



**Conflict Sensitivity Consortium (supported by DFID)  
The Practice of Conflict Sensitivity in Kenya, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka  
and the UK: Beyond the Concept  
Conflict Sensitivity Capacity Self-Assessments:**



**October 2010**

**Editors:**

**Kenya:**  
**Sierra Leone:**  
**Sri Lanka:**  
**UK:**

**Overall consolidation:**

**Mohamed Aliow, National Project Coordinator**  
**Fred Goba, National Project Coordinator**  
**Vindhya Fernando, National Project Coordinator**  
**Sarah Telford, WorldVision UK, Steering Committee member**  
**Heloise Heyer, UK and Overall Project Coordinator**

**Contact Details**

Heloise Heyer  
Project Coordinator  
Conflict Sensitivity Consortium  
+44 (0)20 7934 9447  
[heyer@careinternational.org](mailto:heyer@careinternational.org)  
CARE International, UK

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACRONYMS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CONSORTIUM MEMBERS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. BACKGROUND TO THE SELF-ASSESSMENT.....</b>	<b>7</b>
CONSORTIUM GOAL AND OBJECTIVES.....	7
OBJECTIVES OF CONFLICT SENSITIVITY CAPACITY SELF-ASSESSMENT .....	7
<b>2. SELF-ASSESSMENT IN KENYA.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.1 METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.2 INFUSING CONFLICT SENSITIVITY: STATE OF THE CONSORTIUM .....	9
2.3 WHAT OPTIONS FOR INFUSION?.....	10
2.4 OUTCOMES OF SELF-ASSESSMENTS .....	10
2.5 CASE STUDIES .....	11
2.6 CHALLENGES .....	16
2.7 CHANGE OBJECTIVES.....	17
2.8 GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS .....	19
<b>3. SELF-ASSESSMENT IN SIERRA LEONE .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.1 SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.2 KEY FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3.3 AGENCY-SPECIFIC CHANGE OBJECTIVES AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.4 BEST PRACTICES .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.5 RECOMMENDATIONS:.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>4. SELF-ASSESSMENT IN SRI LANKA .....</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1 BRIEF ON THE SELF-ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY AND ITS PURPOSE.....	27
4.2 METHODOLOGY .....	28
4.3 CONSOLIDATION OF KEY FINDINGS.....	29
4.4 KEY FINDINGS .....	30
4.5 CHANGE OBJECTIVES .....	33
4.6 CONCLUSION .....	34
<b>5. SELF-ASSESSMENT IN UK:.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>5.1 HIGHLIGHTS OF UK CONSORTIUM’S SELF ASSESSMENT PROCESS TO DATE .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>5.2 THE MAIN LESSONS LEARNT FROM THE UK CONSORTIUM SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>5.3 CHANGE OBJECTIVES / CAPACITY BUILDING PLAN CRITERIA.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>5.4 THE MAIN SELF-ASSESSMENT FINDINGS FROM THE UK CONSORTIUM .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>5.5 THE MAIN AREAS OF CHANGE PURSUED BY THE UK CONSORTIUM THROUGH THE CHANGE OBJECTIVE PROCESS.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: TOOL UTILISED BY KENYA .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: TOOL UTILISED BY SIERRA LEONE.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: TOOL UTILISED BY UK.....</b>	<b>48</b>

## ACRONYMS

A.D.Ps	Area Development Programmes
A.L.P.S	Accountability Learning and planning System
APA	Annual Performance Appraisal
CBO	Community Based Organisation
C.C.C.D	Child Centred Community Development
CHAD	Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department
CIAS	Conflict Impact Assessment Systems
C. S	Conflict Sensitivity
CSA	Conflict Sensitive Approaches
CSC	Conflict Sensitivity Consortium
C.S.O	Civil Society Organization
C. S. P	Country Strategy Paper
DFID	Department for International Development
DM & E	Design Monitoring and Evaluation
DNH	Do No Harm
DOSS	Directorate of Social Services
ECHO	European Union Humanitarian Aid Department
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HAP	Humanitarian Accountability Project
IDP	Internally Displaced Person(s)
I.N.G.O	International Non-governmental Organization
KII	Key Informant Interviews
LNGO	Local Non Governmental Organisation
M.O.U	Memorandum of Understanding
MSTC	Making Sense of Turbulent Contexts
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PCA	Peace and Conflict Assessment
PCIA	Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment
P.C.M	Project Cycle Management
PEACENET	Peace and Development Network Trust, Kenya
RBA	Rights Based Approach
UK	United Kingdom
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
V.D.C	Village Development Committee

## **CONSORTIUM MEMBERS**

### **Kenya**

Action Aid International Kenya (AAIK)  
Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD)  
CARE International Kenya  
Plan International Kenya  
Saferworld Kenya  
Save the Children UK in Kenya  
SkillShare International in Kenya  
World Vision Kenya (WVK)

### **Sierra Leone**

Action Aid International Sierra Leone (AAISL)  
Care International Sierra Leone,  
Catholic Agency for Overseas Development-SL  
Enhancing the Interface and Interaction between Civil Society and the State to Improve  
Poor People's Lives (ENCISS),  
International Alert  
Plan Sierra Leone  
Sierra Leone Association of Non Governmental Organizations (SLANGO)  
Sierra Leone Red Cross Society (SLRCS)  
World Vision Sierra Leone (WVSL)

### **Sri Lanka**

CAFOD  
CARE International Sri Lanka  
International Alert,  
Peace and Community Action (PCA)  
RedR UK,  
Saferworld,  
Save the Children in Sri Lanka (SCiSL)  
World Vision Lanka (WVL)

### **UK**

Action Aid  
CAFOD  
CARE International UK  
International Alert  
Plan International UK  
Responding to Conflict (RtC)  
Saferworld  
Save the Children UK  
Skillshare International  
World Vision UK

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are offered to the five project coordinators, who were closely involved throughout the process of the self-assessment and subsequent follow up. In Kenya Mohamed Aliow, in Sierra Leone Fred Goba, in Sri Lanka Vindhya and in the UK Sarah Brown and Heloise Heyer.

**Kenya Self-Assessment:** The Kenya assessments were supported by two consultants, from Local Capacities for Peace: Manasseh Wepundi and Millicent Otieno. Thanks are offered to all members (and partners) of the Kenya consortium who actively participated throughout the self-assessments.

**Sierra Leone Self-Assessment:** The Sierra Leone assessments were supported by two consultants, John Janu and David S/ Yambasu. The Sierra Leone report writing was assisted by Sheik Bakarr Kamara and Abdulai Wlon-Jalloh. Thanks are offered to all members (and partners) of the Sierra Leone consortium who actively participated throughout the self-assessments.

**Sri Lanka Self-Assessment:** Thanks are offered to all members (and partners) of the Sri Lanka consortium who actively participated throughout the self-assessments.

**UK Self-Assessment:** In the UK all agencies led their own self-assessment, without any centralised consultant support. Thanks are offered to all members (and partners) of the UK consortium who actively participated throughout the self-assessments.

## INTRODUCTION

In 2009 and 2010, member agencies of the Conflict Sensitivity Consortium undertook Conflict Sensitivity Capacity Self-Assessments. The aim of these self-assessments was to help member agencies to identify strengths, weakness, opportunities and blockages in terms of each agency's capacity for conflict sensitivity.

A variety of tools were utilized for the self-assessment – each agency and country started with a common framework/tool (developed by the consortium in early 2009) and adapted this tool according to individual agency or country need. Some agencies followed the original tool, some refined the tool into a questionnaire, and others simplified the original tool into more flexible and broader lines of inquiry.

Likewise, a variety of methodologies were followed – In the UK, where the assessment was conducted first, agencies were paired up, and provided each other with peer support for the actual self-assessment. In other countries consultants supported and helped facilitate the process. The self-assessment included use of questionnaires, focus group discussions, targeted interviews, as well as review of relevant agency documents.

Despite following different tools and methodologies, each agency ensured that their self-assessment covered a wide range of issues and stretched across a broad cross-section of the organisation, encompassing departments beyond those actually implementing programming.

The following are nine common sectors:

1. Coordination and programme support
2. Policies, strategies & risk management
3. Design, monitoring & evaluation
4. Communication, documentation and information technology (IT)
5. Human Resource
6. Administration, finance & Audit
7. Grants, fundraising & sponsorships
8. Operations & partnerships

Each agency documented both the process of their self-assessment, and their key findings (documents that are available internally within the consortium). The next step was to share self-assessment findings across each country (Kenya, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, UK). Each country held a review meeting to share findings across agencies to discuss next steps and to define change objectives. In the UK this workshop took place in July 2009, and in Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka and Kenya it was held between August 2009 and early 2010. Each country discussed and developed consolidated potential change objectives, which were taken back to each individual agency for further refinement. By the end of the second year of the consortium (March 2010), each consortium agency had developed (and secured agency internal buy-in) to a list of priority change objectives for working towards over the remaining two years of the consortium project. Recent progress updates from each country/agency are summarized in a separate annex.

# 1. BACKGROUND TO THE SELF-ASSESSMENT

The self-assessment was a core element of the DFID funded Conflict Sensitivity Consortium project.

The self-assessments were initially guided by the definition of Conflict Sensitivity outlined in the Consortium Benchmarking Paper (Feb 2009):

*A conflict sensitive approach involves gaining a sound understanding of the two-way interaction between activities and context and acting to minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts of interventions on conflict, within an organisation's given priorities/objectives (mandate).*

## **Consortium Goal and Objectives**

The main goal of the Practice of Conflict Sensitivity Project is to ensure greater impact of development and humanitarian assistance through improved and more widespread mainstreaming of conflict sensitive approaches. Key outcomes will include:

- Shared understanding of CSA across a network of International and local, development, humanitarian and peace building organizations;
- Lessons and recommendations for mainstreaming effective CSA across a range of contexts and sectors disseminated to policy makers, donors and practitioners;
- Strengthened expertise and capacity within member organizations and civil society partners to institutionalize and implement CSA at HQ and local levels.<sup>1</sup>

The project focuses on 4 countries – Kenya, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka and the UK.

Having a strong focus on effecting organisational change through learning and sharing lessons, the project has been broken down into the following 6 elements;

1. Development of a Shared Definition of Conflict Sensitivity
2. Analysis of Constraints and Barriers to Conflict Sensitivity
3. Building Capacity for Conflict Sensitivity
4. Documenting and Sharing Existing Practice
5. Testing, Monitoring and Evaluating Innovative Approaches
6. Advocacy and outreach

The Conflict Sensitivity Assessments are an integral part of elements 2 and 3, identifying constraints and barriers to conflict sensitivity, and building capacity to sustainably improve conflict sensitivity.

## **Objectives of Conflict Sensitivity Capacity Self-Assessment**

The self-assessments were framed and guided by three key aims:

**Aim 1:** We want to gain an initial assessment of capacity strengths and weaknesses  
Why? In order to be able to develop an initial plan for raising capacity and addressing impediments to CSA

---

<sup>1</sup> The Practice of Conflict-Sensitivity – Conflict Sensitivity Consortium / CARE International UK

**Aim 2:** We want to document clearly what we mean by organisational CSA capacity, what are organizational areas where we most need CSA capacity, what are our expectations for functional roles, and what are our expectations for different organisations more broadly in terms of CSA capacity

Why? In order to be explicit about what is needed to be conflict sensitive as an NGO, in order to clarify expectations, in order to share our learning with other organisations and in order to be able to make the implications of CSA mainstreaming clear to other organisations

**Aim 3:** We want to identify the main constraints / challenges to CSA from different NGO perspectives

Why? To be able to compare the findings of different NGOs, in different locations (different countries, INGO vs LNGO, head office vs country office).



## **2. SELF-ASSESSMENT IN KENYA**

### **2.1 Methodology**

The main part of the self-assessment in Kenya consisted of separate participatory one-day (or, upon members' requests half-day) sessions with the staff of each consortium member. The broad aim of the activity was to share experiences on the concept of conflict sensitivity and how it was applicable organizationally. Besides skills sharing, the self-assessments had enriching reflective value as well as helped in informing Consortium-wide application of conflict sensitivity.

### **2.2 Infusing Conflict Sensitivity: State of the Consortium**

Members are at varying levels of comprehension (and practice) of conflict sensitivity, all consortium members have unique systems and processes some of whose components are identical with the ideals of conflict sensitivity. In as much as this may imply that the process of realising conflict sensitive practice may be simplified, it is noteworthy that only a few of the members explicitly recognize conflict sensitivity in their organisational policy documents and tools.

At least three of the (eight) consortium members either explicitly refer to conflict sensitivity in their policy documents or have comprehensively developed tools and guides for conflict sensitive practice. In the rest of the members' policy documents and/or tools conflict sensitivity is implied, either intentionally because they are piloting conflict sensitive practice (e.g. Do No Harm) or unconsciously because their good/best practice ideals mirror those of conflict sensitivity.

It is also apparent that accountability and transparency standards (e.g. SPHERE standards and HAP) are widely embraced and well known, but that is not the case with CSA.

Thus, it is important to note that conflict sensitivity goes beyond celebrating good practices drawing from one's wisdom and/or experience, or even simply having good intentions and/or caring about good/harmless results. For the practice to be sustainable, it needs to be applied systematically and intentionally – as evidently drawn from the Kenyan consortium's definition. As the case studies in Chapter 3 will demonstrate, there are three success stories drawn from member organisation's adoption of CSA. However, the rest of the consortium members lack tools, publications and/or policies that explicitly mention conflict sensitivity, they do have a considerable level of appreciation for the practice. Values of CSA are equally implied and embraced in their policies and practices (e.g. procurement, recruitment, programming, partnerships etc). Some of these are captured in Chapter 3 as success stories.

Further, some have even facilitated capacity building sessions on some conflict sensitive approaches (e.g. Do No Harm) for partners and other stakeholders. Despite such positive initiatives, the big question has been how to effectively infuse conflict sensitivity in the organisation without creating inertia (in organisational operations).

### ***2.3 What Options for Infusion?***

The fact that an organisation explicitly mentions conflict sensitivity in its policies, develops comprehensive tools of analysis or espouses best practices doesn't necessarily mean successful conflict sensitive practice.

Rather, some key indicators to measure fruitful application of CSA should include its levels of:

- Systematisation (in policies, values, practices, interactions etc)
- Understanding and appreciation among staff (across departments)
- Influence on continuous organisational learning (and adaptation)
- Integration in organisational tools and guides (e.g. in impact assessment tools, needs assessment tools, monitoring and evaluation tools, etc)

There may definitely be numerous options for integrating CSA in daily organisational practice. But all boil down to two major options:

- Whether the consortium members want specific (separate) conflict sensitivity tools to guide their work. This option risks being viewed as tedious.
- Whether consortium members want to apply CSA in such a way that it is sublimated in already existing individual organisational frameworks but still explicitly and unpretentiously recognised.

The Consortium consensually agreed on change objectives that would guide their next steps in relation to conflict sensitivity (see Chapter 4).

### ***2.4 Outcomes of Self-Assessments***

Each of the eight members of the Kenyan Consortium underwent internal conflict sensitivity self-assessment exercises facilitated by the consultants. Individual self-assessment reports were prepared and submitted.

Thus, for purposes of this main report, only general findings will be highlighted. These include:

- Members had general knowledge about conflict sensitivity, but major challenge lay in how to operationalize the approach in programs/organizations. A frequently asked question was about how to institutionalize CSA in a sustainable way. This was later resolved in the change objectives.
- There was also a general concern that mainstreaming CSA could mean "more work". Participants in the self-assessment exercises grappled with whether CSA should be a stand alone or integrated in all departments? Alongside this concern was the question of what tools to utilize, and whether it should be rigorous or seminal. Ultimately, it was agreed that the change objectives should provide a good guiding framework for integrating CSA.
- It was found that in most cases among members, there is lack of systematization of CSA. Even in cases where CSA is contained in organizational policy documents, internal (staff) knowledge of the concept and its use is at best patchy

- and often times lacking. Overall, CSA is mostly implied in organizational policies and practices.
- With regard to internal CSA organizational knowledge and practice, there is a level of compartmentalization – CSA knowledge and use is centralized among organizational conflict experts

## 2.5 Case Studies

### Introduction

Consortium members have excelled in different areas of their work and approaches. A major challenge to sustainable conflict sensitive practice is the lack of documentation of success stories. This analysis summarises some of the celebrated policies and/or practices among consortium members.

### Cases of CSA Integration

For purposes of the case studies, three examples are drawn from members who have reached a milestone in different ways in relation to conflict sensitive practice.

The first example is of an organisation – Skillshare International – that actually explicitly mentions conflict sensitivity in its peacebuilding policy. While this is so, the organisation admitted lacking requisite knowledge and skills on conflict sensitivity.

#### Case Study 1: Committing to Conflict Sensitivity in Organisational Policy

Skillshare International embraces conflict sensitivity in its policy document on “*Promoting Peace Building and Conflict Transformation*”. The organisation adopts the definition contained in the *Conflict-Sensitive Approaches to Development, Humanitarian Assistance and Peacebuilding: A Resource Pack*. In the policy document, Skillshare commits to use a conflict-sensitive approach to their sectoral work by ensuring their work is sensitive to their contexts and facilitating the exchange of expertise (between peace building partners and those working in other sectors).

Secondly, World Vision – Kenya (WVK) has very comprehensive conflict sensitivity tools at macro, meso, and micro levels. These include the Making Sense of Turbulent Contexts (MSTC) Analysis and the Local Capacities for Peace/Do No Harm Framework. The organisation’s (WVK’s) knowledge of CSA however appears to be mostly confined to the peacebuilding unit. Further, the aforesaid conflict sensitivity tools are mainly used for analytical purposes, and more might need to be done to fully integrate CSA beyond just one department.

### Case Study 2: Utilising Conflict Sensitive Tools

MSTC Analysis MSTC helps one analyse historical antecedents to a conflict, actors and inter-group relations and determines the strategic and operational implications of the trends and dynamics of the turbulent contexts. MSTC Analysis is approached through the use of a set of tools that are used together in the MSTC Analysis Cycle:

- Rapid Historical Phase Analysis
- Actor Group Relationships Analysis
- Symptoms of Instability Analysis
- Political Economy of Instability Analysis
- MSTC Mapping
- Triggers and Scenarios Analysis – Process
- Strategic Implications – Process
- Operational Implications – Process

Thirdly, Saferworld, which was part of a group of organisations that developed the *Conflict Sensitive Approaches to Development, Humanitarian Assistance and Peacebuilding: A Resource Pack*, perhaps celebrates that output as one of its most visible on CSA. Drawing from consultations with DFID, this is probably one of the reasons it is relied on (alongside others) to concretely point donors' policies in an appropriate direction in relation to the full integration of CSA. But from the self-assessment deliberations with the Nairobi office, it was apparent that organisational skills on conflict sensitivity might be concentrated in London while the Kenya team lacks such (in-depth) knowledge. Some attention also needs to be put on applying the practice over and above the publication of such a useful resource pack.

### Case Study 3: Developing Resource Guides on Conflict Sensitivity

The *Conflict-Sensitive Approaches to Development, Humanitarian Assistance and Peacebuilding: A Resource Pack* was developed in 2004 by a consortium of six organisations – Africa Peace Forum, Centre for Conflict Resolution, Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies, Forum on Early Warning and Response, International Alert and Saferworld. Developing the Resource Pack was based on extensive mapping of conflict sensitive practice and discussions with representatives from government, civil society and donors. It aims at raising awareness on conflict sensitivity and recording indigenous and international practice. It therefore synthesises different approaches such as Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA), Do No Harm, as well as less-known organic approaches developed by practitioners in the South.

## Organisational Policies

There are aspects of organisational policies, practices and approaches of consortium members that have been cited as worth underscoring.

The first example is that of Action Aid International Kenya (AAIK).

### Case Study 4: AAIK Procurement Policy

The organisation procures for items from communities within which a project is implemented. Where goods and services needed are beyond local business people's ability to supply, they are procured nationally, but this is explained to the local applicants. Through this policy the potential alienation of AAIK from the local community is avoided.

The second success story concerns CARE-Kenya's recruitment policy.

#### **Case Study 5: CARE-Kenya Recruitment Policy**

From its work in North-Eastern Province (Dadaab refugee camp), CARE Kenya has developed the practice of recruiting candidates from the host community for certain job opportunities in the area. As such, job advertisements are made locally, and job requirements that would give them a competitive edge developed (e.g. applicant must speak local language etc). This practice evolved out of the realisation that the host community gets disgruntled when such opportunities are given to "outsiders".

Thirdly, CAFOD embraces participatory approaches in implementing activities with its partners.

#### **Case Study 6: CAFOD Participatory Implementation**

With the exception of its work in Darfur, CAFOD's work is partnership-based. One of its success stories in working through partnerships is the inter-agency intervention in the aftermath of Turbi massacre in Marsabit. In the thick of the conflict, the Church wasn't considered neutral, while a multiplicity of actors wanted to intervene. An inter-faith peacebuilding initiative named the Marsabit Inter-Faith Council was established, which made religion a connector rather than a divider. The Council has grown to have the recognition of community, local leaders, and even the Inter-Religion Councils of Kenya.

The fourth story is about Save the Children (UK) participatory approaches in working with IDPs.

#### **Case Study 7: Save the Children UK Participatory Implementation**

In Rift Valley, Save the Children supported both the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and the local communities e.g. the seeds distribution initiative. At the same time it engaged IDPs for casual work through a joint selection process by a mixed committee representing different communities. This approach helps to minimize the perception of one group being favored over the other, while at the same time ensuring inclusiveness, hence down playing the existing inter-ethnic animosity. It reduced the chances of having only certain groups or communities engaged, which could in turn, would exacerbate the existing tensions. The practice has contributed to reconciliation among the communities and IDPs.

In humanitarian interventions, agencies contend with the dilemma of restricting provision of relief aid to targeted beneficiaries only, or also aiding host and/or neighbouring communities:

#### **Case Study 8: Relief Food Distribution in Kitale**

Program personnel engaged in distributing relief food to IDPs in Trans Nzoia were cognizant of the wider conflict in Mt. Elgon that had spilt over to the region. They knew that solely targeting IDPs in relief food distribution would only reinforce feelings of exclusion among the communities in neighbouring Mt. Elgon and further complicate the conflict. In effect they convinced the Diocese to widen distribution efforts to include Mt. Elgon. This helped in dispelling tensions and enhancing success in the intervention.

There are many more told and untold stories on successes that can be built up on to further entrench the practice of conflict sensitivity. Some of these include:

- Development of detailed tools of analysis and their internalisation e.g. Making Sense of Turbulent Contexts already discussed
- Publication of resource guides and training materials e.g. Resource pack on conflict sensitivity already discussed
- Capacity building forums for partners and staff e.g. training sessions on conflict sensitive practice (such as Do No Harm trainings).

However, an important consideration to make is about letting these success stories inform current and future conflict-sensitive practice among consortium members. Some of the ways these successes can enrich practice include:

- i. Shared learning forums – the consortium can host/organise lessons learnt sessions for members with the aim of achieving shared learning
- ii. Piloting CSA approaches and tools
- iii. CSA analysis – identifying approaches which are ongoing but not recognized
- iv. Organising symposia for feedback from/to consortium members and other stakeholders
- v. Program reviews (redesigning) – based on lessons learnt and skills acquired, members should be open to reviewing their programs and where necessary redesigning them
- vi. Integrating conflict sensitivity in our operations – further integrating CSA in organisational operations would be helpful
- vii. Sharing success stories with donors and other partners can be an effective way of influencing donors' and/or partners' perspectives on conflict sensitivity
- viii. Develop template for success stories documentation as a way of sustaining the practice.

### **Conflict-Blind Programming**

There are still challenges of conflict-blind programming that were noted by members and partners. These should serve to provide opportunities for learning and underline gaps in capacities that may need to be addressed rather than being a criticism and exposition of failures. There was an example of a development project – motivated by good intentions – but which unintentionally ignored underlying conflict issues in the project area.

#### **Case Study 9: Conflict Blind Development Project**

Some religious leaders in Maralal initiated a road construction project with the noble aim of ensuring accessibility of services (health facilities, market etc) to a community that far removed from these facilities. This effort overlooked underlying land issues and the identity politics between the community that had inhabited the areas the longest and the remotely located community that needed access to the services (who were looked at as guests). The road project was therefore interpreted by the “original” inhabitants as favouring the rival (“guest”) community. It there caused further conflict.

In an illustration of noble intentions that were executed wrongly, the government resettlement and reconciliation programs – dubbed *Operation Rudi Nyumbani* (Operation

Return Home) and *Operation Ujirani Mwema* (Operation Good Neighbourliness) – were questioned by a partner organisation.

#### **Case Study 10: Placing Resettlement before Dialogue**

The government coined the terms “Operation Rudi Nyumbani” for its resettlement efforts after the signing of the National Accord in 2008. The government hope to move internally displaced persons (IDPs) from IDP camps back to their farms and/or homes. But coining of the term “operation” gave it a militaristic tone, and demonstrated a lack of appreciation of IDPs. Later, the government began the “Operation Ujirani Mwema”, which didn’t shed the militaristic overtones. Further the government-civil society office responsible for peace building – the National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC) – wasn’t provided resources to facilitate dialogue when they were the lead agency for the task (the Special Programs Ministry, which took the lead in resettlement was on the other hand adequately resourced). The IDPs were therefore faced with the prospect of heading back to hostile neighbours. A good number of the IDPs refused to go back home, and opted to stay in the camps.

There are situations in which agencies have learnt to muddle through, framing solutions as problems and/or conflicts arise over time:

#### **Case Study 11: Framing a Coordination Mechanism to Confront Emerging Issues**

In the Dadaab refugee camp, agencies are confronted with the growing challenges associated with a long-running refugee problem. The refugee communities’ leadership structures are the gateway for any agency’s interventions. This over time made the leaders powerful, and with more power, it was abused (e.g. leaders asking for favours). When one agency attempted distributing relief supplies directly to the refugees, it fell out of favour with the leaders. Some of the leaders also tried playing agencies against each other for their own selfish gain. This was compounded by the proliferation of agencies in the camp – all of them utilising the same structures. This challenge brought with it difference in approaches and practices (e.g. some agencies paying participants per diems while others didn’t). This created a need for a coordination mechanism that would harmonise standards. As such the UNHCR became the coordinating point for agencies in Dadaab, which meet monthly. A referral system was developed – to point refugees in the right direction for their diverse needs and/or problems.

Lastly, in efforts to stay accountable to their donors, and/or stamp their presence (and hence appear involved in resolving local communities’ problems), agencies often brand their projects to be more visible, but this has unintended implications:

#### **Case Study 12: Branding Housing Projects in Resettling IDPs**

In the aftermath of the post-2007 polls violence, and with the challenge of hundreds of thousands displaced communities, some agencies played a critical role in helping resettle the IDPs and in construction of homes for a number of them. In many cases the agencies branded their organisational names on such houses. This has had unintended implications: First, perceived aggressor communities also lost their properties and haven’t enjoyed similar attention. This has entrenched levels of resentment. Second, in the event of renewed animosities, the branded houses could be easily identified for destruction. This is especially concerning in the context that healing and reconciliation efforts haven’t been as prioritised as resettlement efforts.

## **2.6 Challenges**

### **Introduction**

Before outlining the framework that will guide the application of conflict sensitivity among member of the Consortium, it is important to highlight the multiple challenges in the way of this process. The fact that the Consortium is at its formative stages is in itself a special challenge, and especially given that this study found that the membership is at different stages of understanding and utilising CSA.

Acknowledging the challenges in comprehension and application of conflict sensitivity need not be viewed as failures. Rather, these need honest analytical appreciation with a view to refining CSA to surmount the challenges.

### **The Challenges**

There are several challenges that were identified:

- i. Comprehension
  - Confusion between conflict resolution/peacebuilding and conflict sensitivity: As earlier noted (1.0 Conceptualising Conflict Sensitivity) there is a tendency among some to associate conflict sensitive practice with conflict resolution. This can pose a challenge in executing conflict sensitivity – much energy and focus could be invested in peacebuilding-oriented activities when the intention is to minimise the negative and maximise the positive effects of an intervention.
  - Knowledge gap on conflict sensitive approaches: Even with the goodwill towards practicing conflict sensitivity, there is still some lack of knowledge on the different ways conflict sensitivity can be applied. Consortium members may need a more intense exposure to conflict sensitive practice and approaches.
- ii. Appreciation
  - Lack of interest in the practice: The practice of conflict sensitivity faces the challenge of a possible lack of interest in it, where some could view it as one of the many jargons whose time will pass. Therefore how it is packaged and applied will determine the value members and others will place on it.
  - Comfort that individual organisations' practices are good enough. The challenge herein lies in the need to practically demonstrate the additional value conflict sensitivity brings.
- iii. Operationalisation
  - Problem of applying concept among organisations with different mandates: A number of members talked of the need to find a balance between conflict sensitive practice and their respective approaches (e.g. rights based approaches etc). It will be helpful for agencies to learn about how CSA can be adapted to their different mandates.
  - Restriction of practice to organisations/departments/units with peacebuilding mandates: Even where the need for CSA is appreciated, there is the tendency to place its execution within the responsibility of peacebuilding programs/departments/officers. While this might mean its



- more rigorous exposition, it is restrictive while the goals of CSA are to have the practice institutionalised.
  - Fear that applying CSA could be bulky, increase number of tools, and bog down staff/members with lots of guides at expense of efficiency.
- iv. Capacity
  - Expertise/skill
    - Lack of expertise/skill: A good number of organisations lack the skill necessary to apply conflict sensitivity. There is a major need for capacity building.
    - Asymmetrical distribution of skilled staff (e.g. country office lacking skills while organisation has such expertise elsewhere). There are cases (among members), where the Kenyan country office(s) lack skilled staff (on CSA) whereas the larger organisation(s) has the same expertise in other countries. In one instance, staff in one agency felt the execution of their policy-oriented goals in conflict sensitivity is the preserve of the headquarter office. This poses a challenge in sustaining the practice.
  - Funds: Most organisations lack financial resources earmarked for CSA. This impedes its application. It was for example felt by one member that the time spent in consortium-related activities was tricky accounting for (in terms of who pays for the time).
  - Donors'/partners' goodwill: the successful implementation is partly dependent on the goodwill of donors and partners. The challenge lies in coming up with appropriate strategies to engage them on CSA.

## **Overcoming Challenges**

There are several suggested ways of overcoming the challenges to CSA:

- Incorporate conflict sensitivity into programming through strategic plan and business plans
- Specifically identify areas of integration of conflict sensitivity within organisation and/or programs
- Hold staff individually accountable by setting personal standards/plans
- Continuous/regular capacity building opportunities/educational opportunities to maintain knowledge and sustainability
- Strengthen CSA-related advocacy
- Improve documentation and information sharing
- Strengthen coordination and networking

## **2.7 Change Objectives**

The intense process of consultations, self-assessments and validation of the documentation yielded a framework and/or roadmap that will guide the Consortium's next steps. In addition to members agreeing to the need for a systematic approach to conflict sensitivity, the committed to the following change objectives (a more comprehensive lists of change objectives is annexed at the end of this report, in addition to member-specific objectives contained in individual self-assessment reports):

## **1. Knowledge/Experience Sharing**

- Documentation – Consortium members should document best practices and lessons learnt
- Internal and consortium meetings – actively organise and participate in intra-organisational and consortium CSA meetings
- Consortium-government interaction – the Consortium should broaden efforts for integrating conflict sensitivity by engaging with the government through the National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC)
- Information sharing with partners (locally) – the Consortium members should locally share information on CSA with local partners.

## **2. Capacity Building**

- Develop Shared Understanding of Conflict Sensitivity – Members felt that with the adoption of a common definition of conflict sensitivity, this objective had greatly been achieved.
- Continuous training/learning – the Consortium can organise training for members, while members can institute internal mentoring mechanisms to enhance sustainability of knowledge gained.
- Funds – members can consider allocating financial resources for CSA, or jointly fundraise for such funds through the Consortium
- Tool adoption/development/integration – Members agreed that they needed to share amongst themselves CSA tools with the aim of at best developing a harmonised one, and at minimum developing member-specific tools.

## **4. Cross-Departmental Integration**

While members agreed on the need for the integration of CSA across all organisational departments, it was felt that each member organisation should identify the organisational focal point of CSA.

## **5. Programming**

- Infuse conflict sensitivity in member organisations' assessments e.g.
  - Needs assessments;
  - Baseline assessments; and
  - Reviews
- Carry out Context/Conflict analyses for areas of relevance for the Consortium
- Integrate CSA in members' program cycle

## **6. Partners/Donors**

- The Consortium should organise donor round-tables to sell CSA
- Create an e-Community through which online interactions (interactive website, e-library, etc) can be developed
- Nurture UK-Kenya Consortium engagement
- Enhance intra-Consortium involvement in individual members' activities e.g. development of strategic plans, tool development and testing, conflict analyses etc
- Develop donor engagement strategy

## **2.8 General Recommendations**

Given the comprehensive nature of the process – document reviews, self assessments and validation exercises – at which each stage generated a number of recommendations that have been captured; few additional recommendations can be made by the consultants. These include:

- Developing a workable framework of engagement for the consortium – Given that the Consortium is at its inception stages, it is necessary to develop general guidelines that will inform interactions among members in relation to Consortium activities.
- Confidence Building and Buy-Ins – It is doubtful that all members have completely embraced the CSA-integration process. There is need for sustained negotiation on appropriate ways of infusing the practice, as well as the nitty-gritty of full members' participation in the Consortium
- Internal Members' Deliberation on all Reports – It is necessary that an internal deliberative process be planned to examine all the reports (the self-assessment reports, main report documenting case studies and partners' and donors' reports) with the aim of creating intra-Consortium synergy and developing common ground for the Consortium.

### **3. SELF-ASSESSMENT IN SIERRA LEONE**

#### **3.1 Self-assessment process and methodology**

This study was a learning process for all participating agencies at both agency and consortium levels within a streamlined time frame which was a critical factor that influenced the choice of the Sectoral Focus Group Methodology. It provided an opportunity for the consultants to engage through an interactive approach, senior and middle management level staff, programme and programme support staff in nine sectors across CSA Consortium members. The rationale for the choice of this methodology was that it is exploratory, interactive and time saving as the process fast tracks data collection and prompt sharing of feedback at the end of each self-assessment exercise without focusing on who wins or loses or which agency has a more conflict sensitive approach in its interventions.

As a preparatory phase for the self-assessment exercise, the consultants developed tools in the form of templates for documenting case studies and change objectives of agencies, which were validated at a pre-assessment workshop as a milestone in the assessment process. While differences exist in terms of priorities and programme emphasis among consortium members, the pre-assessment workshop helped to identify some organizational and operational commonalities among agencies. This was critical in determining the self-assessment depth and approach. The following are nine common sectors that cut across the seven consortium agencies:

1. Coordination and programme support
2. Policies, strategies & risk management
3. Community-based-programmes (youth, food security, WAS, RBA)
4. Design, monitoring & evaluation
5. Communication, documentation and information technology (IT)
6. Human Resource
7. Administration, finance & Audit
8. Grants, fundraising & sponsorships
9. Operations & partnerships

The process of assessing all partner organizations spanned nearly five months and sufficient data has been collected and analyzed using the following format:

- Review of relevant agency documents ( e.g. strategic framework / papers, incident reports, policies, MoUs) to inform agency CSA Practices
- Discussion with agency staff in all nine sectors (e.g. HR, Programmes, Procurement, DM&E, etc)
- Use of sector-related questionnaire
- Inter-personal interviews with sector personnel
- Exploring sector understanding, experience & definition of CSA
- Pulling together in a plenary, various sector findings, experiences & definitions of CSA.
- Compilation of Agency CSA best practices and Case Studies

### **3.2 Key Findings**

The key findings of this study have been documented based on the principle of anonymity. The consortium will take responsibility regarding who to share the report with. However, members of the consortium on the other hand have agreed to work on selected change objectives as their capacity development plans which might help them to be responsive to conflict sensitive situations at work and in communities where they implement programmes. Below is a summary of key findings which have been aggregated by sectors, focusing on cross-cutting issues.

#### ***Coordination and Programme Support***

1. Management and programme staff demonstrated some level of awareness of CSA
2. Horizontal Resourcing / Peer Support was considered not only as a CS approach, but as a learning opportunity through sharing of similar experiences as opposed to that of 'importing' experts in post-conflict locations.
3. The newly-developed Country Disaster Management Plan is not conflict sensitive. However, a gap analysis has been done, with recommendations made.
4. Challenges of coordinating sectors / projects / programmes are rife where agencies run / manage a series of micro / mini projects with too many reporting lines.
5. Office and Programme Assistants continue to face risks of receiving and delivering mails or packages to donors, partners and service providers without prior checks even though they take full responsibility for prompt, safe and correct deliveries.
6. Tensions exist around denominational differences among staff and programme participants and stakeholders of faith-based organizations in relation to who works with whom and on what project?
7. Tensions with government around statistics of expert staff employed by organizations as some organizations do not supply correct statistics to coordinating NGOs.
8. Challenges of coordinating payments of work permit from expatriates to government where some of these expert staffs are only invited to provide drop-in or consultancy services.
9. Responding to tensions that arise between government and NGOs in relation to taxation, new NGO policies and accountability procedures continue to pose critical challenges.
10. Managing government's attempt to downsize NGOs to '20 NGOs per sector,' raises the challenge of developing a phasing out and merging strategy.
11. Challenges of managing the interface between programme staff and programme support staff as both teams plan, independently, of each other even though there should be a symbiotic relationship between them
12. Challenges of dealing with existing divergences among individual agencies as each agency has its own identity, priorities or mandates.

#### **Policies, Strategies and Risk Management**

1. MoUs prepared between partners and sub-grantees focus more on budget and outputs but are blind to conflict-related issues

2. There is an Urgent need to increase organizational commitment to mainstreaming CSA as only three agencies out of the seven consortium members were able to make such commitments
3. Challenges of mainstreaming CS at organizational level as there are too many existing policies some of which are not CS
4. Partners awareness about CS very low
5. Policies on Conflict of Interests, Child Protection, Vehicle and Procurement are considered a CSA although there are tensions around the discriminatory attributes of vehicle policies which restrict junior or local staff from using agency vehicles without disclaimers.
6. The task of multiple reporting demands on key staff is a possible source of conflict at work.
7. The existing Child Protection Policies are not clear on the issues of Child to Child Abuse or Child to Staff abuse. They also lack clarity on reporting the responsibilities at agency or community levels.
8. Potential negative effects of ' importing ' partners to implement project activities in their non operational areas.
9. Cumbersome procurement policies and procedures continue to create tensions between programme staff and the procurement team
10. Unclear and unrealistic donor policies relating to the utilization of funds affect programme implementation which has led to the cancellation of programme advances in two agencies
11. Problems associated with the inconsistencies of interpreting government policies at various levels which affect HR policies
12. Effects of the misuse of waiver opportunities available to NGOs on well meaning organizations
13. Absence of documents which regulate volunteerism.
14. Gaps / mismatch between current realities and cost specifications in many of the existing HR organizational policies.

#### **Community-Based Programmes (Youth, Food Security, WASH, Women's Rights etc.)**

1. Tensions between community members and agencies around budget cuts after approval by donors continue to pose challenges in their engagements.
2. Unrealistic beneficiary thresholds within deep rooted community needs and expectations can lead to potential community disaffection of NGOs and staff
3. Baseline Surveys and needs assessments conducted without CS bias / focus is likely to have negative impact on community projects

#### **Design, Monitoring and Evaluation**

1. No system for reporting conflict blind practices although there is an efficient Accountability, Learning and Planning systems (e.g. ALPS) in place.
2. CSA not integrated into the Project Cycle Management ( PMC)
3. There is a dire need to review the context analysis as a strategy of attempting to get at the root causes of conflict in Sierra Leone. ( agencies & issues that are possible causes of conflict in Sierra Leone)
4. Challenges of redesigning programmes to identify areas of tension in programme design , monitoring and implementation in the PMC
5. CS not included in many consortium member M&E Policies

6. Challenges of aligning Sectoral Strategies with government policies and Country Strategies (Child Protection Strategies as enshrined in the CRA, The New Education Policy, WASH and Food Aid.)
7. Need to review Registered Child ( RC) mapping to check unfair distribution of registered Children in the ADPs / communities of operations
8. Absence of a documented referral system / policy to guide and inform NGO partners in times of distress or need.
9. The need for joint-evaluation process with community, line ministries, and departments with reports and lessons learned shared at communities, districts, and national levels considered as a CSA.

### **Communication, Documentation and Information Technology**

1. Breakdown in communications between field offices and partners raises tensions
2. Low level of CS awareness among employees / Volunteers/partners
3. No corporate commitment of staff to IT Policy as members of staff are yet to sign IT Policy
4. Absence of written guidelines on documentation process of agency-specific work
5. The need for Sector Team Leaders to review their information dissemination and training Strategies to ensure the inclusion of all Sectoral staff in the information loop.
6. Refusal of staff to explore new technological changes in the cyber world
7. The need to include CS on the agenda for all SLANGO Meetings with member organizations as a strategy of raising awareness of the NGO community on CSA.
8. The challenges of rolling out reviewed IT policies and communication strategies.

### **Human Resources**

1. Lack of awareness of existing codes of conduct on Child Protection Policy, Anti – sexual harassment or confidentiality in some of the agencies
2. Allocation of quality time with line managers as a form of Performance Appraisal and Peer Support is considered conflict sensitive
3. Tensions around the processes and procedures of performance appraisal Systems often erupt between supervisors and supervisees.
4. Limited CS Practice in HR Programmes though unconsciously as HR attempts to go by the procedures and to minimize conflicts and litigations.
5. Challenges for HR to update personnel records and to respond to individual capacity needs as performance evaluations are done every three months by most agencies
6. Absence of grievance procedures often makes room for possible violation of employee rights.
7. The process of documenting, investigating, reviewing, redesigning and responding to every conflict-related incidents, not perhaps CS, as there are no consistent procedures in the four agencies
8. The inability to sign risk Management Policy by ALL staff considered as a CS.
9. Absence of exit interviews in six agencies considered not CS
10. Most HR policies do not meet the current realities
11. Managements' responses to the social welfare of staff are sometimes selective as contributions are made, perhaps based, on the status of the staff in question where agencies do not have policy guidelines to inform such actions.

12. The need to review policy on the allocation and management of medical budget allocations to staff
13. No Clear HR Policies, Job descriptions or Conditions of Service in some organizations.

### **Administration, Finance and Audit**

1. Recurring tensions between Administration, Finance and Programme staff, where programme staff claim ownership of funds as opposed to the 'custodian responsibility' of the same funds by administrative staff.
2. Audit and Administration often excluded in project design and budget planning process, a situation that often leads to tensions between audit and programme staff.
3. Challenges of getting partners to liquidate for grants in line with the agency's financial policy

### **Grants, Fundraising and Sponsorship**

1. Lack of transparency in donor funding strategies (EU & DFID) which continue to pose challenges in programme implementation.
2. Tension around the selection process and management of the 300 per community threshold strategy. Possibility of raising the issue of discrimination at community levels.
3. Challenges of identifying and registering 3,000 children in ADPs or communities of operations among the poorest of the poor
4. Tensions around Gift Notification
5. The existence of a sponsorship Consortium was considered as a CSA
6. Challenges of raising funds and sustaining programmes to respond to community needs.

### **Operations and Partnership**

1. There is an existence of a comprehensive partnership guide in three of the agencies which is considered as CS
2. Low capacities of some partners, which is often a source of conflict as partners either continue to submit poor quality reports or are often late in submitting such reports.
3. Partners are often inclined to compare partnership agreements in the communities in situation where some agencies comparatively provide better packages or services.
4. Some partners operate a closed-door policy with no Open Information Boards / policies which make stakeholders suspicious of possibilities of mismanagement of resources.
5. Lack of capacity to assess NGOs
6. Inconsistencies in the selection criteria of partners, thus making the selection processes conflict blind
7. Lack of collaboration among agencies working on sponsorship programmes at community levels which creates room for friction among agencies
8. The inability to work with existing community structures considered CS.



### 3.3 Agency-Specific Change Objectives and Development Plans

The findings of this study have been categorized into three levels:

1. **Agency Level** – Change objectives which are to be worked on by specific agencies
2. **Consortium Level** – Change Objectives which are to be worked on collectively at consortium level
3. **Joint Learning** - Findings which have been considered as best practices in terms of CSA for which agencies have been identified as lead agencies in the shared learning process.

Although partners did not vote which change objectives to work on, a consensus was reached through a facilitated process at each stage by agency representatives during the validation workshop, hence the choice of change of Change Objectives by agencies to inform their agency-specific capacity building plans.

### 3.4 Best Practices

1. Open information policies practiced by **Agency X**: This practice does not only promote community participation, it also sets the pace for sustainability and the drive for community ownership.

### 3.5 Recommendations:

Two levels: Consortium and Agency levels

#### 1. CONSORTIUM COMMITMENT:

- Mainstreaming CS practice in Sierra Leone will, largely, depend on the commitment of consortium members. We recommend tasking individual agencies to carry out specific components of the process and rotate the hosting of CS Meetings / functions.

#### 2. AWARENESS-RAISING:

- As a strategy to minimize conflict at the work place, HR Departments of consortium agencies should raise the level of awareness of CSA process and align it with existing organizational policies to meet current operational realities

#### 1. GAP ANALYSIS:

- We recommend a gap analysis to minimize negative impact on staff and programmes caused by existing gaps between current corporate commitments and prevailing circumstances.

#### COMMUNICATION STRATEGY:

- As inconsistencies in communication strategies and protocols is crucial to conflict and programming, we recommend a standardized communication

- pattern between SMTS, Field Offices, partners and CS consortium members to minimise possibilities of frictions or tensions.
- We also recommend that consortium agencies develop or review policy documents to reflect / mainstream conflict sensitive approaches in their interventions.

### **AGENCY LEVEL**

- We recommend the integration of CSA when selecting partners and setting beneficiary thresholds in ADPs /Areas of operations to minimize negative impact of interventions
- Increased agency engagement with media to raise awareness of organizations, communities and partners about CS Approaches.
- We encourage consortium agencies to share best practices and lessons learned in programming and policy design (community participation, staff appraisals, Access to information and documentation) with other partner agencies, line ministries and departments.

## 4. SELF-ASSESSMENT IN SRI LANKA

### 4.1 Brief on the Self-Assessment Activity and Its Purpose

In September 2009 the Sri Lankan consortium comprising the following 8 organisations; CAFOD, CARE, International Alert (IA), Peace and Community Action (PCA), RedR, Saferworld, Save the Children in Sri Lanka (SCiSL), and World Vision Lanka; went through a consultative process where each member shared their organisations definition and understanding of Conflict Sensitivity (CS) and how it was applied practically in the organisational structure. The consortium then arrived at a working definition of what 'conflict sensitivity' meant by linking the commonalities. (*Annexure 1*)

*"A conflict sensitive approach involves gaining a sound understanding of the two-way interaction between activities and context and acting to minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts of interventions on conflict, within an organisation's given priorities/objectives (mandate)."*

Informed by this definition of CSA, the Sri Lankan consortium met in October 2009 to plan its self-assessment process. The meeting was convened by World Vision Lanka, which was the lead agency on this activity and attended by Saferworld, Peace and Community Action, and Save the Children. The main outcome of this meeting was a 3-page document providing a framework for the self-assessment process. (*Annexure 2*)

**The objectives of the self-assessment:** The process began by agreeing on what the objectives of the self-assessment should be;

- To assess the capacities, strengths and weaknesses of each organisation in order to develop a plan that would build capacity and address impediments to CSA
- To document clearly what it means to be conflict sensitive in different environments i.e. peace building, development, humanitarian etc.
- To use the self-assessment as a baseline to monitor the progress of project activities

**Sharing of findings:** Since each organisation's findings would be at varied levels and at times controversial and confidential, it was decided to let each one select the finding they wished to share with the consortium, following approval from the management. However, it was decided that as far as possible all would share a summary of findings.

**Language:** In order that staff at all levels would be able to understand and participate fully in the exercise, it was agreed that the monkey survey be translated into local languages. However, as there was room for misinterpretation of terminology in the translation process, it was suggested that English be the chief language while the main questions of each section be translated into Sinhala and Tamil, while also using peer support where necessary.

**The assessment process:** In determining the areas of assessment, it was agreed that while all the organisations would explore all the areas, when it came to sharing experiences, each one would have the freedom to select which areas they would share with the consortium.

- a. Human Resources
- b. Finance
- c. Development
- d. Humanitarian Emergencies
- e. Administration
- f. Peace building
- g. Ministry Quality/ M and E
- h. Management and Field Staff
- i. Partners
- j. Donors (especially for Local NGOs)
- k. Communities/Beneficiaries

Therefore, the entire self-assessment process took the following steps;

1. Online Monkey Survey (which assessed staffs understanding of CS, how they perceived its relevance and use in particular contexts)
2. Interviews (which assessed each agency's capacity for mainstreaming CS, their status on CS policies and strategies, institutional commitment, CS use in terms of dealing with donors etc.)
3. Desk Analysis (which was carried out by agencies to review whether policies and procedures were conflict sensitive)
4. Assessment Matrix to determine:
  - a. The ranking of each of the seven areas identified in the Self-Assessment Document i.e. Emerging or Discovering (considering, enquiring), Developing (partly in place) Advanced (in place)
  - b. The Change Objectives

## **4.2 Methodology**

**The Monkey Survey:** The Sri Lankan consortium decided to use two methods to assess CS capacities of the organisations; the interview guidance developed by the UK (adapted to the local context) as it was thought to be a useful process, and an online survey to assess the understanding of CS. Questions were aimed at identifying staff's understanding and the use of CS, as well as how they perceived its relevance to particular contexts and its use in terms of their own role within the organisation.

In order to ensure greater participation, the definition of CS and the questions of the online survey were translated into local languages. (*Annexure 3, 4, 5*)

104 of participants from 9 agencies (CARE, Caritas, CAFOD, IA, PCA, RedR, SAVE, Saferworld, and WVL) participated in the online questionnaire (the 'monkey survey').

Once all agencies had forwarded the online survey to staff members and completed the questionnaire, the findings which were shared with each agency point person, were analysed and a consolidated agency survey was prepared. The outcome of this process was a synthesised Sri Lankan Consortium output. (*Annexure 6*)

**Interviews:** A second set of questions sought to assess each agency's capacity for mainstreaming CS. (*Annexure 7, 8*) Primarily developed by the UK, this 'question crib' focused on understanding agencies' status on the following; CS policies and strategies, institutional commitment, learning and knowledge management, CS integration into programmes, institutional mainstreaming of CSA, CS use in terms of dealing with donors and funding and CSA capacities.

Each agency had the flexibility to choose their own method of how the second questionnaire would be used. For example, some agencies chose to extract relevant questions/sections from the lengthy questionnaire and adapted it to suit the organisation. Data collection methods also varied, while some forwarded the questionnaire to staff, others hired consultants to carry out interviews (through focus group discussions or key informant interviews).

**Desk Analysis:** Desk research was also carried out by agencies to review whether the policies and procedures were conflict sensitive. This was done by combining the results of the monkey survey and the questionnaire and was completed by each agency using a ranking guide on the findings to help assess the status of the consortium;

- Emerging or Discovering (considering, enquiring)
- Developing (partly in place)
- Advanced (in place)

#### **4.3 Consolidation of Key Findings**

Prior to consolidating the SA process, a workshop was held in January 2010 to pull together and share the findings of each agency. This step in the process brought about an agreement to develop a clear understanding of the strengths and support needs of each organisation and the consortium as a whole. It also helped to develop learning objectives and potential activities to build CS capacity.

At the workshop each agency documented their 'self assessment journey' by illustrating the process in the form of pictures (*Annexure 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14*). Following this 'Learning Needs Plans' were developed, which in turn led to the process of outlining a CS vision for each organisation. This was then followed by determining of potential change objectives and the rationale for them, potential activities to achieve the change objectives such as trainings, awareness raising within organisations and with partners, drafting policies on CS etc. The resultant matrix identified the support (from the project itself as well as the organisations) required to achieve all of the above; in the final step of this process, the matrix was taken to the management for approval.

The entire process was long-drawn and the change objectives along with related plans were finalised in August 2010.

In addition to the above, the outcomes of the workshop also included;

- The agencies agreeing to document the process and the findings of the self assessment exercise using the given format. (*Annexure 15*)

- The collective outlining of draft change objectives, which were later finalised along with related plans at the August 2010 meeting. (*Annexure 16*)

The following section is a summary of key findings of each agency based on the categories listed in the SA process outline document.

#### **4.4 Key Findings**

##### **A) Overall Understanding of CS within Organisations (Based on the Monkey Survey)**

While all organisations were aware of Conflict Sensitivity, the degree of understanding varied to an extent.

Some organisations were aware of and understood CS at all levels of staff, while in others it was felt that CS was relevant to only certain staff e.g. CS was thought to be more relevant to programme than administrative staff. There were also some organisations where staff had heard about CS, but only about half the respondents had some understanding of it.

There was a general feeling that in order to improve CSA, proper methodologies and resources were required; for although there was a general knowledge of CS institutionalising and operationalising CSA in a sustainable manner remained a challenge.

##### **B) Policies and Strategies**

All organisations lacked a clear policy outlining what CS meant and how it was to be mainstreamed. And despite reference to CS being made in major policies such as employment, procurement, travel, administration and security policies, staff knowledge of the concept and its use was often lacking.

Agencies indicated that programme support strategies were indirectly linked to and encompassed CS by ensuring impartiality, fairness and equity through a Code of Conduct, maintaining practices such as 'Do No Harm' and standards such as SPHERE standards and HAP. Overall, CSA was implied in organisational policies and practices.

Suggestions were made that in order to ensure a CSA, the organisation would need to include it in future agreements/programmes, as well as incorporating it into the operations manual and programme strategies.

##### **C) Institutional Commitment**

Although, in principle, an institutional commitment to CSA was accepted as being important, the extent of its use in decision-making varied; it was 'thought to be present and implemented' and was apparent in participatory decision-making where there was a degree of transparency, accountability, and inclusion. Some felt that it was based on individual understanding and used only in particular situations (such as armed conflict or when dealing with different ethnicities) or if it was explicitly incorporated in a project. Others did not consider CS a priority and decisions were made taking into consideration the objective and mandate of the programme and its unintended consequences, with changes being made as, and if, the context changed.

Leadership proactively raising the profile of conflict sensitivity was mixed; with some agency management teams demonstrating a solid understanding and clear commitment, perhaps because they planned as well as designed and delivered training on DNH and CS. In one case, management did not directly seek to promote CS with the rest of the organisation or external partners, but did so through workshops.

Commitment within the consortium on building CSA skills varied; in one case no support was provided for internal or external training to build skills, in another although the training was conducted it was not systematic and with limited follow-up. In the majority of cases the commitment to promote professional standards within the humanitarian sector prompted trainings and awareness-raising on DNH, IHL, CoC, etc. within a CS framework. Some agencies said they used in-house expertise to train staff and partners.

When considering CS and accountability in relation to staff positions, it was not clearly stated who should monitor (except in positions created specifically to deal with CS). CS was not a factor taken into consideration when reviewing staff conduct and not included in IOP's or APA. In one case as the organisations implementation and enforcement of existing accountability frameworks varied it was suggested that these be used to monitor CS too.

#### **D) Learning and Knowledge Management**

Although opportunities existed for CS to be discussed and reflected on in an open atmosphere, whether these 'safe spaces' were recognised as such by staff and adequately used, was uncertain. There is no proper system in place to collect experiences, although success stories/case studies, participants' feedback, employee satisfaction forms etc. are used to an extent. Further, the lack of time and proper follow-up on the information shared were reasons stated for the reluctance to take advantage of the opportunity.

In terms of openness to discussing positive and negative programming, it was felt that staff were more likely to discuss the positive and than the negative in fear of job security or repercussions. There was also a feeling that a manager's openness to discussing conflict insensitive programming was dependant on the individual's integrity, accountability and enforcement of these.

It was suggested that management need to improve their listening skills, change attitudes/ perceptions, as well as show interest and be sensitive to others. Accepting situations that cannot be changed and instead learning from the experience was also vital.

In some cases, while standards such as SPHERE and HAP were embraced, learning and knowledge management of CSA was not yet developed within the organisation.

#### **E) Integration into Programming**

In general, it was found that programming integrated DNH, HAP and SPHERE standards; but many agencies within the consortium had no standardised guidelines for CS incorporation at the different stages of programme i.e. design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

In one organisation, while CS was not considered separately in the planning and PCM, it was a cross cutting issue that was present in the planner's mind during development.

There was also a case where CS in programme implementation was closely monitored and where lessons learnt, specifically in the area of being sensitive to the context and the interaction with the programme, had been deliberately incorporated. Regular reporting on interaction and implication of conflict and programming was also practiced.

Staff awareness on CS at the point of recruitment varied; in some agencies no CS briefing was provided - staff were expected to demonstrate a sound understanding of CS practices and approaches in general. While in another case, briefings were provided on situation analysis, risk assessment, background and history of the programme but only when recruiting international programme staff and not local staff.

One organisation reported that apart from the management, all staff were unaware if CS was integrated into the PCM.

#### **F) Institution-wide CSA Mainstreaming**

While it was generally agreed that mainstreaming CS into advocacy, communications, and campaigning was relevant and important, there was a level of uncertainty to what extent, and how it was being incorporated.

When it came to mainstreaming CSA into Programme Support, feelings were mixed in areas such as Human Resources - while orientations were provided there were no standard practices to include CS in recruitment and appraisals. In one case the management felt that while CS should be recognised to some degree at various levels, it was unwilling to commit resources to trainings etc. As it has also been previously mentioned, programme staff felt that CS is central to their work whereas administrative, finance and HR staff did not see the relevance of it.

One organisation said that CS, although not explicitly referred to, was practiced in programme areas such as audit where it was considered in terms of assessing compliance to policies and procedure and also considered in risk assessments. Vendor selection procedures and dealings with different ethnic groups were also recognised as other areas where CS was practiced.

Another organisation had a specific project titled “Mainstreaming Conflict Sensitivity and Peace building Tools’, which involved LCP/DNH mainstreaming outcomes.

#### **G) CSA Competencies**

In assessing CSA competencies, capacity, and skills it was found that in some organisations staff were unable to clearly articulate appropriate attitudes and behaviours, while staff in other organisations had a solid understanding of CS.

There was also the feeling that while they were more or less aware of the implications of CS in their roles, staff had not been formally informed of it.

The need for CS training in each programme strand, with a general training for administrative staff was also expressed.

#### **H) Funding/Donors/ Partners**

The consortiums experience in incorporating CS in dealing with partners and donors varied greatly.



There were agencies who maintained regular communication of CSA in the form of project and quarterly reports, while reference was also made to CS when liaising with donors during proposal development. However, it was suggested that in some cases only staff who understood CS communicated it to donors (but this depended on the individual).

One organisation reported that its funding agencies and donors were not insisting on CSA nor did they appear to be CSA aware.

There did not appear to be any clear or specific CS guidelines for partner selection, while certain projects had developed specific matrix that were used to select partners, other selection processes included capacity, position, leverage, outreach, and past CS record.

When organisations were asked how partners and donors were educated in terms of conflict sensitivity, it was reported that while resources were sometimes provided for carrying out a DNH analysis or staff orientation, time commitment and resource allocation was uncertain.

In some cases, partners were provided CS know-how through training and a CS approach taken when developing specific projects in consultation with partners. In cases where partners were 'conflict-blind', stock-taking of the situation would be followed by revision or remedial action.

#### **4.5 Change Objectives**

##### **Organisation-level**

- Clarify conceptual linkages between CSD, CSA and conflict prevention and reflect in Strategic and Business Plans as well as CSA strategy.
- CSA needs to be addressed separately; it needs to be structured into existing reporting mechanisms which also need to be recorded.
- Develop a CS policy; raise awareness and ownership of CSA within management by ensuring that all policies and strategies include CSA and that there is a specific CS policy within the organisation.
- Develop practical conflict analysis and assessment tools for use across the project cycle by working with programme staff and partners to develop a framework for CS monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems and by compiling existing conflict analysis, M&E guidance in an easy-to-use toolkit.
- Strengthen practical mechanisms to monitor and evaluate CS in country programme management processes by focusing on 'light' assessment tools and ongoing monitoring and evaluation by developing more ways of conducting 'light' conflict assessments; providing detailed guidance and indicators for monitoring conflict impact in country strategies by encouraging the sharing of CS work in country team meetings and finally by reviewing how budget management and financial planning can best support efforts to be CS.
- Raise awareness of CS by ensuring that it is seen as part of the Organisational Development process.
- Strengthen integration of CS into human resource procedures by reviewing organisational values, making sure they reflect conflict-sensitive behaviour and

attaching these to all job descriptions and use articulation of values for consultant MoUs and identify a way to share information about consultants.

- Strengthen institutional knowledge and capacity on CSA by continuous review and updating of the conflict analysis and CSA 'How to' notes and by conducting more training for staff and partners on a selection of the following according to need; the basics of conflict sensitivity, what it looks like in practice when we're not being conflict-sensitive (adapted to different staff roles), more in-depth tools and resources for CSA. Trainings and resource materials should be available in all local languages.
- Ensure that associate Trainers, partner agencies and district consortia are fully trained in CSA.
- Improve understanding among donors on CS by conducting a briefing day for existing donors on CS, on what it means to the organisation and the implications for funding and programme implementation. Strengthen mechanisms for CS partnerships by developing new material for a partnership toolkit (or revise existing ones) to include guidelines for CS partner selection, to articulate CS behaviour for discussion with partners and inclusion in MoUs as appropriate.

### **Consortium-level**

At the consortium level there were a number of compatible objectives identified collectively by the agencies;

- To strengthen the understanding of CS within member organisations, their partners and beneficiaries; which would essentially be through the introduction of CSA to staff (of member organisations, partners and beneficiaries), trainings and a series of workshops on LCP/DNH ToT, pooling resources available within member organisations and partners and the Human Accountability Partnership.
- To develop guidance notes/tools for mainstreaming CS into project cycle and support functions
- To document and share best practices

### **4.6 Conclusion**

In conclusion it should be mentioned that the self-assessment proved to be a useful, learning process for the agencies, both on an individual level as well as a consortium.

However, there were some negative aspects, particularly with regard to the questionnaire;

- Staff felt it focused more on agencies with large international structures and large country-based operations, rather than on local agencies with a small number of stakeholders and limited operations, resulting in the smaller agencies spending more time on refocusing to ensure relevance,
- There was also an issue with regard to certain support functions which were either not well thought through or non-existent in the questionnaire,

- The length of the questionnaire required a longer than anticipated time commitment by agencies, resulting in point persons spending long hours conducting interviews. In some cases staff were unable to participate in the survey as a result of their schedules.

## 5. SELF-ASSESSMENT IN UK:

### 5.1 Highlights of UK Consortium's self assessment process to date

This annex provides a summary to date of the UK Consortium's self assessment process. Although each agency produced individual reports for sharing and learning within the Consortium, the findings, lessons learnt and main areas of change pursued are presented below in an anonymous form. It should be noted that the individual reports for the UK Consortium agencies document a wide range of findings, reflective of the diverse make up of the Consortium in terms of mandate, priorities, organisational set up, size etc. As such this summary report only highlights the major themes, with the information presented not being applicable to each and every consortium agency.

### 5.2 The main lessons learnt from the UK Consortium self-assessment process

#### *Background on Self Assessment methodology/sampling*

Self Assessments were conducted in FY02 and were based on a process originally piloted by CARE, with input from the Consortium as a whole. A detailed Self Assessment form was developed, although Consortium agencies were able to change this to suit their organisation's needs. As a result most agencies adapted the self assessment forms to some extent. For example it was:

- Used as a guideline to direct discussion, rather than as a prescriptive tool.
- Adapted differently for different departments/ levels of seniority.
- Synthesised into core questions used to stimulate conversation.
- Simplified, as for some agencies this was the first time many staff had come across the concept of CSA.
- Streamlined to avoid duplication and repetition of questions.

The Self Assessment process itself also varied between Consortium Agencies. Some carried out detailed interviews/ focus group discussions/ questionnaires with individuals and small groups. Others conducted workshops with discussion and small group work. Others did a combination of interviews and workshops. Some targeted the whole organisation, others on selected individuals/ senior leadership.

#### *Peer Support*

Each agency was paired up, so that each agency could support and be supported by a peer agency.

Action Aid with RtC

World Vision with CARE UK

Skillshare with Save the Children

CAFOD with International Alert

Plan with Saferworld

#### *Learning from methodology/sampling*

Although most agencies felt that the methodology they used gave an adequate representation of the CSA capacities within their organisation, it was generally felt that

the methodology could have been improved. Those that took a more detailed approach, following the original guidelines more closely, commonly reported that although the process gave rich data it was very time consuming. Those that took a workshop based approach commonly reported that the process could have been more detailed.

For those agencies who line manage operations/ field based staff it was felt that the process would have been improved if these staff were more included in the process.

Each agency was paired with a “peer” for support during the self assessment process. Most agencies found this interesting/ helpful as it enabled them to see how others were approaching the self-assessment, and use these different perspectives to enrich the process.

### *Effectiveness of the assessment*

Most agencies felt that the self assessment process provided useful information and clear steps for the way forward (see change objectives below). The assessments were also seen as useful vehicles for starting conversations about how conflict sensitivity is practiced, raising the profile of the Consortium within Consortium agencies, and raising awareness and understanding about CSA concepts and how they related to different roles (not just programming). Conversely it was also helpful in dispelling misunderstandings about the concept.

### *Lessons learnt*

A wide range of lessons were learnt, in part depending on the approach taken. The key ones are summarised here and may be of relevance to those considering replicating the process:

Enough time needs to be made for the Self Assessment process, especially when involving a wide range of departments, and exploring many areas of information. Compiling the information will also take a considerable amount of time.

HR may need to agree to a high volume of interviews across the organisation. If needed this should be requested early on in the process.

Important to provide clear explanations – Specifically how the self assessment process relates to the overall Project (if relevant), the organisation’s mandate, and the participants work. This should ensure that all participants see the importance and relevance of the process, give it due priority and don’t feel threatened or become cynical. It should also be emphasised that the process is a learning process rather than a finger pointing exercise.

Integration – If/ where possible integrate the process with other strategy or review processes.

The methodology might need to be adapted - as long as key elements are touched upon then it should not matter exactly how agencies go about the self assessment process. For example:

- Adjust the methodology to the levels of CSA knowledge in your organisation. For agencies with greater understanding of CSA issues the questions could be more specific/ complicated, if awareness of CSA is low then they may need to be simpler.
- Simplify things and keep interviews general, focused on a few foundational questions. This should maintain the interest of the interviewees and give them the opportunity to reflect on possible interpretations of conflict sensitivity concepts.

- A short questionnaire could be developed and sent to a wider catchment of participants.
- Focus Group Discussions create a sense of ownership and enable office wide discussions that closed questionnaires or semi/ structured interviews do not always achieve.
- Agencies which directly line manage staff based overseas, may want to develop a workshop to allow for more in-depth discussions based on realities from the ground (as opposed to one to one interviews based on the questionnaire template).

Test the methodology - It is strongly recommended to test the tool first before using it to ensure it has been adapted appropriately.

Listen carefully during the process as different forms of conflict sensitivity that might not explicitly be phrased that way may be discussed. Even when participants do not understand CSA concepts they can often articulate useful information using other language.

### **5.3 Change Objectives / Capacity Building Plan Criteria**

All suggested change objectives / capacity building plans were screened by 3 criteria:

1: Should be related to improving the ability of consortium NGOs to be conflict sensitive.

2: Should where possible focus on integrating fully into other systems / policies / activities rather than stand alone. Eg work to improve the conflict sensitivity of an agency's existing needs analysis work/tools rather than developing a stand alone tool.

3: Should produce sustainable changes. Ie. Instead of stand alone training sessions for current staff, should look at ways of institutionalising the required skills, building into ongoing training / staff development systems, building into guidance systems etc.

For all change objectives / capacity building activities UK agencies were asked:

- How will this improve the ability of the NGO to be conflict sensitive?
- How effectively does this integrate with existing systems/initiatives/activities?
- How sustainable is this (will additional resources be required to sustain this after the end of the project – how will this be addressed)?

Activities should be able to answer positively to all of the above questions. Any activities/change objectives that do not fulfil all of the above three criteria should only be considered if:

- i) They are an essential first step to a secondary goal (ie some one off awareness raising training may be required to reach other more sustainable secondary goals) Or
- ii) There is an additional justification for that activity

### **5.4 The main self-assessment findings from the UK Consortium**

#### *Summary*

Awareness, understanding and commitment to Conflict Sensitive Approaches (CSA) vary across and within Consortium agencies. A wide range of CSA are being

implemented by Consortium agencies, but not always consistently, and they are not always articulated and reported on.

### *Institutional Commitment, Strategy and Policy*

Not all Consortium agencies have Strategies/ Codes of Conduct/ Business Plans/ Thematic areas of work which articulate organisational commitment to Conflict Sensitivity (CS). As such several agencies within the Consortium have no explicit organisational commitment to CS, despite the fact that most agencies work in areas affected by conflict.

Institutional commitment to CSA varies both between organisations and within them. For example there is often more commitment within the programmes/ conflict teams, rather than within senior management, IT or finance.

### *Organisational wide understanding*

Prior to this Project Consortium agencies had invested in training/ awareness raising about CS to differing extents, with awareness and understanding being higher in the 3 peace building agencies and amongst programmes/ fragile states/ conflict staff. The self assessment process found that even in the non-peace building agencies there was a good level of understanding of CSA, and many of those participating in the Self Assessment process across all agencies had sound insights into:

- What was needed to enhance conflict sensitivity - e.g. training, tools/ checklists, more technical input, better analysis etc.,
- What stopped them from being more conflict sensitive – e.g. lack of detailed knowledge/ understanding of CSA, lack of time to do detailed analysis, poor assessments etc.,
- Occasions when organisations had/ had not been sensitive to conflict and the impact that this had had on programmes, communities and staff.

Not all staff were aware of/ fully understood “conflict sensitivity” terminology, although they could understand/ articulate the concepts during deeper discussion. Amongst non-programmes staff in particular there was a common misunderstanding that CSA only related to programming in hostile contexts such as Afghanistan, DRC, Iraq etc. The self assessment process itself helped to break down some of these assumptions.

### *Staff competencies, Learning and Knowledge Management*

Most Consortium agencies do not have explicit expectations or learning requirements regarding staff competencies on CS. It rarely forms an explicit part of staff Job Descriptions, appraisals, induction packages or other related systems, particularly for non-“Programmes” staff such as Finance, IT or Human Resources. The Self Assessment provided an opportunity for agencies to think through the need to identify sensitivities that may arise out of recruitment processes – e.g. implications of appointing somebody from a particular ethnic group, religion, caste, gender etc.

Although some Consortium agencies have systems in place for recording and sharing key lessons learned on CSA across the organisation, many others do not. Even when organisational cultures recognise the importance of learning from negative consequences of work there are concerns about how this could be communicated externally, particularly to donors. Often there are no systems in place to identify/report on conflict blind practice.

### *Integration and Programming*

Not all of the UK Consortium agencies have direct control over the programming that they support and so the findings relating to integration and programming vary depending on if an agency has a direct influence over country programming or not. However, across all Consortium agencies it was clear that CSA has been applied to programming to a much greater extent than other institutional components such as recruitment, management, marketing and fundraising.

The Self Assessment findings show that Consortium agencies are practicing CSA in a wide range of areas. However this is not always either explicitly articulated, or articulated in CS language. The extent to which CSA is practiced within an organisation often depends on whether there are CSA “champions”. For example some agencies have specific staff allocated to leading on peace and conflict issues, others don’t. This influences the extent to which these issues can be considered, and there is evidence that rather than CS analysis being done in a routine and effective manner it is often done according to the experiences of the individuals concerned.

For those agencies where CS was not highlighted as an organisational priority it was seen as more important to ensure that the concept was fully integrated into existing work/ mainstreaming issues in order not to over burden staff with multiple mainstreaming issues. Several Consortium agencies have already made links internally between CSA and diversity/ gender/ age/ Rights Based Approaches etc. For other agencies the need to strengthen conceptual clarity about the overlaps and/or distinctions between work on conflict prevention, conflict-sensitivity, and conflict-sensitive development was identified.

Although most Consortium agencies use some form of Project Cycle Management (PCM) system (even if this is not always standardised across the organisation), there is, on the whole, little integration of CSA into PCM systems. This is not to say that CSA doesn’t happen during the PCM, but it is not always practiced, applied or articulated consistently. The area of the PCM where there is most understanding of integration of CSA is the assessment phase. Agencies often conduct conflict/ context analysis, although it should be noted that not all agencies or agency partners, particularly outside of the 3 peace building agencies, have the tools, skills or capacity to do this consistently, and across all programmes. The area of the PCM where there is least understanding of integration of CSA is monitoring and evaluation, and understanding of what mechanisms can be used to ensure that programme design and implementation are explicitly and consistently conflict sensitive.

### *External relations*

Although most Consortium agencies don’t have a specific policy regarding engagement with donors when project’s are deemed to be conflict insensitive, there are examples where Consortium agencies have gone back to donors and asked if they can revise the Project because of the problems it is causing. However, amongst some agencies it was felt that incentive systems encourage quick submission of proposals to donors, regardless of CSA issues and that often programmes are shaped around donor priorities rather than around sound analysis. It is difficult to turn down funding just because a donor will not fund conflict analysis! This is compounded by the fact that risk monitoring focuses on risk to donors, to reputation and risk of agencies rather than risk to communities.



### *Partnering*

Not all Consortium agencies work through partners, and most agencies don't have policies about CS selection of partners. However, like with other aspects of CSA it is often considered as a factor in partner selection, but it is rarely institutionalised or explicitly articulated. In addition, the need to build the capacity of partners to act conflict sensitively was identified as often partners are not familiar with conflict sensitivity or may behave in a conflict-insensitive way.

Along with consideration about partners, the importance of hiring consultants who understand conflict sensitivity was highlighted, as very few agencies considered this when interviewing/ selecting consultants.

## **5.5 The main areas of change pursued by the UK Consortium through the change objective process**

Each Consortium agency has developed their own measurable change objectives, which are reported on semi annually. These are summarised below.

### *Staff (awareness, knowledge capacity)*

- Trustees/ board members understand and are able to apply CSA principles and practice to the work of their organisation. (Key activities: training).
- All staff/ volunteers understand and are able to apply CSA tools, principles and practice to their areas of work, including being able to undertake conflict analysis/ assess levels of conflict sensitivity etc. Note. Where relevant this includes non-programming staff e.g. finance/ human resources/ admin/ fundraising staff. (Key activities: training/ capacity building (including during induction), learning workshops, development of internal guidance, development of a network of CSA focal point persons, etc.)
- Definition of conflict-sensitivity and how it relates to organisational mandate is clearly articulated and institutionalised. (Key activities: review strategy development process).
- Conflict Sensitivity integrated throughout existing HR systems. (Key activities: review of recruitment policies/ procedures and child protection policy etc.)

### *Programming (processes, systems, policies)*

- Ensure that consultancies and training integrate CSA. (Key activities: review of these processes).
- Useful and accessible in-house tools for undertaking conflict analysis and CSA are developed. (Key activities: collating and summarising existing CSA resources so that they are easily accessible and developing new tools as appropriate).
- Greater incorporation of CSA into country programme strategies and implementation. (Key activities: develop practical framework for correlating intervention impacts upon peace/conflict dynamics, regular review of programme strategies against conflict-sensitivity criteria, sharing of good practice in CSA programming/ development of case studies, greater support to country offices in how to conduct CSA, accompaniment of selected programmes to explore

- challenges to conflict-sensitivity and document lessons learned, inclusion of CS into standard operating procedures for emergency response reflect etc).
- Programme design, assessment, monitoring and evaluation systems integrate CSA. (Key activities: Integration of CSA into existing agencies tools/ processes/ DME frameworks, production of review checklists for UK based staff).
  - Guidelines developed for conflict-sensitive partner selection. (Key activities: development of guidelines).

*Beyond Programming (everything else)*

- External communications and advocacy work is CS. (Key activities: Development and use of guidelines for consideration/ inclusion of CS into communications and advocacy work)
- CSA integrated into new organisational strategy. (Key activities: Active participation in organisational strategy review).
- CSA integrated into the outputs and activities of other Projects. (Key activities: exploring integration with The NGO & Humanitarian Reform Project and CBHA).

## **Annex 1: Tool Utilised by Kenya**

### **CONFLICT SENSITIVITY CAPACITY ASSESSMENT**

#### **Objectives of the assessment**

- To reflect on the experiences of conflict sensitive practice in the organization
- To sensitize staff on conflict sensitive approaches
- To identify gaps and impediments to the practice of conflict sensitivity
- To develop concrete steps that will support organizational CS practice and learning

#### **Reason for conflict sensitive approaches (CSA)**

- Understand the context in which you operate
- Understand interaction between your intervention and the context
- Avoid negative impacts and maximize positive impacts

#### **Conceptualising Conflict Sensitivity**

- Take a moment and reflect on your organisational practice. Based on your experience, what would you (in your own words) say conflict sensitivity is? Offer an organisational, group or personal definition.
- Is CS achievable?

#### **Systematising Conflict Sensitivity**

- In your opinion, what tangible aspects of your country programme and/or agency demonstrate systematic support for the application of CSA (or aspects of it)?
- In which key organisational policy or other relevant documents is CSA (or aspects of it) spelt out?

#### **Integrating Conflict Sensitivity**

- How can conflict sensitivity be best integrated into your work/organisation?
- If in use, share experience.
- How should consortium utilize it?
- How do you interact with and/or utilize the concept in your daily work (if at all)?

#### **Relevance of Conflict Sensitivity**

- How relevant is conflict sensitivity to the organization? Kindly highlight how staff in different departments such as Policy, Governance, Communication, Human Resource, Administration, Audit and Finance, Sponsorship, Procurement and Logistics regard CS?.
- Additionally, how is CS applied in different departments? Where it is not applied, are there specific reasons why not and/or why yes?

## **Effective Application of Conflict Sensitivity**

- Are there specific suggestions as to what would be needed to support more effective advocacy for donors to support mainstreamed conflict sensitivity?
- What challenges could impede CS practice? Kindly focus on factors both internal and external to your agency
- What needs to be done to ensure effective application (or sustained application) of CSA within your agency?
- How best do we ensure lessons learnt are infused back to improve organizational capacity? Kindly make recommendations
- Are there any external factors that support and/or have a bearing on your country office's CS practice?

## **Project Cycle and Conflict Sensitivity**

- How best should conflict sensitivity be integrated into the project cycle?
- What guides would be needed for this? Kindly have a holistic view of this, looking at entire cycle, including how the log frame and budgetary process should/do integrate CSA.
- Share on available mechanisms that are or could be utilized for regular reflection and reporting on the interaction of conflict sensitivity and programming

## **Managing Partnerships**

- What is the process for selecting partners/sponsor links or Development Areas?
- What aspects of your partner/sponsor links selection guidelines borrow from CS?
- In what ways does your agency communicate the need to uphold CS ethics & principles among its partners (including private sector partners)?
- Any constraints, gaps and/or blockages in practice and application of CS?
- Any capacity requirements to effectively use and apply CS in your work?
- When and how do you communicate to partners your expectations with regard to conflict sensitivity?
- What actions would be taken if partner's conflict blind (or conflict contributing) programming is uncovered?
- Better still, how does your agency treat a partner whose approaches are disagreeable?
- Do you offer partners any support / training in conflict sensitivity?
- Are all donors equally targeted (i.e. are private donors targeted as well as institutional donors such as the EC)?
- How is conflict sensitivity currently communicated to donors?
- What are key opportunities for raising CS profile amongst donors?
- Have those involved in donor liaison ever communicated about conflict sensitivity?
- Do those involved in donor liaison feel able (sufficiently knowledgeable) to communicate on conflict sensitivity?

## **Monitoring & Evaluation**

- How is your agency's M&E system utilized to assess the practice and application CS? Further how are CS indicators integrated in your M&E indicators?

- If not utilized that way, how can this (CS) be Integrated into Monitoring & Evaluation system?
- How do you insulate yourselves from the danger of conflict blind programming

### **Human Resource Managing, Procurement and Administration**

- How conflict sensitive is the recruitment process?
- How is the staff induction process implemented conflict sensitively? Is there such a plan?
- Are CSA competencies considered during recruitment?
- How do those in procurement, logistics and administration ensure that conflict sensitivity is applied when procuring supplies and goods for projects from an area where resources are scarce?
- Highlight any logistical guides relevant to Conflict Sensitivity
- Any capacity requirements to effectively use and apply CS in your work?
- Are external resource persons or those on secondment briefed on conflict sensitivity when being hired?
- Any constraints, gaps and/or blockages in practice and application of CS?

### **Organizational Leadership**

- How can management create awareness of conflict sensitivity at top levels and within organization?
- Where is CS placed in terms of organizational priority?
- Is there a need to make CSA mandatory in the proposal development process?
- What CSA checklists exist in proposal development? If none exist, how can proposals be systematically screened for CS?
- Share on available mechanisms that are or could be utilized for regular reflection and reporting on the interaction of conflict sensitivity and policy

### **Prioritisation of Conflict Sensitivity**

- Is conflict sensitivity given similar weight to other considerations such as security and financial risk reduction, environmental conservation, gender and HIV/AIDs mainstreaming, and peacebuilding?
- Does the organization have a designated budget line for conflict sensitivity?
- Do staff involved in budget development priorities including resources for conflict sensitivity?

## **Annex 2: Tool Utilised by Sierra Leone**

### **Annex 2.1: Self- Assessment Questionnaire**

#### **Sector1. Coordination & Programme Support**

- Based on your experience, what would you say Conflict Sensitivity is?
- Is management aware of and understands conflict sensitivity?
- Is Conflict Sensitivity Approaches regarded by management as an organizational priority?
- In which key agency documents is CS spelt out?
- What is the level of importance attached to CS in your agency/organization?
- Any constraints, gaps/blockages in CSA practice and application?
- What kind of support (capacity needs) do you think will help you effectively use and apply CS in your work?

#### **Sector 2: Policies, Strategies & Risk Management**

- Based on your experience, what would you say CS is?
- Is CS referred to in your Country Strategic Plan?
- Name some other agency guidelines/policies that CS is referred to?
- How do you utilize CS in your daily work?
- What factors/challenges impede CS practice and mainstreaming in your agency?
- What kind of support (capacity needs) do you think will help you effectively use and apply CS in your work?

#### **Sector 3: Community-based programmes (Youth, Food Security, WASH, etc)**

- Based on your experience, what would you say Conflict Sensitivity is?
- Is CS integrated in project cycle management?
- If not, what guides would be needed to integrate CS in project cycles?
- If yes, share an available experience or mechanism in which CS is utilized in programme implementation?
- What is the process for selecting partners, sponsors or ADPs?
- In what ways does your agency communicate the need to uphold CS among its partners?
- What action(s) is taken if the practice of agency partners is found to be conflict blind?
- What kind of support (capacity needs) do you think will help you, effectively, use and apply CS in your work?

#### **Sector 4: DM&E**

- Based on your experience, what would you say Conflict Sensitivity is?
- Does your agency have M&E system to monitor CS practice?
- If not, how can CS be integrated in M & E indicators?
- Any system for reporting conflict blind practices?
- What kind of support (capacity needs) do you think will help you effectively use and apply CS in your work?

#### **Sector 5: Communication, Documentation & IT**

- Based on your experience, what would you say Conflict Sensitivity is?
- Is CS considered in the communication, documentation and IT strategies of your agency?

- Is CS considered relevant by Communication/Documentation/IT staff?
- If yes, how is CS applied in this sector?
- Any gaps/blockages in practice and application of CS in this sector?
- What kind of support (capacity needs) do you think will help you, effectively, use and apply CS in your work?

#### **Sector 6: Human Resources**

- Based on your experience, what would you say Conflict Sensitivity is?
- Is CS considered during recruitment, induction, performance appraisals and termination?
- Are HR/OD policies conflict sensitive?
- What kind of support (capacity needs) do you think will help you, effectively, use and apply CS in your work?

#### **Sector 7: Admin, Finance & Audit**

- Based on your experience, what would you say Conflict Sensitivity is?
- Is CS considered when making financial, budgetary and auditory decisions?
- Are Administrative & financial policies conflict sensitive?
- Do procurement, logistics and administration staff ensure CS is applied when procuring goods and services?
- Are there constraints, gaps/blockages to achieve CS mainstreaming?
- What kind of support (capacity needs) do you think will help you effectively use and apply CS in your work?

#### **Sector 8: Grants, Fundraising & Sponsorship**

- Based on your experience, what would you say Conflict Sensitivity is?
- Is CS integrated in proposal development processes?
- Are those involved in fundraising, sponsorships and grants management aware of CSA?
- Are CS issues communicated to donors/sponsors/partners?
- What kind of support (capacity needs) do you think will help you effectively use and apply CS in your work?

#### **Sector 9: Operations & partnerships**

- Based on your experience, what would you say Conflict Sensitivity is?
- Does the process of selecting partners/donors refer to CS guidelines?
- Are all partners (including private sector partners) expected to be conflict sensitive?
- Are partners offered support/training in CSA?
- What kind of support (capacity needs) do you think will help you effectively use and apply CS in your work?

## Annex 3: Tool Utilised by UK

Area for Assessment	Key Questions to consider
<b>1. Policies and Strategies</b>	
<b>1.A. Conflict Sensitivity Policy</b>	
1.A.1 There is an organisational conflict sensitivity policy that corresponds to the definition in the consortium benchmarking paper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Is there a CSA policy?</li> <li>b) What definition is used and how does that correspond to the benchmarking paper definition?</li> <li>c) Does the policy explicitly apply to all phases of conflict?</li> <li>d) Does it emphasise an institutional approach?</li> <li>e) Does it apply to humanitarian, development and peace-building work?</li> <li>f) Does it distinguish conflict sensitivity from peace-building?</li> </ul>
1.A.2 The CSA policy includes guidance on required steps for institutionalizing CSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Does the CSA policy refer to how the policy commitment will work in application?</li> <li>b) Does the CSA policy clarify institutional changes required for CSA mainstreaming?</li> <li>c) Does it clarify programmatic implications of the policy?</li> </ul>
<b>1.B. Mainstreaming into Internal Policies and Strategies</b>	
1.B.1 Current programmatic strategies / policies dovetail with the CSA policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What are key internal programmatic strategies / policies? (RBA strategy, gender strategy, protection strategy)</li> <li>b) Which of these policies explicitly refer to CSA?</li> <li>c) Have overlaps / complementarities / tensions between existing programmatic policies and CSA been analysed and documented?</li> <li>d) Have any policies been adapted to clarify their link to CSA?</li> </ul>
1.B.2 Current institutional policies dovetail with the CSA policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What are key institutional policies (procurement policy, recruitment policy, travel policy)</li> <li>b) Which of these policies explicitly refer to CSA?</li> <li>c) Have overlaps / complementarities / tensions between existing policies and CSA been analysed and documented?</li> <li>d) Have any policies been adapted / clarified to clarify their link to CSA?</li> </ul>
1.B.3 When developing new internal policies (programmatic or institutional), links with CSA are considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What is the procedure for creating new programmatic or institutional policies?</li> <li>b) Is CSA explicitly referred to in strategy development guidance?</li> <li>c) Is CSA a component considered in sign off?</li> </ul>
<b>1.C. Ensuring Consistency with External Policies and Strategies</b>	
1.C.1 Current external programmatic policies that the organisation has signed up to dovetail with the CSA policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What are key external policies?</li> <li>b) Which of these policies explicitly refer to CSA?</li> <li>c) Have overlaps / complementarities / tensions between existing policies and CSA been analysed and</li> </ul>



	documented? d) Do any of these seem to impede CSA and warrant further investigation?
1.C.2 Current external institutional policies that the organisation has signed up to dovetail with the CSA policy	a) What are key external policies that shape the organisation's work? (charity commission policy, UG gov recruitment policy, UK charity audit policy etc) b) Do any of these policies refer to CSA? c) Have overlaps / complementarities / tensions between existing policies and CSA been analysed and documented? d) Do any of these seem to impede CSA and warrant further investigation?
1.C.3 Before signing up to new external policies, links / tension with CSA are considered	a) What is the procedure for creating new programmatic or institutional policies? b) Is CSA explicitly referred to in strategy development guidance? c) Is CSA a component considered in sign off? d) How will CSA be ensured?
<b>2. Institutional Commitment</b>	
<b>2.A. Management Commitment and Leadership</b>	
2.A.1 Management / Leadership in the organization understands conflict sensitivity (in the broad terms defined in the benchmarking paper) and is able to explain why conflict sensitivity is relevant for the organisation.	a) Are management aware of conflict sensitivity? b) Can they describe conflict sensitivity in a way that matches the benchmarking paper definition?
2.A.2 Management / Leadership understands the importance of conflict in the organization and regards it as an organisational priority	a) How does CS relate to other organisational priorities? b) In what ways is CSA prioritized? c) Is conflict sensitivity given high priority in decision making? d) Are conflict analysis results given sufficient weight e) Is commitment translated into enabling decisions, resources etc?
2.A.3 Management / Leadership actively seeks to raise the profile of conflict sensitivity and actively promotes it both to the rest of the organization as well as to external partners, donors etc.	a) Have they experience in explaining CSA to the organisation? b) Have they experience in explaining CSA outside of the organisation? c) In what circumstances and to what audiences have management previously utilized the term conflict sensitivity?
<b>2.B Enabling Effective CSA</b>	
2.B.1 Where deficits in current knowledge or skills are identified, the organization ensures that training is provided.	a) What examples can be found of support for internal or external training to build skills in CSA? b) Is there a systematic way in which skill/knowledge deficits are noted and capacity built?
2.B.2 Policies and practices are systematically reviewed to check interaction with CSA.	a) Is there commitment to ensuring a consistent approach to CSA mainstreaming across all areas of organisational policy?
2.B.3 A system is in place for surfacing and addressing any perceived contradictions between areas of work/policies/mandates etc	a) Is there a system in place? b) How are such tensions handled?

and conflict sensitivity	
2.B.4 Decision making systems are flexible enough to enable changes to projects in light of changing conflict context	<p>a) Is there an explicit commitment that conflict sensitivity is a priority over and above other priorities (eg financial risk)?</p> <p>b) Is there a clear message that when activities risk escalating the risk of violent conflict, the activities will be revised as a priority, with other considerations (staff time, audit risk) secondary to the organisational imperative to avoid making conflict worse?</p> <p>c) Is the organisation committed to freeing necessary capacity / resources (often staff time) to ensuring that required revisions (to contracts, to budgets, donor liaison) are prioritized to avoid activities contributing to conflict.</p> <p>d) How does the organisation ensure that other concerns/priorities (eg donor contract, audit risk, donor priorities) do not push the organisation into continuing with activities that are making conflict worse.</p>
2.B.5 Supporting development of an evidence base of conflict sensitivity and supporting joint advocacy to encourage donors to recognise, fund and even make mandatory conflict sensitivity.	<p>a) Is the organisation committed to collecting and documenting an evidence base for conflict sensitivity</p> <p>b) Is the organisation engaged in joint advocacy to donors to promote donor support for conflict sensitivity</p>
<b>2.C. Responsibility and Accountability Mechanisms</b>	
2.C.1 system is in place for monitoring staff fulfillment of the CSA expectations for their role.	<p>a) What system does / should monitor this?</p> <p>b) How is / can this be integrated into existing performance monitoring systems?</p>
2.C.2 Organisational accountability systems are in place for enabling conflict sensitivity	<p>a) Is there a system for reporting monitoring conflict blind programming?</p> <p>b) Has the organization considered how to create incentive systems where avoidance of conflict blind programming is explicitly encouraged rather than implicitly discouraged?</p>
2.C.3 Conflict sensitivity is integrated into decision making criteria in programme approvals	<p>a) Is commitment to conflict sensitivity mandatory in the proposal approval process?</p> <p>b) Are there any mandatory CS checks in the proposal approval process</p> <p>c) Is it explicit where responsibility for various aspects of conflict sensitivity lie (amongst staff in UK and in target countries)</p> <p>d) Where primary responsibility for ensuring the conflict sensitivity of new proposals lies with staff in the target country, what responsibility lies with the UK? (eg checking a conflict analysis has been done, or cross-referencing the proposal with such a conflict analysis)</p>
2.C.4 Individual accountability of staff evaluation & appraisal includes consideration of programmes impact on conflict	<p>a) As well as checking progress against planned project outputs, is there a mandatory evaluation / appraisal component that considers wider, unintended</p>

	impacts?
<b>3. Learning and Knowledge Management</b>	
<b>3.A. Learning and reflective practice</b>	
3.A.1 The organisation has effective CSA knowledge management, documenting and learning from its experiences in applying CSA	<p>a) What platforms for experience sharing are there? (Meetings, Conferences, Discussion groups, Communities of Practice?)</p> <p>b) How are lessons documented (incident reports, case studies, books, lessons learned, best practices)</p> <p>c) How are lessons learnt collected and shared? What incentives are present for people to share experience of poor CSA practice?</p>
3.A.2 The organization has created a 'safe space' where people can openly discuss areas where they feel programming may have negative impacts on conflict	<p>a) What do people do when they feel a programme may contribute to conflict?</p> <p>b) Is there formal guidance on what steps they should take?</p> <p>c) How are managers supporting such openness?</p> <p>d) If it is being done, what factors are important in creating such a 'safe space'?</p>
3.A.3 The organization has promoted a culture of reflection, where sufficient priority is given to thinking and analysis, such that staff are encouraged and enabled to reflect on the potential unintended consequences of programmes.	<p>a) How can we create a culture of reflection on potential interaction with conflict?</p> <p>b) How much priority is given to thinking and analysis? How does the organization ensure that such consideration is prioritized?</p>
<b>3.B. Encouraging CSA best practice</b>	
3.B.1 The organization has thought through how it would react when CSA in-country leads to a 'tipping point' decision to stop certain activities/cancel certain programmes	<p>a) How will audit react? How can they help/hinder this processes</p> <p>b) How will finance react? How can they help/hinder this process</p> <p>c) How will leadership react – is there a message that we encourage such sensible analysis and response, or is there a message that we should plough on with whatever we originally intended to do?</p> <p>d) How will leadership support project managers who wish to support Cos decision</p> <p>e) How will programme managers/ programme officers, finance officers react? How can they help or hinder this response?</p>
3.B.2 Institutional blockages to conflict sensitivity have been assessed and system put in place to overcome such blockages	<p>a) Has the organization systematically considered blockages to conflict sensitivity (prior to this assessment)?</p> <p>b) Have any changes been made as a result?</p>
<b>4. Integration into Programming</b>	
<b>4.A. Integration into PCM</b>	

4.A.1 CS is integrated into project cycle management systems	<p>a) Is there clear guidance on how and when conflict sensitivity is to be integrated into Project Cycle Management?</p> <p>b) Is CS referred to in PCM systems, templates or guidelines?</p> <p>c) If yes, at what stages of the project cycle is conflict sensitivity mentioned?</p> <p>d) Is there guidance on whether to use conflict sensitivity in more or less depth in different contexts?</p> <p>e) Is consideration of conflict sensitivity and unintended consequences on conflict a mandatory part of all evaluations?</p>
4.A.2 CS in log-frames	<p>a) Ask interviewees to review a sample of their log-frames. Do log-frames have conflict only as a risk to the project (rather than two-way interaction?)</p> <p>b) Are those designing / monitoring log-frames aware of the importance of having conflict sensitivity referred to (other than conflict risk) to ensure that it is monitored and reported on?</p>
<b>4.B Integration into programme design/start up</b>	
4.B.1 CS in project start up	<p>a) Are new staff briefed on conflict sensitivity?</p> <p>b) Are new project managers briefed on conflict in their focus areas?</p> <p>c) Who does this briefing, when, and what does it cover?</p> <p>d) Do such new staff briefings cover conflict issues in sufficient depth?</p>
4.B.2 CS in project design / proposal sign off	<p>a) Is conflict analysis a mandatory part of project design?</p> <p>b) Are staff aware who is responsible for checking that a conflict analysis has been completed?</p> <p>c) Are staff aware who is responsible for considering implications of conflict analysis for the proposed project design?</p> <p>d) Are staff responsible for proposal approval considering conflict sensitivity?</p>
<b>4.C Integration into programme monitoring and evaluation</b>	
4.C.1 CS in project implementation	<p>a) Is there regular reflection and reporting on interaction between conflict and programming?</p> <p>b) How do managers / staff in UK encourage project managers / country office staff to openly share information on unintended negative consequences of programming?</p> <p>c) How does the organisation incentivize sharing real information of on-the-ground project complexities rather than only sharing success stories?</p>
4.C.2 Criteria of evaluations include conflict sensitivity	<p>a) Are there any organisational / PR concerns about highlighting negative consequences of projects, and if yes, how are such tensions dealt with in a constructive manner without losing the importance of sharing and learning from such consequences?</p> <p>b) Is understanding of conflict sensitivity a mandatory consideration when interviewing / selecting</p>

	consultants?
<b>5. Institution-wide CSA Mainstreaming</b>	
<b>5.A Commitment to Institution-wide mainstreaming</b>	
5.A.1 The entire organization has a basic level of awareness and understanding of conflict sensitivity	a) When staff talk about conflict do they refer to it as a risk to projects or do they refer to two-way interactions b) How many staff are able to give a good basic description of conflict sensitivity and why it is important to the organisation?
5.A.2 CSA is mainstreamed across the organization (not only considered by programmatic staff)	a) Is there recognition that conflict sensitivity applies across all departments? b) Do staff outside of programmes consider conflict sensitivity as relevant to their work? c) Do programme staff see conflict sensitivity as relevant to their UK focused work (eg advocacy)?
<b>5.B Mainstreaming into advocacy, communications, campaigning</b>	
5.B.1 Conflict sensitivity is mainstreamed into advocacy	a) Do staff working on advocacy see conflict sensitivity as relevant to their work? b) If no, why not? c) If yes, when and how do they apply it?
5.B.2 Conflict sensitivity is mainstreamed into campaigning	a) Do staff working on campaigning see conflict sensitivity as relevant to their work? b) If no, why not? c) If yes, when and how do they apply it?
5.B.3 Conflict sensitivity is mainstreamed into communications	a) Do staff working on communications see conflict sensitivity as relevant to their work? b) If no, why not? c) If yes, when and how do they apply it?
<b>5.C Mainstreaming CSA into Support services</b>	
5.C.1 HR effectively mainstreams conflict sensitivity	a) Does staff induction include CSA? b) Which job descriptions explicitly refer to CS? c) Are CSA competencies included in job descriptions? d) Are CSA competencies included in recruitment? e) Are CSA competencies included in appraisals? (what %)
5.C.2 Audit is effectively supporting conflict sensitivity	a) Is conflict sensitivity given similar weight to other security and financial risk considerations? (perhaps question for the managers of audit staff rather than audit staff themselves) b) Do audit staff consider conflict sensitivity in their work c) When outside auditors are hired, are they briefed on conflict sensitivity?
5.C.3 Finance enables conflict sensitivity	a) Does the finance department see conflict sensitivity as relevant to their work? b) If yes, when and how do they apply it?
5.C.4 Other departments and CSA (Security/Procurement/IT etc)	a) Do other departments see conflict sensitivity as relevant to their work? b) If no, why not? c) If yes, when and how do they apply it?

<b>6. CSA Competencies</b> capacity, skills and understanding of conflict sensitivity	
<b>6.A. Staff CSA expectations</b>	
6.A.1 The organization has clarified what expectations (in terms of specific actions) are required from different functional roles in order for the organization to be conflict sensitive.	a) Have you clarified expectations according to roles? See also CSA Self-Assessment document 2.
6.A.2 Staff are briefed on CSA expectations for their role and training / support is provided when needed.	a) Are staff aware of the implications CSA has for their role? b) Are they able to describe what they should be doing to ensure CSA? c) Are they receiving support to build skills / awareness where there are deficits?
<b>6.B. Staff CSA awareness, attitude and behaviours</b>	
6.B.1. Staff have general awareness of CSA and implications for their role	See self assessment doc 2 part A – General questions
6.B.2 Staff are able to articulate appropriate attitudes and behaviours	Self-awareness – recognize who we are and our own biases Consciousness of our actions in general life and how they contribute to conflict / peace Well developed cultural antennae / intercultural understanding
<b>7. External Relations</b>	
<b>7.A. Donors / Funding</b>	
7.A.1 The organisation gives a clear message to all donors that CSA is a non-optional part of our work	a) Have those involved in donor liaison ever communicated about conflict sensitivity? b) Do those involved in donor liaison feel able (sufficiently knowledgeable) to communicate on conflict sensitivity? c) Are all donors equally targeted (ie are private donors targeted as well as institutional donors such as the EC)? d) How is conflict sensitivity currently communicated to donors? e) Do those involved in donor liaison feel that it is being mentioned to donors sufficiently to raise the profile of conflict sensitivity? f) What are key opportunities for raising CS profile amongst donors?
7.A.2 The organisation ensures that resources for conflict sensitivity (staff time, specialist support where needed, workplan time for conflict analysis, resources for conflict analysis etc) are an integral part of proposals to all donors	a) Do staff involved in budget development prioritise including resources for conflict sensitivity? b) Do staff involved in workplan development include time-lag for initial conflict analysis as well as specific slots for monitoring interaction with conflict and potential revision to programming? c) Do staff involved in designing M&E indicators / systems include conflict sensitivity indicators?

7.A.3 Where the donor is unwilling to fund essential conflict sensitivity elements (eg conflict analysis), the organisation specifically commits to finding such resources elsewhere or declines that funding	a) How do we ensure that we only continue with programming where we are able to effectively mainstream conflict sensitivity (otherwise we risk exacerbating conflict)? b) How do we balance the wish for increased funding with the commitment to conflict sensitivity? c) Are we explicit about what compromises to effective conflict sensitivity we are or are not willing to make to secure additional funding?
7.A.4 The organisation itself targets conflict sensitivity un-friendly donors with conflict sensitivity advocacy, or at least shares information with peers for other agency or consortium advocacy on the importance of conflict sensitivity	a) Do staff currently advocate to donors for support for conflict sensitivity within the proposed activities (conflict sensitivity mainstreamed into all donor proposals)? b) When and how does advocacy on the importance of conflict sensitivity take place? c) Are there specific suggestions as to what would be needed to support more effective advocacy for donors to support mainstreamed conflict sensitivity?
<b>7.B. Partners</b>	
7.B.1 Conflict sensitivity is considered and prioritized in relations with partners	a) What is the process for selecting partners? b) Do partner selection guidelines refer to CSA? c) Do we expect all partners (including private sector partners) to apply conflict sensitivity? d) When and how do we communicate to partners our expectations with regard to CSA? e) What actions would be taken if partner conflict blind (or conflict contributing) programming is uncovered? f) Do we offer partners any support / training in conflict sensitivity?

## Interview Form

### Name of Interviewees:

#### Part 1: At Start of Each Interview

##### 1.1 Give Background to Consortium

###### *Interviewer:*

"As you would be aware, Agency X is a member of the DFID funded Conflict Sensitivity Consortium. This project aims to improve the conflict sensitivity of NGOs, focusing on building NGO conflict sensitivity capacity in four countries, Sri Lanka, Kenya, Sierra Leone and the UK."

##### 1.2 Give and Introduction to Self-Assessment

###### *Interviewer:*

"The consortium has now reached the stage of self-assessment of CS capacity at UK offices of all consortium members. In this self-assessment we will reflect upon the conflict sensitivity of our work and explore the ways in which the UK can impede or support the conflict sensitivity of our country offices."

The relevance and implications of conflict sensitivity for a UK based NGO has not previously been well defined. At the same time as attempting to map our conflict sensitivity capacity, we will be seeking UK perspectives on what elements of conflict sensitivity are appropriate for a UK-based NGO. This self-assessment will help us to clarify what are our strengths and weaknesses in terms of conflict sensitivity. It will help us to develop change objectives for the remaining 3 years of the consortium project. These change objectives will feed into a consortium wide capacity building plan, and support and training will be offered to UK in response to the needs highlighted by this self-assessment."

## Part 2: Initial General Questions

Ask the interviewee:

- 2.1 What do you understand by the term conflict sensitivity? (*Staff should understand the two-way interaction*)
- 2.2 What implications if any do you think conflict sensitivity has for your role?
- 2.3 When do you consider conflict sensitivity?
- 2.4 Do you feel that you need to be conflict sensitive?
- 2.5 Do you feel that you are currently conflict sensitive?
- 2.6 If yes, can you give some examples?
- 2.7 If no, why do you think you are not?
- 2.8 Do you currently perform any activities that are consciously conflict sensitive?

## Part 3: Organisational Conflict Sensitivity

3.1 Review the above UK self-assessment tool. For each benchmark, discuss:

- i) Has Agency X already achieved this benchmark?
- ii) What evidence can we collect to show our current capacity in this area?
- iii) Do you think achievement of this benchmark is appropriate / a priority for Agency X?
- iv) How do you think we could improve Agency X capacity against this benchmark?

## Part 4: Improving CSA

Ask interviewee to:

- 4.1 Consider what areas of their job CSA is most relevant to.
- 4.2 Consider what minimum CSA expectations are relevant for their role. (What actions do you believe you/someone in a similar role might do to be conflict sensitive)
- 4.3 Are there any impediments to your conflict sensitivity?
- 4.4 What needs to happen (training, guidance or support) to build your conflict sensitivity?