | Data entry number | | | | |  | | | | | |
| **Module 2: Collaboration on Human Rights, Security and Peace Building** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | | **Question Filters** | | | | **Answers and Coding** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Skip** |
| 200 | | Name of Civil Society Organization (CSO)? | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 201 | | Type of CSO?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | | | Community Based Organization | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |  |
| Non-Governmental Organization | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | |
| Faith Based Organization (FBO) | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | |
| Other (specify): | | | | | | | | | |  | | |
| 202 | | Legal status of CSO?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | | | CAC Registration | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |  |
| State Registration | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | |
| Local Government Registration | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | |
| Other (specify): | | | | | | | | | | 4 | | |
| 203 | | Date of registration | | | | \_\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 204 | | Designation of respondent in the CSO? | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 205 | | Employment status of respondent?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | | | Full-time | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |  |
| Part-time | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | |
| Volunteer | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | |
| 206 | | What is the primary focus of your organization? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 1 | | Humanitarian interventions | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | Peace building and security | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | Community development | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | Human rights and advocacy | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | Other (specify): | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 207 | | Does your organization work in rights and advocacy or security and peace building? | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2/DK⇨300 |
| 208 | | If yes to 207, how many years have your organization worked in human rights and advocacy or security and peace building in the North-East Nigeria?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | | | None | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |  |
| Less than one year | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | |
| 1 – 2 years | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | |
| 2 years plus – 5 years | | | | | | | | | | 4 | | |
| More than 5 years | | | | | | | | | | 5 | | |
| Don’t know | | | | | | | | | | 98 | | |  |
| 209 | | Is your organization involved with other CSOs in rights and advocacy or security and peace building work? | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2/DK⇨211 |
| 210 | | List the names of the major CSOs your organization is involved with in rights and advocacy or security and peace building work  ***Please write the answer*** | | | | a. | | | | | | | | | | | | | ***Please write the answers*** |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DK | | | | | | | | | 98 | | | |  |
| 211 | | Is there a coalition or network of actors working in rights and advocacy or security and peace building in the State? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| a | | In the last 1-9 months? | | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| b | | Before the last 9 months? | | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 212 | | Is there any existing meeting of inter-CSOs working in rights and advocacy or security and peace building in the state? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| a | | In the last 1-9 months? | | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2/DK⇨215 |
| b | | Before the last 9 months? | | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2/DK⇨215 |
| 213 | | If yes to 212, how often do the inter-CSO meeting hold? | | | | | a. Last 1-9 months | | | | b. Before the last 9 months | | | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick one answer under a & b respectively* |
| Biweekly | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Monthly | | | | | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Quarterly | | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Yearly | | | | | 4 | | | | 4 | | | | | | | |
| Never | | | | | 5 | | | | 5 | | | | | | | |
| Don’t know | | | | | 98 | | | | 98 | | | | | | | |
| Other (specify): | | | | |  | | | |  | | | | | | | |
| 214 | How would you rate the level of inter-CSO meetings and collaborations in the State? | | | | | | | a. Last 1-9 months | | | | b. Before the last 9 months | | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick one answer under a & b respectively* |
| Very cooperative | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Cooperative | | | | | | | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | | | |
| Fair cooperation | | | | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Poor cooperation | | | | | | | 4 | | | | 4 | | | | | | |
| No cooperation | | | | | | | 5 | | | | 5 | | | | | | |
| Don’t know | | | | | | | 98 | | | | 98 | | | | | | |
| 215 | Would you like to see increased collaboration between your organization and other CSOs? | | | | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | | | | | | | | 2/DK⇨217 |
| 216 | If yes to 215, in what ways would you like to see increased collaboration between your organization and other CSOs in rights and advocacy work? | | | | | | | Networking & Coalitions | | | | | | | | | | 1 | *Please cycle/tick one answer* |
| Support in programming | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| Information sharing | | | | | | | | | | 3 |
| Coordination | | | | | | | | | | 4 |
| Other (specify): | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 217 | What skill do you think is most important and required for actors/CSOs working on rights and advocacy? | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | *Write the answer* |
| 218 | Does your organization, NHRC and Judiciary relate to one another? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| a | During the last 1-9 months? | | | | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | | | | | | | | 2/DK⇨300 |
| b | Before the last 9 months? | | | | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | | | | | | | | 2/DK⇨300 |
| 219 | If yes to 218, have you ever filed a report to the NHRC? | | | | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | | | | | | | | | 2⇨ 222 |
| 220 | If yes to 219, how many reports did you file on average in a month? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| a | During the last 1-9 months? | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| b | Before the last 9 months? | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| 221 | What kinds of actions have the NHRC taken on the reports you filed?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | | | | | | Mediate | | | | | | | | | 1 | |  |
| Report to appropriate channel | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| Observe | | | | | | | | | 3 | |
| Report to Legal Aid | | | | | | | | | 4 | |
| Gave advice | | | | | | | | | 5 | |
| Other (specify): | | | | | | | | |  | |
| 222 | How would you describe the relationship between your organization and the NHRC? | | | | | | | a. Last 1-9 months | | b. Before the last 9 months | | | | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick one answer under a & b respectively* |
| Very cooperative | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Cooperative | | | | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Fair cooperation | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| Poor cooperation | | | | | | | 4 | | 4 | | | | | | | | |
| No cooperation | | | | | | | 5 | | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| Don’t know | | | | | | | 98 | | 98 | | | | | | | | |
| 223 | How would you describe the relationship between your organization and the judiciary? | | | | | | | a. Last 1-9 months | | b. Before the last 9 months | | | | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick one answer under a & b respectively* |
| Very cooperative | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Cooperative | | | | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Fair cooperation | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| Poor cooperation | | | | | | | 4 | | 4 | | | | | | | | |
| No cooperation | | | | | | | 5 | | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| Don’t know | | | | | | | 98 | | 98 | | | | | | | | |
| 224 | Would you like to see increased collaboration between your organization, the NHRC and the Judiciary? | | | | | | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | | | | | | | | Cycle/tick one answer |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module 3: Involvement with Early Warning and Early Response System** | | | | | | |
| No | **Question Filter** | | **Answers and Coding** | | | **Skip** |
| 300 | Does your organization get conflicts, violence, or security warning information in the communities? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK⇨End |
| 301 | Did your organization receive conflicts, violence, or security warning information… | | | | |  |
| a | during the last 1-9 months? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK⇨End |
| b | before the last 9 months? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK⇨End |
| 302 | If yes to 301, how many conflicts, violence, or security warning information was received… | | a. in the last 1-9 months? | b. before the last 9 months? | | *Write the number of cases or 0 under a & b for 1-5 respectively* |
| 1 | Boko Haram Attack | |  |  | |
| 2 | Disasters (Flood/Drought) | |  |  | |
| 3 | Intercommunal/other Religious crises | |  |  | |
| 4 | Other (specify under each timeline) | |  |  | |
| 5 | Total | |  |  | |
| 303 | Did your organization analyze the conflicts, violence, or security warning information that was received? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK⇨308 |
| 304 | Who were involved with your organization in the analysis of the conflicts, violence, or security warning information? | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1-12 respectively* |
| 1 | Security actors | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 2 | Other CSOs including CBO/NGO/FBO | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 3 | Community leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 4 | Religious leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 5 | Peace Committee | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 6 | Appointed Individuals | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 7 | EW/ER Network members | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 8 | LG Officials | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 9 | SEMA/NEMA | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 10 | UN Agencies | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 11 | WANEP/ECOWAS | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 12 | INGOs | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 13 | Other (specify): | |  | | |
| 305 | Did your organization respond to the conflicts, violence, or security warning information? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK⇨308 |
| 306 | How was the decision made to respond to the conflicts, violence, or security warning information? | Based on the analysis of information | | | 1 | *Please cycle/tick one answer* |
| Instructed by superior organization | | | 2 |
| Other (specify): | | |  |
| 307 | Who were involved with your organization in the response to the conflicts, violence, or security warning information? | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No for 1-12 respectively* |
| 1 | Security actors | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 2 | CSOs including CBO/NGO/FBO | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 3 | Community leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 4 | Religious leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 5 | Peace Committee | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 6 | Appointed Individuals | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 7 | EW/ER Network members | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 8 | LG Officials | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 9 | SEMA/NEMA | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 10 | UN Agencies | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 11 | WANEP/ECOWAS | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 12 | INGOs | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 13 | Other (specify): | |  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 308 | What mechanisms are used by your organization to get reliable conflicts, violence, or security warning information in the communities? | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No under a & b for 1–15 respectively* |
| **Channels of Information** | a. Last 1–9 months | | b. Before last 9 months | |
| 1 | Neighbor or close friend | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 2 | Community leader | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 3 | Religious leaders | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 4 | Appointed individual/group | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 5 | Newspaper | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 6 | Television (TV) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 7 | Radio | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 8 | Internet on phone or other internet access | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 9 | CSO/CBO/FBO/NGO | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 10 | Text message | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 11 | Government Security Agencies | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 12 | Local Vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 13 | SEMA/NEMA | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 14 | Local Government Office/Official | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 15 | Private organizations | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 16 | Other (specify under each timeline): |  | |  | |
| 309 | What mechanisms are used by your organization to give alerts on conflicts, violence, or security warning information in the communities? | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No under a & b for 1–15 respectively* |
| **Channels of Communication** | a. Last 1–9 months | | b. Before last 9 months | |
| 1 | Neighbor or close friend | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 2 | Community leader | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 3 | Religious leaders | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 4 | Appointed individual/group | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 5 | Newspaper | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 6 | Television (TV) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 7 | Radio | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 8 | Internet on phone or other internet access | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 9 | CSO/CBO/FBO/NGO | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 10 | Text message | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 11 | Government Security Agencies | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 12 | Local Vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 13 | SEMA/NEMA | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 14 | Local Government Office/Official | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 15 | Private organizations | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 16 | Other (specify under each timeline): |  | |  | |
| 310 | How effective are the mechanisms use by your organization for conflicts, violence or security warning information and response? | | a. Last 1-9 months | | b. Before last 9 months | *Please cycle one answer under a & b respectively* |
| Very effective | | 1 | | 1 |
| Effective | | 2 | | 2 |
| Okay | | 3 | | 3 |
| Not effective | | 4 | | 4 |
| Very ineffective | | 5 | | 5 |
| Don’t Know | | 98 | | 98 |

**END: Thank you for your time.**

*Conclusion: Do you have any question for me on the topic above?*

**Questionnaire for Community Members**

**Introduction**

Hello, Good Morning/Afternoon/Evening. My name is … I am an independent Research Assistant. I am currently carrying out data collection to evaluate two projects: “*Expanding Initiatives to Reduce Human Rights Abuse in Northern Nigeria*” and “*Early Warning/Early Response Mechanisms in Northern Nigeria*”**.** These projects are implemented in Adamawa and Borno States by Search for Common Ground (SFCG), an international non-profit organization that promotes peaceful resolution of conflict. SFCG has hired a consultant to evaluate the projects and I am working with the consultant to carry out the survey data collection. And we have selected you to take part in the survey data collection process.

The purpose of the survey is to collect, analyze, and present information related to the projects that currently is not known, or only partly known to SFCG. It shall provide information of the situation in Borno and Adamawa States. Additionally, as the projects are already being implemented, it will also include information on the progress so far made in the implementation of the project activities. I would like to ask you some questions to get your views about human rights issues, early warning and response system and the relationships with the security actors, among the general population and other stakeholders, to understand the type of security actors operating at the community, systems for dealing human rights issues, early warning and early response, channels of communication and decision making, involvement of the community and the media. Some questions would also be asked to get your basic socio-demographic information and your views on the situations in the community.

**Confidentiality and Informed Consent**

This survey is confidential and anonymous. Information collected from you will be combined with information collected from others, and at no point would you be required to disclose your name. Findings will be used to help SFCG and its partners to implement the projects better. You are not under any compulsion to participate in this study and there will be no direct or indirect consequences if you decide not to participate. You should not hesitate to say you do not understand a question, or if you don't want to answer, just let me know and I will go on to the next question or you can stop the interview at any time. I will however be very grateful if you decide to willingly participate. It will take about 30 to 60 minutes to complete the interview. Would you be willing to interview? Yes [\_\_\_]No [\_\_\_]

Thank you.

Did the respondent consent to participate? 1. Yes [\_\_\_]Continue 2. No [\_\_\_] End (Move to another respondent)

*Note: Please,* ***Interviewer:*** *Fill out 100–108 before the interview proper.* ***Supervisor:*** *Fill 109–111 after review of questionnaire.* ***Data entry staff:*** *Fill out 112 –114 after entry the answers into the database*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module 1: Survey Summary and Identification** | | | | | | |
| **No** | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** |  | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** | |
| 100 | Interviewer’s name |  | 108 | State | Adamawa – 1 Borno – 2 | |
| 101 | Date of interview | \_\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_\_ | 109 | Name of supervisor | |  |
| 102 | Interview start time |  | 110 | Complete questionnaire | | Yes – 1 No – 2 |
| 103 | Interview end time |  | 111 | Date of review | | \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 104 | Gender/Sex | Male – 1 Female – 2 | 112 | Name of data entry staff | |  |
| 105 | Person with disability | Yes – 1 No – 2 | 113 | Data entry date | | \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 106 | Community/village name |  | 114 | Data entry number | |  |
| 107 | Local Government Area | Yola North – 1 Girei – 2 MMC – 3 Jere – 4 Mafa – 5 | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module 2: Demographics** | | | | | | |
| No | **Question Filters** | | **Answers and Coding** | | | **Skip** |
| 200 | Language used | |  | | |  |
| 201 | Displacement status | | Displaced person – 1 | Non-Displaced person – 2 | | 2 ⇨203 |
| 202 | If displaced, which place you where before? | |  | | |  |
| 203 | How long have you lived here, in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Less than one year | | 1 |  |
| 1–2 years | | 2 |
| 2 years plus – 5 years | | 3 |
| 5 years plus – 10 years | | 4 |
| More than 10 years | | 5 |
| 204 | Tribe/Ethnicity | |  | | |  |
| 205 | Religion  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Christianity | | 1 |  |
| Islam | | 2 |
| Traditional | | 3 |
| None | | 4 |
| Other (specify): | |  |
| 206 | Marital status  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Married (monogamous) | | 1 |  |
| Married (polygamous | | 2 |
| Informal union | | 3 |
| Divorced | | 4 |
| Separated | | 5 |
| Widowed | | 6 |
| Never married | | 7 |
| 207 | Age as at your last birthday | | *Record the number of years:* | | |  |
| 208 | Highest educational level completed  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | No qualification | | 1 |  |
| Arabic education | | 2 |
| Islamiya/Qur’anic | | 3 |
| Primary school certificate | | 4 |
| SSCE/WAEC | | 5 |
| OND/NCE | | 6 |
| HND/BSc | | 7 |
| Postgraduate certificate/degree | | 8 |
| Other (specify): | | |
| 209 | Have you worked in the last 12 months? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | | 2 ⇨300 |
| 210 | If yes, what was your work status? | | Full-time work – 1 Part-time work – 2 | | |  |
| 211 | What is your major occupation?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Student/Apprentice | | | 1 |  |
| Government worker (Public/Civil servant, Teacher, Nurse, etc.) | | | 2 |
| Private sector employee (Company, Bank, etc.) | | | 3 |
| Development worker (CSO/NGO/Agency employee) | | | 4 |
| Self-employed (Professional, consultant, artisan, etc.) | | | 5 |
| Self-employed (Trader, Small business operator, Farmer, Herder etc.) | | | 6 |
| Security services (Police, Military, Civil defense, Private guards, etc.) | | | 7 |
| Transport (Motor driver/Motoycle rider) | | | 8 |
| Volunteer/ House help | | | 9 |
| Daily labourer, Hunting | | | 10 |
| Other (specify): | | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module 3: Profile of Security Actors** | | | | | | |
| **No** | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** | | | | **Skip** |
| 300 | Who are the security actors involved in peace building in your community? | a. Last 1–9 months | | b. Before last 9 months | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK under a & b for 1–5 respectively* |
| 1 | The Military | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 2 | The Police | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 3 | Civil Defense Corps | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 4 | Local Vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 5 | DSS | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 6 | Other (specify under each timeline): |  | |  | |
| 301 | Where are the security actors currently present in the community? | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1–5 respectively* |
| 1 | Road blocks | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 2 | Mosque, Church, and Government Offices. | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 3 | Office station | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 4 | Market place | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 5 | Everywhere of suspected violence | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 6 | Other (specify): |  | | | |
| 302 | Does the security actors and community relate to one another? | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | 2/DK⇨306 |
| 303 | If yes to 302, how do the security actors and community relate to one and another? | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1–5 respectively* |
| 1 | Sharing information on security | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 2 | Periodic meeting on security and peace building | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 3 | Collaboration for solutions to human rights abuses/violation | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 4 | Working together for early warning and response system | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 5 | Training on human rights protection | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 6 | Other (specify): | |  | | |
| 304 | How effective is the security actors working with the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Very effective | | | 1 |  |
| Effective | | | 2 |
| Okay | | | 3 |
| Not effective | | | 4 |
| Very ineffective | | | 5 |
| Don’t Know | | | 98 |
| 305 | How would you rate the level of collaboration between security actors and the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Very low | | | 1 |  |
| Low | | | 2 |
| Medium | | | 3 |
| High | | | 4 |
| Very high | | | 5 |
| Don’t Know | | | 98 |
| 306 | What is your most preferred way to engaging with security actors in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Sharing information on security | | | 1 |  |
| Periodic meeting on security and peace building | | | 2 |
| Collaboration for solutions to human rights abuses/violation | | | 3 |
| Working together for early warning and response system | | | 4 |
| Training on human rights protection | | | 5 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 307 | What is the current level of trust in the security agents working in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | None | | 0 |  |
| Very low | | 1 |
| Low | | 2 |
| Medium | | 3 |
| High | | 4 |
| Very high | | 5 |
| Don’t Know | | 98 |
| 308 | In your view, would you agree or disagree that security personnel respect human rights in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Strongly agree | | 1 |  |
| Agree | | 2 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | | 3 |
| Disagree | | 4 |
| Strongly disagree | | 5 |
| Don’t know | | 98 |
| 309 | Aside the security actors, which other actors are important to work with in the prevailing context of peace building in the community? | |  | | ***Please write the answers*** |
|  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module 4: Early Warning/Early Response Context** | | | | | | | |
| No | **Question Filter** | | **Answers and Coding** | | | | **Skip** |
| 400 | Please recall, have there been conflicts, violence or emergencies in this community… | | | | | |  |
| a | During the last 1-9 months? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | 2/DK⇨408 |
| b | Before the last 9 months? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | 2/DK⇨408 |
| 401 | If yes to 400, how many cases of conflicts, violence or emergencies in this community…? | | | | | | *Please write the number of cases or 0 under a & b for 1-5 respectively* |
| **Cases** | a. During last 1-9 months | | b. Before last 9 months | | |
| 1 | Boko Haram Attack |  | |  | | |
| 2 | Disasters (Flood/Drought) |  | |  | | |
| 3 | Intercommunal/other Religious crises |  | |  | | |
| 4 | Other (specify under each timeline) |  | |  | | |
| 5 | Total |  | |  | | |
| 402 | Who was **most** responsible for bringing the conflict or violence under control? | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1–7 respectively* |
| 1 | The Military | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 2 | The Police | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 3 | Civil Defense Corps | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 4 | Local Vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 5 | Community leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 6 | Religious leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 7 | Civil Society | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 8 | Other (specify): | |  | | | |
| 403 | How long did the conflict or crises last in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Less than one week | | | 1 |  |
| 1–2 weeks | | | 2 |
| Two weeks plus – one month | | | 3 |
| One month plus – 6 months | | | 4 |
| Six months plus – one year | | | 5 |
| Over one year | | | 6 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| 404 | Who are most responsible for conflicts and violence in this community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Men | | | 1 |  |
| Women | | | 2 |
| Youth (Boys/Girls) | | | 3 |
| Differently Abled | | | 4 |
| Everyone | | | 5 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | | |  |
| 405 | Which community group is most affected by conflicts and violence in this community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Christian communities | | | 1 |  |
| Muslim communities | | | 2 |
| Both communities | | | 3 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | | |  |
| 406 | Which gender group/people are **most** affected by conflicts or violence in this community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Men | | | 1 |  |
| Women | | | 2 |
| Children | | | 3 |
| Elderly | | | 4 |
| Differently Abled | | | 5 |
| Youth (Boys/Girls) | | | 6 |
| Everyone | | | 7 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | | |  |
| 407 | What is your reason for the people you think are most affected by conflicts or violence in this community? | |  | | | | ***Please write the answers*** |
| 408 | Is there traditional system of addressing conflicts or violence in this community? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | 2/DK⇨500 |
| 409 | If yes to 408, what is the system of addressing conflicts or violence in the community? | |  | | | |  |
|  | | | |
| 410 | Who is most involved in the system of addressing conflicts or violence in this community? | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1–11 respectively* |
| 1 | Men | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 2 | Women | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 3 | Youth | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 4 | Community leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 5 | Religious leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 6 | Civil Defence Corps | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 7 | Local vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 8 | The Police | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 9 | The Military | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 10 | CSO/CBO/NGO/FBO | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 11 | Private Organizations | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 12 | Other (specify): | |  | | | |
| 411 | How effective is the system for addressing conflicts or violence in the community? | | a. Last 1-9 months | | b. Before last 9 months | | ***Answer for a & b*** |
| Very effective | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 ⇨ 412 |
| Effective | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 ⇨ 412 |
| Okay | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 ⇨ 414 |
| Not effective | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 ⇨ 413 |
| Very ineffective | | 5 | | 5 | | 5 ⇨ 413 |
| Don’t Know | | 98 | | 98 | | 98⇨414 |
| 412 | Why is the system very effective or effective for addressing conflicts or violence in the community? | |  | | | | 412 ⇨ 414 |
| 413 | Why is the system not effective or infective for addressing conflicts or violence in the community? | |  | | | | 413 ⇨ 414 |
| 414 | Do you know of any other type of conflict resolution program operating in this community? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | 2/DK⇨500 |
| 415 | If yes to 414, does the program works with existing community system or differently in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Works with Community system | | | 1 |  |
| Differently from community systems | | | 2 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| 416 | Describe the way the program works in this community | |  | | | | ***Write the answers*** |
| 417 | Which organization implements the program in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | A United Nation (UN) system | | | 1 |  |
| SFCG/CSO Partner | | | 2 |
| Other CBO/NGO/CSO | | | 3 |
| Security Agencies | | | 4 |
| Government agencies | | | 5 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | | |  |
| 418 | Who is involved in the program in the community? | | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1–10 respectively* |
| 1 | Community Men | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 2 | Religious Leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 3 | Traditional Leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 4 | Community Women | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 5 | Community Youths | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 6 | CSO/CBO/NGO/FBO | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 7 | Government Agencies | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 8 | International Organizations | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 9 | Security Agencies | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 10 | Private Organizations | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 11 | Other (specify): | |  | | | |
| 419 | How long has the program lasted/been implemented in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | 1–9 months as at today | | | 1 |  |
| More than 9 months as at today | | | 2 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| 420 | Has the community benefited from the program? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | 2/DK⇨500 |
| 421 | If yes to 420, how does the community benefit from the program? | |  | | | | ***Write the answers*** |
|  | | | |
| 422 | How would you rate the program for addressing conflicts or violence in the community? | | a. Last 1-9 months | | b. Before last 9 months | | *Please cycle one answer under a & b respectively* |
| Excellent | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Very good | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Good | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Okay | | 4 | | 4 | |
| Not so good | | 5 | | 5 | |
| Bad | | 6 | | 6 | |
| Don’t know | | 98 | | 98 | |
| 423 | Is there public campaign (such as community forum) to promote awareness about how to address conflicts or violence in the community? | | Yes | | | 1 | 2/DK⇨500 |
| No | | | 2 |
| DK | | | 98 |
| 424 | If yes to Q423, how would you rate the campaigns? | | a. Last 1-9 months | | b. Before last 9 months | | *Please cycle one answer under a & b respectively* |
| Very effective | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Effective | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Okay | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Not effective | | 4 | | 4 | |
| Very ineffective | | 5 | | 5 | |
| Don’t Know | | 98 | | 98 | |

| **Module 5: Human Rights Abuses or Violations** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | **Question Filter** | **Answers and Coding** | | | **Skip** |
| 500 | Have you experienced human rights abuses/violations in your community… | | | |  |
| a | During the last 1–9 months? | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK⇨509 |
| b | Before last 9 months? | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK⇨509 |
| 501 | What is the extent of the human rights abuses/ violations taking place in the community? | a. Last 1–9 months | b. Before last 9 months | | *Please cycle/tick one answer under a & b respectively* |
| Very low | 1 | 1 | |
| Low | 2 | 2 | |
| Medium | 3 | 3 | |
| High | 4 | 4 | |
| Very high | 5 | 5 | |
| Don’t know | 98 | 98 | |
| 502 | During which period/time most human rights abuses/violations take place in the community? | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1-6 respectively* |
| 1 | During violence conflict and attack | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 2 | During political campaign | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 3 | During election/voting | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 4 | During post-election/voting | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 5 | Occasionally other times | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 6 | All the time | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 7 | Other (specify): |  | | |
| 503 | What kind of human rights abuses/violations are mostly taking place in the community? | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1-6 respectively* |
| 1 | Rape | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 2 | Extra judicial killings | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 3 | Torture | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 4 | Arbitrary detention | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 5 | Extortion | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 6 | Harassment | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 7 | Other (specify): |  | | |
| 504 | Who most commit/perpetrate the human rights abuses/violations in the community? | | | |  |
| 1 | The Military | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1-8 respectively* |
| 2 | The Police | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 3 | Civil Defence Corps | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 4 | Local vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 5 | Community leaders | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 6 | Religious leaders | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 7 | Civil Society | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 8 | Private Organizations | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |
| 9 | Other (specify): |  | | |
| 505 | What action is most commonly taken to address human rights abuses/violations in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Case documentation | | 1 |  |
| Report case to security agents | | 2 |
| Report to community/traditional leader | | 3 |
| Report to religious leader | | 4 |
| Take case to court | | 5 |
| Nothing | | 6 |
| Don’t know | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 506 | Who often take the action to address human rights abuses or violations in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one (most appropriate) answer*** | The Abused | | 1 |  |
| Family members | | 2 |
| Community & Religious leaders | | 3 |
| Judiciary | | 4 |
| The Police | | 5 |
| The Military | | 6 |
| Civil Defense Corps | | 7 |
| Local vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | | 8 |
| CSO/CBO/NGO/FBO | | 9 |
| Media | | 10 |
| Combined actions (specify who) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | 11 |
| Don’t know | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | |  |
| 507 | Which community group is most affected by human rights abuses/ violations in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Christian communities | | 1 |  |
| Muslim communities | | 2 |
| Both religion communities | | 3 |
| Don’t know | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | |  |
| 508 | Which gender group is **most** affected by human rights abuses/ violations in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Men | | 1 |  |
| Women | | 2 |
| Youth (Boys & Girls) | | 3 |
| Children | | 4 |
| Differently abled | | 5 |
| Women and Children | | 6 |
| Everyone | | 7 |
| Don’t know | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | |  |
| 509 | Is there traditional system of addressing human rights abuses/violation in this community? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | 2/DK⇨600 |
| 510 | If yes to 509, what is the system of addressing human rights abuses/violations in the community? | |  | | ***Write the answers*** |
|  | |
| 511 | Who is most involved in the systems of addressing human rights abuses/violations in this community? | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1-10 respectively* |
| 1 | Men | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 2 | Women | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 3 | Youth | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 4 | Community leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 5 | Religious leaders | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 6 | Civil Defence Corps | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 7 | Local vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 8 | The Police | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 9 | The Military | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 10 | CSO/CBO/NGO/FBO | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 11 | Private Organizations | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | |
| 12 | Other (specify): | |  | |
| 512 | Is the system effective for addressing human rights abuses/violations in the community? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | 2⇨ 514  DK⇨600 |
| 513 | If yes to 512, why is the system effective for addressing human rights abuses/violations in the community? | |  | | ***Write the answers*** |
|  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 514 | If No to 512, why is the system not effective for addressing human rights abuses/violations in the community? |  | | | | ***Write the answers*** |
|  | | | |
| 515 | Do you know of any other type of program for addressing human rights abuses/violations in this community? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK⇨600 |
| 516 | Does the program works with existing community system or differently in addressing human rights abuses/violations in the community? | Works with Community system | | | 1 | *Please cycle/tick one answer* |
| Differently from community systems | | | 2 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| 517 | Describe the way the program works in the community |  | | | | ***Write the answers*** |
| 518 | Which organization implements the program in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | A United Nation (UN) system | | | 1 |  |
| SFCG/CSO Partner | | | 2 |
| Other CBO/NGO/CSO | | | 3 |
| Security Agencies | | | 4 |
| Government agencies | | | 5 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | | |  |
| 519 | Who is involved in the program in the community? |  | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No/DK for 1–10 respectively* |
| 1 | Community Men | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 2 | Religious Leaders | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 3 | Traditional Leaders | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 4 | Community Women | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 5 | Community Youths | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 6 | CSO/CBO/NGO/FBO | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 7 | Government Agencies | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 8 | International Organizations | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 9 | Security Agencies | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 10 | Private Organizations | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | |
| 11 | Other (specify): |  | | | |
| 520 | How long has the program lasted/been implemented in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | 1–9 months as at today | | | 1 |  |
| More than 9 months as at today | | | 2 |
| Don’t know | | | 98 |
| 521 | Has the community benefited from the program? | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | | 2/DK⇨600 |
| 522 | If yes, describe one benefit of the program to the community. |  | | | | ***Write the answers*** |
| 523 | How would you rate the program for addressing human rights abuses/violations? | a. Last 1-9 months | | b. Before last 9 months | | *Please cycle/tick one answer under a & b respectively* |
| Excellent | 1 | | 1 | |
| Very good | 2 | | 2 | |
| Good | 3 | | 3 | |
| Okay | 4 | | 4 | |
| Not so good | 5 | | 5 | |
| Bad | 6 | | 6 | |
| Don’t know | 98 | | 98 | |
| 524 | Is there public campaign (such as community forum) to promote awareness of ways to deal with human rights abuses/violations in the community? | Yes | | | 1 | 2/DK⇨600 |
| No | | | 2 |
| DK | | | 98 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 525 | If yes to Q524, how would you rate the campaigns?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Very effective | 1 |  |
| Effective | 2 |
| Okay | 3 |
| Not effective | 4 |
| Very ineffective | 5 |
| Don’t Know | 98 |

| **Module 6: Channels of Communications** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | **Question Filter** | **Answers and Coding** | | | | **Skip** |
| 600 | Are there ways people can get and provide reliable information about concerns over conflicts, violence, security and human rights abuses/violations in this community? | | Yes | | 1 | 2/DK ⇨700 |
| No | | 2 |
| DK | | 98 |
| 601 | If yes to 600, how can people find reliable information about concerns over conflicts, violence, security, and human rights abuses/violations in this community? | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No under a & b for 1–16 respectively* |
| **Channels of Information** | **a. Last 1–9 months** | | **b. Before last 9 months** | |
| 1 | Neighbor or close friend | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 2 | Community leader | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 3 | Religious leaders | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 4 | Appointed individual/group | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 5 | Newspaper | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 6 | Television (TV) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 7 | Radio | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 8 | Internet on phone or other internet access | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 9 | CSO/CBO/FBO/NGO | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 10 | Text message | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 11 | Joints/Viewing Center | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 12 | Government Security Agencies | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 13 | Local Vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 14 | SEMA/NEMA | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 15 | Private organizations | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 16 | Local Government Office/Official | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 17 | Other (specify under each timeline): |  | |  | |
| 602 | Who can people report their concerns over conflicts, violence, security, and human rights abuses/violations to in this community? | | | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No under a & b for 1–11 respectively* |
| **Communication Channels** | **a. Last 1–9 months** | | **b. Before last 9 months** | |
| 1 | Neighbor or close friend | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 2 | Community leader | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 3 | Religious leader | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 4 | Appointed individual/group | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 5 | CSO/CBO/FBO/NGO | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 6 | Government Security Agencies | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 7 | Local Vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 8 | SEMA/NEMA | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 9 | Media (TV, Radio) | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 10 | Private Organizations | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 11 | Local Government Office/Official | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | |
| 12 | Other (specify under each timeline): |  | |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 603 | What action is usually taken if people report concerns over conflicts, violence, security, and human rights abuses/violations in this community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Document the report | 1 | |  |
| Analyze the report | 2 | |
| Immediately respond | 3 | |
| Document, analyze and respond | 4 | |
| Do nothing about the report | 5 | |
| Don’t know | 98 | |
| Other (specify): |  | |
| 604 | Who often make the decision of what to do in response to concerns over conflicts, violence, security and human rights abuses/violations in this community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Neighbor or close friend | 1 | |  |
| Community leader | 2 | |
| Religious leader | 3 | |
| Appointed individual/group | 4 | |
| CSO/CBO/NGO/FBO | 5 | |
| Government Security Agencies | 6 | |
| Local Vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | 7 | |
| SEMA/NEMA | 8 | |
| Private Organizations | 9 | |
| Don’t know | 98 | |
| Other (specify): |  | |
| 605 | How are warnings most communicated to alert people about impending conflicts, violence, and disasters in the community?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Community leader | | 1 |  |
| Religious leader | | 2 |
| Appointed individual/group | | 3 |
| CSO/CBO/FBO/NGO | | 4 |
| Government Security Agencies | | 5 |
| Local Vigilantes (Civilian JTF) | | 6 |
| SEMA/NEMA | | 7 |
| Media (TV and Radio) | | 8 |
| Private Organizations | | 9 |
| Don’t Know | | 98 |
| Other (specify): | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module 7: Media Consumption** | | | | |
| No | **Question Filters** | **Answers and Coding** | | **Skip** |
| 700 | Do you listen to radio at least once per week? | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | 2 ⇨End |
| 701 | If yes to 700, when do you listen more to the radio?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Weekdays | 1 |  |
| Weekends | 2 |
| Everyday | 3 |
| 702 | What hours do you listen most?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | 5-7 am | 1 |  |
| 7-9am | 2 |
| 9-12 am | 3 |
| 12-1pm | 4 |
| 1-6pm | 5 |
| 6-9pm | 6 |
| 9-12pm | 7 |
| Other (specify): |  |
| 703 | Write the name of the radio station you prefer to listen to the most |  | | ***Write the answers*** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 704 | Which type (s) of radio programs do you like? | |  | | | *Please cycle/tick Yes/No for 1-6 respectively* |
| 1 | News | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | |
| 2 | Talk Shows | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | |
| 3 | Request show (Phone-in) | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | |
| 4 | Drama | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | |
| 5 | Music | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | |
| 6 | Sports | | Yes – 1 No – 2 | | |
| 7 | Other (specify): | |  | | |
| 705 | Which language would you like to hear more on the radio?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Hausa | | 1 |  |
| English | | 2 |
| Kanuri | | 3 |
| Fulfude | | 4 |
| Other (specify): | |  |
| 706 | Are there programs for security and human rights abuses/violations, conflicts, violence, and disasters awareness on the radio? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK ⇨712 |
| 707 | If yes to 706, how often do you listen to such programs on radio in a month?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Daily | | 1 |  |
| 1-2 times a week | | 2 |
| 2 times per month | | 3 |
| Once a month | | 4 |
| Less than once a month | | 5 |
| 708 | How long have you been listening to the programs for security and human rights abuses/violations awareness on radio? | | 1–9 months as at today | | 1 | ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** |
| More than 9 months as at today | | 2 |
| Don’t know | | 98 |
| 709 | How would you rate the programs? | **a. Last 1–9 months** | | **b. Before last 9 months** | |  |
|  | Excellent | 1 | | 1 | | 1 ⇨710 |
| Very good | 2 | | 2 | | 2 ⇨710 |
| Good | 3 | | 3 | | 3 ⇨710 |
| Okay | 4 | | 4 | | 4 ⇨712 |
| Not so good | 5 | | 5 | | 5 ⇨711 |
| Bad | 6 | | 6 | | 6 ⇨711 |
| Don’t know | 98 | | 98 | | 98 ⇨712 |
| 710 | Why do you think the program is excellent, very good, or good? | |  | | | 710 ⇨712 |
| 711 | Why do you think the program is bad or not so good? | |  | | | 711 ⇨712 |
| 712 | Is there program on radio for promoting awareness on judicial accountability process? | | | | |  |
| a | Last 1–9 months | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK⇨714 |
| b | Before last 9 months | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK⇨714 |
| 713 | If yes to 712, would you say you understand the judicial accountability process? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | |  |
| 714 | Is there program which discusses issues facing displaced people on radio? | | Yes – 1 No – 2 DK – 98 | | | 2/DK ⇨718 |
| 715 | What kind of program which discusses issues facing displaced people on radio?  ***Please don’t give the options but cycle/tick the right option after respondent answer*** | | Talk show | | 1 |  |
| Phone in program | | 2 |
| Drama | | 3 |
| Documentary | | 4 |
| Other (specify): | |  |
| 716 | What kind of issues are discussed by the programs?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | | Violation of Basic Rights | | 1 |  |
| Judicial Processes | | 2 |
| Other (specify): | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 717 | How long have you been listening to the program which discusses issues facing displaced people on radio? | 1–9 months as at today | 1 | ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** |
| More than 9 months as at today | 2 |
| Don’t know | 98 |
| 718 | What kind of programs should be aired to deal with issues that affect displaced people?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Talk show | 1 |  |
| Phone in program | 2 |
| Drama | 3 |
| Documentary | 4 |
| Other (specify) |  |
| 719 | What should these programs discuss?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Human rights | 1 |  |
| Judicial processes | 2 |
| Other (specify) |  |
| 720 | Which type of media do you trust the most?  ***Please cycle/tick one answer*** | Social media | 1 |  |
| Television (TV) | 2 |
| Radio | 3 |
| Newspapers | 4 |
| Other (specify): |  |

**END: Thank you for your time.**

*Conclusion: Do you have any question for me on the above topic?*

# ANNEX 3: BIOGRAPHY OF EVALUATORS

**Stanley Aifuwa Garuba (Lead Evaluator).**

Stanley Aifuwa Garuba holds a Ph.D. degree in Sociology and over 16 years’ record of achievement and success driving social research in the development and humanitarian arena; particularly in monitoring and evaluation, impact and outcome assessments and shared learning. He has proven skills in tailored technical assistance on assessments, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, research, strategy development, program development and program management. Stanley has worked extensively for the World Bank both as staff and consultant, providing technical support in the design, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of social protection programs, policy discourse and dialogue with governments and development partners. Previously Impact Assessment and Shared Learning Coordinator in ActionAid Nigeria and Catholic Relief Services respectively, overseeing monitoring and evaluation activities, providing leadership support on overall performance management, planning, program development, strategy development, and technical support to the thematic leads. He led the development and institutionalization of social performance management system, including impact monitoring, planning, and research activities in the Lift Above Poverty Organization. Stanley specializes in operational research approaches to development and humanitarian program effectiveness, focusing on social protection, employment, education, health and HIV, governance, human security in conflict and emergencies, women empowerment and microfinance program. Stanley has executed various evaluation research works for different organizations including Save the Children International, Mercy Corps, International Rescue Committee, DFID, and USAID.

**Dr. Chinedu Monye (Co-Lead/Principal Associate, MB; BS; MA Humanitarian Assistance Spain).**

Dr. Monye is a medical doctor and development specialist with over 13 years of multidisciplinary and integrated experience in International Development and in the humanitarian sector in Nigeria. His experiences span Development research, Impact assessments and Evaluations, Stakeholders’ landscaping and Institutional Capacity Assessments, Performance Appraisals, Quality Assurance and Improvement assessments, Policy analysis, and development, Strategy development and Assessments, Documentation and Shared learning, civil society strengthening as well as Capacity Development. He is very experienced conducting high quality and bespoke qualitative evaluations for donor-funded projects; and has strong experience consulting for International development agencies including the World Bank, Options UK, WHO, DFID, USAID, ActionAid, Christian-aid, Futures Group, Society for Family Health, Winrock International, UNDP, Capacity-Plus, Intra-Health International, ABT associates, Girl Hub International, Mercy Corps, Save the Children and International Rescue Committee. He also has solid experience providing technical services to Government MDAs and the Cognate Private Sectors; including Civil Society. Dr. Chinedu led the donor and program landscaping of Adolescent girls programming in Nigeria for Girls Hub International and has just concluded an Assessment of the effectiveness of a community-based project for IDPs living in host communities and informal settings in North-eastern Nigeria for IRC, Landscaping of local humanitarian actors in North-eastern Nigeria for Mercy Corps and the final evaluation of the Dutch Relief Funded National Humanitarian Joint Response in Nigeria FOR Save the Children International and Consortium partners. Recently Dr. Monye led the Outcome tracking and attribution mapping for the V4C project in South Eastern Nigeria for Palladium Group International. He is an excellent and amiable facilitator, with excellent experience in Community participatory approaches coupled with great interpersonal and group communication skills. He is engaging and creative, very organized and efficient with time and resources. Dr. Monye is a professional member of the International OD Network. He currently heads the International Bureau of the Centre for Social Research and Evaluation in the UK.
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4. Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. 1970. Determining sample size. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)