

# GAIN Peacebuilding Indicators



PEACEBUILDING

Copyright © 2010 Catholic Relief Services

For any commercial reproduction, please obtain permission from [pqpublications@crs.org](mailto:pqpublications@crs.org),  
or write to:

Catholic Relief Services  
POSD Publications Team  
228 W. Lexington St.  
Baltimore, MD 21201

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Increased Equity

Number of joint initiatives between youth organizations and strategic governance agencies 'in x time period'.....	1
Primary school net enrollment for girls .....	7
Number of joint activities undertaken by Church and other faith-based organizations to advocate for increased equity on targeted issues (state targeted issues here) in 'X time period'. .....	13
Increased degree of transparency about extractive industry operations in the national budget, including tax and royalty payments and costs associated with regulation and oversight (measured by index score). .....	17
Increased citizen participation in the government's annual budget development process (measured by participation index). .....	21

Degree of social and economic inequalities between ethnic and other key identity groups in 'x time period'.....	27
---	----

### Social Cohesion

Percent of revenue generated by extractive industry operations reinvested in projects benefitting poor communities in 'X time period'. .....	33
Number of sexual gender-based violence victims (SGBV) receiving professional assistance (psychosocial, medical, legal) in 'X time period' .....	39
Levels of inter-religious violence reduced (incidents, destruction, injuries, deaths) in last 'X time period' .....	45
Number of instances where youth leaders of community service and community-based organizations act as catalysts to prevent or reduce violence in 'x time period'. .....	51
Proportion of local statutory authorities that referred one or more appropriate conflicts to indigenous, customary or community based mechanisms for dispute resolution in 'X time period' .....	55

Percent of targeted youth engaged in violent activities in 'x time period' .....	61
--	----

### Church Action

Percent of target population who can correctly cite 3 key messages related to preventing SGBV from the public statements made by Church leaders. ....	67
Number of public statements made to target audience by Church leaders on Artisanal Small-scale Mining (ASM) activities and the local population's associated rights and benefits in 'X time period' .....	71
'Positive developments' in youth education or employment practices/policies related to the public statements made by the Church in 'x time period'.....	77
Increased level of resources strategically committed by the Church to Peacebuilding and Justice programs .....	81
Percent of target population who believe inter-religious structures are adding value to a peace process in X time period. ....	85
Number of social conflicts in which Church leaders have spoken/acted in unison despite internal ethnic divides in the last 'XX time period' .....	91

<b>Annex A. Illustrative Peacebuilding Indicators .....</b>	<b>97</b>
---	-----------



## INTRODUCTION

CRS began the Globally-Accepted Indicators (GAIN) Initiative in June 2008 to strengthen indicator practice across sectors. Globally-Accepted Indicators are those that CRS and the global development community generally consider to be appropriate and effective for project monitoring and evaluation. GAIN has two main objectives: to improve the quality of indicator selection and use and to contribute to a more efficient M&E design process. GAIN is comprised of a series of indicator templates and a library of indicator resources with information to assist project teams in M&E system design, tool development, and in analysis and interpretation of data.

Under GAIN, M&E and sectoral teams work together to create indicator resources tailored to the sector's specific indicator needs and priorities. Each sector determines which indicators should be included in the resources and how these indicators should be used in M&E practice. For example, sectors may choose to promote the use of selected key indicators while other sectors may choose to include a wide menu of illustrative indicators in GAIN without particular emphasis on any of the indicators. As an initiative, GAIN does not include core or mandatory indicators; however, sectors may choose to do so independently.

For peacebuilding, GAIN resources include templates for 18 illustrative indicators which were developed in March 2010. These indicators are illustrative in that the templates provide good examples of Peacebuilding indicator practice, but there is little emphasis on the use of the indicator outside of specific project or program contexts. The 18 selected indicators are organized according to CRS' three strategic objectives and key sub-sectors of work, and encompass increased equity, social cohesion, church action, civic engagement, extractives, sexual and gender-based violence, interfaith dialogue and cooperation, and youth. Each indicator is also linked to a possible "theory of change." *Note that the indicators selected are in no way representative of the full spectrum of Peacebuilding programming implemented by CRS and its partner organizations.*

The indicator templates present many of the necessary components and considerations for holistic M&E for Peacebuilding. The templates identify the terms and concepts in the indicators which need to be locally-defined and provide suggestions on how to monitor the project context and reflect upon the underlying theory of change. In addition, each template includes suggested qualitative and quantitative data collection questions, calculations for analysis, and tips for interpreting the results against the project's broader objectives.

We have found the development and use of GAIN resources to be an important advancement in our M&E work for Peacebuilding, and they have elicited considerable interest among donors and other international NGOs. We hope these resources will be useful in your future practice for peace.

Best Wishes,

**The GAIN Peacebuilding Team**

Tom Bamat, Aaron Chassy, Clara Hagens, Guy Sharrock

---

© 2010 Catholic Relief Services. All rights reserved. Any 'fair use' under U.S. copyright law should contain appropriate citation and attribution to Catholic Relief Services.



## NUMBER OF JOINT INITIATIVES BETWEEN YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS AND STRATEGIC GOVERNANCE AGENCIES 'IN X TIME PERIOD'

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SEC TOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<p><b>The institutional development theory:</b> If youth increase the effectiveness of their participation in local governance processes then youth will feel their interests are being addressed, remain engaged in the civic arena and be more likely to abstain from violent behavior.</p>	<p>Youth have increased their effective participation in targeted local governance processes relevant to their needs and interests</p>	<p>Increased equity</p>	<p>Youth</p>	<p><b>SO</b> (for youth development project)</p>
				<p><b>IR</b> (for governance project)</p>
				<p><b>Output</b></p>
				<p><b>Activity</b></p>

### BACKGROUND

This indicator is a measure of the frequency of joint youth and local government engagement in local civic processes. However, the indicator is only relevant in areas where youth are well organized and capable of (a) forming their own NGOs, (b) serving on youth commissions formally linked to governance structures, or (c) serving on youth-led governance structures (such as the student-directed District Board of Education in Madras, India). In order to be most effective the indicator needs to be tailored to the project area by creating local definitions and a list of relevant actors. Consider the following in your target area:

- **Joint initiatives:** Define joint initiatives based on what is most relevant in the project context, and what would be considered a significant development or change within that context. The initiative itself should include a series of planned actions to address a community need. Joint initiatives may be those that are jointly organized by youth NGOs and the government, government initiatives where youth NGOs are invited to participate, youth NGOs where the government is invited to participate or another form based on the context.
- **Youth Organizations:** Create a list of relevant youth organizations in the project area. These may be NGOs led and founded by youth or NGOs with a great deal of youth participation. It may also be the case where youth have organized around certain issues but have yet to create and legally register as an NGO. Identify those governance structures where youth participate directly in formal commissions. It is important to look at less formal but no less important associations of youth who have identified specific issues in which they have a stake and are engaged.

- **Strategic Government Agencies:** Determine which government agencies, positions or persons in government are targeted in the indicator. Strategic agencies would be those that enable youth to participate in small community projects or larger process such as budget development, service design and delivery, conflict resolution, citizen monitoring and oversight of the government. Be as specific as possible about who will be counted in the indicator.
- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Will it be useful to measure the number of initiatives in the last 6 months or in the last year? Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.

This indicator measures one particularly concrete aspect of youth engagement in governance. In addition, an understanding of opinions of youth and government authorities of their joint initiatives, and/or their degree of satisfaction with such engagements and the results are needed to provide a more complete picture of youth engagement. Talk to youth—both those directly engaged and less engaged—and officials from government agencies, to compare their perspectives on youth engagement. Possible data collection questions include:

- How was the nature of the initiative determined? Who participated in planning the initiative? What community needs does the initiative reflect?
- Which sectors of youth (by gender, age, education level, ethnic identity, other demographic measures) are engaged in this initiative?
- Have youth organizations and government agencies collaborated on initiatives in the past? If so, what was the outcome of this?
- How satisfied are youth with the changes they perceive, and about how well local government bodies received their input?
- How and when will we know when the initiative has been successful?
- What has changed so far because of the initiative?
- How would members of youth organizations like to be involved in future governance processes?
- Do youth organizations consider gender in their articulation of issues to be addressed in their meetings with government officials?

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should produce information relevant to the underlying theory of change in the project context. To learn about the theory of change, talk to youth about whether they feel their interests are addressed through government processes, if they think they will engage or continue to engage with civic processes and what change in their daily lives, if any, has resulted from the current youth engagement in government



processes. Ask specifically about the incentives for youth to participate in youth organizations and then to seek to engage with the government. Discuss whether certain youth (male or female, members of minority groups) are more likely to participate than others and why this might be. Also ask youth if the level of violence has changed and, if so, ask what are all of the reasons for this change. Engagement with government processes is not likely to emerge as a directly connected to a change in violence, but may be an underlying factor in some answers cited by youth.

**PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data sources / Measurement method**

Interview members of youth organizations and targeted government officials who have participated in the joint initiatives.

**Illustrative data collection questions for both youth group members and targeted government officials**

<b>Q1</b>	How many joint initiatives have you had including both youth NGOs ( <i>specify NGOs here</i> ) and targeted government officials ( <i>specify positions or persons here</i> ) in the last X (designated time period)?  <i>Note: specify what is meant by "joint initiative" if possible</i>	___ ___ joint initiatives
<b>Q2 For each joint initiative: repeat for all</b>		
a. When did the initiative begin?		Began ___ ___ / ___ ___ (mm / yy)
b. When did the initiative end?		Ended ___ ___ / ___ ___ (mm / yy) <i>'Enter 99/99 if on-going'</i>
c. Who is participating/participated from youth organizations?		<i>List the youth organizations and the individuals/positions that participated</i>
d. Who is participating/participated from government agencies?		<i>List the government agencies and the individuals who participated</i>
e. What was the purpose of the initiative?		<i>Leave open to record messages as stated by respondent</i>
f. What role did members of the youth organizations ( <i>specify organizations here</i> ) play in the initiative?		<i>Leave open to record messages as stated by respondent</i>
g. What role did the government officials play in the initiative?		<i>Leave open to record messages as stated by respondent</i>

h. What do you consider to be the major achievement of joint youth and government initiatives to date?	<i>Leave open</i>
i. How satisfied are you with the progress of the initiative? Why?	1 = very satisfied 2 = satisfied 3 = neutral 4 = not satisfied 5= other <i>Why: .....Leave open for response....</i>
j. What needs to happen to improve the effectiveness of joint youth/government initiatives?	<i>Leave open</i>

**Calculation:**

Number of joint initiatives between youth and strategic government agencies in 'X time' period.

**Disaggregated by:** geographic region, types of youth organizations participating in the initiative, ethnicity, socio-economic class, male vs. female youth participants, different government officials participating in the meetings; key governance issues addressed during the meetings. *Exclude, or include others, as relevant based on context.*

**Tips for data collection:** Make sure that respondents are aware of what is considered to be a joint initiative prior to beginning the survey. If you have background information on an on-going or recent joint initiative, tailor the data collection questions to ask specifically about this initiative. This will yield to more in-depth responses than the generic set of questions provided above.

**Timing/frequency:** Consider how often these initiatives take place. Measure this indicator only as often as that change may occur. Consider including this in baseline, mid-term, and final survey data collection and monitor any changes that may occur in between those points in time.

**FURTHER INFORMATION  
INTERPRETATION QUESTIONS**

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. How is the current level of youth engagement in key governance processes (specify here) relevant to the project objectives and goal? *Follow up by asking how this differs for female youth and members of ethnic or minority groups.*
  - a. What specific changes would be necessary to increase engagement in these key government processes?

2. What were the changes in the level of youth engagement over time or during the life of the project?
  - a. What factors have led to these changes?
3. What are the current incentives for youth engagement in key governance processes (*specify here*)?
  - a. How can these be increased?
4. What are the current challenges for increased youth engagement in these processes?
  - a. How can these be addressed?
5. Is there a legal basis for increased participation of youth in key governance processes?
  - a. If so, how can this be leveraged to increase youth engagement?

**Related indicators (GAIN)**

**Increased equity:** Primary school net enrollment for girls; Number of joint activities undertaken by Church and other faith-based organizations to advocate for increased equity on targeted issues (state targeted issues here) in ‘X time period’; Increased degree of transparency about extractive industry operations in the national budget, including tax and royalty payments and costs associated with regulation and oversight (measured by index score); Increased citizen participation in the government’s annual budget development process (measured by participation index); Degree of social and economic inequalities between ethnic and other key identity groups decreased in ‘x time period’

**Youth:** # of instances where youth leaders of community service and community-based organizations act as catalysts to prevent or reduce violence in ‘x time period’; % of targeted youth engaged in violent activities in ‘x time period’; ‘Positive developments’ in youth education or employment practices/policies related to the public statements made by the Church in ‘x time period’.

**Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none



# PRIMARY SCHOOL NET ENROLLMENT FOR GIRLS

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<p><b>The institutional development theory:</b> If girls' access to education is increased, equity in other institutions and systems will grow with it, fostering a more democratic and ultimately more stable process of development.</p>	<p>Girls have increased access to primary education.</p>	<p>Increased equity</p>	<p>Gender equity</p>	<p><b>SO</b> for education project</p>
				<p><b>IR</b> for governance project</p>
				<p><b>Output</b></p>
				<p><b>Activity</b></p>

## BACKGROUND

Net enrollment rates measure the percentage of primary school age children in a school catchment area who are enrolled in primary school.<sup>1</sup> Net enrollment rate is a measure of access to education and focuses specifically on primary school age children. In some parts of the world, girls' net enrollment is as high as that of boys, or even higher. In many regions, however, there is a large gap in access to schooling. Consider the following to tailor the indicator to your target area:

- Primary school age range:** Based on the local context (including any local or national laws stating) include the appropriate age range for primary enrollment in the indicator. Consult the Ministry of Education to determine the official primary school age and whether they promote making adjustments to the official age range for purposes of calculation. In some contexts where children generally enter school later, the primary school age is adjusted to include children up to 3 years older than in the official primary school age. For this indicator, only girls in this age range will be counted in either the numerator or denominator when calculating the percentage enrolled.
- Catchment area:** Determine the catchment area of the schools in the project area. The catchment area refers to the geographic area from which a school draws its students. This may be more or less fixed depending on context. Again, consult the Ministry of Education to see if they have suggested catchment area boundaries. If it will be necessary to compare different areas or schools within the overall catchment area, plan to review or collect data to represent each area or school that you'll compare. Consider the availability of secondary data before committing to any comparisons. For example, if only national-level enrollment rates are available, it will be difficult to compare administrative regions without extensive primary data collection.

<sup>1</sup> FANTA Food for Education Indicator Guide (2001).

- **Enrollment:** Consider local enrollment practices when specifying this indicator. In some cases, students may need to have been enrolled at the beginning of the year to meet local requirements and in others they may enroll up to 3 months into the school year. Determine what it is most relevant to measure. This may affect the timing of data collection.

This indicator measures one aspect of education but additional data should be considered to understand the degree and quality of primary education and attendance rate to create a complete picture of education in the project area. A variety of methods are available to measure the quality of primary education, many of which require observing classrooms and interviewing teachers and students.<sup>2</sup> Information on attendance rates can be obtained by reviewing school records if they are available and reliable. Additional insight can be gained by discussing the following with parents and students:

- What are the incentives to enrolling children in primary school? What are the incentives for enrolling girls in primary school?
- What are the reasons why some children in the primary school age range (XX years to XX years) are not enrolled in primary school? What are the reasons that some girls age XX to XX are not enrolled in primary school?
- Which girls age XX to XX are least likely to be enrollment? Why?
- If girls are enrolled, what prevents them from attending school?
- What would help to increase attendance among girls age XX to XX?
- What are the public attitudes towards girls' education and women's roles in and outside of the household in the targeted communities?
- What current government policies and programs are in place to increase girls' enrollment?

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should provide information relating to the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, talk to community members (men and women) to discuss how the education of women and girls has contributed to change in their community. If changes have not occurred, discuss what changes men and women would like to see result from education. In discussing future changes, it's often useful to contrast what changes communities would love to see (i.e. best case scenario) and what communities would expect to see at minimum. Engaging communities in this discussion helps to understand how optimistic and confident communities are to see this change. To approach the theory of change from another direction, ask communities what factors they think will contribute to economic growth and good governance to see if they consider education of women and girls to play a major or minor role or no role at all in these improvements.

---

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the USAID DEC Website and the World Bank Education page for suggested methods.

**PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**DATA SOURCES / MEASUREMENT METHOD**

Use secondary data if available from the Ministry of Education, bi- and multilateral donors, the UN, or other groups. In order for secondary data to be of use for this indicator, they must be relatively reliable, up to date, and represent the catchment area as well comparison areas or schools (if needed). If appropriate secondary data are not available, rely on a review of enrollment records in all schools in the catchment area, and population data for the communities included.

**Illustrative data collection questions**

*If relying on primary data collection:*

<b>Q1</b>	How many girls age XX to XX (primary school enrollment age range) are currently enrolled in the primary school?	_ _ _ _ _  girls
<b>Q2</b>	How many girls age XX to XX live in the communities with access to this primary school?	_ _ _ _ ,  _ _ _ _  girls <i>If these numbers are not available, estimate the number girls based on the number of households.</i>
<i>Repeat for each school in the catchment area</i>		

**Calculation:**

$$\frac{\text{Number of girls age XX to XX (primary school age range) enrolled in primary school (sum of all schools in catchment area)}}{\text{Number of girls age XX to XX (primary school age range) (sum of all communities in catchment area)}} \times 100$$

**Disaggregated by:** geographic region, youth from different backgrounds (ie. minority groups and lower socio-economic status), public or private schools. *Include others as relevant based on context.*

**Tips for data collection:** If collecting primary data, ensure that there is no duplication in the counting of girls age XX to XX in the enrollment or population official age groups in the catchment area.

**Timing/frequency:** Enrollment rate should generally be measured every year. However, if enrollment is known to change considerably during the school year for example because of the labor calendar or weather cycles, consider measuring enrollment during the highest and lowest point in the year. Plan to collect data during the same time during each year so that the data will be directly comparable.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

### Interpretation Questions

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. How are the net enrollment rates different for girls and boys age XX to XX in primary school?
  - a. What are the reasons for these differences?
  - b. Does the difference seem to be increasing or decreasing? Why?
2. How do attendance rate differ for girls and boys age XX and XX?
  - a. What are the reasons for any difference?
  - b. Does this difference seem to be increasing or decreasing? Why?
3. Which girls age XX to XX are least likely to be enrolled? Why?
  - a. What can be done to address this?
  - b. What is already being done to address this, how effective have these efforts been, and what should be done to improve these efforts?
4. Are enrollment rates different for public and private primary schools? If so, how are they different?
  - a. What factors would account for these differences?
5. What does the community perceive to be the incentives and disincentives for girls' education?
  - a. Can these incentives be increased? If so, how?
  - b. Can these disincentives be decreased? If so, how?
  - c. What are members and leaders of the community willing to do to pursue these actions?
6. To what extent are the levels of girls' net enrollment explained by issues of access, as separate from issues of equity?

### Related indicators (GAIN)

**Increased equity:** # of joint initiatives between youth organizations and strategic governance agencies 'in x time period'; Number of joint activities undertaken by Church and other faith-based organizations to advocate for increased equity on targeted issues (*state targeted issues here*) in 'X time period'; Increased degree of transparency about extractive industry operations in the national budget, including tax and royalty payments and costs associated with regulation and oversight (measured by index score); Increased citizen participation in the government's annual budget development process



(measured by participation index); Degree of social and economic inequalities between ethnic and other key identity groups decreased in 'x time period'

**Gender equity and SGBV:** # of sexual gender-based violence victims (SGBV) receiving professional assistance (psychosocial, medical, legal) in 'X time period'; % of target population who can correctly cite 3 key messages related to preventing SGBV from the public statements made by Church leaders

**Links**

CRS Education Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Education/Pages/home.aspx>)

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

FANTA Food for Education Indicator Guide (2001) (<http://www.fantaproject.org/downloads/pdfs/FFE.pdf>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

None



# NUMBER OF JOINT ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY CHURCH AND OTHER FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS TO ADVOCATE FOR INCREASED EQUITY ON TARGETED ISSUES (STATE TARGETED ISSUES HERE) IN 'X TIME PERIOD'

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<p><b>The Root Causes of Justice Theory:</b> If underlying issues of injustice, threats to group identity, and/or people’s sense of insecurity or victimization are addressed by credible religious leaders acting together, then the potential for sustainable peace is enhanced.</p>	<p>The Church and other faith-based organizations contribute to increased equity in _____ (<i>targeted equity issues</i>).</p>	<p>Increased equity</p>	<p>Interfaith dialogue and cooperation</p>	<p><b>SO</b> (for Church capacity project)</p>
				<p><b>IR</b> (for governance project)</p>
				<p><b>Output</b></p>
				<p><b>Activity</b></p>

**BACKGROUND**

This indicator is a measure of the Church’s commitment and that of others to work across denominational and inter-faith lines to advocate for peace and justice. Given the wide range that engagement in policy and advocacy can take, this indicator is intentionally stated in general terms to allow teams to tailor the indicator to the project context. Consider the following:

- **Joint advocacy activities:** Advocacy activities can take many forms and will fall along a spectrum from ‘less engaged’ to ‘very engaged’. State which specific activities will be considered in this indicator based on the type of engagement that is most relevant and considered to demonstrate a sufficient level of engagement based on the change you plan to measure. This may include more than one type of activity. Examples include: direct participation in policy (re)formulation, testimony at legislative meetings or hearings, correspondence with or personal appeals to specific policy makers, analytical reports to government bodies and/or the general public, joint statements on human rights, participation in public protests, vigils or prayer gatherings, among others.
- **Church and other faith-based organizations:** Identify the relevant Church and faith-based organizations to be considered in this indicator. This list of actors will be used during data collection.

- **Targeted equity issues:** Enter the targeted equity issue(s) into the indicator statement. These targeted equity issues can be drawn from the project strategy. Examples include the socio-economic or the cultural rights of poor and marginalized segments of society, democratic processes, police or military repression against dissidents, official corruption, gender or ethnic group policies, etc. Be as specific as possible so that it will be clear which issues should be included in the indicator and which should not.
- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Will it be useful to measure activities in the last 6 months or in the last year? Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.

Interpret results of this indicator by considering the current level of capacity and willingness of the Church and other religious actors to engage in equity issues. Understanding the Church's goals and purpose related to these issues will help to further contextualize the findings. Suggested discuss topics with religious leaders include:

- How do these targeted equity issues affect justice in the area?
- What do you believe to be the Church's/religion's role in promoting justice and addressing equity issues (*include targeted equity issues here*). Please be specific.
- What limitations do you face in addressing these equity issues? How do you plan to overcome these limitations?
- What challenges have you faced in collaborating with other faith-based organizations to address these equity issues? Are there currently any plans to address these challenges?

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should provide information relevant to the underlying theory of change in the project context. Talk to community members, Church members and leaders, as well as the staff in diocesan and other Church structures responsible for carrying out the Church's policy advocacy initiatives. Ask how they think that addressing these equity issues will contribute to peace or sustain peace in their community. Follow up by asking about how (and how much) the Church's/religion's activities have contributed to increasing levels of equity in these targeted issues. Separately, ask community members if they think that peace has generally increased in their community and, if so, what are all of the reasons for this change. If the Church and faith-based organizations' advocacy efforts are not directly cited, determine if they indirectly contribute to the some of the factors cited.

## PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION

### Data sources / Measurement method

Interview targeted religious leaders to understand how they have engaged in targeted issues.

### Illustrative data collection questions for Church leaders

*To be determined based on the type of engagement.*

**Calculation:** # of specified joint activities

**Disaggregated by:** type of activity (if more than one is measured), targeted equity issues (if more than one is included), and persons or religious authorities engaged in advocacy. *Include others as relevant based on context.*

**Timing/frequency:** Consider how often the advocacy activities are likely to occur. Generally, activities that occur more frequently should be measured more frequently. Most advocacy activities will be measured at baseline, mid-term, and final.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

### Interpretation Questions

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. What are the obstacles to greater involvement in joint advocacy activities for the Church? For other faith-based organizations? How can these be addressed?
2. What degree of resources has been dedicated to these activities by the Church and the other organizations? Is this level of resources appropriate?
3. What have been the effects of these advocacy activities? What future impact is anticipated for these activities?
4. Are there any other advocacy efforts not included in this indicator? If so, what are these efforts? What impact have they had on equity issues?
5. What are the general obstacles to increased equity in the community? How can these be addressed?
6. What are the general obstacles to policy change in support of greater equity? How can these be addressed?

### Related indicators (GAIN)

**Increased equity:** # of joint initiatives between youth organizations and strategic governance agencies 'in x time period'; Primary school net enrollment for girls; Increased degree of transparency about extractive industry operations

in the national budget, including tax and royalty payments and costs associated with regulation and oversight (measured by index score); Increased citizen participation in the government's annual budget development process (measured by participation index); Degree of social and economic inequalities between ethnic and other key identity groups decreased in 'x time period'

**Interfaith dialogue and cooperation:** Levels of inter-religious violence reduced (incidents, destruction, injuries, deaths) in last 'X time period'; % of target population who believe inter-religious structures are adding value to a peace process in X time period.

**Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none

## INCREASED DEGREE OF TRANSPARENCY ABOUT EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY OPERATIONS IN THE NATIONAL BUDGET, INCLUDING TAX AND ROYALTY PAYMENTS AND COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH REGULATION AND OVERSIGHT (MEASURED BY INDEX SCORE)

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>The (Political) Economics Theory:</b> If there is an increase in public access to information related to the government-extractive industry relationship, both government and extractive industries will operate in more equitable and accountable fashion.	Civil society has successfully advocated for increased transparency in the national budget involving the government's relationship with extractive industries.	Increased equity	Extractives	SO
				IR
				Output
				Activity

### BACKGROUND

A budget is considered transparent when a government consistently makes available to the public accurate information related to government fiscal and administrative oversight, as well as the regulation of extractive industry operations. With a transparently developed and managed budget, citizens are able to obtain budgetary spending information upon request—or if they encounter government resistance, through more formal legal recourse mechanisms such as freedom of information, right-to-know, or “sunshine” laws. The open budget index is a survey instrument used by the World Bank for measuring variations in transparency in the host country government budgetary process. The more open the budget development process, the more accountable a government should be regarding the use of tax and royalty revenue collected from extractive industries. The open budget index is known to be correlated with other measures of governance, such as the World Bank’s World Governance Indicator on Voice and Accountability and the Global Integrity Index.<sup>1</sup> Campaigns like Publish What you Pay (PWYP) advocate for open, more transparent budgets as a step towards reducing poverty and generating economic growth and development.<sup>2</sup>

Identify key civil society actors involved in campaigning for an open budget. Plan to interview these civil society members regarding progress in making the budget process more open and which advocacy efforts were most effective in achieving these gains. Civil society members will also have insights into

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.openbudgetindex.org/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.publishwhatyoupay.org/en/about>

additional advocacy efforts (including corporate responsibility measures or future generations reserves), or current challenges and resistance they are encountering to make the budget development process more transparent.

In interpreting these findings, consider the following:

- What are the specific institutional arrangements between host country government ministries or agencies responsible for oversight/regulation of extractive industry operations? In the executive branch? In the legislative branch?
- Is there a legal framework for public disclosure of such information?
- What mechanisms of legal recourse exist for citizens or civil society whose initial efforts to access public information have been rejected by state authorities?
- What are the regional, international treaties and/or foreign laws with which the extractive industry corporations must comply, e.g., for U.S. firms, Sarbanes-Oxley Act, Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, etc.
- Is the government participating in the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative, Kimberly Process, or other voluntary monitoring mechanisms? How effective have these been in assuring transparency and regular, accurate reporting?

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should provide information relating to the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, determine how and how much an open budget process has contributed to increased equity and accountability of the government in the collection, allocation and management of tax and royalty revenue from extractive industries. Conversely, if a change in equity and accountability has occurred, identify all of the factors contributing to this change and where increased transparency ranks among all of the other factors. If a greater contribution from transparency to accountability is anticipated in the future, identify the factors that will enhance or inhibit this contribution.

## **PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION DATA SOURCES / MEASUREMENT METHOD**

Interview representatives of civil society organizations that have been involved in a PWYP campaign, in other budget campaigns or in watchdog groups and anti-corruption coalitions. Also interview government officials in the legislative and executive branch agencies responsible for regulation and oversight of extractive industries. Interview those in the executive branch at both central and local governments who are involved in or responsible for the collection and eventual allocation and programming of royalties and taxes from extractive industries (or as otherwise specified in the open budget index guidance).



## **Illustrative data collection civil society members / to government**

Refer to the open budget index questionnaire. The open budget index is somewhat of a gold standard and will be beyond what most projects are prepared to collect. Still, it is a useful reference for selecting certain elements which you'd like to measure. Select questions that which will allow you to determine if the indicator has been fully met. Create an index of these indicators if more than one is used.

### **Calculation:**

This will depend on which aspects of the budget process are selected for attention. For some items there will be a yes/no answer. Create an index of these indicators if more than one is used.

**Disaggregated by:** local, regional, and national levels (if appropriate).

**Tips for data collection:** Expect resistance in most cases, including unwillingness to provide information or at best the provision of incomplete data. In many countries, governments will classify certain expenditures as sensitive or secret and thus unavailable to the general public. Documenting public officials' cooperation (or lack thereof) may serve as a useful tool and provide anecdotal, qualitative data related to the government's fiscal transparency.

**Timing/frequency:** To be determined based on the frequency of budget development. Plan to measure this indicator once during each budget cycle.

## **FURTHER INFORMATION**

### **Interpretation Questions**

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or civil society members, consider the following:

- How has advocacy for a more transparent budget contributed to increased equity and accountability?
- What gains are expected in the short term for equity and accountability?
- What gains are expected in the long term for equity and accountability?
- In what areas is accountability weakest (considering different questions in the index) and why?
- In what areas is it strongest (considering different questions in the index) and why?
- What changes has the government made to its budget development process overall, and to institutional checks and balances, as a result of civil society advocacy for greater transparency in the government's

relationship with extractive industries?

- How have international, regional, foreign treaties, laws, voluntary monitoring mechanisms, etc. contributed to changes in the level of transparency in the budget development process?
- How could any of these treaties, laws and mechanisms be modified to improve their effectiveness, i.e., give them “teeth”?
- Note: Consider *publish what you earn* information (if available) as part of the reflection, as well as other dimensions of public policy accountability.

### **Related indicators (GAIN)**

**Increased equity:** # of joint initiatives between youth organizations and strategic governance agencies ‘in x time period’; Primary school net enrollment for girls; Number of joint activities undertaken by Church and other faith-based organizations to advocate for increased equity on targeted issues (state targeted issues here) in ‘X time period’; Increased citizen participation in the government’s annual budget development process (measured by participation index); Degree of social and economic inequalities between ethnic and other key identity groups decreased in ‘x time period’

**Extractives:** % revenue generated by extractive industry operations reinvested in projects benefitting poor communities in ‘X time period’; # of public statements made by to target audience by Church leaders on Artisanal Small-scale Mining (ASM) activities and the local population’s associated rights and benefits in ‘X time period’

### **Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (<http://eitransparency.org/>)

Open Budget Initiative (<http://www.openbudgetindex.org/>)

Publish What you Pay Campaign (<http://www.publishwhatyoupay.org/>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators* (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

### **Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none

# INCREASED CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE GOVERNMENT’S ANNUAL BUDGET DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (MEASURED BY PARTICIPATION INDEX)

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<p><b>The institutional development theory:</b> If socio-political institutions guarantee inclusion and transparency in decision-making about the use of public resources, political unrest will be prevented or mitigated.</p>	<p>Government units have increased the level of citizen inclusion in processes of public resource allocation</p>	<p>Increased equity</p>	<p>Civic Engagement</p>	<p><b>SO</b> (for governance project)</p>
				<p><b>IR</b> (for integrated project focusing on service delivery)</p>
				<p><b>Output</b></p>
				<p><b>Activity</b></p>

## BACKGROUND

A national, regional or local government budget process that actively solicits and incorporates public inputs is responsive to its citizens, and may ultimately be a more effective planning tool than one that is exclusionary. In some cases, government units are required by law to create a mechanism for public inputs, so that community-based and civil society organizations are able to participate. In others, the process is more ad hoc. Civic engagement can range from providing input into the budget, a review of the budget, or participation in budget formation. In some cases, civil society organizations may even form an “ideal budget,” based on principles of equity and priorities of poverty alleviation, as in South Africa. In many of the countries where CRS operates, sometimes only a portion of the total budget is made publicly available or open to public inputs. This indicator measures the degree to which citizens participated in the budgetary process instead of providing a simple ‘yes’ or ‘no’ (see the suggested scale of participation below, under ‘Calculation’).

In order to be most effective the indicator needs to be tailored to the target area by creating a list of relevant actors and revising the participatory scale, if needed. Consider the following in your target area:

- Civil society organizations:** List the civil society organizations that have either participated in the budget process or advocated for increased participation in the budgetary process. These organizations can provide insight into the budgetary process as well as monitor the quality of implementation of participatory mechanisms adopted and utilized.
- Community-based organizations:** Similar to the civil society

organizations, community groups can mobilize their members and other members of the community to participate and participate more actively in the budget development process. Plan to interview community-based organizations that have participated or would like to participate in the budget development process.

- **Key government officials:** Determine which representatives from which levels and branches of government will be able to provide insight into how, how much, and why the budget development process has been participatory.
- **Scale of community participation:** Review the scale for citizen participation provided in the ‘Calculations’ section below. Adapt the scale to the project context if different measures or activities are more relevant.

In interpreting the results, consider whether there is a legal framework requiring public input or citizen participation in the budget at the local, regional or national level. In addition, consider the capacity and willingness of local government units, community-based organizations and civil society organizations to participate in the process.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should provide information about the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, talk to community-based organizations and civil society organizations to determine if and if so, how much, participation in the budget development process has contributed to good governance and prevented or mitigated political unrest. If the level of political unrest has decreased, consider what role citizen participation in governance has played in this improvement, given other potentially contributing factors.

## **PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION**

### **Data sources / Measurement method**

Interview members of civil society organizations and community-based organizations involved in advocating for a transparent budget process and targeted government officials, at both local and higher levels, as necessary.

### **Illustrative data collection questions for civil society organizations/ community-based organizations / targeted government officials**

<b>Q1</b>	Before the budget was finalized, to what degree was information about the budget made publicly available?	1 = no information is made available > skip to Q7 2 = limited information is made available 3 = some but not all information is made available 4 = all information is made available > skip to Q7
<b>Q2</b>	If some, but not all, information was made available, what information was made available?	<i>Provide list of relevant documents or types of information here</i>
<b>Q3</b>	When was this information made available?	I__II__II/I__II__I (mm/yy)
<b>Q4</b>	What information was not made available?	<i>Provide list of relevant documents or types of information here</i>
<b>Q5</b>	How was the information made publicly available (i.e., through what media or mechanism)?	<i>Provide list here of possible means for making information publically available</i>
<b>Q6</b>	In what languages was this information made available?	<i>Provide list of relevant languages here</i>

**Now, referring to after the budget is finalized.....**

<b>Q7</b>	To what degree was budget information made publicly available after budget development was completed?	1 = no information is made available > skip to Q10 2 = limited information is made available 3 = some but not all information is made available 4 = all information is made available > skip to Q10
<b>Q8</b>	If some, but not all, information was made publicly available, what information was made publicly available?	<i>Provide list of relevant documents or types of information here</i>
<b>Q9</b>	What information was not?	<i>Provide list of relevant documents or types of information here</i>
<b>Q10</b>	Did any community-based or civil society organizations provide input into the budget development process before it was finalized? If so, which organizations?	1 = no groups / organizations provided input > skip to Q12 2 = yes, _____ (specify group here) 3 = yes, _____ (specify group here) 4 = yes, _____ (specify group here)  <i>Revise list to include all potential community groups and CSOs that may have contributed input.</i>

<b>Q11</b>	What was the input provided, and how did the budget change as a result of that input?	<i>Leave open to record response</i>
<b>Q12</b>	Did any community-based or civil society organizations review the budget before it was finalized? If so, which organizations?	1 = no groups or organizations provided input 2 = yes, _____ (specify group here) 3 = yes, _____ (specify group here) 4 = yes, _____ (specify group here)  Revise list to include all potential community groups and CSOs that may have contributed input.
<b>Q13</b>	Did any community-based or civil society organizations contribute to formulating the budget before it was finalized? If so, which groups or organizations? How were they solicited and selected by local government to participate? What was the content and quality of their contribution? To what extent did the local government unit incorporate their contribution into the finalized budget?	1 = no groups or organizations provided input 2 = yes, _____ (specify group here) 3 = yes, _____ (specify group here) 4 = yes, _____ (specify group here)  Revise list to include all potential community groups and CSOs that may have contributed input.
<b>Q14</b>	Did any community groups or CSOs participate in the budgetary process in any other way? If so, how did they participate?	<i>Leave open to record responses</i>

**Calculation:**

Use answers to the questions included above to rate the degree of citizen participation. Create a scale which can be used to measure and compare participation at multiple points in time. An example is provided below (adapted from R. Hart, *Children’s Participation from Tokenism to Citizenship*. Florence, Italy: Innocenti Research Centre (1992):

- 0 – Excluded from process
- 1 – Manipulated by the process
- 2 – Informed of the process
- 3- Informed and consulted in the process
- 4 – Informed and involved in the process design
- 5- Involved in design and participant in the process
- 6 – Equitable partner in decision-making

*N.B.: The calculation can be deepened further to measure the quality and/or the significance of the citizen participants’ inputs in the budget formulation process.*

**Disaggregated by:** local, regional, and national levels (if appropriate).

**Tips for data collection:** Review the list of options in the survey questions and adapt or include questions if necessary to ensure tool is appropriate and complete for the project context. Determine the best respondents to provide a balanced picture of participation. Represent civil society organizations and community-based organizations involved in advocating for a transparent budget process and targeted government officials in the survey.

**Timing/frequency:** To be determined based on the frequency of budget development. Plan to measure this indicator once during each budget cycle.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

### Interpretation Questions

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or community members/civil society members, consider the following:

1. To what degree is the lack of government transparency affecting the level and quality of citizen participation in the budgetary process?
2. Why is the government doing what it does, vis-à-vis budget participation? How can this be addressed?
3. To what degree is the capacity or willingness of community-based or civil society organizations contributing to the level and quality of citizen participation? *Be specific about which factor(s) are inhibiting participation.* How can this be addressed?
4. How has the degree of citizen participation contributed to changing levels of quality and equity in local governance? *Please be specific.*
5. How can sustained levels of citizen participation in the budget development process contribute to additional and consolidated gains in the quality and equity of local governance? Contribute to the prevention or mitigation of public unrest?
6. What factors explain the variance in the degree of inclusion in the budget development processes at different levels of government (i.e., national, regional, local)? Why?

### Related indicators (GAIN)

**Increased equity:** # of joint initiatives between youth organizations and strategic governance agencies 'in x time period'; Primary school net enrollment for girls; Number of joint activities undertaken by Church and other faith-based organizations to advocate for increased equity on targeted issues (state targeted issues here) in 'X time period'; Increased degree of transparency about extractive industry operations in the national budget, including tax and royalty payments

and costs associated with regulation and oversight (measured by index score); Degree of social and economic inequalities between ethnic and other key identity groups decreased in 'x time period'

**Civic engagement:** Proportion of local statutory authorities that referred one or more appropriate conflicts to indigenous, customary or community based mechanisms for dispute resolution in 'X time period'; Increased level of resources strategically committed by the Church to Peacebuilding and Justice programs

**Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

Open Budget Initiative (<http://www.openbudgetindex.org/>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none



# DEGREE OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC INEQUALITIES BETWEEN ETHNIC AND OTHER KEY IDENTITY GROUPS DECREASED IN 'X TIME PERIOD'

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>Root causes:</b> If social and economic (and political and cultural) inequalities between ethnic and other identity groups lessen, then there will be less violence between them.	Identity/stakeholder groups have achieved more equitable social, political and economic opportunities and access to assets and services.	Increased equity	none	<b>SO</b>
				<b>IR</b>
				<b>Output</b>
				<b>Activity</b>

### BACKGROUND

Here, inequalities refer to objective differences between identity groups such as ethnic groups (examples are employment rates, levels of education, infant mortality rates, etc.). The identity group members' *perceptions* of such differences also matter, however. Where measurable inequalities are widely perceived as unfair rather than natural or legitimate, they also become *inequities*. Inequalities can be social, political, cultural, and economic but most projects tend to focus on social and economic inequalities. Political inequalities (e.g., government positions, political influence and other forms of access to decision-making) and cultural inequalities (e.g., such as respect for language and customs) should be addressed if relevant in the project context. A working hypothesis about identity group or "horizontal" inequalities is that the likelihood of violence increases when social, economic, political and cultural inequalities tend to run in the same direction (are cumulative): e.g. a given ethnic group has less access to schooling than another, as well as less income, less political clout, and less cultural prestige (see Frances Stewart, *Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict: Understanding Group Violence in Multiethnic Societies* (Palgrave, 2008)).

This template provides general guidance for inequality indicators. To create one or more specific indicators, first select the inequalities that are relevant in the project context and for the project objectives. Projects will likely need more than one indicator to measure change in equality. To complete the indicators, determine the following with the project team:

- Determine relevant identity (or other) groups:** Determine which identity groups or other relevant groups will be considered in this indicator. While this may be general knowledge for the project team, it is important to state these groups in the indicator itself. Take note of how

members of these groups will be identified, if this is not evident.

- **Key measures of inequalities:** The indicator(s) should state a specific change related to inequalities and the project's objectives. Specific examples include employment rates, access to markets, access to education, political appointments, representation in governance bodies, official recognition of a group's traditions, or adoption of the group's language for certain official purposes. In post-conflict situations equity is commonly a central concern in security sector reform (police, courts, etc.)
- **Availability of secondary data:** Consider in advance whether you will be able to reliably measure the indicator(s) you have chosen. Most projects will rely on secondary data and may face limitations in what the secondary data will represent. Some secondary data will not allow for comparisons between relevant groups or are only collected every 5-10 years (problematic for a 5 year project). The World Bank, the UNDP Human Development Index and the U.S. Demographic Health Survey (DHS) may provide good options for secondary data.
- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Will it be useful to measure changes in inequality in the last few years and compare it to a baseline? Or to measure the last year and compare that to the previous year? Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.

*Note: for further guidance on developing indicators, refer to ProPack I, pages 108-110.*

In addition to quantitative measures of inequality, hold separate discussions with members of each identity (or other relevant) group to determine how different groups perceive any changes in inequality. Ask each group what changes have been the most important to them and why; and which changes have been the least important and why. Ask the groups about changes that affect other relevant groups, not just about changes to their own group, as their perception of the situation of other groups plays a key role in inequalities. Discuss with each group which changes are still necessary, whether in fact or perception, to lessen inequality and inequities. Consider the broader social and political history to contextualize this information.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should provide information about the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, map out how inequality has historically contributed to violence between groups. Consider institutional reforms and changes in process and access, and how these may have affected inequalities and perceptions of unfairness. Then determine if the level of violence has changed between groups and to what degree decreased inequality has contributed to this change. Review

any records of violent activity, if available, to determine if activity has changed. Discuss these changes with different groups and ask what factors contributed to this change. Probe the group to determine which factors have been the most important contributors to this change. Ask specifically about the role of inequalities if this does not come up naturally in discussion.

## PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION

### Data sources / Measurement method

Measurement would ideally be composed of two different pieces of information: changes in inequality and changes in perceptions about such inequality (i.e. are the inequalities seen as unfair or inequitable).

*To measure **inequality**:* Use secondary data, where appropriate. Secondary data are considered to be appropriate if they a) are reliable, b) are able to represent and compare the relevant groups, and c) are timely and represent the time period of interest for the project. In order to demonstrate change, compare two data points. Ideally both data points should fall within the project time period.

*To measure perceptions of **inequity**:* Individual interviews and focus group discussions can be used to understand the perception of different groups of inequity (what is unfair and why). Represent the perspective of the different groups by holding 2-3 interviews or focus group discussions with each relevant identity (or other group).

### Illustrative data collection questions (Perceptions of inequity)

1. Please describe the current situation for \_\_\_\_\_ (respondent's identity group) regarding \_\_\_\_\_ (target inequity issue).
2. Is the situation of \_\_\_\_\_ (respondent's identity group) for this issue different than the situation for \_\_\_\_\_ (other identity groups)?
  - a. If so, how is this different? *Please be specific.*
  - b. Why do you think these differences exist?
  - c. What factors are contributing to these differences?
3. How has the difference between \_\_\_\_\_ (your group) and \_\_\_\_\_ (other groups) changed in 'x' time period)?
  - a. How have the differences changed?
  - b. What have these differences changed?

**Calculation:** Depends on type of specific indicator chosen. Determine first the change in inequality regarding the target issue. Next, determine the change in the perception of each group regarding the target issues.

**Disaggregated by:** by group, by geographic region, rural vs. other. *Include others as feasible and relevant based on context.* For programs seeking equitable outcomes, data may need to be disaggregated by the “starting” conditions of the participants.

**Tips for data collection:** In consultation with an M&E staff person, review the methodology used to collect the secondary data to ensure that these data will represent the actual change you are interested in. If possible, review the questionnaire used to collect these data as well. To determine if available secondary data are appropriate for this indicator, consider whether groups such as ethnic, regional or religious identity groups can be adequately represented through regional comparisons. In some contexts, ethnic groups are relatively concentrated by region and a regional comparison would be valid proxy.

**Timing/frequency:** To be determined based on the time frame in the indicator. For example, if the indicator refers to change in inequality over the last year, data should be collected yearly.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

### Interpretation Questions

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. What is most meaningful about changes in inequalities? Consider this question for different groups.
2. To what degree are perceived changes in group inequalities based on reasonably objective measures? To what degree do they rely on subjective perceptions of inequity?
3. What other changes are needed to secure further reduction in violence between groups?
4. To what degree can changes in the level of violence reasonably be attributed to levels of inequality? How important are perceptions of inequity (ie unfair inequality) to changes in the level of violence?

### Related indicators (GAIN)

**Increased equity:** # of joint initiatives between youth organizations and strategic governance agencies ‘in x time period’; Primary school net enrollment for girls; Number of joint activities undertaken by Church and other faith-based organizations to advocate for increased equity on targeted issues (state targeted issues here) in ‘X time period’; Increased degree of transparency about extractive industry operations in the national budget, including tax and royalty payments and costs associated with regulation and oversight (measured by index score);

Increased citizen participation in the government's annual budget development process (measured by participation index)

**Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

*Stuart, Frances. Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict: Understanding Group Violence in Multiethnic Societies. Belgrave MacMillian. 2008.*

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators* (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none



# PERCENT OF REVENUE GENERATED BY EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY OPERATIONS REINVESTED IN PROJECTS BENEFITTING POOR COMMUNITIES IN 'X TIME PERIOD'

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE (S)	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<p><b>The institutional development theory:</b> If reliable institutional mechanisms are established to promote equitable benefits from extractive activities, social and economic disparities will be reduced and social cohesion will grow.</p>	<p>Significant revenues from transnational /national extractive businesses have been invested in development in affected and poor communities</p>	<p>Social cohesion Equity</p>	<p>Extractives</p>	SO
				IR
				Output
				Activity

### BACKGROUND

This indicator measures the degree to which benefits accrue to local communities from the presence and operation of extractive industries. These benefits may be derived from projects financed through extractive industries' investment of a portion of their revenues, or through government-run social investments funded by extractive activities through royalty payments, user rights fees, permits, licenses, environmental mitigation and/or other tax revenues.

This indicator could readily be considered an equity indicator, since it involves fair access to or distribution of resources. To a certain extent, however, it also serves as something of a proxy for vertical social cohesion. Extractive industries have often operated like an "enclave," spatially and systematically separated from the rest of the local or national economy. If the revenues are invested in ways that address the needs of the poorest, includes them in key decisions, and/or reduces the gaps between rich and poor, they can help to build ties of solidarity and a sense of national or local unity. If reinvestment levels are minimal or perceived largely as public relations ploys, for example, they will do nothing to produce social cohesion. In order to be most effective the indicator needs to be tailored to the project area reflecting local definitions and a list of relevant actors. Consider the following in your target area:

- Extractive industries:** List as specifically as possible the names of extractive industry corporations working in the project target area. Note that in some contexts, extractive industries are government-owned or mixed enterprises.
- Poor communities:** Determine in the local context which communities are considered to be poorer. This will likely align with your program's

definitions of vulnerability based either on geographic location, ethnic groups, livelihood groups, etc. Here the distinction between poorer and less poor is used to ensure that money from extractive industries does not only improve the situation for better-off communities, increasing disparity.

- **Projects benefitting the community:** Create criteria to determine which projects, financed by extractive industry revenues, benefit the affected or poor communities.
- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Often the time period will be linked to the budget cycle of the extractive industry or to the financial year for the community projects.

While this indicator is a strong quantitative measure, it is important to collect complementary data regarding the project context and from local communities on their involvement in the projects and what impact, to date, projects have had. For example, consider some or all of the following:

- What is required de jure of the extractive industries, viz. the affected communities? *As part of this, thoroughly describe and evaluate all ongoing extractive industry efforts to engage with the affected communities.*
- What are the current government commitments related to allocation of royalties and extractive industries remitted to poor communities and in terms of host country government commitment to international protocols?
- How did local communities participate in the planning of these projects? Who within the community participated in the planning? How were these individuals or organizations selected?
- Do local communities feel that some of their priority needs and interests are addressed? *Consider whether the interests and needs of minority, poor, and/or marginalized groups in the community were adequately addressed.*
- Who has benefited from the project to date? How have they benefitted? How much have they benefitted?
- Considering the future project impact, who seems likely to benefit most during the life of the project? How and how much? Why this group and not others?
- What are the levels of transparency and accountability in the allocation and programming of local development or social investment funds? What specifically are the oversight mechanisms and to what extent are members of affected, poor communities able to participate in operating these mechanisms?



- How are disputes over the local development or social investment fund between the extractive industries and affected communities resolved? What are the means of recourse? What is the role of the host country government? At what level and branch of government?

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should produce information relevant to the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, determine whether the revenues from the extractive industries are perceived to have been used equitably and/or to have created social bonds from the perspective of the affected, poor communities. Qualify how and how much these investments have contributed to increased levels of equity in targeted sectors or services in the affected, poor or marginalized communities.

Determine if, and how, advocacy efforts and other activities have contributed to changes in the size of investments and allocations, review contracts, meeting notes, memoranda of understanding between the extractive industries and community groups advocating for this change (civil society organizations, church groups, etc).

## PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION

### Data sources / Measurement method

Rely on a review of secondary data where available. It is helpful to review the budgetary documents of the extractive industries with an employee of the organization or an expert from government or academia who can to interpret the numbers and share relevant project documents (outlining the scope of the project, target groups, etc). It should be acknowledged that in all likelihood extractive industries, especially transnational corporations as well as local and central government agencies, will be reluctant to disclose what they might consider to be proprietary or classified information. Accessing this information may prove to be fairly challenging and/or time consuming.

### Illustrative data collection questions for each extractive industry corporation in the target area

Q1	What was the total revenue generated by the corporation in X time period?	_ ,  _ _ _ _ ,  _ _ _ _  (local currency)
Q2	How much was invested in projects benefitting affected, poor communities in X time period through a local development fund?  <i>*Make sure to have determined which projects benefit poorer communities in advance*</i>	_ ,  _ _ _ _ ,  _ _ _ _  (local currency)

<b>Q3</b>	<p>How much was invested in projects benefitting affected, poor communities in X time period through a government-run social investment fund?</p> <p><i>*Make sure to have determined which projects benefit poorer communities in advance*</i></p>	<p>_ _ ,  _ _   _ _ ,  _ _   _ _  (local currency)</p>
-----------	---	--

**Calculation:**

Total amount invested in all local development and/or social investment funds (or other similar mechanisms) for projects benefitting affected, poor communities in target area in X time period

$$\frac{\text{Total amount invested in all local development and/or social investment funds (or other similar mechanisms) for projects benefitting affected, poor communities in target area in X time period}}{\text{Total amount of revenue generated by extractive industries in X time period}} \times 100$$

**Disaggregated by:** geographic area, type of project, type of extractive industry. Include others as relevant based on context.

**Tips for data collection:** Contact government officials and/or representatives from the extractive industry corporations to ask that relevant project and budgetary documents be sent in advance for your review. Note that this first step may be quite challenging, particularly if transnational corporations consider this information to be proprietary. Once you have had a chance to review the documents and determine which projects are considered to benefit the affected community, arrange a meeting with an expert to ensure you are interpreting the numbers and understanding project strategies correctly. Budgetary amount for revenue and expenditure should be broken down per budgetary cycle.

**Timing/frequency:** Measure this indicator yearly, once during the budgetary planning cycle and once during the reporting of expenditures cycle.

**FURTHER INFORMATION**

**Interpretation Questions**

As part of reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. To what degree are the projects designed to benefit the community? Rely on secondary data and information to answer this question. *Provide narrative summary of the type and degree of benefit.*
2. Do you anticipate that some community members will benefit more than others? How? Why these groups?
3. Do you anticipate that some community members will benefit less than others? How? Why these groups?

4. Are some corporations investing more than others? If so, who and why?
5. Overall, is the percent of revenue invested by the extractive industries perceived as equitable in the context? Why or why not?
6. What efforts are currently underway to increase the amount of revenue invested? What efforts can be done in the future?

*Additional suggested interpretation questions:*

1. To what extent are the projects integrated into the local government service delivery and local economic development plans?
2. What role is government playing in the oversight of the projects, once completed, to ensure that they meet sector policies, regulations, standards, etc.?
3. What is the level and nature of community contributions towards the projects financed by the local development plan?
4. What was the level and quality of the participation by members of the affected communities in the development, selection, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the projects that were financed?

### **Related indicators (GAIN)**

**Social Cohesion:** # of sexual gender-based violence victims (SGBV) receiving professional assistance (psychosocial, medical, legal) in 'X time period'; Levels of inter-religious violence reduced (incidents, destruction, injuries, deaths) in last 'X time period'; # of instances where youth leaders of community service and community-based organizations act as catalysts to prevent or reduce violence in 'x time period'; Proportion of local statutory authorities that referred one or more appropriate conflicts to indigenous, customary or community based mechanisms for dispute resolution in 'X time period'; % of targeted youth engaged in violent activities in 'x time period' is decreased

**Extractives:** Increased degree of transparency about extractive industry operations in the national budget, including tax and royalty payments and costs associated with regulation and oversight (measured by index score); # of public statements made by to target audience by Church leaders on Artisanal Small-scale Mining (ASM) activities and the local population's associated rights and benefits in 'X time period'

### **Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

None

## NUMBER OF SEXUAL GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE VICTIMS (SGBV) RECEIVING PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE (PSYCHOSOCIAL, MEDICAL, LEGAL) IN 'X TIME PERIOD'

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<p><b>The victim reintegration theory:</b> If victims of aggression such as SGBV receive appropriate professional assistance and the support of an accepting community, they will better deal with the harms of the past and engage more fully in a constructive future.</p>	<p>Victims of sexual or gender-based violence receive appropriate professional services.</p>	<p>Social Cohesion</p>	<p>Gender Equity and SGBV</p>	SO
				IR
				Output
				Activity

### BACKGROUND

Sexual gender-based violence (SGBV) is much more than a matter of individual perpetrators and individual victims. It may be deeply imbedded in gender dynamics in societies and cultures. It includes atrocities like rape as a premeditated weapon of war. The indicator is a measure of service-seeking behaviors by SGBV victims, of professional service provision, and of collective solidarity with victims. Professional assistance and community support are means to personal healing and resilience but also to social reintegration. They are envisioned here, then, as components of building or re-building social cohesion. In order to be most effective this indicator needs to be tailored to the project area. Consider the following in your target area:

- Available assistance:** Determine the relevant types of professional assistance that are available in the project area, including but not limited to psychological, medical, and legal support. Based on the list of available support, specify in the indicator whether the SGBV victim will need to have received one, some or all of the services (or specific services deemed to be more relevant than others) in order to qualify as having received assistance.
- Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Will it be useful to measure the SGBV victims that received assistance and support in the last 6 months or in the last year? Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.
- Time before services/support received:** In some situations, M&E

systems will be able to determine how long after the SGBV incident the victim/s received assistance based on the detailed records available. If this is possible in the project context, specify within the indicator how long after the incident the victim/s should have received assistance to be counted in the indicator. Specify also the time lag between the incident and any expressions of community support. These may be difficult to ascertain in many contexts but can help provide a fuller picture of the assistance received.

This indicator is a quantitative measure and it is important to collect complementary data on the *quality* of the assistance received to understand the full impact and value of project efforts. Through interviews with SGBV victims and other community members, determine the local perception of the quality of the assistance and support available or expected. Visiting service providers to understand more about the services they provide will also contribute to a complete understanding of the assistance available. To further understand the context, talk to community members to define and qualify community (including family) support commonly provided to SGBV victims. It may be as basic as not shunning or ostracizing persons as a result of the sexual violence, may include public expressions of understanding and support, and/or provision of community resources to deal with trauma and shame. Consider using community score cards to rate the quality of services and/or support actually provided along criteria identified by the community.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to perceived issues with quality of assistance, there may be barriers to seeking assistance, including stigma and the cost of services. In order to identify these barriers and to understand who in the community is more likely to seek services after incidents of SGBV, hold focus group discussions with community members (men and women separately). In the discussion, depersonalize the questions by asking about why someone would or wouldn't seek out assistance and what type of community member would be most and least likely to seek assistance and receive support. Given the sensitive nature of SGBV, respondents may be more comfortable discussing general factors than their own behavior. However, if it is appropriate to hold individual interviews with SGBV victims (without drawing undue attention to these individuals), personal behaviors and experiences can also be discussed one-on-one.

Interpretation of results should consider the probability that many SGBV victims have not come forward and/or will not. Talk to community members and relevant service providers to understand proportionally how many SGBV victims are likely to come forward and be counted, and consider this in your interpretation. Be careful also about making causal inferences; consider the fact that an increase in levels of professional assistance may be the result of a wide variety of factors,

---

<sup>1</sup> For resources on community score cards click here.

including higher levels of SGBV, increased service-seeking behavior based on greater awareness of assistance and options, and/or public budget increases.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should produce information relevant to the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, determine how and to what degree access to professional assistance and community support for SGBV victims has contributed to transformation at individual, relational, and communal levels, challenged gender dynamics, reduced the sense of victimization, and/or helped victims socially reintegrate.

Depending on the larger political and social context, it will be more or less likely assistance and community support have had a discernable effect on peaceful relations or social cohesion. It will also be important to assess the manifest aim of the public services/private assistance: to increase SGBV victims' resilience? Increase Legal justice? Contribute to Spiritual healing? Discussions with community members (SGBV victims and non-SGBV victims) about how these services contribute in any way will be valuable. If multiple factors contribute to changes, interpret the relative contribution of these different services with the community.

**PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data sources / Measurement method**

Measuring professional assistance levels relies on secondary data to determine the number of SGBV victims that have sought different services. Contact the relevant service providers (referring to the list of services developed by the project team) to determine the number that have sought the service within the given timeframe.

*Note: Where rape was an instrument of war, victims have additional needs, adding to their risks and needs. Related services may be in order and may also need to be tracked. Children conceived through rape may also be victims of SGBV and need assistance; additional measures may be needed to monitor and assist unwanted children and orphans.*

**Illustrative data collection question**

**To determine the number of SGBV victims who sought services\***

<b>Q1</b>	<p>How many SGBV victims have sought services/ assistance in the last XX time period?</p> <p><i>Note: this may require a review of records. Be sure to sum different monthly or weekly records to represent the time period without omission or overlap. If the same individuals have returned twice or more for the same service review the records closely to ensure they are counted as just one individual (and not double counted).</i></p>	<p> _   _   _  SGBV victims</p>
-----------	--	---------------------------------

\*repeat with each service provider in your list of relevant services.

**Calculation:**

Number of SGBV victims who received assistance (specify here what type or how many) in X time period\*

---

*\*Sum totals from different types of services without double-counting if possible. If there is no way to avoid duplication, calculate separately for the different types of services provided.*

**Disaggregated by:** nature of the SGBV, geographic region, socio-economic status of victim, ethnic or racial identity, type of services sought. Include others as relevant based on context.

**Tips for data collection:** Counting the numbers of SGBV victims that have received services is relatively straightforward. However, complications arise when records cannot identify which individuals sought multiple services, and this may result in double-counting of individuals. Make efforts to identify where double-counting may occur in data collection. In some cases, it will be possible to compare names or numbers to avoid double-counting while in others it won't be possible given the confidential nature of these records.

**Timing/frequency:** To be determined based on the time frame in the indicator. For example, if the indicator refers to SGBV victims who have received assistance in the last six months, data should not be collected more often than every six months.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

### Interpretation Questions

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. Why aren't more SGBV victims seeking assistance? Or seeking more or different assistance? *Consider also severe cases where SGBV victims have died without receiving assistance or support.*
2. What can the project do to increase the proportion of SGBV victims seeking assistance?
3. Who is least likely to be seeking assistance? *Consider this along ethnic lines, by gender, educational level, race, region, and socio-economic status, etc.* What can the project do to increase the likelihood that these individuals will seek assistance?
4. What has been the effect of education and outreach on SGBV, on the demand for services?
5. How has the public perception of victims of SGBV and their status in the community changed?



6. Is a change in the increase in number of SGBV seeking assistance due to a change in incidence of SGBV? If so, what are the reasons for changes in the incidence of SGBV in the community?

7. Is the level and quality of community support provided for SGBV victim sufficient? Is this support available to *all* community members? What can be done to increase community support for SGBV victims?

### **Related indicators (GAIN)**

**Social Cohesion:** % revenue generated by extractive industry operations reinvested in projects benefitting poor communities in 'X time period'; Levels of inter-religious violence reduced (incidents, destruction, injuries, deaths) in last 'X time period'; # of instances where youth leaders of community service and community-based organizations act as catalysts to prevent or reduce violence in 'x time period'; Proportion of local statutory authorities that referred one or more appropriate conflicts to indigenous, customary or community based mechanisms for dispute resolution in 'X time period'; % of targeted youth engaged in violent activities in 'x time period' is decreased

**Gender equity and SGBV:** Primary school net enrollment for girls; % of target population who can correctly cite 3 key messages related to preventing SGBV from the public statements made by Church leaders

### **Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

### **Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none



# LEVELS OF INTER-RELIGIOUS VIOLENCE REDUCED (INCIDENTS, DESTRUCTION, INJURIES, DEATHS) IN LAST 'X TIME PERIOD'

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<p><b>The healthy connections theory:</b> If isolation, division and prejudice between identity groups are broken down, and common interests addressed, then constructive, non-violent relationships can be established.</p>	<p>Inter-religious violence is reduced</p>	<p>Social Cohesion</p>	<p>Interfaith dialogue and cooperation</p>	SO
				IR
				Output
				Activity

### BACKGROUND

Inter-religious violence is relatively frequent in many parts of the world, but religious identities and practices themselves are rarely root causes of violent conflict. Instead, socio-economic and political factors, such as access to resources and socio-economic opportunities, often underlie inter-religious divisions. Elites often manipulate people along religious lines and other sources of socio-cultural identity, and incite them to carry out acts of aggression against the “other” on the basis of religion. In order to be most effective the indicator needs to be tailored to the project context by creating a local definition of inter-religious violence and determining how to reflect and compare violent acts that are considered more or less severe. Consider the following in your target area:

- Inter-religious tensions:** Identify the inter-religious tensions in your project area. The basis for violence may be blatant or subtle, and creating a local definition of specific inter-religious motivations will help in future data collection efforts. Discussions with different religious groups in the community will be necessary to determine whether or not the motivation for each act involved inter-religious dynamics.
- Nature of violence:** The definition of violence commonly includes death, destruction, and vandalism; however, there may be other specific acts which should not be overlooked in the project context. List all types of violence that you want to be considered in the measure of project impact. Some acts of violence may be considered to be more severe than others. Discuss how you will reflect different levels of violence, outside of a simple count, in your indicator.
- Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to

include in the indicator. Will it be useful to measure the level of inter-religious violence in the last 6 months and compare it to the previous 6 months? Or to measure the last year and compare that to the previous year? Note that the Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.

As referenced above, this indicator cannot be limited to a count of violent acts. Discussions with the community to determine their perceptions of changes in levels of violence, whether in frequency or severity, and reasons for these changes constitute the majority of the data collection and interpretation required for this indicator.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should validate the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, determine to what degree divisions and prejudices between identify groups have broken down and what effect this has had on inter-religious conflict. Identify any other factors that have contributed to increases or decreases in inter-religious violence. Try to identify ways that reduction in violence contributes to other aspects of peace and conflict resolution.

## PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION

### Data sources / Measurement method

Data for this indicator are collected with different religious groups in the community. Group interviews, with a combination of closed-ended and open-ended questions, can be used to help determine the number of, severity of, and motivations for different acts of violence. To the extent possible and practicable, try to consider holding a group discussion that is inter-faith.

### Illustrative data collection questions

*\*Hold these discussions with each religious group separately*

<i>Start with an introduction about what you hope to learn from this discussion and explain how the data will be used. Include some opening questions to warm up the group for an in-depth discussion.</i>		
<b>Q1</b>	How many incidents of violence have occurred in your community in the last XX time period?	_   _  incidents
<b>Q2</b>	How many of these incidents of violence were at all related to inter-religious conflict or tension? <i>Explain this concept to ensure that indirect causes are also identified.</i>	_   _  incidents
<b>Q3</b>	Were there causes other than religious ones?	<i>Record description of non-religious causes</i>

<b>Q4</b>	I'd like to learn more about each incident. Starting with the incident that happened most recently: a. please explain what happened. b. Without using names or specifics, who was involved in the incident? <i>Note: we are interested here in which group the individual(s) was a part or represented. Do not ask for or record names to maintain anonymity.</i> c. Why did this incident occur? d. Why do you think this was related to inter-religious conflict or tension?
<b>Q5</b>	Now moving to the incident before that: a. please explain what happened. b. Without using names or specifics, who was involved in the incident? <i>Note: we are interested here in which group the individual(s) was a part or represented. Do not ask for or record names to maintain anonymity.</i> c. Why did this incident occur? d. Why do you think this was related to inter-religious conflict or tension?
<b>Q6</b>	<i>Repeat for each incident included in Q2.</i>
<i>Before concluding the discussion, ask about any other incidents related to inter-religious conflict that have not yet been mentioned. Ask 'a-d' about any additional incidents that arise.</i>	

**Calculation:**

Step 1. A participatory, qualitative analysis of the data collected is useful to determine which of the incidents of violence were inter-religious, and how. Determine the level of inter-religious violence reflected at the time of the discussion. Note this is more than a count of incidents of violence and needs to reflect the severity of the incidents. Try to dig deep as to determine if and how religious differences were the root or proximate causes of the violence. A strong narrative should be developed to summarize the current level of violence, including the number and type of incidents. Consider developing a scale and ranking the current level of violence as a complement to the narrative.

Step 2. In order to show a reduction, two or points in time must be compared. Attempt to quantify how the levels of inter-religious violence differ (if at all) in the two points in time. The ranking method may help in this comparison. A strong narrative description of how and why these points in time differ will complete the analysis. If two points of data are not available, ask communities if the level of inter-religious violence has changed and why to identify general trends.

**Disaggregated by:** geographic region, type of violence, perpetrators of the violence, victims of the violence (by religious group, socio-economic group, ethnicity, and gender). Include others as relevant based on context.

**Tips for data collection:**

The strength of this measure relies on the depth and quality of data collected as well as the perspectives reflected in the data. Train the focus group discussion facilitator to be able to establish trust among the discussants and to pull out

in-depth contributions from all group participants. Be sure to collect data from all relevant viewpoints to avoid overlooking the point of view of those in the minority and potentially sources of additional incidents of violence.

If baseline data are not available, ask the focus group respondents to reflect on two periods in time: the most recent timeframe and an earlier period in time to serve as a baseline. Note that these periods in time need not be of equal length. For example, ask a focus group to discuss the incidents of violence in the last six months and then ask discussants to compare to the level in the previous year, two years, or five years ago.

Reports about incidents of violence are likely to be available through the press, human rights and documentation offices, and other sources. Use these as research background and as means of “triangulating” data.

**Timing/frequency:** To be determined based on the time frame in the indicator. For example, if the indicator refers to levels of inter-religious violence in the last six months, data should not be collected more often than every six months.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

### Interpretation Questions

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. How do the levels of inter-religious violence differ in these two periods in time? Be specific about how the numbers, severity, and perpetrators and victims may differ.
2. Which factors have contributed to these differences? Which of these factors are likely to account for more of the difference? Why these in particular?
3. What impact has this change in inter-religious violence had on the community overall?
4. What are current opportunities for faith traditions and their leaders to build bridges and to collaborate? As part of this, identify current inter-group and inter-religious connectors and dividers (Do No Harm) and identify any actual and potential spoilers of peaceful coexistence

### Related indicators (GAIN)

**Social Cohesion:** % revenue generated by extractive industry operations reinvested in projects benefitting poor communities in ‘X time period’; # of sexual gender-based violence victims (SGBV) receiving professional assistance (psychosocial, medical, legal) in ‘X time period’; # of instances where youth leaders of community service and community-based organizations act as catalysts to prevent or reduce violence in ‘x time period’; Proportion of

local statutory authorities that referred one or more appropriate conflicts to indigenous, customary or community based mechanisms for dispute resolution in 'X time period'; % of targeted youth engaged in violent activities in 'x time period' is decreased

**Interfaith dialogue and cooperation:** Number of joint activities undertaken by Church and other faith-based organizations to advocate for increased equity on targeted issues (state targeted issues here) in 'X time period'; % of target population who believe inter-religious structures are adding value to a peace process in X time period.

**Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998)* ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none





# NUMBER OF INSTANCES WHERE YOUTH LEADERS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS ACT AS CATALYSTS TO PREVENT OR REDUCE VIOLENCE IN 'X TIME PERIOD'

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>Youth Leaders against Violence Theory:</b> If key youth leaders take a stance against the use of violence they can influence others, thereby helping to prevent or mitigate violent conflicts in their community/ environment.	Youth leaders of CBOs and CSOs actively prevent or limit local incidents of violence	Social Cohesion	Youth	<b>SO</b>
				<b>IR</b>
				<b>Output</b>
				<b>Activity</b>

### BACKGROUND

This indicator is measure of the influence for peace of youth leaders who are engaged in local community structures. In many societies, cultural norms or low socio-economic status limit youth access to important institutional arenas where key decisions are made, limiting their voice. This indicator looks at youth who are in leadership roles in community-based organizations (CBOs) and community service organizations (CSOs), and their engagement on behalf of peace. Tailor the indicator to your project context by considering the following:

- **Youth:** Determine the relevant age range of youth based on what ages your project is targeting and social factors influencing the local concept of youth. For example, youth could be considered as 15-35 year olds or any subset thereof for the purpose of this indicator.
- **Leadership positions:** Determine which positions in the CBOs and CSOs will be considered to be leadership positions. These often include, but are not limited to the president, vice-president, treasurer, secretary, and member of a governing committee. Be sure to refer to the terms used by the CSO or CBO in creating your list. Finally, consider youth informal leadership in the organizations included.
- **CBOs and CSOs:** Create a list of relevant CBOs and CSOs in the project area for use during data collection. Consider the full diversity of informal and formal organizations, including peer cohort organizations, student organizations, sports and/or cultural clubs, political party youth wings, gangs.

- **Acting as catalysts for reducing violence:** Consider the different ways that community groups and their leaders can prevent escalation, diminish the geographic impact or the number of victims, or otherwise constructively influence more positive outcomes. Potential examples include: rumor mitigation, influencing peer organizations, using non-violent action, early warning, establishing safe zones/ corridors, convening stakeholders, lobbying, etc. Determine whether the indicator will measure just one or many of these acts of catalyst.
- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. In most contexts these events won't occur often and thus the indicator would be measured once a year. Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.

These data will be collected from CSO/CBO members. It will also be important to triangulate these data with input from community members. Ask community members about events where youth leaders served as catalysts for prevention of violence. Record and compare the perspective of different community members and CSO/CBO members of the same event. If the accounts differ, determine why this would be.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should provide information helpful in understanding the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, talk to community members (youth and adults) to discuss how the role youth play in has evolved in the community and what broader changes this has influenced related to prevention of violent conflict. This may be dependent on which religious or minority groups are represented in youth leadership. Be sure to discuss anticipated changes in the future related to youth leadership as its contribution to reduced conflict may only be apparent in the long-term.

It is also important to identify factors that will contribute to and inhibit the role of youth in reducing conflict in the community in the future. In many cases, the proportion of youth in communities is projected to increase with time. In such cases, it will be important to determine whether youth are assuming greater responsibility and more important roles in society due to transformation of societal and cultural norms or because of shift in demographics. Consider also whether the trend in youth leadership is a result of conflict and/or the youth's reaction to it.

## PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION

### Data sources / Measurement method

Interview CSO/CBO members (at least 2 members of a given CSO/CBO). Include all CSO/CBOs in the project area in the survey.

### Illustrative data collection questions

<i>Note: place an X in each that apply</i>		President	Vice President	Treasurer	Secretary	Governing committee members	Other (specify)	
Q1	Who are the key leaders in your organization?							
Q2	Which of these positions are held by youth age X to X?							
Q3	Which of these positions are held by female youth age X to X?							
Q4	<i>If relevant:</i> Which of these positions are held by _____ (enter minority group) youth age X to X?							
Q5	Has your organization acted to reduce violence in the last X time period?						1 = yes 2 = no > skip to Q9 3 = don't know	
Q6	Please describe what your organization did to reduce violence						Record narrative provided	
Q7	Please describe the situation and potential for violence at that time						Record narrative provided	
Q8	What role did youth leaders play in this situation? <i>Circle all that apply</i>						1 = it was the idea of youth leaders 2 = helped to plan the act 3 = participated in the act 4 = didn't participate 5 = other (specify) _____ <i>*Revise list as needed</i>	
Q9	Any opportunities to prevent violence when your organization didn't act? If so, what was the situation? If so, why not?						Record narrative provided	

#### Calculation:

Sum of number of acts where the youth leadership helped to plan or came up with the idea for the act as catalyst to prevent or reduce violence in 'x time period'

**Disaggregate by:** different types of acts by youth leaders, geographic region, male vs. female youth, youth from different backgrounds (ie. minority ethnic/caste groups and lower socio-economic status). *Include others as relevant based on context.*

**Tips for data collection:** Make sure to talk to both youth and adult members of the CSO/CBO if possible. This may be a group or individual interview.

**Timing/frequency:** Consider including this in baseline, mid-term, and final survey data collection and monitor any changes that may occur in between those points in time.

### FURTHER INFORMATION

#### Interpretation Questions

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. What effect have the youth leaders of CSO/CBOs had on the community overall?
  - a. Has this impact varied for different types of households in the community? If so, why?
2. Do you leadership sufficiently represent male and female youth? And minority groups as relevant?
3. What are the obstacles to a greater role by youth in preventing violence?
  - a. How can these be addressed?
4. What factors are enhancing the role of youth leadership in some contexts but not in others?
  - a. How can this be expanded?
5. Is the current level of youth leadership in the community sufficient to contribute to the project objective and goal?
  - a. If not, what specific changes would be necessary so that it is sufficient?

#### **Related indicators (GAIN)**

**Social Cohesion:** % revenue generated by extractive industry operations reinvested in projects benefitting poor communities in 'X time period'; # of sexual gender-based violence victims (SGBV) receiving professional assistance (psychosocial, medical, legal) in 'X time period'; Levels of inter-religious violence reduced (incidents, destruction, injuries, deaths) in last 'X time period'; Proportion of local statutory authorities that referred one or more appropriate conflicts to indigenous, customary or community based mechanisms for dispute resolution in 'X time period'; % of targeted youth engaged in violent activities in 'x time period' is decreased

**Youth:** % of targeted youth engaged in violent activities in 'x time period'; # of joint initiatives between youth organizations and strategic governance agencies 'in x time period'; 'Positive developments' in youth education or employment practices/policies related to the public statements made by the Church in 'x time period'.

#### **Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

#### **Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none

# PROPORTION OF LOCAL STATUTORY AUTHORITIES THAT REFERRED ONE OR MORE APPROPRIATE CONFLICTS TO INDIGENOUS, CUSTOMARY OR COMMUNITY BASED MECHANISMS FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN 'X TIME PERIOD'

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>Respect for Alternative Dispute Resolution Theory:</b> If government officials respect viable indigenous, customary or community-based dispute resolution mechanisms, there will be greater inter-cultural understanding and more peaceful coexistence in the society at large.	Local governments recognize and legitimize indigenous dispute resolution mechanisms.	Social Cohesion	Civic Engagement	SO
				IR
				Output
				Activity

### BACKGROUND

This indicator is a measure of local statutory authorities' recognition of the legitimacy of and their support for indigenous or community-based dispute/conflict resolution mechanisms. Indigenous mechanisms are recognized as providing viable and appropriate means for dispute or conflict resolution. Communities recognize these mechanisms as "their own," as they are culturally-shaped and grounded in indigenous belief and value systems. It is important to note that these mechanisms are often considered in situations where the application of modern legal mechanisms is unwieldy, or has excluded a significant portion of the population and limited its access to justice. Where central and local governments respect and/or adapt customary practices, peacebuilding can be enhanced. Examples include the *gacaca* courts in Rwanda and the use of customary law in indigenous communities in Latin America. Determine how to tailor this indicator to the project context by considering the following:

- Local statutory authorities:** Create a list of the local statutory bodies/councils in the project area to be used during data collection. Look for places where people are raising issues, airing grievances and seeking solutions to their conflicts. This includes family conflicts as well those affecting greater numbers of people in the program area. The number of local statutory authorities will serve as the denominator for the indicator.
- Appropriate conflicts:** Develop a general description of appropriate conflicts which should be referred to dispute mechanisms in this indicator

and a description of the conflicts which should not be referred. These descriptions will help in data analysis. *Note: Change the indicator to refer to 'two or more' or 'all appropriate' indicators, etc if appropriate.*

- **Indigenous, customary or community-based mechanisms:**

With members of the target community, identify and characterize the indigenous, customary or community-based resolution mechanisms. For future analysis, record how these mechanisms function and who (or members of which groups within the community) are involved and with what source of in/formal authority.

- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Will it be useful to measure the mechanisms used for resolution in the last year or three years? Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.

Use of these mechanisms alone does not guarantee inclusion or satisfaction of all community members. To understand the broader context surrounding these mechanisms, talk to community members to find out if some types of disputes or conflicts are more likely to be brought to these mechanisms than others, and if there are any groups within the community that do not recognize the legitimacy of the practitioners or outcomes attained using these mechanisms. Also talk to local government authorities to understand the rules (both formal and informal) that govern the use of these mechanisms. It may be useful to gauge local officials' level of satisfaction with these mechanisms as a proxy for the likelihood of their continuing to support using them. Note that there may be clear jurisdictional differences between customary and statutory law that are known to all, but written nowhere. If possible, talk to those involved in the conflict and ask if they were satisfied with the process and outcome.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should inform learning about the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, talk to community members (youth and adults) to discuss how they view their responsibility towards conflict resolution. Ask if their sense of responsibility has changed and, if so, how and why. Discuss the ways in which community resolutions have contributed to lessening conflict in the community, as well as cultural and ethnic/racial tensions in the society.

## **PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION**

### **Data sources / Measurement method**

Interview local government council members and local (non-governmental) customary leaders to understand when and how often these mechanisms have been used.

<b>Q1</b>	How many disputes or conflicts have been brought to your office or committee in the last X (designated time period)?	_   _  conflicts
<b>Q2</b>	How many of these disputes or conflicts have you referred to a customary or community-based resolution mechanism? <i>Note: refer to specific resolution mechanisms if possible.</i>	_   _  conflicts
<b>Q3</b>	<i>FOR THOSE ADDRESSED THROUGH COMMUNITY MECHANISM:</i> Why did you refer these disputes or conflicts to the community-based mechanism?	Leave open to record messages as stated by respondent
<b>Q4</b>	<i>FOR THOSE NOT ADDRESSED THROUGH COMMUNITY MECHANISM:</i> Why didn't you refer the other disputes or conflicts to the community-based mechanism?	Leave open to record messages as stated by respondent
<b>Q5</b>	For each conflict (or at least the major conflicts) brought to the community-based resolution mechanism: <i>repeat for other issues</i>	
<b>Issue 1</b>		
<b>Q5.1</b>	a. What was the nature of the dispute or conflict? <i>Please be specific.</i>	Leave open to record messages as stated by respondent
<b>Q5.1</b>	b. How was it resolved?	Leave open to record messages as stated by respondent
<b>Q5.1</b>	c. Were the parties to the conflict satisfied with the resolution? Why or why not?	Leave open to record messages as stated by respondent

**Calculation:**

Number of local statutory authorities that referred one or more\* appropriate conflicts to indigenous or community-based resolution mechanisms in X time period

....Out of .....

Total number of local statutory authorities in project area

*\*tailor this calculation to reflect the number needed to meet the indicator.*

*Note: proportion is used above instead of percent due to the small number of local government units in most project areas.*

**Disaggregate by:** geographic region, type of dispute, type of disputants, type of authority, jurisdiction. Include others as relevant based on context.

**Tips for data collection:** Talk to both local government authorities and especially community leaders to understand their level of satisfaction with the alternative dispute resolution process and their perception of the credibility or legitimacy of the process' outcomes. Conduct case studies to understand the full process of dispute resolution and how different types of conflicts are resolved in the community.

**Timing/frequency:** Consider how often disputes or conflicts arise in the project area. Measure this indicator only after several conflicts have occurred and keep the time period consistent through each period of data collection. Consider

including this in baseline, mid-term, and final survey data collection and monitor any changes that may occur in between those points in time. Note that not every time period is equal. The frequency of conflicts varies greatly by context and circumstances.

## **FURTHER INFORMATION**

### **Performance Questions**

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the some or all of the following:

1. What is the community's sense of responsibility towards resolving disputes or conflicts?
  - a. Has this changed during the life of the project? If so, why and how?
2. Are community alternative dispute resolution mechanisms still accepted as relevant by a majority in the community? Why or why not? Have they been adapted to changing realities? What historic and current sources of moral authority legitimize their usage?
  - a. If not, who doesn't accept them and why?
3. What are the incentives for the local statutory authorities to refer cases to indigenous alternative dispute resolution mechanisms?
  - a. How can these be increased?
  - b. What are the risks involved?
  - c. How do these mechanisms perpetuate or reduce perceptions of inequities across lines of gender and age, i.e., youth?
4. What are the challenges for the local statutory authorities to refer cases to indigenous alternative dispute resolution mechanisms?
  - a. How can these be addressed?
  - b. What has been the progress made so far at institutionalization?
5. What is the relationship (current and proposed) between indigenous (i.e., customary) alternative dispute resolution processes and more formal, legal dispute resolution processes? Which takes precedent in adjudicating given disputes?
6. How has greater use of these dispute mechanisms affected conflict resolution in the community? How do you anticipate that greater use of these dispute mechanisms will affect the community in the future?

Related indicators (GAIN)



**Social Cohesion:** % revenue generated by extractive industry operations reinvested in projects benefitting poor communities in 'X time period'; # of sexual gender-based violence victims (SGBV) receiving professional assistance (psychosocial, medical, legal) in 'X time period'; Levels of inter-religious violence reduced (incidents, destruction, injuries, deaths) in last 'X time period'; # of instances where youth leaders of community service and community-based organizations act as catalysts to prevent or reduce violence in 'x time period'; % of targeted youth engaged in violent activities in 'x time period' is decreased

**Civic engagement:** Increased citizen participation in the government's annual budget development process (measured by participation index); Increased level of resources strategically committed by the Church to Peacebuilding and Justice programs

#### **Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998)* ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

#### **Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none



# PERCENT OF TARGETED YOUTH ENGAGED IN VIOLENT ACTIVITIES IN 'X TIME PERIOD' IS DECREASED

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>Youth needs and interests theory:</b> If youth needs (i.e. life skills and employment) are met, then they are less likely to engage in violent behavior.	Fewer young men and women engage in armed violence	Social Cohesion	Youth	<b>SO</b>
				<b>IR</b>
				<b>Output</b>
				<b>Activity</b>

## YOUTH

This indicator is appropriate for projects addressing youth employment and promoting life skills as part of an effort to reduce youth violence, which predominantly involves young men. Note that many significant factors related to youth engagement in armed violence are *not* considered here, including: poverty and marginalization; a need for respect/recognition from other segments of society; the desire to be part of a community of belonging; domestic abuse and violence; repression or persecution; manipulation by elites, or forced recruitment by others. The indicator measures youth engagement in violence, but does not measure the level of violence in a country, region, or urban center overall.

The indicator is stated in a general form here and needs to be specified based on the project context. Consider the following in your target area:

- Youth:** Determine the relevant age range of youth based on information about the age groups engaged in armed violence, and social factors influencing the local concept of youth. For example, youth could be considered in the age range of 15-19, 15-24, or 15-29. However, it will likely be relevant to consider upper ages for this indicator since problems of violence and employment generally affect an older youth contingent. Enter this age range into the indicator itself.
- Violent activities:** Decide in advance what activities will be considered to be violent and counted in this indicator. These might include forms of gang and non-gang related violent criminal activity, participation in armed militias in civil or military conflicts, etc. Create a list of specific activities considered to be violent for use during data collection and analysis.
- Youth from minority groups and female youth:** Consider whether it will be relevant to measure violent activity among youth from minority groups in addition to youth overall. If so, determine which minority groups

are relevant in the context and include questions to identify these youth in data collection tools. Note that this indicator will focus on males in most contexts. However female youth may or should be included in data collection and analysis, depending on the context.

- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Will it be useful to measure the change in violent activity in the last 6 months or in the 1-2 years? This will be related to the frequency of violent activity in the project area. Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.

In addition to collecting data for this indicator, research the current employment (and underemployment) rates among youth and among the overall population. In addition, if the proposed project includes vocational or technical training, it will be important to access recent labor market surveys, either from the host country government or chamber of commerce. These surveys will help identify which sectors with the greatest demand for labor that can be met with the youth trained by the project. Finally, try to specify the life skills to be developed among the youth targeted by the project, which may include conflict transformation, dialogue and negotiation, social construction of gender, self-esteem, stress management, family relationships and domestic violence, human rights, leadership, working in a team, communication and negotiation, sexuality and HIV, and good environmental stewardship.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should generate information relating to the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, talk to community members (youth and adults) to discuss how employment and life skills have contributed to less violent activity by youth. General concepts will emerge in the group discussions, but due to the sensitive nature of some of these topics (engagement in violence, etc) no individual cases should be raised in the group. Hold key informant interviews to talk to youth about the impact that life skills and employment have had on their lives and activities. Employment may include self-employment in a micro-enterprise. Also ask youth if they perceive a difference in the level of violence and, if so, what the reasons for this would be. Determine if youth see increased employment or life skills as a direct influence or underlying factor related to changes in violence.

## **PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION**

### **Data sources / Measurement method**

Ideally, one should interview and collect at least some data directly from the youth themselves. Given security and trust issues and the sensitive nature of questions about violent activity, however, it may be necessary to restrict data collection to local authorities or program coordinators who work directly with youth. In this case, ask each of the program coordinators to provide information

about the youth in the project area, beginning with their employment situation, level of life skills, and engagement in violent activity over the time period specified in the indicator. Ideally the level of life skills should not only be determined by participation in training but by actual skill level.

**Illustrative data collection questions for each program coordinator in project area**

<b>QA</b>	How many youth are in the project’s current cohort (i.e. group)?	_   _  youth
<b>Youth Cohort 1</b>		
<b>Q1.1</b>	What percentage of the individuals in the cohort was currently employed prior to participation in the project?	_   _  percentage
<b>Q1.2</b>	What percentage of the individuals in the cohort obtained full time employment as a result of the program?	_   _  percentage
<b>Q1.3</b>	What percentage of the individuals in the cohort completed the program’s life skills training?	_   _  percentage
<b>Q1.4</b>	What percentage of the individuals in the cohort experienced an X% increase in test scores, for any life skills that were measured?	_   _  percentage
<b>Q1.5</b>	How many individuals in the cohort had been involved in violent activity XX (enter time period) prior to the beginning of the project?	_    _  individuals
<b>Q1.6</b>	What type of activities were they involved in? Circle all that apply	<i>Enter list of possible activities here</i>
<b>Q1.7</b>	How many individuals in the cohort were involved in violent activity in the last XXX (time period)?	_    _  individuals
<b>Q1.8</b>	If so, what type of activity? Circle all that apply	<i>Enter list of possible activities here</i>
<b>Q1.9</b>	What percentage of the individuals in the cohort are members of a minority group?	<i>Minority status may be determined by race, ethnic group, religious background, etc.</i>
<i>Repeat for all cohorts in the program</i>		

**Calculation:**

Review and sum the data collected from each program coordinator for the calculation below.

Number of youth in all program cohorts engaged in any violent activity in XX time period

---

Total number of youths in all program cohorts X 100

**Disaggregated by:** under/unemployed vs. employed youth (as well as self-employed), level of life skills, geographic region, male vs. female youth, youth from different backgrounds (i.e., ethnic minority groups, race, religion, and lower socio-economic status). Include others as relevant based on context.

**Tips for data collection:** Project coordinators should record information on the youths' violent activities as part of the project baseline to be able to demonstrate impact later in the project. Ensure through data collection that there is no overlap in the information provided by different project coordinators (ie. that no youth are counted twice). Phrase Q1.5 and 1.7 so that they refer to the same time period and are directly comparable.

**Timing/frequency:** To be determined based on the time frame included in the indicator. For example, if the indicator refers to violent activity in the last year, the data should be collected annually.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

### Interpretation Questions

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. Does employment or do life skills seem to contribute more to reduced engagement in violence?
2. What personal and contextual factors (outside of youth skills and employment) are contributing to youth engagement in violent activities? How are these being addressed or how could these be addressed in the future?
3. Are there certain youth that seem to be reducing their violent activity more than others? If so, who? Why?
4. Has the type of violent activity by youth changed since the project began? If so, how? Has it worsened or improved?

### Related indicators (GAIN)

**Social Cohesion:** % revenue generated by extractive industry operations reinvested in projects benefitting poor communities in 'X time period'; # of sexual gender-based violence victims (SGBV) receiving professional assistance (psychosocial, medical, legal) in 'X time period'; Levels of inter-religious violence reduced (incidents, destruction, injuries, deaths) in last 'X time period'; # of instances where youth leaders of community service and community-based organizations act as catalysts to prevent or reduce violence in 'x time period'; Proportion of local statutory authorities that referred one or more appropriate conflicts to indigenous, customary or community based mechanisms for dispute resolution in 'X time period'

**Youth:** # of instances where youth leaders of community service and community-based organizations act as catalysts to prevent or reduce violence in 'x time period'; # of joint initiatives between youth organizations and strategic governance agencies 'in x time period'; 'Positive developments' in youth education or employment practices/policies related to the public statements made by the Church in 'x time period'.

**Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/) )

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998)* ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none





# PERCENT OF TARGET POPULATION WHO CAN CORRECTLY CITE 3 KEY MESSAGES RELATED TO PREVENTING SGBV FROM THE PUBLIC STATEMENTS MADE BY CHURCH LEADERS

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SEC TOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>The public attitudes theory</b> - If key Church leaders denounce sexual and gender based violence and promote measures to prevent it, then SGBV will decrease.	Church information, communication and education campaign has increased awareness of SGBV and knowledge about how to prevent it.	Church action	Gender Equity and SGBV	<b>SO</b>
				<b>IR</b>
				<b>Output</b>
				<b>Activity</b>

## BACKGROUND

This indicator reflects the Church’s public commitment to combat sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) and the effectiveness of its information, education and communication campaigns on prevention of SGBV. However, in order to be most effective the indicator needs to be tailored to the project area by creating local definitions and a list of key actors. Consider the following in your target area:

- Target population:** Consider which positions or persons within government leadership the church leaders will be targeting with public statements in the context of policy dialogue, advocacy, and communication with media outlets. Try to make this list as specific as possible to help in determining which statements should be counted in the indicator and who to talk to regarding the impact of these statements. There may also be targeted audiences of potential employers within the private sector as well as segments of the general public.
- Key messages related to preventing SGBV:** Determine the number of key messages that the respondent will need to have cited to be counted in this indicator. This may be 3 out of 3, 2 out of 5, etc and should be based on number of messages (i.e. the change in knowledge) that you determine to be adequate to support higher level change (ie. behavior change). Make sure you have recorded the content of the key messages for use in developing the questionnaire. These may include, but are not limited to sexual trafficking and prostitution, migration, worker’s rights, women’s rights, domestic violence and abuse, etc.

- **Public Statement:** Clarify what constitutes a public statement, as made by the Church, and its significance in the implementing environment. Examples might include pastoral letters or speeches, declarations in a press conference or other media event, collective positions or individual statements, and level of Church leadership that makes the statement.
- **Church leaders:** Create a list of key church leaders in the project target area as a reference during data collection. Key church leaders will be those with relatively greater levels of internal and public influence and credibility, viz. other church leaders.

While this indicator is a quantitative measure, it is important to collect complementary qualitative data on the effectiveness and reach of the messages to understand the full impact of these messages. In order to understand the full impact of the indicator, document the content of the messages and talk to targeted community members regarding the following:

- Who heard the messages? *Characterize which community members were most likely to have heard these messages. Why these community members and not others?*
- Approximately how many people heard the messages?
- What difference do you think these public statements on SGBV will make in your community? Why these changes?
- Do you plan to do anything to address the issues mentioned in the public statements? If so, what? If not, why not?
- Whose responsibility is it to address these issues (refer specifically to target issues, secondary education, women's and other social support services, private sector employment opportunities, etc)?
- Besides public statements, what kinds of things do you think will help to reduce SGBV in your community?

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should validate the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, determine how and to what degree the public statements contribute to reduced SGBV and increased gender equity. Talk to community members, male and female, to understand what changes in SGBV and equity they have observed and experienced and why these changes have occurred. There will likely be multiple factors contributing to any change and the project team, in close consultation with the community, will need to interpret the relative contribution of these public statements to the change.

*Note: This indicator measures a mid-level change (usually IR) and should be used together with an indicator to measure the number of statements made by church leaders and*

an indicator to measure any positive outcome of these messages. Together these three indicators will measure relevant change related to these statements.

## PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION

### Data sources / Measurement method

Use a representative random sample to collect data from the target population. Consider whether you will cluster or include comparison groups in your sample to determine the sample size.<sup>1</sup> Consult your local M&E team members to finalize the sample size and selection method.

### Illustrative data collection questions

<b>Q1</b>	Have you heard any messages related to SGBV from church leaders in the last <i>X time period</i> ?	1 = yes 2 = no > skip to end 3 = don't know
<b>Q2</b>	How was the statement(s) disseminated? <i>Circle all that apply</i>	1 = Church events closed to the public 2 = Church events open to the public 3 = Print media, e.g., newspapers, Church bulletins, newsletters 4 = Broadcast media, e.g., radio and/or TV 5 = Web-based media 6 = other (specify) _____
<b>Q3</b>	What were the messages in that statement(s)? Any others? <i>Circle all that apply</i>	<i>Include full list of key message included in the statement. Also include some incorrect options in case respondents remember incorrectly. Include an 'other' option as well.</i>

### Calculation:

$$\frac{\text{Number of respondents who selected 3 or more correct* and no incorrect answers in Q3}}{\text{Total number of respondents}} \times 100$$

\*or the number of correct statements needs for the indicator.

**Disaggregated by:** geographic area, males vs. females, members of different religious groups, youth vs. adults, respondents who heard the message in different media. *Include others as relevant based on context.*

**Tips related to data collection:** Collect any additional information needed to allow comparisons between any relevant groups. Make sure to include incorrect options in Q3 to capture any common misinterpretations of the public statements made.

**Timing/frequency:** To be determined based on the time frame included in the indicator. For example, if the indicator refers to public statements in the last year, the data should be collected every year.

<sup>1</sup> For more guidance on random sampling, refer to the CRS Asia M&E Guidance Series available on CRS Global.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

### Interpretation Questions

As part of reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. Are these public statements simply by an individual as an individual *within* the Church or issued a collective statement, reflecting the institutional position and interests of the Church?
2. Are these public statements effective in addressing public attitudes and awareness around issues of SGBV? Why or why not?
3. How and how much are these statements contributing to reduced SGBV and to increased gender equity? *Consider these questions separately if appropriate.*
4. What else is needed to more fully address issues of SGBV?

### Related indicators (GAIN)

**Church action:** # of public statements made by to target audience by Church leaders on Artisanal Small-scale Mining (ASM) activities and the local population's associated rights and benefits in 'X time period'; 'Positive developments' in youth education or employment practices/policies related to the public statements made by the Church in 'x time period'; Increased level of resources strategically committed by the Church to Peacebuilding and Justice programs; % of target population who believe inter-religious structures are adding value to a peace process in X time period; # of social conflicts in which Church leaders have spoken/acted in unison despite internal ethnic divides in the last 'XX time period'

**Gender equity and SGBV:** # of sexual gender-based violence victims (SGBV) receiving professional assistance (psychosocial, medical, legal) in 'X time period'; Primary school net enrollment for girls

### Links

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) [http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

### Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor

none

## NUMBER OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS MADE TO TARGET AUDIENCE BY CHURCH LEADERS ON ARTISANAL SMALL-SCALE MINING (ASM) ACTIVITIES AND THE LOCAL POPULATION'S ASSOCIATED RIGHTS AND BENEFITS IN 'X TIME PERIOD'

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SEC TOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>Political elites theory:</b> If the Church influences political elites and other decision-makers to reform extractive sector policy and/or practice, then (a) ASM miners will have more secure livelihoods, or (b) extractive industries will assume greater corporate responsibility, or (c) local population will benefit more from extractive industry operations.	Church has waged information, communication, and education (IEC) campaign on extractive sector policy and/or practice, promoting greater equity for the sector's labor force, the local population, and/or the general public.	Church action	extractives	<b>SO</b>
				<b>IR</b>
				<b>Output</b>
				<b>Activity</b>

### BACKGROUND

This indicator is a measure of the Church's public commitment to reform of extractive industry policy and practice. A major assumption is that IEC interventions like public statements contribute to public demand for reform and that changes emerge at least in part from shifts in public will. In order to be effective the indicator needs to conform to the political context and culture, and be tailored to the project area by creating local definitions and a list of relevant actors. Consider the following in your target area:

- Public Statement:** Consider what constitutes a public statement, as made by the Church, and its significance in the implementing environment. Examples might include pastoral letters or speeches, declarations in a press conference or other media event, collective positions or individual statements, and level of the Church leader/s that makes the statement.

- **Target audience:** Consider which positions or persons within government leadership or the extractive industry, domestic and international, the church leaders will be targeting with public statements in the context of policy dialogue, advocacy, and communication with media outlets. Try to make this list as specific as possible to help in determining which statements should be counted in the indicator and who to talk to regarding the impact of these statements.
- **Church leaders:** Create a list of relevant church leaders in the project target area as a reference during data collection.
- **ASM activities, rights and benefits:** Within extractive policy and practice, define which issues are most relevant issues for the project context and should be counted in the indicator. These may include, but are not limited to, increased livelihood security of ASM miners, benefits to the local population, industrial (management-labor) relationships, upstream and downstream pollution mitigation and cleanup, levels and transparency of industry royalty payments to government, specific legislation and other legal dispensations for extractive sector operations, and corporate and social responsibility of the extractive industries. Determine which issues indirectly related to extractive policy and practice will also be counted in the indicator.
- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Will it be useful to measure the number of messages delivered in the last year or more? There may be certain occasions in the year during which church leaders are more likely to make statements. If so, consider these by including the same number of events in comparable time periods. Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.

While this indicator is a quantitative measure, it is important to collect complementary data on the effectiveness and reach of the messages to understand the full impact of these messages. In order to understand the full impact of the indicator, document the content of the messages and talk to individuals in the target audience regarding the following:

- Who heard the messages? *Characterize which community members most likely heard the messages.*
- How many people heard the messages?
- What was the content of the public statement(s) made by church leaders?
- Do people remember the content of the messages?
- Do you think the issues included in the public statement are likely to result in changes in public attitudes and behaviors? If so, why? If not, why not?

- What has changed for those who now have this information?
- Do you plan to do anything to address the issues mentioned? If so, what? If not, why not?
- Are the statements part of a larger Church effort, e.g., participation in PWYP coalition, monitoring of host country government compliance with EITI, etc.
- Whose responsibility is it to address these issues (*refer specifically to relevant issues such as the livelihood security of ASM miners, corporate responsibility of extractive industries, benefits to contiguous communities, etc*)?

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should produce information that promotes understanding about the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, determine whether, how and to what degree the public statements have influenced or contributed to addressing the target issues related to extractive sector reform policy and/or practice. Change to policy in particular may be slow or evidenced only in the long term so it is important to consider signs for future change. There will likely be multiple factors contributing to any change and the project team, in close consultation with the target audience and church leaders, will need to interpret the relative contribution of these public statements to the change.

*Note: This indicator measures a lower level change (either output or IR) and should be used together with an indicator to measure the % of the population who heard the statement(s) and can correctly cite the key messages and an indicator to measure any positive outcome of these messages. Together these three indicators will measure relevant change related to these statements.*

## PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION

### Data sources / Measurement method

For both monitoring and evaluation purposes, arrange individual interviews with all relevant church leaders in your project area to follow up on or complement the Church’s public statements, which should be available in the mass media. In addition, it will be important and useful to collect and study the reactions to the Church’s public statements.

### Illustrative data collection questions for church leaders

<b>Q1</b>	How many public statements have you made in the last X (designated time period)?	_   _  public statements
<b>Q2</b>	How many of these statements dealt with extractive industry policy / practice ( <i>specify relevant issues here</i> )?	_   _  public statements

STATEMENT 1		
Q3.1a	When was this statement made?	_   _  /  _   _  (mm / yy)
Q3.1b	What were the key messages?	<i>Leave open to record messages as stated by respondent</i>
Q3.1c	Who heard the message?	1 = representatives of the extractive industry (cite names if possible) 2 = representatives of the government (cite names if possible) 3 = other (specify) _____ <i>Revise list of coded responses to be as specific as possible for your information needs</i>
Q3.1d	How did the new information influence behaviors?	<i>Leave open to record messages as stated by respondent</i>

**Calculation:** Number of public statements by church leaders regarding extractive policy and practice (*specify target issues here*) made to the target audience in X time period (sum messages made by relevant church leaders in the designated timeframe)

**Disaggregated by:** messages referring to different specific issues (among targeted issues), messages intended for broad audiences or targeted for specific segments, e.g., government, extractive industry or other segments. Include others as relevant based on context.

**Tips for data collection:** The interviews with church leaders are a good opportunity to discuss general issues related to extractive policy and practice and do not need to be limited to the illustrative data collection questions above. Note that in addition to collecting data from church leaders, the project team should listen directly to the public statements and talk to the target audience (government and industry representatives, etc) to understand the impact of these messages.

**Timing/frequency:** To be determined based on the time frame included in the indicator. For example, if the indicator refers to public statements in the last year or two, the data should be collected annually.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

### Interpretation Questions

As part of reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the following:

1. Are these public statements effective in addressing the target issues related to extractive policy and practice? Why or why not?



2. What are the media through which these messages were communicated?
3. How did the Church modify the statements to appeal to different targeted audiences?
4. To what extent did the statements address issues and challenges associated with gender and youth?
5. How and how much are these statements contributing to changing extractive policy and practice? *Consider these questions separately if appropriate.*
6. What else, in addition to the statements, is needed to more fully address the project's target issues?

**Related indicators (GAIN)**

**Church action:** % of target population who can correctly cite 3 key messages related to preventing SGBV from the public statements made by Church leaders; 'Positive developments' in youth education or employment practices/policies related to the public statements made by the Church in 'x time period'; Increased level of resources strategically committed by the Church to Peacebuilding and Justice programs; % of target population who believe inter-religious structures are adding value to a peace process in X time period; # of social conflicts in which Church leaders have spoken/acted in unison despite internal ethnic divides in the last 'XX time period'

**Extractives:** % revenue generated by extractive industry operations reinvested in projects benefitting poor communities in 'X time period'; Increased degree of transparency about extractive industry operations in the national budget, including tax and royalty payments and costs associated with regulation and oversight (measured by index score).

**Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none



## ‘POSITIVE DEVELOPMENTS’ IN YOUTH EDUCATION OR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES/ POLICIES RELATED TO THE PUBLIC STATEMENTS MADE BY THE CHURCH IN ‘X TIME PERIOD’

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SEC TOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>The public attitudes theory:</b> If schooling and job opportunities improve for youth, and youth will abstain from violent behavior.	Church information, communication and education campaign has increased levels of youth access to (a) education or (b) employment.  <i>*specify ‘a’ or ‘b’ in the SO</i>	Church action	Gender Equity and SGBV	<b>SO</b>
				<b>IR</b>
				<b>Output</b>
				<b>Activity</b>

### BACKGROUND

A risk factor commonly associated with violence, from that of urban gangs to armed conflict, is a “youth bulge:” a large number of young people who are out of school and un- or under-employed—particularly young men. This indicator is a measure of the efficacy of the church’s public work to address the youth bulge and related injustices confronting youth. The indicator stated above is intentionally vague and left open in order to be tailored to the project area and objectives. Consider the following in your target area:

- **Positive developments:** Determine what kind of changes in practices or public policies will qualify as positive developments. These may include, but are not limited to, increased level of supply and/or quality of youth support services; more private sector actors recruiting and retaining youth as employees; improving levels of access, equity and quality of primary and/or secondary education; vocational training and education programs; corruption in the education system. Include one of these changes in the indicator. Create separate indicators for separate changes.
- **Public Statement:** Consider what constitutes a public statement, as made by the Church, and its significance in the implementing environment. Examples might include pastoral letters or speeches, declarations in a press conference or other media event, collective positions or individual statements, and level of Church leadership that makes the statement.
- **Church leaders:** Create a list of key church leaders in the project

target area and specify these in the indicator. Key church leaders will be those with relatively greater levels of internal and public influence and credibility, viz. other church leaders.

- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Changes in practice and policy often occur over the longer-term. This indicator should be measured approximately every year and at the end of the project.

The most challenging part of this indicator will be to establish a linkage between the statement made by the Church and the positive developments in the target issue. In order to establish the level of contribution by these statements, talk to relevant stakeholders to identify all of the factors that contributed to this change. Then use participatory methods to rank these factors in order of their level of contribution. Ask why some factors contributed more than others. For policy changes, ask similar questions to stakeholders involved in the policy decisions.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should consider the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, determine if these positive developments in youth employment and schooling opportunities have contributed to a reduction in violent activity among youth. If changes in youth schooling and employment are minimal to date, ask community members (youth and adults) what impact they anticipate that these improvements will have on youth violence in the future and why.

*Note: This indicator measures a higher level change (usually SO) and should be used together with an indicator to measure the number of statements made by church leaders and/or an indicator to measure the % of the population who heard the statement(s) and can correctly cite the key messages. Together these three indicators will measure relevant change related to these statements.*

## **PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION**

### **Data sources / Measurement method**

Identify the respondents who can provide the most reliable information related to the change identified in the indicator.

### **Illustrative data collection questions**

*Ask directly if the intended positive development has occurred. Follow up this 'yes/no' question by asking for more details about the change so that you have a full picture of the scope of the development at the end of the interview.*

### **Calculation:**

*This will likely be a sum of the number of positive developments that have occurred in X time period, based on the specifics provided in the tailored indicator.*

**Disaggregated by:** positive developments for youth in different age ranges, youth in different geographic areas, and male and female youth. *Include others as relevant based on context.*

**Tips for data collection:** Make the data collection questions as specific as possible, based on the specifics included in the tailored indicator. Note that in addition to collecting data stakeholders on the positive developments made, the project team should listen directly to the public statements and talk to the target audiences in government and the private sector to understand the impact of these messages.

**Timing/frequency:** To be determined based on the time frame included in the indicator. This indicator should generally be collected at the end of the project and monitored throughout the life of the project.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

### Interpretation Questions

As part of reflection session with the project team and/or community members, consider the some or all of following:

1. Did the Church's public statements contribute to this positive development?
  - a. If not, why not?
  - b. If so, to what degree did they contribute?
  - c. How can this level of contribution be increased in the future?
2. What other factors contributed to the positive development?
3. What else is needed to more fully address the project's target issues?
4. To what extent has the Church leadership engaged representatives from youth NGOs or the youth wing of the Church in formulating, developing and delivering the public statements?
5. Have the public statements addressed the different challenges associated with young women and young men for the particular issue raised by the Church?
6. What else can the church do to support the positive developments? *Consider if the Church itself could be directly providing basic education or vocational/technical training; and/or partnering in holistic educational, life skills and employment projects?*
7. Have any positive developments benefitted some youth more than others? *Consider youth from minority groups and females here. Why or why not?*

### **Related indicators (GAIN)**

**Church action:** % of target population who can correctly cite 3 key messages related to preventing SGBV from the public statements made by Church leaders; # of public statements made by to target audience by Church leaders on Artisanal Small-scale Mining (ASM) activities and the local population's associated rights and benefits in 'X time period'; Increased level of resources strategically committed by the Church to Peacebuilding and Justice programs; % of target population who believe inter-religious structures are adding value to a peace process in X time period; # of social conflicts in which Church leaders have spoken/acted in unison despite internal ethnic divides in the last 'XX time period'

**Youth:** # of instances where youth leaders of community service and community-based organizations act as catalysts to prevent or reduce violence in 'x time period'; % of targeted youth engaged in violent activities in 'x time period'; # of joint initiatives between youth organizations and strategic governance agencies 'in x time period'

### **Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

### **Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none

## INCREASED LEVEL OF RESOURCES STRATEGICALLY COMMITTED BY THE CHURCH TO PEACEBUILDING AND JUSTICE PROGRAMS

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>The institutional development theory:</b> If the Church strengthens its own institutional commitment to promote justice and peace, then it will respond more decisively to social inequities and conflicts.	Church has committed the human and financial resources necessary to enable its JPC and/or other church entities to serve effectively in national and local peacebuilding efforts.	Church action	Civic engagement	SO
				IR
				Output
				Activity

### BACKGROUND

This indicator is a measure the Church's willingness and dedicated asset base for engaging in Justice and Peacebuilding efforts. It could be complemented by measures like individual motivation, knowledge, skills and competency. The indicator is relevant not only in considering whether *current* resources committed are sufficient given the context and challenges, but also in tracking changes in the level of resource commitments over time. Adapt the indicator to the project context by considering the following:

- Create an index:** With the project team and others, attempting to take into account the specific context and level of conflict, create an index (or at least a tally) that includes financial, physical capital and human resources. Consider whether it is relevant to include the number of positions created or retained, the amount and/or percentage of budget committed to Justice and Peacebuilding, the number of related programming initiatives, and/or the impact of these initiatives. Plan to use the same index or tally to measure the church's commitment in future data collection as well, to make the results more comparable.
- Peacebuilding and justice programs:** If it is not readily apparent in the local context, create criteria to identify which programs address Peacebuilding and Justice among the wider range of relief and development programming. Peacebuilding and justice programs may address conflict directly and indirectly.

In interpreting these data, consider the church's overall budget, its sources of revenues, and its major resource commitments. Discuss with church leaders

why other sectors and commitments may receive either more or less than the church commits to Justice and Peacebuilding. Also ask church leaders which Peacebuilding and Justice initiatives seem to be the most effective, efficient in terms of cost-benefit, and most capable of being scaled up.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should provide information relating to the underlying theory of change in the project context. To address the theory of change, determine the role the church has played in the promoting justice and peace relative to other key societal and state actors. Describe the contribution the church has made to advancing justice and peace given its current level of resources and other competing commitments, and determine whether the current allocation of resources to justice and peacebuilding efforts is sufficient to make a significant contribution to generate positive change. To address issues of attribution, identify the other actors and factors contributing to increased justice and peace and seek to determine their relative contribution.

## PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION

### Data sources / Measurement method

Interview church leaders responsible for allocating financial, physical capital and human resources to access budget, organizational charts, and other planning documents.

### Illustrative data collection questions for church leaders

Q1	If publicly available, what is the total program budget for the church this year for relief, development, and justice and peace programs?	_____, _____ (local currency)
Q2	How much of the program budget allocations can be reasonably associated with Justice and Peacebuilding?	_____, _____ (local currency)
Q3	How many positions in the church are associated with J&P programming? How many of these positions are full time? How many are part time?	a. _____ Full time positions b. _____ Part time positions
Q3	How many initiatives are associated with Justice and Peacebuilding?	_____ programs
<b>For each Justice and Peacebuilding Program or Initiative, ask the following....</b>		
<b>Program 1: enter program name _____</b>		
Q4.1	How many positions are associated with this program? How many of these are full time positions? How many are part time?	a. _____ Full time positions b. _____ Part time positions



<b>Q4.2</b>	How many of these positions were <u>new</u> during this last funding cycle?	a.  _   _   _  Full time positions b.  _   _   _  Part time positions
<b>Q4.3</b>	What is the total budget for this program during the last funding cycle?	_   _   _ ,  _   _   _  (local currency)
<b>Q4.4</b>	Please describe the impact of this program or initiative	Record either the description by the respondent or create a coded list of options

**Calculation:**

1. Calculate the sum of labor, physical capital and other direct cost allocations that can be reasonably associated with Justice and Peacebuilding (Q2)
2. Determine percentage share of Justice & Peacebuilding of total budget:

$$\frac{\text{Sum of allocations made to Church justice and peacebuilding activities (Q2)}}{\text{Total amount of the Church program budget (Q1)}}$$

**Disaggregated by:** Include as relevant based on context.

**Tips for data collection:** It is extremely important to recognize that this is a sensitive exercise, investigating the Church’s internal resources, documents, etc., which may be interpreted as implicitly critical of church partners. Data collectors will need first to establish trust and then decide if and how to proceed. Second, they should ensure there is no duplication in data on Justice and Peacebuilding programs. In order to avoid any confusion, clarify what is considered to be a Justice and Peacebuilding program with the church leaders before starting the interview.

**Timing/frequency:** To be determined based on the frequency of budget development. Plan to measure this indicator once during each budget cycle or period of time.

**FURTHER INFORMATION**

**Interpretation Questions**

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or church leaders responsible for resource allocation, consider the following:

1. Is the current resource commitment (human, capital, and financial) to Justice and Peacebuilding by the church sufficient to contribute to the challenges identified? Is yes, why? If not, why not? *Specify here how sufficient is defined during the discussion. If not, what else can be done?*
2. Has the amount of resources committed by the church changed in comparison to the previous year? If so, how and why? What does this mean for Justice and Peacebuilding programs?

3. Has the amount of resources committed by the church changed over the last ten years? If so, how and why? What has this meant for Peacebuilding?
4. What are the obstacles to greater resource commitment by the church?  
*Discuss whether willingness or capacity is an obstacle.*
5. What has been the impact to date from the Church's Peacebuilding and Justice programs on local communities?
6. How does the church anticipate that their role in promoting justice and peace will evolve in the next few years? What changes will it need to make in the level of resource

**Related indicators (GAIN)**

**Church action:** % of target population who can correctly cite 3 key messages related to preventing SGBV from the public statements made by Church leaders; # of public statements made by to target audience by Church leaders on Artisanal Small-scale Mining (ASM) activities and the local population's associated rights and benefits in 'X time period'; 'Positive developments' in youth education or employment practices/policies related to the public statements made by the Church in 'x time period'; % of target population who believe inter-religious structures are adding value to a peace process in X time period; # of social conflicts in which Church leaders have spoken/acted in unison despite internal ethnic divides in the last 'XX time period'

**Civic engagement:** Proportion of local statutory authorities that referred one or more appropriate conflicts to indigenous, customary or community based mechanisms for dispute resolution in 'X time period'; Increased citizen participation in the government's annual budget development process (measured by participation index)

**Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none

# PERCENT OF TARGET POPULATION WHO BELIEVE INTER-RELIGIOUS STRUCTURES ARE ADDING VALUE TO A PEACE PROCESS IN X TIME PERIOD

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SEC TOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>Healthy relationships and connections theory:</b> If different faith traditions work together systematically, they help overcome isolation, polarization, division, prejudice and stereotypes between/ among groups.	Church participation in inter-religious structures has leveraged significant peacebuilding results.	Church action	Interfaith dialogue and cooperation	SO
				IR
				Output
				Activity

### BACKGROUND

This indicator measures public perceptions of the efficacy of the Church’s willingness and capacity to engage with other religious communities in inter-religious justice and peacebuilding efforts. Adapt the indicator to the project context by considering the following:

- Target population:** Specify if this indicator will refer to a sub-set of the target population. Determine which age range or type of individual you’d like to represent with this indicator, if applicable.
- Inter-religious structures:** In consultation with church partners and others, identify which are the existing inter-religious structures in the project area. You may also wish to consider which religious communities are or should be represented in the structures for the inter-religious structure to be relevant or truly representative of the targeted population’s diversity. In some contexts it may be sufficient to have two faith communities represented, while in others it may be more relevant for a structure to represent a wide variety of religious groups.
- Adding value:** This indicator is based on the perception of the target population and includes a somewhat generic reference to positive popular perception with ‘added value’. If you have a more specific change or addition that you’d like to measure, simply tailor the indicator to refer directly to this instead. Instead of a ‘yes/no’ question about value addition, you may chose to include a scale, allowing respondents to rate the contribution of the religious structures from 1-5 or strong to weak.
- Peace process:** If possible, specify the specify peace process or reference a particular conflict in the indicator. It is important that respondents understand the data collection questions in the same way and respond based on the same peace process.

- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Will it be useful to contribution in the last 6 months or in the last year? Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.

To complement this quantitative indicator of the public perception, collect qualitative data from members of different religious groups and community members about why/why not religious groups have added value to the peace process. Ask community members for specific examples of this value addition. These qualitative data will provide more depth to what would otherwise be a relatively flat measure of perception.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should provide information about the underlying theory of change in the project context. To validate the theory of change in the project context, talk to both leaders and members from different faith communities to determine to what degree members of different faiths have worked together to address divisions and prejudice between and among different groups. Discuss any current gains in dispute resolution and conflict transformation processes and what role, if any, these inter-religious structures have played. Also ask community members what the impact there has been from these gains on different types on households. Discuss how these groups can enhance their role in the future by making an improved, more constructive contribution.

Note that establishing functioning inter-religious structures may be a basic step towards creating a more formal platform for inter-religious dialogue and action. In some situations formal structures emerge from informal dialogue sessions or the need to respond to humanitarian emergencies.

## **PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION**

### **Data sources / Measurement method**

Use a representative random sample to collect data from the target population. Consider whether you will cluster or include comparison groups in your sample to determine the sample size.<sup>1</sup> Consult your local M&E team members to finalize the sample size and selection method.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more guidance on random sampling, refer to the CRS Asia M&E Guidance Series available on CRS Global.

### Illustrative data collection questions

<b>Q1</b>	Has there been any progress in the peace process ( <i>enter specific process/conflict if possible</i> ) in the last X time period?	1 = yes 2 = no > skip to Q3 3 = don't know
<b>Q2</b>	If yes, what individuals and groups have made a contribution to this progress?  <i>Circle all that apply</i>	<i>Provide a list of relevant individuals and groups here</i>
<b>Q3</b>	Have inter-religious structures ( <i>provide specifics here</i> ) added value to the peace process? If so, have they added a lot or a little value?	1 = yes, a lot 2 = yes, a little 3 = no 4 = don't know  <i>*enter any scale that's relevant</i>

**Calculation:** This indicator can be calculated based on responses for Q2 or for Q3:

a. *Using Q2:* In Q2, respondents give a non-prompted response. With this question, there is less room for respondent bias based on any assumptions about the right answer to the question.

$$\frac{\text{Number of respondents which select relevant inter-religious groups in Q2}}{\text{Total number of respondents}} \times 100$$

b. *Using Q3:* In Q3, respondents answer a prompted question. The way the question is phrased suggests that inter-religious structures have or should have contributed to the process.

$$\frac{\text{Number of responded 2 OR 3 in Q3}}{\text{Total number of respondents}} \times 100$$

*\*Note: it will be interesting to compare Q2 and Q3 calculations to determine whether one question is more effective than the other and if the prompt in Q3 affects the types of responses given.*

**Disaggregated by:** members of different religious groups, geographic area. Include others as relevant based on context.

**Tips for data collection:** Make sure that questions are specific enough to solicit a thoughtful answer by respondents. Tailoring the questions to ask about specific conflicts or peace processes and specific inter-religious structures will likely elicit more relevant responses.

**Timing/frequency:** This indicator should be collected at intervals of 6 months or a year depending on the pace and momentum in the local peace process. If

the peace process is progressing quickly, collect the data for the indicator more often.

## **FURTHER INFORMATION**

### **Interpretation Questions**

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or church leaders that participate in these inter-religious structures, discuss the following questions:

1. What are the incentives and disincentives for the church to participate in these inter-religious structures? What are the incentives and disincentives for other religious groups to participate? Do these disincentives and incentives differ? If so, how and why? What actions can and should be taken to reduce disincentives and increase the disincentives for each group's participation?
2. What are the potential "dividers" between different religious groups? How are these currently being addressed? How can these be addressed in the future? How can inter-religious groups address and reduce these dividers?
3. What are potential "connectors" that are not being used, and how could they become involved?
4. Who are the "spoilers" or potential spoilers in the conflict, and how can inter-religious initiatives influence those spoilers?
5. How have inter-religious initiatives coordinated and connected with other peacebuilding initiatives?
6. How can these inter-religious structures become more active in the peace process? What results have been achieved from the efforts of these inter-religious structures? What have been the factors inhibiting these results? How can these been addressed? What have been the factors contributing to these results? How can these

### **Related indicators (GAIN)**

**Church action:** % of target population who can correctly cite 3 key messages related to preventing SGBV from the public statements made by Church leaders; # of public statements made by to target audience by Church leaders on Artisanal Small-scale Mining (ASM) activities and the local population's associated rights and benefits in 'X time period'; 'Positive developments' in youth education or employment practices/policies related to the public statements made by the Church in 'x time period'; Increased level of resources strategically committed by the Church to Peacebuilding and Justice programs; # of social conflicts in which Church leaders have spoken/acted in unison despite internal ethnic divides in the last 'XX time period'

**Interfaith dialogue and cooperation:** Levels of inter-religious violence reduced (incidents, destruction, injuries, deaths) in last 'X time period'; Number of joint activities undertaken by Church and other faith-based organizations to advocate for increased equity on targeted issues (state targeted issues here) in 'X time period';

**Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

USAID Conflict Management and Mitigation Site ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting\\_programs/conflict/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/))

USAID Center for Democracy and Governance Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators (1998) ([http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf))

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none





# NUMBER OF SOCIAL CONFLICTS IN WHICH CHURCH LEADERS HAVE SPOKEN/ACTED IN UNISON DESPITE INTERNAL ETHNIC DIVIDES IN THE LAST 'X TIME PERIOD'

THEORY OF CHANGE	RESULTS STATEMENT	OBJECTIVE	SUB SECTOR	INDICATOR LEVEL
<b>Healthy relationships and connections theory:</b> If Church leaders can reduce or transcend internal tensions among themselves, they will be more credible and effective promoters of healthy relationships in the broader society.	Church leadership has spoken/acted together on key social conflicts despite internal inter-ethnic divisions.	Church action	None	SO
				IR
				Output
				Activity

**BACKGROUND**

Establishing internal cohesion and promoting internal equality within the Church is a prerequisite towards its establishing greater credibility to use its moral authority to promote just, equitable structures and systems in the broader society. This indicator looks at how Church leadership structures, which themselves reflect society’s ethnic diversity, respond (or not) to social conflicts in broader society. There have been occasions in which divisions within Church leadership structures, such as ethnic divisions, have prevented Church leaders from publicly addressing conflict in their societies, made them less-than-credible witnesses to Gospel values or worse. An obvious example is Rwanda prior to and during the genocide of 1994, but there are many others around the world. Talk to both Church leaders and lay members of the structures’ secretariat from different ethnic groups to determine to what degree, if any, these Church leadership structures have addressed and resolved internal disputes or conflicts, resulting from social inequalities, i.e., ethnic-based bias, prejudice, and divisions. Adapt the indicator to the project context by considering the following:

- **Social conflicts:** Establish a few simple criteria to determine what constitutes a social conflict. For social conflicts, this indicator focuses on ethnic conflicts in the broader society generated by contestation for political power, prestige, income disparity, unequal access to resources and public services, etc.
- **Church leaders:** In consultation with church partners and others, identify existing church leadership structures in the project area, such

as bishop conferences, and determine which Church leaders should be included in data collection interviews.

- **Internal Divides:** Establish a few simple criteria to determine what constitutes the Church leadership's internal divisions. These may be based on ethnic differences, among others.
- **Time period:** Determine what time period will be the most useful to include in the indicator. Will it be useful to measure the social conflict in the last 6 months or in the 1-2 years? Enter the time period to complete the indicator in the M&E system and in M&E tools.

For a greater understanding of the context, determine the number and type of conflicts that are and are not addressed by the church leadership and, separately, determine which social conflicts have and haven't been successfully resolved. In many cases, a trend will emerge regarding which type of conflicts are more likely to be resolved and which are less likely to be resolved.

To contribute to project learning, the M&E system should validate the underlying theory of change in the project context. To validate the theory of change in the project context, discuss any current or recent efforts to resolve internal inter-group disputes or conflicts to enable the Church to address similar inter-group conflicts in broader society. Discuss also what dispute or conflict resolution rules or mechanisms the Church leadership has put in place to increase internal cohesion and achieve greater consensus around the same sensitive, potentially dividing issues that contribute to horizontal inequality in the broader society.

*Note: once inter-group cohesion and equality have been well established, it may be relevant to create a new indicator to measure the impact of the Church leadership's efforts and activities conducted to reduce inequality and to increase social cohesion on broader social issues.*

## **PLANNING FOR DATA COLLECTION**

### **Data sources / Measurement method**

Determine the ethnic composition of the leadership body in question. Talk to both Church leaders and lay employees of the Church from different ethnic groups to determine what degree, if any, these Church leadership structures have addressed and resolved internal disputes or conflicts, resulting from social inequalities, i.e., ethnic-based, bias, prejudice, and divisions. It may also be useful to interview partners and community members to triangulate the (subjective) perspectives given by the Church leaders and the lay people.

**Illustrative data collection questions for representatives from each inter-religious structure**

<b>Q1</b>	What are the percentages of the ethnic groups represented in the total population of _____ (enter name of the country)?	<i>Provide a list of all possible ethnic groups and their percentage of the total population here</i>
<b>Q2</b>	What are the percentages of the ethnic groups represented in the Church leadership structures?	<i>Provide a list of all possible ethnic groups and their percentage of the total population here</i>
<b>Q3</b>	How often does the leadership structure meet?	1 = more than once a month 2 = once a month 3 = at least once per quarter (three months) 4 = twice a year 5 = less often than twice a year <i>Tailor list as appropriate</i>
<b>Q4</b>	What types of internal ethnic disputes or conflicts have arisen over the last year?	<i>Record response in narrative form or create a list of coded responses here.</i>
<b>Q5</b>	Which ethnic disputes or conflicts were addressed fully by the leadership structure?	<i>Record response in narrative form or create a list of coded responses here.</i>
<b>Q6</b>	What impact have these inter-ethnic disputes or conflicts (and their resolution or lack thereof) had on the Church leadership's capacity to operate or function? <i>Please be specific</i>	<i>Enter list of possible activities here</i>
<b>Q7</b>	What impact have these inter-ethnic disputes or conflicts (and their resolution or lack thereof) had on the Church leadership's capacity to effectively address broader societal issues, e.g., inequality and lack of social cohesion? <i>Please be specific</i>	<i>Record responses in a narrative form</i>
<b>Q8</b>	What social conflicts have affected your community in the last year (or other relevant time period)?	<i>Record response in narrative form or create a list of coded responses here.</i>
<b>Q9</b>	Which of these has the church leaders (enter specific names/titles) spoken out on?	<i>Record response in narrative form or create a list of coded responses here.</i>
<b>Q10</b>	Which of these has the church leaders (enter specific names/titles) acted together to address?	<i>Record response in narrative form or create a list of coded responses here.</i>
<b>Q11</b>	Have any of these social conflicts resolved or improved? If so, how have they resolved/improved?	<i>Record response in narrative form or create a list of coded responses here.</i>
<b>Q12</b>	What are all of the factors that have contributed to this improvement or resolution? <i>List all that apply</i>	<i>Record response in narrative form or create a list of coded responses here.</i>

**Calculation:** Sum the number of social conflicts that the church leaders have spoken / acted in unison to address. Separately consider the number of the inter-ethnic based disputes or conflicts in Church leadership structures that were adequately addressed based on criteria established by the project team.

**Tips for data collection:** Be aware of the sensitivity of inter-ethnic divisions, their complexity, history, and resistances to the “other.” It is likely that it will be difficult to collect data on the internal proceedings, actions and decisions taken by the Church leadership structures. Therefore, expect resistance in most cases, including unwillingness to provide information or at best incomplete data. In an initiative along these lines it is wise to consider working with trusted partners inside the Church structure, possibly even with skilled mediators who are acceptable to all or most of the Church leaders.

Church officials’ willingness to share documentation on conflict/dispute resolution (or lack thereof) may serve as a useful proxy for and provide anecdotal, qualitative data of the degree of the Church’s willingness and capacity to mediate societal conflicts. Consider as well that the causes of conflicts are not always transparent. You may need to prompt respondents to reflect upon the underlying root and proximate causes for each conflict.

**Timing/frequency:** The frequency of data collection might correspond with the Church leadership structure’s operational calendar, e.g., its fiscal year, linked to societal conflict or to changes in the Church leadership structures’ membership or leadership patterns.

## **FURTHER INFORMATION**

### **Interpretation Questions**

As part of a reflection session with the project team and/or church officials and lay leaders, discuss some or all of the following questions:

1. What are the root and proximate causes of ethnic group dispute or conflict in the Church leadership structures?
2. What are the dividers between the different inter-ethnic groups and what are some potential connectors?
3. How are these disputes and conflicts currently being addressed? How are the dividers preventing a more rigorous, consistent application of a conflict/dispute resolution process?
4. Which types of conflicts are more likely to be resolved? Which types of conflicts are less likely to be resolved? What accounts for these differences?
5. How can members of the Church leadership address and reduce these divisions?
6. What are the incentives and disincentives for the church leadership to adopt new practices, procedures, etc. to resolve their internal inter-ethnic disputes and conflicts more consistently, etc.?
7. Do these disincentives and incentives vary for the different ethnic groups in the conflict? If so, how and why?

8. What actions can and should be taken to reduce disincentives and increase the incentives for each ethnic group's participation in resolving the Church leadership structure's internal disputes and conflicts?
9. How have these internal disputes and conflicts affected the public's perceptions of the Church leadership's credibility to address social issues in general? Its credibility to address issues of social inequality and cohesion in particular?
10. Similarly, how have public perceptions shifted in reaction to the Church leadership's efforts to resolve its internal inter-ethnic disputes or conflicts?
11. Have public perceptions affected the Church leadership's willingness to resolve its internal inter-ethnic disputes or conflicts?

**Related indicators (GAIN)**

**Church action:** % of target population who can correctly cite 3 key messages related to preventing SGBV from the public statements made by Church leaders; # of public statements made by to target audience by Church leaders on Artisanal Small-scale Mining (ASM) activities and the local population's associated rights and benefits in 'X time period'; 'Positive developments' in youth education or employment practices/policies related to the public statements made by the Church in 'x time period'; Increased level of resources strategically committed by the Church to Peacebuilding and Justice programs; % of target population who believe inter-religious structures are adding value to a peace process in X time period

**Links**

CRS Peacebuilding Community Site (<https://global.crs.org/communities/Peacebuilding/Pages/home.aspx>)

**Cite if indicator is promoted or required by a donor**

none



## ANNEX A. ILLUSTRATIVE PEACEBUILDING INDICATORS

**\*ALL INDICATORS HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW HAVE CORRESPONDING TEMPLATES AVAILABLE IN THIS PUBLICATION AND ON THE GAIN SITE ON CRS GLOBAL.**

PEACEBUILDING STRATEGIC OBJ	SUB-SECTOR					
	GENDER EQUITY & SGBV	EXTRACTIVES	YOUTH	CIVIC ENGAGEMENT	INTERFAITH DIALOG AND COOPERATION	GENERAL
<b>Social Cohesion</b>	% of young female war participants in community-based development program	% revenue generated by extractive industry operations reinvested in projects benefitting poor communities in 'X time period' Note: Also an equity indicator."	% of community members who say that youth play an "important role" in promoting a culture of peace in the community	% decrease in incidences of election related violence between current and previous election cycle	Church responds more immediately to inter-religious tensions, violence	
<b>Social Cohesion</b>	# of sexual gender-based violence victims (SGBV) receiving professional assistance (psychosocial, medical, legal) in 'X time period'		% of eligible youth involved in electoral process	% increase of repatriates who report feeling safe in intervention zone	Levels of inter-religious violence reduced (incidents, destruction, injuries, deaths) in last 'X time period'	
<b>Social Cohesion</b>	# of women who feel their case has been handled promptly and reached an acceptable outcome		% of conflict affected youth receiving key public services	# of multiracial/ ethnic/ religious community based (CBOs/CSOs) healing initiatives underway	Reduced levels of tension, fear (indicated by joint trade, neighborliness, joint forms of leadership, joint participation in religious celebrations like Ramadan, Christmas)	
<b>Social Cohesion</b>	% of people reporting domestic violence unacceptable under any circumstances		% of trained youth surveyed who can identify manipulation tactics and provide two strategies for avoiding manipulation	% excombatants adopting civilian identity		
<b>Social Cohesion</b>			# of instances where youth leaders of community service and community-based organizations act as catalysts to prevent or reduce violence in 'x time period'	% of survey respondents who report having increased knowledge in human rights, peacebuilding, conflict management, etc.		

	SUB-SECTOR					
PEACEBUILDING STRATEGIC OBJ	GENDER EQUITY & SGBV	EXTRACTIVES	YOUTH	CIVIC ENGAGEMENT	INTERFAITH DIALOG AND COOPERATION	GENERAL
<b>Social Cohesion</b>			#/% youth engaged in community healing activities	Proportion of local statutory authorities that referred one or more appropriate conflicts to indigenous, customary or community based mechanisms for dispute resolution in 'X time period'		
<b>Social Cohesion</b>			% of targeted youth engaged in violent activities in 'x time period' is decreased			
<b>Social Cohesion</b>			# of Increased economic opportunities developed for youth			
<b>Increased Equity</b>		"% revenue generated by extractive industry operations reinvested in projects benefitting poor communities in 'X time period' Note: Also a social cohesion indicator."				
<b>Increased Equity</b>	# of individuals receiving accurate information on property rights for women	% change of HR violations filed against government security forces, multinational and national corporations in the extractive sector	# of joint initiatives between youth organizations and strategic governance agencies 'in x time period'	"Public policies, administrative procedure or law changed consistent with CSO advocacy campaign objectives"		
<b>Increased Equity</b>	Primary school net enrollment for girls	minimum environmental standards established through participatory processes	% business or institutions responding to incentives for at risk/ marginalized youth	Increased access to services across ethnic/religious lines (horizontal equity)	Number of joint activities undertaken by Church and other faith-based organizations to advocate for increased equity on targeted issues (state targeted issues here) in 'X time period'.	



	SUB-SECTOR					
PEACEBUILDING STRATEGIC OBJ	GENDER EQUITY & SGBV	EXTRACTIVES	YOUTH	CIVIC ENGAGEMENT	INTERFAITH DIALOG AND COOPERATION	GENERAL
<b>Increased Equity</b>		# of local people receiving information on legal rights, land rights, trade data and prices	% of youth being approved for small loans	Number and diversity of citizens (disaggregated by gender, rural/urban, ethnicity, etc.) who make use of local programs, benefits, and services		Degree of social and economic inequalities between ethnic and other key identity groups in 'x time period'
<b>Increased Equity</b>		Increased degree of transparency about extractive industry operations in the national budget, including tax and royalty payments and costs associated with regulation and oversight (measured by index score)		Increased citizen participation in the government's annual budget development process (measured by participation index)		
<b>Increased Equity</b>				Number of times over the past year local council officials have worked in coalition with other local councils, civil society and/or private sector to engage higher-level authorities on matters of local governance or national policy		
<b>Church Action</b>				# of public statements on peace and justice issues by bishops, other church leaders		
<b>Church Action</b>				Church engaged with multiple nonchurch stakeholders (governments, civil society)		

	SUB-SECTOR					
PEACEBUILDING STRATEGIC OBJ	GENDER EQUITY & SGBV	EXTRACTIVES	YOUTH	CIVIC ENGAGEMENT	INTERFAITH DIALOG AND COOPERATION	GENERAL
<b>Church Action</b>	% of target population who can correctly cite 3 key messages related to preventing SGBV from the public statements made by Church leaders	# of public statements made by to target audience by Church leaders on Artisanal Small-scale Mining (ASM) activities and the local population's associated rights and benefits in 'X time period'	'Positive developments' in youth education or employment practices/policies related to the public statements made by the Church in 'x time period'.	Increased level of resources strategically committed by the Church to Peacebuilding and Justice programs	Inter-religious prayers in public	# of social conflicts in which Church leaders have spoken/acted in unison despite internal ethnic divides in the last 'X' time period'
<b>Church Action</b>				Trained Peacebuilding and Justice staff at all levels of church	% of target population who believe inter-religious structures are adding value to a peace process in X time period.	
<b>Church Action</b>				People outside church structure seek it out on peace and justice issues		



228 W. Lexington Street  
Baltimore, MD 21201-3413  
USA  
Tel: 410.625.2220

---

**[www.crs.org](http://www.crs.org)**

