



The Practice of Conflict Sensitivity – Concept to Impact



Fifth Narrative Report April 2010 – September 2010

Submitted to:
Department of International Development (DFID)
Purchase Order Number – 40012470

Prepared by:
Project Coordinator
on behalf of the
Conflict Sensitivity Consortium

Contact Details

Heloise Heyer
Project Coordinator
Conflict Sensitivity Consortium
+44 (0)20 7934 9447
hey@careinternational.org
CARE International, UK
10-13 Rushworth St.
London, SE1 0RB

Report Date
31st October 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Basic Data Sheet	3
II. Basic Data Sheet: Finances	4
III. Emerging Impact – Progress and Key Results at Goal, Purpose and Output Levels	5
IV. Lessons Learnt	32
V. Flagged Issues	33
VI. Risk Assessment	33

I. Basic Data Sheet

Project Title:	The Practice of Conflict-Sensitivity – Concept to Impact
Contract Number:	Purchase Order Number – 40012470
Project Locations:	UK, Sri Lanka, Sierra Leone, Kenya
Name of Consortium Lead Organisation:	CARE International UK, 10-13 Rushworth Street London, SE1 0RB, Tel: +44 (0) 20 7934 9334
Contact within Consortium Lead Organisation:	Heloise Heyer, Project Coordinator, Conflict-Sensitivity Consortium CARE International UK, Tel: +44 (0)20 7934 9447 E-mail : hey@careinternational.org
Names of other Consortium Members:	ActionAid; CAFOD; International Alert; Plan International; Responding to Conflict; Saferworld; Save the Children; Skillshare International; World Vision; Sierra Leone Red Cross Society; Sierra Leone Association of Non Governmental Organizations (SLANGO); ENCIS; Peace and Community Action (PCA)
Project Cost:	£2,100,000
Project Header: (Purpose and key outputs)	<p>The project purpose is to improve policies and practices that support CSA across a broad network of NGOs, local partners and donor agencies. Key outcomes will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared understanding of CSA across a network of international and local development, humanitarian and peacebuilding organisations; • 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 amongst member organisations and civil society partners to institutionalise and implement CSA, at HQ and local levels.
Project Duration:	1st August 2008 – 31st March 2012
Status of Report:	5 th Narrative Report (covering April 2010–September 2010)
Outputs (headline key outputs from this period):	Output 1 completed Output 2 completed Outputs 3, 4, 5 and 6 underway
Flagged Issues:	

II. Basic Data Sheet: Finances

1. Summary Financial Information

Total Project Cost	£2,100,000.00
Total Expenditure to date (August 2008 – September 2010)	£1,008,005.58

2. Summary of expenditure

Unspent balance at end of previous quarter (X)	£10,070.42
Funds received from DFID for current reporting period (July - September 2010) (A)	£67,438.59
Actual expenditure for current reporting period (July – September 2010) (Y)	£84,551.25
Excess /Deficiency of Receipts over Disbursements (C = (X+A)-Y)	£-7,042.24
Forecast of Expenditure for the next quarter (Oct – December 2010) (B)	£148,749.22
Payment Requested for the next quarter (B+C)	£155,791.46

III. Emerging Impact – Progress and Key Results at Goal, Purpose and Output Levels

A. Progress and Key Results at Goal and Purpose Level

Project Goal

The overall goal of this project is to ensure greater impact of development and humanitarian assistance through improved and more widespread mainstreaming of conflict-sensitive approaches.				
Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No of donors and NGOs: i) able to give examples / evidence of improved CSA policies and practice since 2008. ii) able to give examples of how the CSA consortium influenced/supported the above.	0 agencies in 0 countries	Goal indicator target finalised	All consortium agencies in 4 countries; NGOs/Donors targeted in FY03 outreach/advocacy	X Donors and X NGOs in 4 countries (TBD see milestone 1)
	Proposal	Source Mid-term evaluation	Source Reports on consortium agency improved practice	Source End of project survey across NGOs/Donors targeted through consortium outreach Final evaluation

According to the mid-term evaluation (MTE) completed in March 2010, "the project is found to remain effective, efficient and relevant within the constraints it operates under, and is considered to be on its way to achieving its goal and purpose."

At the mid-point of the project implementation period, it is now possible to start identifying progress at the goal level:

- Following the completion of the self-assessment process and development of change objectives, member agencies in each focus country have started to achieve concrete changes in their organisational policies and practices (see details in key results under output 3 and in annex 5). These changes have been happening at different levels, depending on the agency's starting points and particular blockages and opportunities. For a number of agencies that had a previously limited understanding of and commitment to conflict sensitivity, engagement in the Consortium's work has been instrumental in increasing staff awareness of the meaning and value of the concept in relation to their own work, and in starting to garner senior management buy-in. Other agencies, which were committed to applying conflict sensitivity but were facing capacity constraints, have been able to use the Consortium's technical and financial support to start integrating conflict sensitive approaches into their organisational strategies, standards and tools.
- Building on the findings and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation, the Consortium has developed two overall strategies on Learning and Outreach & Advocacy, which provide a common operating framework for the Consortium while leaving space for country consortia to develop more detailed plans in view of their particular contexts and priorities (see details under output 3, 6 and annexes 1 and 2).
- Advocacy efforts have resulted in the integration of Consortium's recommendations into the revision of the Sphere handbook and Comic Relief guidelines (see details under output 6).

- The Consortium is progressing on milestones 1 and 2. Within the framework of the overall Outreach and Advocacy strategy now developed, country consortia are defining specific country-level targets, which will be completed by the end of FY03.

Project Purpose

The project purpose is to improve policies and practices that support CSA across a broad network of NGOs, local partners and donor agencies.				
Purpose Indicator 1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
DFID adjusts its policies and procedures based on Consortium findings and best practice ¹	No previous consortium engagement with DFID	Consortium/DFID develop joint strategy for improving DFID policies and procedures based on consortium findings	Progress in the joint strategy. DFID and consortium working jointly to influence other donors/NGOs to support conflict sensitivity.	Achievement of goals in joint strategy
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Strategy document Meetings with DFID Mid-term evaluation	Progress report	Final evaluation
Purpose Indicator 2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (date)
No. of countries achieve targets set in outreach strategies	No previous consortium outreach	Outreach strategies ² developed in 4 countries	Progress according to outreach strategies in 4 countries	Achievement of outreach strategies in 4 countries
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Outreach strategies Mid-term evaluation	Outreach progress reports	Final evaluation
Purpose Indicator 3	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No of agencies able to demonstrate improvements in CSA capacity	Minimal previous coordinated multi-agency attempts to build CSA across consortium agencies in target countries	Agencies in 4 countries establish CSA capacity baselines	10 in UK 9 in Sri L 9 in Sierra L 8 in Kenya Meeting milestones	10 in UK 9 in Sri L 9 in Sierra L 8 in Kenya Demonstrate improvements
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Baselines from self-assessments Mid-term Evaluation	Progress reports from 4 countries Baselines from self-assessments	Final evaluation

¹ This could encompass e.g. DFID adjusting its approach to conflict audits based on Consortium assessment methodology, integration of Consortium best practice on conflict sensitivity into new guidance papers, as well as more institutional changes e.g. the Consortium helping pave the way for integrating conflict sensitivity clauses into PPAs.

² Targeting non-consortium members/external donors/quality initiatives and aid standards.

1. DFID Adjusting Policies and Practices Based on Consortium's Findings

UK consortium members met with DFID in January and July 2010. Priority areas for immediate engagement were agreed, including:

- Involving the Consortium in DFID's review of its conflict audit methodology (in FY03);
- Involving the Consortium in future conflict audits (Kenya/Sierra Leone, possibly in FY04);
- Engagement between the Consortium and DFID around their M&E frameworks and development of indicators related to conflict sensitivity. The Consortium would notably review and comment upon DFID's first draft indicators and share its own M&E frameworks to be developed for the country pilots (on-going engagement in FY03 and FY04).

In addition to these areas, further opportunities may be explored as part of the new Consortium's Outreach and Advocacy strategy and country plans (see details under output 6 and annex 1).

2. Country Progress on Outreach Targets

Building on the MTE's recommendations, the Consortium has rethought its approach to outreach and advocacy, bringing those two components into one single strategy and linking it closely to the learning process (see details under output 6 and in annex 2). The overall strategy has been developed during the reporting period and, following on from this, more specific country-level plans and targets are currently being established and will be shared in the next narrative report.

In several countries, member agencies are sensitising their partners and donors, as well as project beneficiaries, to the concept of conflict sensitivity and work of the Consortium. A highlight of the reporting period has been the start of the pilot implementation in Sierra Leone and Kenya, which has provided a powerful momentum to raise the Consortium's visibility and conduct outreach towards new partners. The launch of the CAFOD pilot project in Maralal, Kenya, in August 2010, was attended by more than 400 people from the Samburu, Turkana and Pokot communities, local state authorities, religious leaders and elders. In Sierra Leone, the launch of the CARE pilot project in September 2010 was attended by many local and international NGOs beyond the Consortium, as well as more than 150 people from local communities, representatives from the state ministry, police and district council and local community leaders. A representative from the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) also attended the launch of the Sierra Leone Red Cross Society pilot project and committed to raise the awareness of the APRM national team towards CSA in addition to his own support to the project initiative.

3. Agencies Demonstrating Improvements in CSA Capacity

The four country consortia have completed milestone 1 (see details under output 2) and are making significant progress on milestone 2 (see details under output 3 and in annex 5).

B. Progress at Output Level

OUTPUT 1

Output 1: A clarified and shared understanding of conflict-sensitive approaches to development and humanitarian assistance				
Indicator 1.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No. consortium agencies reach shared	Minimal multi-agency wide	10 UK Shared	10 UK 8 Kenya + 7 more partners from Saferworld, Skillshare,	Articulation of sharing understanding of

understanding of CSA.	shared understanding in target countries.	understanding reached in UK	Save the Children and CAFOD 9 Sri Lanka 9 Sierra Leone Shared understanding reached within 4 countries.	CSA across consortium members within and across 4 countries
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal. Desk review document	UK benchmarking paper and report on UK workshop	Reports from workshops in 3 countries + feedback on benchmarking paper Mid-term evaluation	Consortium wide report on shared understanding Final evaluation

Shared Understanding of CSA Across the Consortium

Output 1 has been achieved. See the first and second annual reports and their annexes for details.

The Consortium members agreed to continue to return to their definition as the project progresses, to ensure that it remains fit for purpose. Worth noting is the fact that while members reached a shared understanding of the concept of conflict sensitivity and agreed on the substance of the definition across the four countries, they agreed not to push for a single Consortium-wide definition, but allow for space to have tailored definitions in each country.

OUTPUT 2

Output 2: CSA review of institutional blockages and capacity constraints to CSA within each consortium agency and externally and identified practical steps to address these				
Indicator 2.1	Baseline	Milestone 1 (end FY01)	Milestone 2 (mid FY02)	Target (March 2012)
No. of agencies having conducted CSA capacity self-assessments and identified blockages/capacity constraints to conflict sensitivity	0 agencies	Methodology developed	10 in UK	10 in UK 9 in Sri L 9 in Sierra Leone 8 in Kenya
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Methodology documents	UK self assessment case studies	Kenya, Sri Lanka, Sierra Leone self assessment case studies Final evaluation
Indicator 2.2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No. of agencies having reported on internal/external constraints to CSA and no. of agencies having developed change objectives to address constraints.	0 agencies	10 agencies in UK having reported on internal/external constraints	8 Kenya 9 Sri L 7 Sierra L having reported on internal/external constraints	10 UK 8 Kenya 9 Sri L 9 Sierra L having developed change objectives to address constraints.
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Report on self-assessment findings from UK	Report on self-assessment findings from 3 other countries Mid-term evaluation	Finalised change objectives from 4 countries

Output 2 has been completed in all four country consortia:

1. Agency Self-Assessments

Milestones 1, 2 and 3 have been achieved across the whole Consortium (see details in the FY02 annual report). All agencies in the four countries have now completed their self-assessment process. Each country has documented the methodology followed, lessons learnt from the process and key findings from the self-assessments. The consolidated report, which has been conceived to maintain an adequate level of confidentiality for members, is now ready to be shared and included as annex 4.

While the milestones have been completed, the Consortium will continue to conduct more work on the case studies, following on the MTE's findings that those developed as part of the self-assessment process were not necessarily deep enough to allow other actors to better understand and implement CSA (see Mid-Term Evaluation, pp. 21-22). Members are acting upon the recommendation to focus on fewer and deeper cases in order to effectively stimulate practice change within and beyond the Consortium. This will be pursued as part of the country pilot implementation.

2. Reporting on Constraints to CSA Integration and Development of Change Objectives

Overall

The milestones 1, 2 and 3 have now been completed across the whole Consortium. All agencies have conducted and reported on their self-assessment process, which enabled them to identify not only constraints and blockages to CSA integration but also strengths and opportunities. Each agency has then developed change objectives on that basis. The UK Consortium has decided to only have agency-specific change objectives, but with agencies sharing relevant learning and documentation, and collaborating where relevant. In contrast, the Kenyan, Sierra Leonean and Sri Lankan consortia have also established Consortium-level change objectives. In addition to information already provided in the FY02 annual report, additional elements are highlighted below.

Kenya

The self-assessment process enabled the Kenyan consortium to identify blockages that impede the practice of CSA internally and externally. The Kenya consortium developed their own specific assessment guide, which members used to 'audit' their various respective units. The process also provided an opportunity for agencies to provide training for their respective staff on CS, exposing its relevance to the work they do. Other members introduced the approach in their strategic plans to work towards organisation-wide approaches. The self-assessment also informed the design of a toolkit by the Kenyan consortium to guide members, other organisations and donors in their practice of CSA. The toolkit is currently being field tested by two of the consortium members in the implementation of the CSA pilots. Across the entire process of conducting self-assessments and developing change objectives, activities and action points were geared towards ensuring the sustainable grounding of the concept of CSA within organisations.

One particularly important realisation for agencies was that conflict sensitivity is not only applicable to the project management cycle but to all sectors and departments of an organisation. This provided a good platform to stimulate an understanding and buy-in of conflict sensitivity across the board. The Consortium published a booklet to capture the main findings of the self-assessment process (*Conflict Sensitive Practice in Kenya: Beyond the Concept*, see part 2 of annex 4). As some blockages were common to several agencies, members decided to address those through consortium-wide change objectives. Other constraints will be addressed through agency-specific change objectives, to be taken forward individually (see overview in annex 4).

Sierra Leone

The self-assessment process served as tool to establish a baseline of agency capacities in terms of being conflict-sensitive rather than as a means of ranking agencies in terms of competence. It was important to clarify this aspect as it fostered trust and presented a level playing ground for agencies to flag areas with room for improvement and identify how capacities can be built to address constraints and blockages.

On the basis of the self-assessment findings and priorities identified during the process and consolidation workshop, change objectives have been developed at agency-level and consortium-level. While significant progress has already been achieved by consortium members and their partner agencies in understanding the concept of CSA and its implications for enhancing the impact of the work we do (see more details under output 3), one challenge identified as particularly prominent is around gaining senior management buy-in. High staff turnover at that level has been a contributing impediment. The consortium developed full and an abridged versions of the consolidated findings from the process, preserving the anonymity of organisations, which will notably serve as a basis for engagement with head of NGOs and donor local mission representatives and has been shared with DFID Conflict Advisor for West Africa as part of the updates on the work of the country consortium (see details under output 6).

Sri Lanka

While the outcome of the whole self-assessment exercise was found to be very timely and a useful learning process at both the agency and consortium levels, some areas for improvement were also identified, particularly with regard to the questionnaire used:

- The questionnaire was 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;
- Although the importance of assessing the CS of support functions (such as Human Resources, finance and procurement) was highlighted, the questionnaire did not support this as much as it did for the programme functions. The questions could be rethought to be made more explicit;
- The length of the questionnaire required a longer than anticipated time commitment by agencies, resulting in point persons spending long hours conducting interviews and in some cases to staff being unable to participate in the survey due to heavy schedules.

Through the self-assessment process and January 2010 consolidation workshop (see details in second narrative report), the consortium reached a clearer understanding of not only constraints but also strengths existing in each agency, and identified areas where support was needed from others to achieve the objective of being conflict-sensitive.

After defining a CS vision for each agency and outlining objectives to achieve that vision, each agency spent time finalising their change objectives and securing management support. Getting approval from management did take a longer time than anticipated in some agencies, mainly because all the change plans had to be discussed at management meetings and go through the appropriate decision-making structures.

Consortium-level change objectives were also developed. The main reason to develop these joint objectives came from the January 2010 workshop where the Sri Lanka consortium mapped the expertise and strengths available within agencies, and where members decided to explore the option of using this expertise to the benefit of each organisation. All findings from the process of self-assessment and development of change objectives have been synthesised into a consolidated Sri Lanka consortium report (see annex 4).

UK

Most UK agencies felt that the self assessment process provided useful information and clear steps for the way forward and development of change objectives. 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.

All agencies then developed their own measurable change objectives, to be reported on semi annually. Securing buy-in from the organisations' senior management required significant time but was needed to ensure an adequate level of understanding and support for change objectives at the corporate level. For several agencies, this process proved to have value in itself as a way of communicating to senior management about CSA and raising their awareness about the benefits of a better integration of CS principles at the organisational and programmatic levels.

While the UK consortium decided not to develop joint objectives, member agencies will still work jointly on some of their objectives where common areas of interest have been identified (such as around Human Resources processes and assessment tools).

During the reporting period, the UK consortium has also compiled an overview of the findings from the self-assessment process, lessons learnt and highlights on agency change objectives (in an anonymised form). These can be found in annex 4.

OUTPUT 3

Output 3: Increased capacity of international consortium members and civil society partners implement effective CSA				
Indicator 3.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No of agencies having developed capacity building plans for achieving change objectives ³ .	0 agencies	10 UK agencies	8 Kenya +7 partners from CAFOD, Saferworld, Skillshare and Save the Children 8 Sri L + partners 9 Sierra L	Agencies in all countries
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Capacity building plans Mid-term evaluation	Capacity building plans Mid-term evaluation	Summary report on capacity building plans Final evaluation
Indicator 3.2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No of individual agencies achieving change objectives in line with capacity building plans ⁴ .	0 agencies	10 UK 8 Kenya 9 Sri L 9 Sierra L	10 UK 8 Kenya 9 Sri L 9 Sierra L	10 UK 8 Kenya 9 Sri L 9 Sierra L
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Progress reports from 4 countries	Progress reports from 4 countries	Final progress reports from 4 countries Final evaluation

³ Capacity building plans will contain clear milestones, targets, indicators etc.

⁴ Change objectives will be prioritised, approved and promoted by each agency.

1. Development of Capacity-Building Plans to Achieve Change Objectives

Overall

The milestones 1, 2 and 3 have been completed across the whole Consortium. Capacity-building plans to pursue change objectives have been established in all four countries, at both the agency and consortium levels. In addition, the development of an overall Consortium Learning strategy during the reporting period, based on the MTE findings and recommendations, is intended to support the process of joint learning and capacity-building within and across the country consortia (see strategy in annex 4). Main progress and achievements to date on change objectives are described under indicator 2. Below are some brief overviews of the rationale and logic of current capacity-building plans, which will be further completed in view of the Learning strategy and as work on the change objectives advances.

Kenya

As part of the plan to implement consortium-wide and agency change objectives, members agreed to focus on conducting capacity building as a first step, before diversifying strategies and embedding capacity-building as part of the broader consortium work – such as within pilot implementation, through the development and testing of a CSA toolkit and through the rolling out of mini-pilots in agencies not involved in the two main ones. Worth highlighting is the fact that a number of agencies are currently considering the inclusion of CSA in their strategic planning and review, which would play a major role in ensuring the sustainability of consortium results well beyond the lifespan of the project.

Sierra Leone

A consolidated capacity building plan on agency-specific and joint consortium objectives has taken time to establish, primarily due to the critical issue of ensuring buy-in on change objectives by consortium partner management teams. The plan has now been developed and capacity-building activities have already started to be implemented on an ongoing basis, focusing on addressing key assessment findings. The monitoring template of individual agency progress and achievements will start in the next quarter and will capture work and results achieved in the previous reporting periods as well.

Sri Lanka

The Sri Lanka consortium has developed capacity building plans in line with individual and joint change objectives. These plans were submitted to the steering group and approval received endorsing the support requested from the project. The plans will be executed during the next two quarters, and some beyond FY03. In terms of joint trainings/learning initiatives, the consortium agreed on the following priorities, to be conducted during the next quarters:

- Introduction to Conflict Sensitivity: aiming at raising the awareness or programme and support staff within member agencies and partners.
- Conflict-Sensitive Economic Recovery Training – Participants will learn to assess the conflict risks and peacebuilding opportunities present in different economic interventions, through conflict and political economy analysis; to identify different types of economic actors and their capacities for contributing to peace and conflict; and to develop practical ideas and strategies for working with them.
- CSA Training of Trainers, with a focus on Do No Harm/Local Capacities for Peace as the main tool: hoping to build a resource pool within the consortium that other agencies and donors in Sri Lanka can draw on.
- M&E training: joint sharing and learning on developing conflict sensitivity indicators.

The consortium will ensure that most of the above trainings are conducted in local languages, and that background materials and training modules are also translated.

Additional to the capacity building plans the consortium has developed a monitoring mechanism to help monitor the progress made in achieving the CS vision in each agency (see annex 5).

UK

Individual agency change objectives and capacity-building plans have been finalised by each UK agency and shared during a full UK Consortium workshop in July 2010. Progress to date and challenges were also discussed, which fed into the development of joint capacity-building plans for the Consortium. A 3-day learning and capacity-building workshop will be held at the end of November 2010, centred on real-life scenarios and concrete pieces of work brought in by agencies and structured in clusters. These will probably include some of the following (non-definite and non-exhaustive list): 1) Multiple mainstreaming (CSA, gender, HIV/AIDS), 2) Assessment, Impact and Learning Processes (including M&E systems and indicators, as well as agency-specific assessment tools); 3) Embedding CSA in HR Processes.

2. Progress on Change Objectives

Overall

All four country consortia are currently making significant progress towards achieving the second indicator milestones, both at the level of individual agency changes and in terms of implementation of joint learning and capacity-building plans. Over the reporting period, the UK and Sri Lankan consortia have started implemented a monitoring template to keep track of individual agency progress and changes in policies and practices (see annex 5). The Kenyan and Sierra Leonean consortia will start using the monitoring template as of the next quarter but are already able to report on particular agency work and achievements (see details per country below).

Kenya

The monitoring template of progress against change objectives will be implemented as of the next quarter, but examples of work conducted to date by the consortium and individual agencies is provided below:

- Trainings on Do No Harm and Local Capacities for Peace. The trainings, in which members' partners were invited to take part, have made participants more aware of the concept and practical implications of CSA. The impact is that all those engaged in the training have been able to communicate internally on CSA and start identifying the relevance of applying conflict sensitivity as part of their particular areas of work.
- Capacity-building and joint learning on how to conduct conflict analysis and link the findings to the project planning;
- Exploring the integration of CSA in organisations' strategic plan and review;
- Exploring the integration of CSA in HR and organisational development units;
- Development, testing and on-going review and updating of the draft toolkit developed by the Kenya consortium. The second main joint Consortium training held in June 2010 was designed to be very practical and field-based to enrich the pilot planning, and most particularly to review the draft toolkit to develop a version that could be appropriately tested during pilot implementation. Areas covered during the event and currently followed up on an on-going basis as part as the launch and implementation of the CAFOD and CARE pilots include: how to map conflict-related risks; minimum conflict-sensitive guide; application of CSA in project implementation phases; linking analysis to intervention and CSA in exit strategy.
- One of the case studies documented as part of the self-assessment process was of a conflict-blind road construction project in Maralal, which contributed to raising tensions between communities in the target area. After a number of trainings and as one of the CSA pilot activities, the Maralal diocese team decided to implement the same project through a

conflict-sensitive lens, whereby all groups were informed of the purpose of the road project, consulted about the design and involved in implementation. Communities notably brought forward a team of youth – the “Morans”, usually community raiders – to be involved in the project. This unique approach gave the community leaders a chance to reflect and see changes in the way the work. As an outcome, the two once warring teams ended up working together and sharing resources as part of the project.

Sierra Leone

A consolidated action plan for monitoring agency-specific and consortium-wide change objectives, including progress against set indicators, is being formulated for dissemination in Q3. Main work and achievements to date are highlighted below:

- In response to the practical recommendations for addressing the self assessment findings, two joint works were taken forward in Sierra Leone over the reporting period. Both were built on sustaining learning undertaken in FY02 on increasing stakeholder knowledge on the concept of conflict sensitivity and articulating an understanding of the impact of the two way interaction between aid and context. The previous training (in FY02), was modelled on World Vision’s humanitarian accountability process of Do No Harm / Local Capacities for Peace and had the objective of enhancing knowledge and practice of context and project analysis. It served as a basis for clearer articulation of SLRCS’s facilitated learning forum on Participatory Approaches to Development, and SLANGO-led initiative on Inclusiveness and Impartiality in Conflict-Sensitive programming. The trainings have been useful in providing capacity and direction as the consortium moves into piloting CSA at the project implementation level.
- At consortium level a number of findings were identified as constituting integral approaches for mainstreaming conflict sensitivity. These include:
 - Enhanced stakeholder knowledge on the concept and practice of conflict sensitivity at organisation and field implementation levels. Significant progress has been attained around this not only within consortium agencies but also among their field implementing partners;
 - Development and maintenance of Open Information Boards on program / project activities. This initiative championed by AAISL is slowly gaining ground among other participating agencies;
 - Joint assessments and evaluations with community stakeholders. Much focus will be placed on this for partner learning in FY04.
- At the agency-level:
 - Forums are being held to stimulate discussions around issues identified as having a high potential to trigger tensions and are particularly important to take into account in terms of interaction with project activities at the field level.
 - WVSL recently conducted community engagements on tensions around “Gifts Notification” Administration and its related implication for Child Sponsorship Programming. Conflict- sensitivity approaches now constitute an integral component of WVSL’s Staff Induction process and staff transfer policy.
 - SLANGO has placed emphasis on providing CSA overviews in its bi-monthly Board Meetings and in engagements with national NGO forums.
 - Best practices are being recognised and documented by participating agencies. Plan SL has just undergone a midway review of their six monthly conflict sensitive action plans at two Field Program Units. Each action was reviewed against the following criteria: i) Intention of learning; ii) What was learnt; iii) How learning was documented and transferred.

Sri Lanka

Progress and achievements made by the consortium and member agencies on their change objectives have been captured by the monitoring template established during the reporting period (see details in annex 5). Some highlights include:

- Taking forward agency capacity building plans, organisations had achieved milestones on their way towards becoming CS organisations.
 - CARE identified the lack of conflict sensitive M&E indicators as a critical gap to mainstreaming CS within the organisation, and provided skills for the M&E staff of the organisation to improve integration of CS in the M&E systems. This was not limited to training but regular follow up was conducted with projects on their progress towards the agreed action plans and technical support was provided as and when needed.
 - PCA, built the capacity of the senior management team to explore and understand the issues, embed learning within the organisation and identify behaviours and practice that hinders it being CS. Further it helped the staff to understand organisational policies and practice, and how they can and should be CS. PCA's project management cycle model, produced a communal 12 month plan to embed CS into the organisation at all levels and this is being regularly monitored for progress.
 - WVL has a clear strategic commitment to peacebuilding and DNH/LCP. The assessment led to the discovery that WVL does not have in place a CSA policy or procedure or DME indicators to ensure that its commitment is followed through in practice. The assessment provided the rationale for capacity building through various steps towards attainment of the goal that WVL become conflict sensitive.
- Joint training opportunities were identified with the finalisation of the individual and consortium change objectives. Members decided to capitalise on existing capacities within the consortium to conduct cross-learning initiatives, focused on sharing and gaining more practical knowledge on CSA. For instance, when World Vision Lanka conducted a CSA assessment of one of their programmes, they invited consortium members to be involved as consultants. Similarly, PCA led a three-partner approach to conducting a conflict analysis in the troubled Eastern Province of the country. Trainers from Save the Children, WVL and PCA supported by a steering group member worked together on developing a delivery plan, training workshop, and practical research "toolbox". They then went on to train and support over 30 staff researchers to conduct the analysis in the field and write up their results. This "joined up" working provided a real added value in terms of capacity building outputs:
 - An experienced cross-organisational training team to deliver field-level training in conducting conflict analysis;
 - Experienced conflict analysis trainers within each of the three organisations to further build their in-house capacities;
 - A tried and tested three day conflict analysis training workshop to encourage staff to undertake this form of research and initiative in the future;
 - 10 trained staff researchers in each organisation.
- With the learning generated from the self assessment process, Save the Children in Sri Lanka reviewed their partnerships to assess whether the organisation was being conflict sensitive in its choice of, and relationships with partners. It identified opportunities for improvement, gaps prevailing in former partnerships and proposed changes to the partnership policy and implementation guidelines. The review took place in April 2010 along with the organisation's strategic planning process. It defined a "partner" as any organisation that works with Save the Children in Sri Lanka to help it achieve its thematic objectives. In total, 37 organisations and 15 partnerships were chosen to represent different districts and thematic sections. Main recommendations included the following:
 - Building the institutions of civil society (and pro-poor government and private sector) is one of the driving motives for working through partners and is central to Save the Children's model of sustainable change. It is therefore suggested that a capacity building strategy (which would include Do No Harm and conflict sensitivity along with

humanitarian accountability and rights-based approach) is clearly integrated into all partnership agreements.

- A systematic approach to relationship management; the development of thematic newsletters and updates and distribution of key resources and publications would go a long way towards improving communication and information flows and transparency.
- Involvement of partners in joint events and organisational processes.
- Further, under the joint capacity building plans, the Sri Lanka consortium agreed to review and refine the capacity assessment tools on partnerships, with Save the Children in Sri Lanka providing technical support.
- IA partnered with a locally based organization (Peacebuilding & Development Institute in Sri Lanka) to build their capacity to deliver a range of trainings for development and peacebuilding practitioners on conflict sensitivity in practice through different areas of focus (e.g. economic recovery).

UK

UK agency progress against change objectives:

Further detail on this is provided in Annex 5.

Some key highlights of progress in the last quarter include:

- Action Aid has integrated CSA into the participatory vulnerability analysis guide/manual
- CAFOD has provided inputs towards CBHA staff competencies, and ensured that CS knowledge and practice was included in the staff competencies
- CARE has integrated conflict sensitivity into an EC-funded Indigenous Rights Programme in Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia (the first explicit application of CS for CARE in that region)
- International Alert has trained their programme design and fundraising team in conflict sensitivity in order to ensure that projects are conflict sensitive from the outset
- Plan has integrated a CSA into Plan Liberia's new Country Strategic Plan and also conducted a Conflict Analysis
- Responding to Conflict have included conflict sensitivity in all consultancies this year
- Saferworld has worked to embed conflict sensitivity as a part of their three year organisational Strategic Plan and has integrated conflict sensitivity into three new projects.
- Save the Children has integrated conflict sensitivity into Emergency Standard Operating Procedures for education, health, programme design and quality
- World Vision has secured inclusion of conflict sensitivity into the International Programmes Team Plans for FY11 (Oct 10- Sept 11 – the first time CS has been specifically mentioned in WVUK's team planning)

Some key highlights of plans for the coming quarter include:

- Action Aid is working to get conflict sensitivity emphasised in the new organisational strategy
- CAFOD will present CS at CAFOD's Global Humanitarian meeting in October 2010
- CARE is integrating CS into Underlying Causes of Poverty Analysis
- International Alert will focus on building up ability to build conflict sensitivity into country office audits and 'health scans'.
- Plan will hold a full day Conflict Analysis training organised in November 2010 for the Plan UK Programme Department
- Responding to Conflict are presenting to the Secretary Generals of 80 National Red Cross offices to be held in Geneva on 7 October – with a focus will on conflict sensitivity
- Saferworld will include conflict sensitivity into a roundtable on October 13th, entitled 'Giving aid in difficult environments', aimed at funders including statutory donors, trusts and foundations.
- Save the Children is including conflict sensitivity into training provided to the UK Ministry of Defence as part of their training for staff officers of the UK/NATO Stabilisation unit.

- World Vision is integrating conflict sensitivity into their Child Protection policy and briefing

OUTPUT 4

Output 4: Articulation and documentation of effective practice in CSA mainstreaming in a range of countries/contexts, across different sectors and multiple organizations				
Indicator 4.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No of countries having posted no. of case studies on external part of consortium website.	0 countries consistently documenting case studies and no consortium website	Website re-launched	Current practice case studies documented in 4 countries + emergency pilot	Consortium case studies documented in 4 countries + emergency pilot
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Website Mid-term evaluation	Website List of available case studies	Consolidated consortium report on case studies Final evaluation
Indicator 4.2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No. of countries achieving targets set in Consortium communications and dissemination strategy	0 past consortium communication /dissemination work	Consortium communications and dissemination strategy developed	4 countries achieving first milestones	4 countries achieving targets
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Strategy Mid-term evaluation	Progress reports from 4 countries	Consolidated report on communications and dissemination Final evaluation

1. Case Studies Completed and Posted on the Website

Case Studies

Overall:

As mentioned under Output 2.1 above, case studies have been conducted as part of the self-assessment process and already included in the desk review and self-assessment documentation by the UK, Kenya and Sierra Leone (see details in second annual narrative report, and Kenya case studies in annex 4). Sierra Leone is in the process of deepening the research and analysis around its initial case studies, in accordance with the MTE's recommendations. Sri Lanka is in the process of finalising its own case studies, with a preliminary overview provided below.

Sri Lanka:

Documenting the case studies has provided an opportunity for the project to share both successes and challenges in achieving conflict sensitivity in a given context. Sri Lanka consortium members are documenting case studies that offer a source of information regarding

the practical issues at stake when trying to be sensitive to conflict in an emergency context – an area in which knowledge and best practices have been slow to evolve – and that may contribute to the ‘business case’ for conflict sensitivity which was noted as lacking in the Consortium’s benchmarking paper. Saferworld Sri Lanka office took on the responsibility to develop these case studies, using a participatory and qualitative methodology. Both case studies have been shared with all member agencies and are now being finalised. The two projects selected within the consortium were :

1. CARE’s Governance Project in the south of the country;
2. Peace and Community Action’s project in the east named “Child Protection Network Project”.

Some main (and anonymised) findings/recommendations that can already be shared include:

- Being conflict sensitive will enable project staff to recognise and analyse micro-level conflicts and political issues, which may help improve the project’s effectiveness and impartiality.
- The need to move from theory to practice: staff of these projects have benefited considerably from Do No Harm and conflict-sensitive trainings that contributed to improving their skills and have an increased capacity to achieve project objectives while strengthening relations between different stakeholders, upholding core values and avoiding feeding into political or other state/non-state actors’ agendas. It may also be helpful to consider moving away from training in theory to more direct accompaniment of needs assessment exercises to ensure that relevant conflict sensitivity themes and questions are factored into needs assessments and project design, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation.
- The need to focus on undertaking an explicit and systematic conflict analysis as part of project planning and documenting the findings.
- The M&E system should increase its focus on changes in the context such as key local dynamics. It needs to also improve to cover indicators relevant to the project objectives to assess changes at outcome level.
- In all future projects, when choosing project locations, surveying/cross checking conditions in selected communities against others not selected, and identification of the perceptions of different communities regarding their needs would be of critical importance before finalising selection of locations.
- Consider training for stakeholders on Do No Harm or Conflict Sensitivity. Training for officials in land issues is a particular area in which capacity building could have particularly beneficial impacts on local conflict dynamics.

Website

Milestone 1 has been completed as the ConflictSensitivity.Org website has been re-launched in August 2010. Monitoring of the website statistics from 14 August to 13 September 2010 has revealed good results: more than 1000 visitors from 90 countries/territories have visited the site in a month, generally visiting several pages of the site in one visit. A new phase of improvement and completion of the site is currently underway and will be completed by the end of November 2010, notably including the addition of project findings and publications. An official launch to donors, NGOs, policy-makers and other relevant contacts will also be organised by the end of 2010. Regular review and updating of the website will then be conducted on an on-going basis during the rest of FY03 and in FY04 – notably in view of a detailed analysis of the website statistics and review of feedback and expectations from Consortium members and a selected panel of external stakeholders.

The four countries have produced case studies and documentation that will be posted on the website during the next quarters, including:

- Kenya: *Conflict Sensitive Practice in Kenya: Beyond the Concept*; Kenya conflict analysis (to be broadly launched at the end of November 2010); possibly draft toolkit and pilot emerging case studies;

- Sierra Leone: desk research on conflict in Sierra Leone; organisational capacity assessment findings; context analysis; possibly synthesis of donor policies and recommendations, and pilot emerging learning and case studies;
- Sri Lanka: case studies once they are finalised; other documents such as donor policy review (choice to be made in view of particularly sensitive operating context in Sri Lanka);
- UK: Introductory PowerPoint presentations to conflict-sensitivity; self-assessment template (with introduction explaining how to practically use it); overview of findings from Consortium's self-assessment process; possibly practical guidance on conducting introductory sessions on CSA within organisations.

2. Countries Achieving Communication and Dissemination Strategy Targets

Following on the recommendations from the MTE, the Consortium's overall Steering Committee recommended the development of a Learning strategy covering not only documentation, communication and dissemination aspects, but also key learning questions, process to pursue learning and sharing of knowledge, experiences and skills within and across country consortia, as well as linkages with outreach and advocacy. Consortium members agreed to this way forward and small groups from the UK Consortium, in communication with country coordinators and selected members, developed an overall Consortium Learning strategy (see annex 2). The strategy may be further enriched and developed during the next quarter, and will be regularly reviewed, monitored and updated during the remaining lifespan of the project. See details of the outreach and advocacy work conducted by the country consortia, including communication and dissemination aspects, under output 6.

OUTPUT 5

Output 5: Innovative approaches to conflict-sensitivity are field tested by consortium members and their partners in three country contexts, and application of CSA to one emergency response is documented.				
Indicator 5.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No. of countries having conducted CSA project implementation pilots	No consortium CSA implementation pilots previously undertaken	3 countries document current practice on CSA in project implementation	3 countries design CSA pilots	CSA pilots implemented in 3 countries
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Reports on CSA in project implementation practice from 3 countries	CSA pilot plans from 3 countries Mid-term evaluation	CSA pilot reports from 3 countries Final evaluation
Indicator 5.2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
Effect of conflict sensitivity assessed by appropriate M&E system ⁵	No past consortium experience with CSA M&E	Appropriate M&E system designed in 3 countries	Appropriate M&E system being applied in 3 countries	Appropriate M&E system evaluated in 3 countries
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Reports on M&E system from 3 countries Mid-term evaluation	Progress report on M&E of CSA implementation pilots	Summary of M&E evaluation findings and recommendations. Final evaluation
Indicator 5.3	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
Guidance for applying CSA to emergency response developed	No past consortium experience	First draft of guidance for applying CSA to emergency response developed	CSA guidance applied to 1 emergency response	CSA emergency pilot evaluated and guidance revised
	Source	Source	Source	Source
	Proposal	Guidance documentation	Report on emergency response	Post-response evaluation Final Evaluation

1. CSA Pilot Projects

Overall

The three focus country consortia are making progress towards achieving the indicator milestones. The Sri Lanka consortium has held several planning meetings and will launch the pilot in December 2010. The delay in Sri Lanka has resulted from several factors: the conflict analysis had to be postponed to FY03, due to risks in conducting the analysis during major

⁵ M&E system developed by consortium (milestone 1)

elections early in 2010, and the initial project selected for the pilot did not receive the expected UNICEF's funding (due to UNICEF withdrawing all its funding for next year), therefore forcing the Sri Lanka consortium to identify an alternative project and redraw the pilot plans.

Kenya and Sierra Leone have each launched two pilot projects over the reporting period and have identified key objectives to guide the CSA pilot implementation:

- To generate evidence based conflict-sensitive lessons from various phases of project implementation
- To Identify CSA best practices and explore the added value of applying conflict sensitivity to the targeted project
- To identify at what stages of the project conflict-blind decisions occur and how this is checked and adapted
- To devise strategies and options of project re-design and adaptation strategies
- To identify key interaction indicators from the project through comparative analysis of conflict and project profile/intervention analysis
- To document processes and develop conclusions that focus on changes that are specifically linked to conflict sensitivity and not about general programme quality
- To provide the Consortium with evidence-based advocacy messages that will be used to influence donors, peer agencies and other stakeholders in adopting and applying CSA in their work

Kenya

Conflict Analysis

A participatory conflict analysis was conducted by the Kenya consortium in FY02 (see details in second annual reports). The report that was completed in March 2010 has been further updated during the reporting period to capture the on-going reforms and passing and promulgation of a new Constitution in Kenya. The changes have notably resulted in the consortium changing the report title to "*Embracing CSA in National Cohesion and Integration: Analysis of the Kenya Context*". The report is set to be launched publicly in November 2010 for sharing with wider audiences and will be posted on the Consortium website.

Pilot Project Implementation:

The conflict analysis informed the selection of the projects on which to conduct CSA pilots: 1. CAFOD "Integrated Peace and Livelihood Project" in Maralal (see pilot box below); 2. CARE access to justice project in Kibera (details to be provided in next report). In addition to these two full-scale pilots to be conducted on behalf of the entire consortium, it was agreed that each member agency would identify a mini-pilot with the purpose of promoting further in-house learning. For example, CAFOD will focus on their administration unit and integrating CSA in its practice and function. ActionAid have identified two of their operation areas for pilot testing of CSA and other agencies are currently in the process of identifying the areas to mini-test CSA internally.

Kenya Pilot Project Overview (Project 1 – CAFOD)

<i>Title:</i>	Integrated Peace and Livelihood Project
<i>Implementing Agency:</i>	CAFOD and partner: Diocese of Maralal
<i>Location:</i>	Maralal (Northern Kenya)
<i>Project Objectives:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased household incomes through enhanced access to markets, improved livestock breeds and increased access to capital for income generation activities and livestock marketing; - Enhanced and strengthened peace and harmony among different communities.

Pilot Launch and Capacity-Building Workshop Overview

- ❖ Opening event held in Longewan, Maralal district, on 17th August 2010, with the participation of Kenya Consortium members (CARE, ActionAid, World Vision, Saferworld, Skillshare, CAFOD) and implementing partners (Diocese of Marsalal and Diocese of Marsabit) and attended by more than 400 people from the Turkana, Pokot and Samburu communities, state representatives, religious leaders, community and women leaders, morans (young community warriors).
- ❖ Capacity-building and planning workshop for pilot team, consortium members and partners held on 18th-20th August 2010. Sessions focused on: components of CSA; conflict analysis of project area; project overview and identification of possible interaction factors (positive and negative) between the project and context; mapping the pilot strategy.
- ❖ Planned 4 phases/layers of pilot implementation: 1. Capacity-building of pilot team, pilot design and launch; 2. Implementation and M&E with regular exchange visits with community members/consortium/implementing team; 3. Documentation/case studies/development of influencing messages/outreach and advocacy; 4. Closing with launch of CSA toolkit and review of CSA contribution to the project.



Pilot Launch Ceremony – Samburu and Pokot community speeches, Maralal, Kenya, 17 August 2010

Sierra Leone

Conflict Analysis:

A participatory conflict analysis process was undertaken during the previous reporting period (see details in second annual narrative report). Over the current reporting period, findings generated from the conflict analysis helped inform the choice of the project implementation pilots in two geographically distinct regions of the country, characterised by some of the following conflict issues:

- Tensions and reported violent conflict between agro and pastoralist farmers;
- Pastoralist conflicts including cattle theft;
- Water scarcity;
- Politisation of land distribution;
- Corruption in land allocation;
- Wide political divide affecting not only governance structures but also livelihood patterns.

The context / conflict analysis in the two pilot environments was updated during the first capacity building workshop for pilot project staff and beneficiaries. The analysis brought out new flashpoints, key conflict actors and issues as well as current power dynamics in the project context.

Pilot Project Implementation:

The development of a draft plan for pilot implementation started in November 2009 and more thoughts and discussions have continued since then with the aim of continually revising the plan and understanding how learning could be generated through the pilot. The Sierra Leone Consortium members aim to use the pilots not only to document information on key flashpoints / pitfalls attributed to conflict insensitivity in the project environment (context), but also to identify and document practical best (and worst) practices in ensuring conflict sensitive project implementation; focusing on practical ways in which existing systems / actions can be adapted for enhanced conflict sensitivity.

Terms of Reference have been developed and shared with pilot project staff clearly highlighting the methodology for implementation, which will focus on changes that only directly relate to conflict sensitivity, and not to overall issues of programming quality. The purpose is to give consortium members and key stakeholders a chance to understand the implication, relevance and application of conflict sensitivity approaches at project implementation level. Such understanding will help members develop evidence-based business cases that can be used in influencing donors and internal management into adopting the approaches for future intervention.

The two selected pilot projects are: 1. CARE Conservation Agriculture Project; 2. Sierra Leone Red Cross Society (SLRCS) Community Animation and Peace Support Project (see details in Sierra Leone Pilot Boxes below). Both were launched during the reporting period. The launching programmes were instrumental in stimulating learning and the realisation by project staff and community participants of previously unnoticed hindrances and opportunities, and additionally contributed to serve the consortium's outreach objective. Monthly updates on an ongoing basis are reporting progress of the pilots, highlighting key findings, lessons learnt, best practices and challenges.

Sierra Leone Pilot Box 1

Project Overview

<i>Title:</i>	Conservation Agriculture Project (CAP) with Land Tenure Support for Women and Youth
<i>Implementing Agency:</i>	CARE International in Sierra Leone
<i>Location:</i>	Koinadugu District, Sierra Leone
<i>Project Goal:</i>	More productive and environmentally sustainable agricultural practices, benefiting 11,000 people, including all land users and marginalized groups, in 40 communities in Koinadugu district.

Pilot Launch and Capacity-Building Workshop Overview

- ❖ Opening event held in the Kabala Community Centre on 23 September 2010, attended by Consortium members, many other local and international NGOs, as well as by more than a hundred persons from local communities, representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security, police and district council and local community leaders.
- ❖ Workshop for pilot team, Consortium members and communities held in September 2010, focusing on: presentation of project; getting to under conflict sensitivity; review of pilot project conflict analysis key findings and causes of tensions in the project environment; identification of conflict (in)sensitivity issues from the organisation and community perspectives; building bridges/pilot strategies; identification of pilot strategy, action points and next steps.

Project Overview

<i>Title:</i>	Community Animation & Peace Support (CAPS)
<i>Implementing Agency:</i>	Sierra Leone Red Cross Society – with partners: Human Rights Commission; District Council; Network Movement for Justice and Development; Bo Peace and Reconciliation Centre
<i>Location:</i>	Pujehun
<i>Project Objectives:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Increase in community cohesion and family ties and the ability of communities to resolve conflict- Improve food security practice in targeted communities- Increase access and use of clean water, and general hygiene practices improved in targeted communities

Pilot Launch and Capacity-Building Workshop Overview

- ❖ Opening event held in Pujehun on 4 September 2010, attended by Consortium members, operating organisations within the District, representative from the District Council, religious bodies, government line ministries and from the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). Also participating were beneficiaries drawn from rural communities where the project intends to focus. A total number of more than 150 people attended the launching ceremony.
- ❖ The capacity-building workshop for the pilot implementation team was held in Pujehun on 5 October 2010 and focused on: 1. Discussing and defining the multiple understandings of conflict, peace and violence; 2. Acquiring knowledge on the focus of the Conflict Sensitive Consortium in Sierra Leone; 3. Determining the relevance of conflict sensitivity to the project operations at all levels; 4. Suggesting strategies to be explored to make the project more conflict sensitive at the planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation stages.

Sri Lanka

Conflict analysis:

As part of the conflict analysis methodology agreed in FY02, six sub-national workshops were conducted in Nuwara Eliya in the central province of Sri Lanka (by CARE and World Vision Lanka (WVL)), Ampara in the East (PCA, SC and WVL), Hambantota in the South (IA), Vavuniya (SW and RedR) and Jaffna in the North of Sri Lanka (RedR, SW). The full overall analysis is currently being reviewed and finalised by members and will be shared in the next narrative report. Below is a brief overview of main findings from each area analysis that can be highlighted:

- *The central province analysis* (Nuwara Eliya District): The plantation community suffers from numerous social, economic and political discriminations which, in most cases, they are powerless against. Being a group of landless people employed mainly as daily-paid manual workers, estate residents are vulnerable and insecure; their livelihood depends almost entirely on estate work and they lack access to essential government services. Trade unions play a key role here, advocating for labour rights and ensuring welfare facilities for the workers.
- *The southern province analysis* (Hambantota District) revealed that unemployment is a key issue faced, owing to the absence of economic development, a weak private sector, lack of

educational facilities and a mixture of issues that reconnect to challenges at the national level.

- *Northern province analysis* (Jaffna and Vavuniya): The analysis conducted in Jaffna revealed that although the armed conflict had officially ended, tensions remained due to continued presence of a large number of armed forces, land issues, migration flows, tensions between resident communities and IDPs, administrative isolation between communities. Saferworld and RedR undertook the analysis in *Vavuniya* with a focus on the 'Conflict Dynamics' and opportunities for peace. The participants who took part included representatives from the Vavuniya NGO Consortium (includes district, national and international NGOs).

- *Eastern Province analysis:*

The consortium recognises the Eastern Province as the most conflict-affected province in Sri Lanka, with a long history of ethnic tensions, post tsunami challenges, and that has suffered from changing and uncertain governance as both the LTTE and Government forces battled, lost, and retook the area on numerous occasions over the three decade of civil war. Tensions remain high between the three ethnic communities here and between the security forces and the minority communities. In consideration of the above, it was decided to engage in a more substantial study of the "post military solution" conflict in the area. As such PCA, Save the Children, and WVL seconded an experienced trainer from each organisation, supported by a member of the steering group, to work in partnership to train 10 experienced field work staff from each organisation to be conflict analysis researchers within the communities. In total 4 training officers were trained up by the consortium who then trained a further 31 cross-partnership staff to undertake community level conflict analyses. A template for collecting information from each interaction was produced together with a summation framework to draw together the information collected by each staff researchers. All staff researcher training was undertaken in Tamil medium with Inhala translation. Similarly all forms to collect evidence were in local languages to increase coherence and reduce misunderstandings. These staff undertook;

- 1) Individual interviews of villagers, community leaders, CSO NSA & local NGO staff working in the villages, government officers, journalists, police, security forces, and where possible, the leaders of local underground armed groups.
 - 2) Focus Group Discussions within (a) villagers through community meetings arranged by their CBOs, (b) staff of other (CSO/NSA) organisations working in the same villages, (c) other actors such as INGOs, Senior Government Officials,
 - 3) SWOT analysis with staff from the projects undertaken by the three consortium partners in the Province with respect to how conflict sensitive these were and to what extent they were influenced by, or influenced the conflict within which they operated.
- The process of completing the conflict analysis of the Eastern Province is continuing but is delayed as the volume of data to be examined is very important and makes the extraction of relevant information more complex. The sensitivity of the data collected is also being addressed to ensure individual responses to the interviews cannot be identified and lead back to the interviewee. It is expected that first draft of the results should be ready in November 2010.
- Main issues in the area that can be flagged relate to:
 - Newly arrived communities belonging to majority ethnic group perceived as "colonising" the land owned by the minority ethnic community and competing for fishing rights with Tamil fishermen in already over-fished areas. Police and security forces are seen as protecting and aligning themselves with the newly arrived Sinhala populations.
 - High level of government surveillance and intervention in areas seen as seen hosting LTTE sympathisers, which are seen as an attempt to further disempower minority communities.
 - Overall major issues are the continuing police checkpoints, military camps set up in the middle of minority communities, continuing lack of employment and advantages perceived as unfair given to majority ethnic communities.
 - Underpinning these issues is an unwillingness to go to war again under any circumstance, together with a fear that the political "solution to the Tamil problem" (and by default to all

ethnic minorities) promised by the President will not be based on greater equality for all, and may not be addressed at all.

Pilot Project Implementation

Several planning meetings were held to identify a suitable project for the pilot. Out of the options discussed the consortium selected an inter-community understanding project to be implemented by Peace and Community Action. The said project is for 3 years and looks at community cohesion and developing inter-community understanding. Located in the Matara district in the south of Sri Lanka, the project will work with 6 remote villages in two conflicting divisions (three villages in each division) during the first year, and “Intercommunity Understanding Exchanges”, whereby representatives from each of the village communities will travel to the East to meet Tamil villagers who face similar community cohesion difficulties. It is hoped to develop an ongoing village-based twinning arrangement on that basis. The pilot will focus on the Phase 1 of the project, which is starting this quarter. .

Key activities identified for the consortium around the pilot are :

1. Review the project documents and agree on a plan of engagement;
2. Revisit the original project context analysis and identify gaps (if appropriate) and measures to improve the analysis;
3. Review the proposal to understand to what extent CS elements from the analysis have been incorporated, and what else needs to be included to improve the CS of the project;
4. M&E strategy for the CS elements of the project and how these interact with the project M&E systems;
5. Capacity building action plan for the project (organisational systems, staff and beneficiaries);
6. CS project reporting structure;
7. Lastly, considering the pilot as a learning process for the wider consortium, for other organisations to identify:
 - a. What learning does your organisation want to get out of this pilot?
 - b. How will you embed this learning into your organisation?

2. Conflict Sensitivity Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

The pilot teams in Kenya and Sierra Leone are each working on designing M&E systems and specific indicators to be tested during the pilot implementation. Full sessions of the launch capacity-building workshops have been dedicated to the M&E system development, with exercises notably focused on identifying possible indicators for the level of conflict-sensitivity of the project, interaction between project and context, and impact of CSA inclusion. This work has proved very challenging for consortium members and pilot teams, but also confirmed the importance of focusing on M&E issues in relation to CSA. To move forward, the decision has been made to establish a cross-consortia working group comprising the four coordinators and a selected expert per country (including the UK), which is mandated to develop a common M&E framework and guidelines for the pilots by the end of November 2010, to be taken on and adapted by pilot teams in each country with the continuing support of the group. One of the main overall principles agreed on across the focus countries is to integrate conflict sensitivity M&E as part of the existing project M&E systems rather than as a separate add-on. Based upon the project analysis and the project M&E Framework, Conflict Sensitive (interaction) indicators will be introduced at each project output level to document and evaluate the application of CSA and its impact on the project and context. Details on the pilot M&E frameworks and findings from its application will be shared with DFID on an on-going basis and in the next narrative report.

3. CSA in Emergency Response

The UK consortium has produced a set of guidelines to incorporate CS Approaches in the first 30 days of an emergency. Many of the consortium members felt that this guide was not adapted to

be piloted as such. The guide has some good examples of the value of applying CSA in emergencies drawing on case studies presented in the annexes. The document also provides valuable guidance with regard to emergency preparedness and for organisations involved in emergencies to ensure that response staff are trained in and able to use CSA in humanitarian and emergency work. Hence, the guide has value and will be integrated in the revised strategy that has been proposed by the UK consortium emergency working group. See the details of the new three-pronged strategy in annex 3.

OUTPUT 6

Output 6: Key lessons and policy recommendations generated and delivered through an effective advocacy strategy to influence policy processes within donors, networks and NGOs				
Indicator 6.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No of countries having undertaken policy analysis to inform advocacy agenda	No past consortium analysis	Review of global CSA policy	Policy review conducted in 4 countries	Policies monitored in 4 countries
	Source Proposal	Source UK desk review document	Source Policy review reports	Source Policy review reports Final evaluation
Indicator 6.2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No. of countries achieving ⁶ progress as per advocacy strategy	No past consortium advocacy	Advocacy strategy developed in 4 countries	Advocacy strategy progressing in 4 countries	Achievement of advocacy strategy aims in 4 countries
	Source Proposal	Source Advocacy strategies	Source Reports on advocacy progress / reports on advocacy events	Source Reports on achievement of advocacy targets Final evaluation
Indicator 6.3	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)
No. of countries having consolidated and disseminated key consortium recommendations	No past consortium experience.	Recommendations developed	Dissemination strategy developed	Recommendations shared as per dissemination strategy in 4 countries
	Source Proposal	Source List of recommendations	Source Dissemination strategy	Source Report on dissemination Final evaluation

1. Country Policy Analyses

Overall

There has been significant progress in each country under Indicator 1. Milestone 1 was reached in FY01 by the UK consortium (see first annual report and annex) while milestone 2 is under progress in Kenya and is nearing completion in Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka, with the findings of their donor policy review currently being consolidated by the consortia.

⁶ (reaching planned milestones/targets)

Kenya

The Kenya consortium recommendations on the donor policy review key findings were captured during the synthesis of the UK benchmarking paper and since then a number of case studies and practical illustrations have been recorded and shared. This activity has been embedded in different strands of the work, most notably in the conflict analysis process and validation workshop. Recommendations captured will be shared as part of the conflict analysis public launch in November 2010 and more confidential and sensitive aspects will be disseminated later on in FY03.

Sierra Leone

In Sierra Leone, a review of donor policy and practice started in the previous reporting period. A synthesis of the findings was circulated to consortium partners and across the focus countries for feedback and as a basis for informing the country advocacy and outreach agenda. Valuable feedback received highlighted the need to go beyond a global perspective of the policies of key donors such as DFID, Irish Aid, the EC and USAID, and to elaborate the review to reflect a country perspective on the application of donor policies to the local context. Further work was then done to expand and contextualise the analysis and include local aid /donor organisations and the Government of Sierra Leone. The revised draft has been circulated for further consolidation and will be finalised during the next quarter. Some key findings can already be shared in this report (and will be communicated to and discussed with DFID and the donor community in Sierra Leone as part of the outreach and advocacy strategy):

- Donors should base their assistance on a thorough and shared assessment of a country's specific dynamics – taking all perspectives into account – and respond to the causes of conflict and insecurity sensitively. Donors should analyse the context and work towards ensuring that their aid is conflict-sensitive
- Donors should promote accountability within assistance mechanisms. Engagement not only with the government and other international donors but also with civil society in monitoring, tracking and assessing aid is important. This process is only starting now in Sierra Leone and needs to be explored further by civil society. Aid arrangements such as the multi-donor budget support monitoring should be a platform for CSO participation in setting the benchmarks and subsequent monitoring.
- Donors and southern civil society have been largely absent from the design and implementation of tools, frameworks and approaches for conflict-sensitive development practice. This is very new in Sierra Leone as revealed in interviews conducted. It is sometimes perceived that these approaches have primarily emerged from northern academic and policy institutions in co-operation with donor governments with little space given to beneficiary national governments and their civil society. Donors need to ensure that the design and implementation of approaches to peace and conflict-sensitive development occur with the full participation and collaboration of actors from the side of donors and aid recipient governments. The joint EU/ DFID country assistance strategy for Sierra Leone provides an example of such an attempt. The extent of civil society engagement in this effort is currently limited though.
- The use of conflict sensitive approaches should not be restricted to overseas development aid but should include “political” instruments such as trade tariff policies, arms controls and diplomatic measures.
- Donor governments under review have demonstrated some level of recognition of the concept of CSA and that effective conflict prevention and peace-building require improved coherence between the full range of external policy instruments, not just those of ODA. Donor/NGO co-operation in conflict assessments has been identified as a way to enhance the coherence of multi-agency responses to a conflict and lead to improved co-ordination of activities.
- In order to ensure more effective mainstreaming of conflict prevention, more will need to be done to improve conflict analysis capacity within organisations. Capacity building is crucial in

order to get a greater and more diverse range of actors, including local and grassroots-based ones, to play an active role in decision-making and implementation processes. The capacity of donor governments too needs to be reinforced as this has been identified as a limiting factor in programme effectiveness. Donors should attempt to decentralise assistance to district level, where appropriate, and this will require concomitant attention to the development of capacity at that level.

Sri Lanka

The activity 'Examining donor policy - literature review', planned by consortium members to support them in working to understand the context and minimise their negative and maximise positive impacts of their work in Sri Lanka, is timely as part of the consortium's efforts to analyse the overall context for intervention and formulate recommendations on how conflict sensitivity should be taken forward by the humanitarian, development and peace-building community.

Saferworld is leading the literature review activity on behalf of the consortium in consultation with the other members. A consultant was hired with extensive experience of the conflict-related issues in Sri Lanka, as well as specifically on conflict sensitivity and donor engagement. The objectives of his assignment were to:

- Collect and review donor publications with the support of consortium members, and conduct key informant interviews with donors where relevant;
- Draft and finalise the analysis report on conflict sensitivity of donor policy on Sri Lanka;
- Share the findings with members and donors as directed by the consortium.

The Consortium is in the process of finalising the report incorporating comments from the consortium members.

2. Progress on Advocacy Strategy

Overall

For the updated consortium approach to outreach and advocacy, taking into account Mid-Term Evaluation Recommendations please annex 1

Kenya

The Kenya consortium has successfully engaged partners and a variety of stakeholders in consortium activities, such as the monthly consortium meetings and training and learning platforms. The launch of the pilot projects has provided a particular momentum in this respect (see report on outreach targets at purpose level and output 5 above).

Printed copies of the case studies have been shared out and disseminated to other NGOs and donors for public use. Academics and other groups have been inquiring about the debate around CSA and the aims and work of the consortium. A number of donors have been referring the organisations they are funding to the consortium for learning. USAID Kenya office for instance referred Mercy Corps to engage with the consortium members, to learn about how to adopt and practice CSA and conduct context analysis. The consortium is currently working on this initiative.

Sierra Leone

Outreach and influencing has been conducted on an on-going basis by the Sierra Leone consortium since the start of the project, based on emerging opportunities:

- Over the reporting period, SLANGO facilitated a forum bringing together representatives from the consortium agencies and their partners to identify key advocacy issues and targets in a bid to inform the country advocacy agenda. The issues were mainly drawn from the learning from consortium work done so far. These relate to information generated by the

conflict / context / project analysis, donor policy reviews, pilots etc. Besides engagement with consortium members' partners, SLANGO has continued its proactive engagement with its widespread constituency of NGOs on the concept of conflict sensitivity.

- An abridged version of the report on the Sierra Leone self-assessment findings has been circulated to partners and the consortia and reproduced for wider readership as part of the learning and outreach strategy of the country consortium. The full report had been earlier shared with the DFID Conflict Advisor for West Africa.
- Flyers have also been produced and disseminated for outreach purposes, providing concise and user-friendly information on the work of the overall Conflict Sensitivity Consortium.
- Another initiative that has been started over the reporting period and is currently ongoing is the development of audio / visual materials on CSA and participatory approaches in project implementation. This will be harmonised with the overall outreach and advocacy strategy for a more focused approach in Q3.
- Relationships continue to be maintained with the EU and Christian Aid (Partners in Conflict Transformation) who had requested information and showed interest in engaging with the consortium, and with whom reports and updates are shared.
- The launch of the pilot projects has also been used as a particularly important outreach and influencing opportunity (see details under purpose and output 5).

Sri Lanka

The Sri Lanka consortium will start to focus upon advocacy/outreach taking into consideration the findings of the self-assessment process, case studies, context analysis and donor policy review. Given the sensitivities related to the findings and particular risks of sharing complete documents in the current context of Sri Lanka, members decided that what information to share and how needs to be carefully planned and strategised. In the current country environment, consortium members have encountered a general reluctance to engage in discussions about conflict analysis or conflict sensitivity and met with comments such as: 'What conflict? The conflict is ended'. These comments illustrate the need to communicate with care on CSA matters, using for instance the term "context analysis" rather than "conflict analysis".

One potential means considered as part of a country-level strategy would be the setting up of a "CS forum" where practitioners, academics, donors and other stakeholders would be invited to learn about and discuss CSA. This could be planned in two phases: the initial forum focusing on those already familiar with CS and who have used it (in FY03) and the second expanded on that basis and reaching out to a broader audience of donors and policy-makers (in FY04).

UK

Comic Relief – Several consortium members met with Comic Relief in 2009/2010, sharing updates on the consortium and sharing material on conflict sensitivity and the consortium's definition. The consortium was very happy to see some of this emphasis on conflict sensitivity reflected in the Comic Relief material published in summer 2010 on "supporting quality education for conflict-affected children and young people". Recommendation 1 of their report was:

"Strengthening conflict-sensitive and protective approaches to education by:

- developing together some simple and practical guidance & case studies
- requiring conflict context analysis alongside applications
- developing questions to adapt & include in grant evaluations"

The consortium responded to Comic Relief to commend them on their emphasis on conflict sensitivity and to add our support to them prioritising recommendation 1. We also agreed to continue to keep Comic Relief updated on consortium work related to conflict sensitivity, and to support Comic Relief as they action their above recommendation.

Sphere: The Consortium has on many occasions over the past year engaged with the group revising the Sphere Handbook. In early Summer 2010 the latest draft version of the new Sphere

Handbook was released. The consortium was pleased that many of the consortium's earlier comments and suggestions had already been addressed in this version (much greater reference to conflict, to analysis etc). In July/August 2010 the consortium sent two new pieces of feedback on this latest draft, one to the Sphere board requesting inclusion of the consortium website www.conflictsensitivity.org in the glossary and information section, and some more detailed feedback to the group writing the section on 'Core Standards'.

3. Consolidation and Dissemination of Key Consortium Recommendations

For the updated consortium approach to outreach and advocacy, taking into account Mid-Term Evaluation Recommendations and addressing the question of recommendations, please see annex 1.

OTHER PLANNED OUTPUTS

1. Consortium Overall Steering Committee Meetings

The July 2010 Steering Committee meeting focused upon:

- Introducing and inducting Heloise Heyer as the new Project Coordinator
- Reviewing each Mid-Term Evaluation Recommendation and agreeing consortium responses (agreeing next steps, responsibilities, timelines)
- Preparing for the DFID Annual Review meeting and agreeing on Steering Committee representation
- Discussing ways forward for the Emergencies Pilot
- Agreeing remit for November UK capacity building event
- Reviewing UK agency submissions for funding related to agency specific change objectives
- Agreeing next steps for ensuring website re-launched by end August
- Agreeing requirements for UK agencies reporting progress against change objectives

The September 2010 Steering Committee Meeting focused upon:

- Agreeing agenda and responsibilities for November UK capacity building event
- Reviewing draft learning strategy
- Reviewing draft outreach/advocacy strategy
- Reviewing draft emergencies plan
- Reviewing FY03 budget
- Reviewing new UK agency submissions for funding related to agency specific change objectives
- Reviewing action points from DFID Annual Review meeting to ensure the consortium is on track to submit the required updates at end of October
- Discussing progress of pilots in Kenya, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka
- Discussing steering committee membership for FY04

2. Annual Cross-Learning Event

The first annual event (for FY01) was held in the UK in March 2009. Details on the FY01 event in the UK were documented in the 2nd Narrative report (in April 2009). The Year 2 (Annual Cross-Learning Event) was held in February 2010 in Mombasa, hosted by the Kenya consortium (see FY02 annual report and annex). The third Consortium annual learning event will be held in Sri Lanka from 14-18 February 2011 and will focus on the pilot implementation and consolidation of preliminary findings and lessons learnt, as well as on the details of the outreach and advocacy work to be conducted in FY04 and how to ensure synergies and mutually reinforcing efforts towards target audiences across countries.

VI. Lessons Learnt

Working with Partners

While the inception phase of the project required a huge investment by project coordinators and all member agencies in establishing consortium governance, administrative and financial procedures, the benefits of that process are now starting to flow and relationships between partners in all countries have considerably strengthened. While time-consuming, establishing a functional consortium and trust relationships between partners has been an achievement in its own right. Members in all consortia are increasingly looking for ways to connect and demonstrating a preference for carrying out work collaboratively and relying on the joint expertise available within the consortia rather than resorting to external consultants. It is also worth noting that in addition to the UK-based and international agencies, the Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka consortia include local partners and grassroots organisations in their membership while in Kenya most consortium activities have involved an active participation by local partners of the member agencies. This has brought in new perspectives as well as helped increase the consortium understanding and lessons learnt on conflict sensitivity at various levels. Generally, the project is proving to be a valuable learning experience for the sector as a whole with regards to working through a broad multi-agency multi-country consortium.

Best Practice/Innovation

The Consortium has been testing innovative approaches both in terms of process (working together as consortium) and content (deepening knowledge of how to mainstream and apply conflict sensitivity in practical terms).

In the UK Consortium, agencies have notably been developing and integrating new ways of fostering internal organisational change. The focus has been on building capacity on conflict sensitivity beyond trainings, finding ways to incorporate conflict sensitivity into organisational systems on a continuous basis, and overcoming notably the challenge of staff-turnover. One of the particular initiatives being developed centres on HR systems and recruitment processes, including integrating conflict sensitivity into induction processes and detailing in job descriptions how conflict sensitivity relates to particular teams and roles in a tailored manner.

In Kenya, one of the best practices highlighted by member agencies has been the establishment of activity-based working groups, which also form decision-making units for the consortium and are giving each member a chance to take a leadership role in the consortium work based on their particular strengths and areas of expertise. To make the working groups more effective and increase their ownership, an addendum to the Terms of Engagement was recently developed articulating the clear role played by those groups.

In Sierra Leone, an innovative approach that has proved particularly successful has been the development of six-monthly conflict sensitive action plans focused not only on the organisational level but also on the engagement with communities. Engagements with consortium member partners and other structures (project / community management / development committees, community volunteers) has helped disseminate the concept and practical implications and value of applying CSA to a much larger constituency. The establishment of CSA contact points in partner agencies, at headquarters level and in the field program units has helped sustain communication flows and learning, especially for the majority of agencies with no direct or day to day engagement in pilot implementation. These contact points have facilitated the development of conflict sensitive action points to guide project interaction with the operating context. Five agencies have so far developed action plans and ownership over the process is gaining ground. A mid-way review of conflict sensitive action plans developed in two of Plan SL field program units were evaluated during the reporting period. Significant learning and documentation of opportunities and bottlenecks emerged from these review sessions.

In Sri Lanka, the consortium designed a participatory conflict analysis process based on the active involvement of all member agencies, putting a strong onus on the practical application of conflict-sensitivity and capacity-building of members through the process. On the contract management level, after extensive consultation with the consortium agencies, the contract holder Care International UK and by observing other consortiums methods adapted for financial procedures, Sri Lanka adopted the “advance” method. Prior to a transfer of funds for each activity, agencies that carryout the activity are to provide their forecasts which are approved by the steering group before an addendum to the MoU is signed indicating the amount that is allocated to each agency. This addendum is then signed by all consortium agencies. Operationalising this process can seem quite tedious but ensures a transparent process where every agency is aware of the allocation.

XIII. Flagged Issues

While the Consortium has been achieving significant progress and moving forward on several fronts simultaneously – notably on individual and joint capacity-building and work on change objectives, and start of the pilot implementation –, one main challenge is to keep the content of the work focused across the four countries and 37 agencies and ensure efforts are not diverted into areas of less value for the project learning. The development of the different strategies is intended to help address this issue. Another challenge relates to the need to balance process and content considerations – ensuring the quality of outputs generated by the project is of the expected level while at the same time ensuring ownership of the process by all countries and agencies involved.

IX. Risk Assessment

As evidenced by the withdrawal of UNICEF funding to the initially envisaged project to support the pilot in Sri Lanka, an uncertain funding environment means that country consortia face risks of funding cuts to the projects they are conducting pilots on. To mitigate this risk, member agencies will closely monitor the background to the pilot projects and be ready to action contingency plans.

An additional risk relates to the political environment in Sri Lanka, which may prevent the Consortium from holding its annual learning event in this country in February 2011 as planned. This risk is currently identified as low but will be closely monitored, and as part of the event planning, alternative options will be identified.