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<tr>
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<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
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Executive Summary

This evaluation of PCI’s project “Embedding social peace and conflict transformation” in Libya assesses the project’s performance and effectiveness. The evaluation was conducted between February and April 2019 and is based on literature review, as well as qualitative interviews and focus groups conducted with 114 direct and indirect beneficiaries across six targeted locations in Libya where the project has been implemented. In addition, semi-structured interviews have been conducted with the project’s donors and managers.

Project background:
“Embedding social peace and conflict transformation” is a 24-month project implemented by Peaceful Change Initiative (PCI), and jointly funded by the UK’s Conflict Stability and Security Fund (result area 1), the European Union’s Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (result areas 2 and 3), and the Government of Switzerland’s Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (result areas 2 and three). The project aims to contribute to decreasing violent and conflict, as well as to achieve greater stability in and between 22 target communities across Libya. It works through three parallel results areas:

1. Establishing Social Peace Partnerships (SPP) – inclusive community groups that engage with local authorities on matters of peace and development in 22 areas across the country.
2. Creating an enabling environment for the international community aiding Libya to apply conflict-sensitivity effectively to their work.
3. Supporting experienced peacebuilders from across Libya to increase cooperation and work strategically in the format of a network of practitioners.

Evaluation methodology and process:
This evaluation assessed the project’s performance and effectiveness, and identified key lessons learned. The evaluation adopted a qualitative approach, followed the OECD-DAC criteria and relied on mainly qualitative data collected through KIIIs and FGDs.

For data collection, six location were selected in Libya and a total of 47 KIIIs and 12 FGDs conducted: Souq Aloum and Sabrata in the West of Libya; Benghazi and Ajdabia in the East; and Wadi Alabawanis and Obari in the South.

Eight interviewers, selected by the PCI team and trained by CMC for the purpose of this evaluation, were in charge of collecting data and conducting key informant interviews with direct beneficiaries of the project. In addition, focus group discussions with in-direct beneficiaries were organised in the six targeted locations in Libya. For the project’s international dimension, the evaluation team conducted semi-structured interviews with PCI’s donors and managers working on the Libya project.

Evaluation findings:
The evaluation confirmed that the project is highly relevant to the Libyan context and aligned with the UK government’s overall security and stabilisation programme. It is also aligned with the EU and Swiss government’s strategic priorities in Libya, as it implements local interventions that are supporting local stabilisation, resilience and inclusion.

The interviews conducted with Partnership members, Trainer-Mentors and other project beneficiaries showed that the project is highly relevant for them. All respondents agreed that the project is relevant to the current situation in Libya and to their work and role in the peace building and conflict management process.
The evaluation found that the project was able to achieve most of its expected outcomes and outputs, albeit to different extent. According to project reports, the number of Social Peace Partnerships (SPP) formed increased during project implementation, covering more than 14 target areas and reaching over 400 SPLD members. The interviews conducted with the direct and indirect beneficiaries in Sabrata, Wadi Albawanis, Obari, Ajdabiya, and Benghazi, showed that project activities were highly successful, including workshops that enhanced the capacity of the Trainer-Mentors and partnership members. In the field of conflict management and social peace, the grants supported the development of local initiatives and peacebuilders’ networks. The evaluation also showed that Social Peace Partnerships played a crucial role in managing local conflicts and are seen by local communities in some locations as a trusted public forum that functions in an inclusive and participatory way and is addressing issues that matter to community members.

In terms of impact, the project contributed to reducing violence between communities and established an infrastructure for a political settlement to take over, by supporting the creation of partnerships and building capacity throughout Libya to engage in transformational approaches to conflict management. It also helped to build trust between the local government and local communities.

In comparison to other entities operating in Libya, such as the UN, embassies as well as commercial implementers and non-profit organisations, PCI’s work is assessed as efficient. It reached a large number of direct and indirect beneficiaries with a modest amount of funding. Compared to the overall cost of insecurity, conflict, and armed confrontations in Libya, it seems a defendable investment. Furthermore, the methodology followed by the project in order to reach several regions, proved to be very efficient. The training of Trainer-Mentors from each region allowed to enhance the project’s ability to reach a larger number of people in limited time, as the Trainer-Mentors supported the creation of the Partnerships in their own communities and regions. Each of them was responsible for operating in a limited area, which was more efficient.

With regards to sustainability, the Trainer-Mentors and other beneficiaries demonstrated ownership of the capacities they developed during project implementation. They now independently deliver trainings and workshops without PCI’s directions or involvement. However, the evaluation could not substantiate the sustainability of the Social Peace Partnerships’ capacity, at least not in the locations where the interviews were conducted. Nevertheless, the partnership members who were interviewed reported that they are working on sustainability plans.

Overall, PCI leaves behind a legacy of improved conflict sensitivity and understanding of Libyan local dynamics. While it is difficult to quantify this, PCI has certainly spread a culture of conflict-sensitive thinking among donors, embassy staff and implementers. As staff rotation is high, a large number of people were exposed to the importance of conflict-sensitive approaches and how to promote them and implement them in practice.
I. Evaluation background and objective

1.1 Project background and description

The 2011, Libyan revolution and civil war and its aftermath involved large-scale violence unseen in most other Arab countries that witnessed a “spring”, with the exception of Syria. Libya’s revolution triggered a range of local conflicts and tensions and re-surfaced historical conflicts. At national and sub-national levels, these conflicts threatened the country’s social fabric, increasing divisions and weakening ties between communities.

Local conflicts have also made it harder to agree on a shared vision for a new civil state in Libya, because they coincided with widespread circulation and possession of weapons across the country and an increasing tendency towards the use of violence to solve disputes.

At the national level, the international community has focused efforts on Libya’s transitional process since 2011, led by the United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) and managed by the UN Stabilisation Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL). In response to the political crisis in 2014, the process then focused on building a Government of National Accord (GNA), centred around a Presidential Council (PC) that was constituted as the result of the dialogue process.

At the sub-national and local levels, support to municipalities, the majority of which have directly elected Municipal Councils, have been one area in which the international community has been able to support longer-term institutional capacity building in Libya, without necessarily engaging with authorities that challenge the GNA’s legitimacy.

“Embedding social peace and conflict transformation” is a 24-month project implemented by Peaceful Change Initiative (PCI), and jointly funded by the UK’s Conflict Stability and Security Fund (result area 1), the European Union’s Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (result areas 2 and 3), and the Government of Switzerland’s Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (result areas 2 and 3). The project aimed to achieve greater stability in and between 22 target communities across Libya by working through three parallel results areas, and by implementing the activities described below:

**Result 1 (local level):** Establishing Social Peace Partnerships – inclusive community groups that engage with local authorities on matters of peace and development in 22 areas across the country.

**Activity 1.1:** 6 trainings for new and inexperienced Trainers-Mentors (TMs)
**Activity 1.2:** 4 Skills based trainings and workshops for experienced TMs
**Activity 1.3:** 12 Extended mentoring and monitoring visits
**Activity 1.4:** 20 Start-up grants to support TMs’ core practice
**Activity 1.5:** Maintain and extend online platforms
**Activity 1.6:** 10 grants for Social Peace actions in target communities
**Activity 1.7:** 8 rounds of training for women in 4 communities

**Result 2 (sub-national level):** Supporting experienced peacebuilders from across Libya to increase cooperation and work strategically in the format of a network of practitioners.

**Activity 2.1:** 7 Network Meetings/Training component
**Activity 2.2:** 3 Network Consolidation Grants
**Activity 2.3:** 12 Regional Network meetings of Network inside Libya
**Activity 2.4:** 9 Network Peace Grants targeted
Activity 2.5: Review, production and dissemination of SPLD handbook  
Activity 2.6: 1 national communication campaign against divisive narratives  
Activity 2.7: 8 working advocacy sessions with key influencers

Result 3 (international level): Creating an enabling environment for the international community aiding Libya to apply conflict-sensitivity effectively to their work.

Activity 3.1: 10 Conflict-Sensitive Assistance Forums  
Activity 3.2: Maintenance and adaption of online platform  
Activity 3.3: 4 trainings on applied practice of conflict sensitivity  
Activity 3.4: 3 Conflict Sensitivity peer reviews  
Activity 3.5: 7 quarterly Conflict Sensitivity reports  
Activity 3.6: 7 quarterly working meetings with Leadership Group  
Activity 3.7: On-call facility for conflict analysis and conflict-sensitivity accompaniment

1.2 Objectives and scope of the evaluation

This evaluation assessed the project’s performance and effectiveness, and identified key lessons learned that are linked to practical recommendations for future work. The evaluation was conducted by a team of three CMC staff working from Istanbul and Tunis, as well as a team of eight Libyan interviewers who were able to travel to or are resident in the project target communities, for the purpose of engaging first-hand with project stakeholders and beneficiaries. The evaluation:

- Assessed the relevance of the project and progress in achieving outputs and outcomes against what was planned (effectiveness) in the project plan, as well as efficiency of interventions and their sustainability;
- Evaluated the achievement and weaknesses of the project against the five OECD DAC evaluation criteria and the original programme objectives;
- Identified key lessons learned and made practical recommendations in order to inform future interventions and projects of a similar nature.

1.3 Theory of Change and results framework

From the results framework developed by PCI, including the Theory of Change (ToC), it is clear that this was a priority at the beginning and during project implementation. Some progress reports are structured around the results framework, promoting its use. There are, nevertheless, some inconsistencies in the wording of outcomes and some indicators, and also the Impact-level Goal was not operationalised with indicators or measurements. A recommendation has been included how to strengthen this, and added in the Annex.

The Theory of Change for the Libya programme reads:

“IF The practices of social peace (Output 1) are embedded and expanded beyond the original 14 locations; AND successes from Output 1 are made widely known throughout the country through strategic advocacy and cooperation by a network of people across Libya challenging divisive narratives; (Output 2) AND international interventions in Libya are better informed about drivers of conflict and about how their work is perceived; (Output 3)

\[\text{CMC staff regularly works in FCAS and proposed to travel to Libya for the purpose of the evaluation, strongly believing in the added value of face-to-face interviews and an enhanced understanding of realities on the ground; but in the context of this evaluation and PCI’s work, it was decided to be too complicated to deploy CMC staff.}\]
THEN Communities across Libya will be better equipped to manage potential conflicts via social peace methodologies, thus contributing to reducing the incidence of violent conflict and increasing local level inclusion and stability, AND International interventions will be more conflict sensitive and better able to respond in an agile way so that their work receives more trust from the Libyan public;

THEN This will contribute to reducing the incidence of violent conflict and increasing local level inclusion and stability in Libya; WHICH WILL THEN Enable an environment/social infrastructure for a political settlement to take root.”

The evaluation finds that the theory is well-developed and well-aligned with the results framework, as well as the project’s monitoring and reporting to its donors. The evaluation team is aware of the challenges this project faced, as it was funded by three donors and the log frame had to answer all of their expectations and priorities, which led the PCI team to merge different logframes into one.

II. Evaluation approach and methodology

2.1 General approach

The evaluation methodology was based on an inclusive approach that involved programme stakeholders and beneficiaries, in order to generate diverse views on the programme’s performance, taking into consideration the local context as well as cultural sensitivities. The evaluation followed three phases, including the inception phase, the field work phase, and the analysis and reporting phase.

- **Inception phase:**
  During the first phase of the assignment, the team conducted a thorough review of all project documents shared by PCI, in order to develop a strong understanding of the project’s components, objectives and results.

  During this phase, the team designed the evaluation methodology, including the tools and protocols for data collection to be used during the field work. In addition, the team designed and delivered a training for the enumerators that were responsible for data collection inside Libya. The training workshop took place in Tunis on 14 and 15 February 2019. As enumerators, PCI made their programme officers (PO) as well as selected Trainer-Mentors available from various Libyan communities. Those were selected because it was not possible to send CMC staff to Libya in the context of this evaluation.

- **Field work phase:**
  Eight interviewers, selected by the PCI team and trained by CMC for the purpose of this evaluation, were in charge of collecting data and conducting key informant interviews with direct beneficiaries of the project. In addition, focus group discussions with indirect beneficiaries were organised in six locations in Libya. For the project’s international dimension, CMC conducted semi-structured interviews with PCI’s donors and managers working on the project.

  The team of interviewers was led and supervised by the CMC team and worked hand-in-hand in order to address any obstacles faced and in order to ensure data checking, cleaning and verification. The interviewers were guided by the PCI team while in Libya to assess the risks and manage all logistics and security related to the field work. All interviews were conducted in Arabic, translated by an external translator into English, and submitted to the CMC team for analysis and reporting.
While it was initially planned and foreseen in the ToR to conduct community surveys with randomly sampled respondents, it was jointly decided during the inception phase that the evaluation would not employ this method. Nevertheless, CMC proposes a detailed methodology on how to conduct surveys in Libya for future interventions, included in this report.

- **Analysis and reporting phase:**
Based on a systematic analysis of the collected data, the evaluation team drafted the evaluation report, responding to all evaluation questions provided in the ToR. The methodology looked to generate general impressions, verify and triangulate data obtained from different stakeholders and documentation.

### 2.2 Evaluation criteria and key questions

The design of the evaluation and its corresponding methodological framework was based on CMC’s understanding of what can realistically be accomplished given security, time and budget constraints. The evaluation followed the OECD DAC evaluation criteria for analysing and assessing the implementation of the programme to date, focusing on relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency, and sustainability of PCI’s work, and answering the evaluation questions outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>To what extent are the objectives of the project relevant to the following key stakeholders:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trainer-Mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Members of the Social Peace Partnerships (including members of the peacebuilder’s network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Members of the communities in which Social Peace Partnerships have been established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Heads of agencies providing-assistance in Libya?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>To what extent have the results included in the project proposals been achieved in terms of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building the capacity of Social Peace Partnerships to manage conflict and enable participative decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building the capacity of Trainer-Mentors to support the SPLD methodology across the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building cooperation and networks among peacebuilders across the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Raising awareness and enabling the application of conflict-sensitive approaches in the work of international organisations working in and on Libya?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>To what extent was the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives, with specific focus on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building the capacity of Social Peace Partnerships to manage conflict and enable participative decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building the capacity of Trainer-Mentors to support the SPLD methodology across the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building cooperation and networks among peacebuilders across the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Raising awareness and enabling the application of conflict-sensitive approaches in the work of international organisations working in Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>- What has been the impact of the programme’s activities in specific communities in preventing, ending and managing violence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What has been the cumulative impact of the programming in contributing to an enabling environment for a political deal to take root?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What has been the cumulative impact of the programming in encouraging...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
international assistance providers to be more conflict-sensitive in their work in Libya?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Who owns the achievements of the project? How sustainable are the results in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social Peace Partnership target communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The community of Trainer-Mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The peacebuilders’ network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The international community’s application of conflict-sensitivity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Data collection and analysis

The evaluation relied on qualitative data collected through KIIs and FGDs in order to identify project stakeholders and beneficiaries in targeted locations.

To answer the evaluation questions (EQs), the evaluation team collected data from multiple categories of respondents, and analysed multiple lines of evidence (i.e. primary and secondary documents, semi-structured interviews, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions). The evaluation team designed questionnaires in order to collect data from direct and indirect beneficiaries, to be able to comprehensively address each of the EQs. Data was triangulated to reinforce findings and identify inconsistencies. The set of data tools is attached in the Annex.

Four main sets of information-gathering techniques were used:

- Project documentation review
- KIIs with direct beneficiaries, donors and other stakeholders
- FGDs with indirect beneficiaries of the project.

a) Project documentation review:

During the inception phase, the evaluation team collected and reviewed all relevant and available documentation to inform the evaluation. Programme documentation relevant to this evaluation included result frameworks and quarterly and annual reports produced for each donor. The documents informed the development of the evaluation matrix and the tools and questionnaires for data collection included in the Annex.

b) Key Informant Interviews:

KIIs were conducted mainly with the project’s direct beneficiaries, including Trainer-Mentors (members of communities in which Social Peace Partnerships (SPP) have been established), as well as members of the peacebuilders’ network (PBN). The informants were selected by CMC’s team from the list of direct beneficiaries and participants shared by PCi’s teams. Interviews were designed to address information gaps and inconsistencies that emerged during the desk review.

The team of enumerators conducted a total of 42 KIIs, (7 KIIs in each location) within the agreed timeline. The KIIs were based on an interview protocol and geared towards categories of beneficiaries and in line with the analytical framework and the EQs. The interview protocol was shared with the enumerators during a two-day workshop, discussed and finalised immediately after.

2 Locations have been selected by PG.
The questionnaires were developed in English and Arabic, and the interviews were conducted in Arabic.

c) Focus group discussions:
FGDs were conducted with the project’s indirect beneficiaries and stakeholders, to provide another perspective on its contribution to the desired impact. FGDs allowed for multiple lines of inquiry and offered a safe environment where participants could share their views and perceptions, and interact with the group, allowing the facilitator to capture relevant and in-depth information.

d) Semi-structured interviews:
CMC’s team conducted additional interviews with PCI staff and three main donors as well as participants of the conflict-sensitivity forums PCI organised regularly in Tunis, in order to complete the information pertaining to project activities and processes, and its contribution to intended objectives, especially to result 3.

e) Community surveys:
PCI conducted a number of community surveys in several locations in Libya, in order to monitor the project’s activities and to capture the population’s perceptions. This included approximately 100 interviews in each of the target communities in which PCI was directly managing SPLD processes. Light-touch surveys focused on four basic questions related to the ‘big-picture’ objectives of the Social Peace Partnerships. While in Tunis, the CMC team met with the project officers, who were responsible for survey administration and data collection earlier, in order to develop an understanding of the previous methodology used and the way the data has been collected. Based on the information available to CMC and a discussion with PCI, it was decided not to repeat a similar exercise in the context of this evaluation. Instead, CMC proposes options for future community surveys, appropriate methodologies and recommendations for strengthening the reliability of survey information in the future, taking into consideration the security challenges and limitations that the field team regularly faces in Libya during any data collection. The survey methodology is presented in this report.

2.4 Sampling / selection of locations and respondents for KIIIs and FGDs

PCI selected six locations in Libya where interviews were conducted for the purpose of this evaluation. The main criteria were geographical spread, types of prevalent conflicts and interaction of PCI work with other projects:

During the selection of the regions, it was considered important to have all three historic regions of Libya represented equally, since they still inform people’s sense of identity and are partly a driver of conflict. Hence the selection included:

- Two regions from the west (Suq Aljuma and Sabratha),
- Two regions from the east (Benghazi and Ajdabiya),
- Two regions from the south (Wadi Albawanis and Ubari).

Hard conflict versus social cohesion: PCI believes there are essentially two types of conflict-related work that the Partnerships have been doing. If the communities are not affected by violent conflict, then the Partnerships tend to work on social cohesion or participative decision making. In those areas where there is direct conflict, Partnerships are mentored to address these issues. Both types are reflected in the selection in each region:
- Suq Aljuma is home to some important militias that have had political impact on Libya, but there are no clear conflicts between groups inside the area.
- Sabratha has been the site of open conflict along a number of fault lines, culminating in the violence of September 2017 when there was armed conflict between some of the biggest militias. Members of the Partnership intervened in this and tried to have an impact.
- Benghazi was a very dysfunctional municipality for a long time, before the appointment of military administrators. Conflicts between groups clearly exist but are not permitted to come out into the open owing to the military oversight, so the work has had to focus more on accountable governance and decision making.
- Ajdabiya is a very divided city based on a couple of major tribes (which spills into politics). The work of the Partnership has tried to work on managing this conflict.
- Wadi Albawanis is quite resilient and does not experience major divisions, so the work has focused on social cohesion and accountable governance.
- Obari has experienced extremely violent conflict and the work of the Partnership has focused on trying to underpin the truce that was reached.

Five of those six selected target communities also have active members of the peacebuilders’ network. The sixth (Wadi Albawanis) had an active member until he moved to another location recently.

Interaction with other projects: PCI’s work has regularly supported other, often bigger assistance providers to deliver aid in an inclusive and conflict-sensitive way. PCI believes that in these communities the partnerships can play a role to inform an assistance provider of how their aid can help contribute to social peace. As a consequence, these communities have received more resources from donors, but there are other challenges in terms of communication between multiple actors and delivery accountability. One such community has been selected from each region:

- Sabratha is involved in UNDP’s ‘Resilience and Recovery’ project, which focuses on strategic locations from the point of view of migration through Libya towards Europe.
- Benghazi and Obari are both involved in UNDP’s Stabilisation Facility for Libya, which was created to incentivise peace in the aftermath of the Libya Political Agreement.

The table below shows the locations and number of KIIs and FGDs conducted in each location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>KIIs (7 KIIs/location)</th>
<th>FGDs (2 FGDs/Location)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli (Souk a Juma)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabratha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Albawanis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obari</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajdabiya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benghazi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each location, PCI’s team sent the evaluation team a list of direct and indirect beneficiaries, from which the evaluation team selected seven respondents in each location. A total of 42 KIIs and 12 FGDs (with 6-8 respondents each) were conducted. In addition, six interviews via WhatsApp, skype and phone have been conducted with peacebuilders’ network members.
The respondents were selected based on specific criteria, including sex, age, place of residence and involvement in the project. For the KIIIs, the team selected seven direct beneficiaries in each location to be interviewed. For the FGDs, the team selected indirect beneficiaries, defined as community members who have knowledge of the project but benefitted only indirectly from it.

**Brief description of the profile of the KII and FGDs respondents:**

As mentioned in the section above, FGDs and KIIIs have been conducted with direct and indirect beneficiaries in six locations, including members of SPP, the peacebuilders’ network (PBN) and the beneficiaries who benefited from grants, trainings and initiatives delivered under this project. The respondents were selected randomly by the evaluation team, from the lists of participants provided by PCI.

The KII respondents from the six locations represented direct beneficiaries, including members of the partnerships and networks. The respondents’ age ranged between 19 and 70 years old. They had a relatively high level of education (33 out of 42 have a master or bachelor degrees). 14 out of 42 respondents were female. 36% of the respondents were not members of any civil society organisation or institution, but were part of the partnerships and attended activities implemented by the project.

**2.5 Evaluation limitations**

One of the project’s main target groups were local authorities, but most of the contacts that were shared with the evaluation by PCI, had mainly Partnership members who were not representatives of local government. The number of local authority representatives was very limited in all locations. The evaluation team felt that this did not affect the overall findings but considered it as a missed opportunity to obtain additional inputs.

Moreover, findings are based on the assumptions that information shared by the informants and focus group participants is accurate, and not influenced by the data collectors, who are also part of the Project’s participants and beneficiaries (all of them were Trainer-Mentors, who benefited from trainings and supported the creation of several Partnerships in different locations inside Libya). This is a theoretical risk and CMC has no information to suggest any concern with the data collection. The main mitigation measures included the training of the enumerators during which the purpose of the evaluation and the role of the enumerators in the context of the evaluation was explained and discussed in detail. Data was triangulated and verified to the extent possible. PCI staff supervised the enumerators during data collection and write-up.

The project logical framework was not immediately clear, as it has a number of outcomes and outputs based on what the three donors wanted but not on how and what the Project is actually aiming to deliver. For example, “Communities showing signs of increased resilience” is described under output 1, but at the same time it is an outcome.³

³ To this point, PCI responded: “To be more precise, the UK government accepted the whole of our proposal but then wanted to specify that it was funding only one Result Area (Output). The PCI team then conducted a separate meeting with the UK Embassy team to develop a separate logframe for that Output, creating new Outcomes and Outputs. We didn’t consider these to clash with the overall approach, but they did add a certain level of foginess.”

The evaluation teams were not able to conduct a survey, in order to collect data about people’s perceptions on the peace process in Libya, and their trust of local and international organisations.
This means that the assessment was mainly qualitative, and therefore can hardly be generalised. This evaluation helped to understand in-depth people’s opinions, but the number of the interviews was limited because of the limited resources and time.
### Evaluation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Key Question(s)</th>
<th>Sub-question(s)</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Collection Method(S)</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>To what extent are the objectives of the project relevant to the key stakeholders? Including Trainer-Mentors, members of SPP, members of communities in which SPP have been established and heads of agencies providing-assistance in Libya?</td>
<td>Was a needs assessment conducted? Did the program answer a need in the targeted locations? Was the project designed in consultation with relevant stakeholders?</td>
<td>- The engagement of different stakeholders in the development of the project activities. -Level of engagement of the project beneficiaries after the implementation of the project</td>
<td>Project document analysis; Interviews and focus groups with relevant stakeholders including direct and indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td>Required information is available and accessible; Access to targeted locations for interviews is possible; Informants are available, collaborate and are willing to share information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>To what extent have results in project proposal been achieved?</td>
<td>What are enabling and limiting factors that contributed to the achievement of results? What actions need to be taken to overcome any barriers that limit the progress? To what extent were the SPP able to manage conflict and enable participatory decision-making in their communities? To what extent were the trainers capable to support SPLD methodology across</td>
<td>-Evidence of contribution to outcomes as outlined in the project log frame and articulated in the TOC. -Evidence of the application of conflict-sensitive approaches in the work of international organisations working in and on Libya</td>
<td>Project document analysis; Interviews and focus groups with relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>Required information is available and accessible; Access to targeted locations for interviews is possible; Informants are available, collaborate and are willing to share information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Key Question(s)</td>
<td>Sub-question(s)</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Collection Method(S)</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>What has been the impact of the project’s activities in specific communities in preventing, ending and managing violence?</td>
<td>Has the conflict situation in targeted locations changed over time? How did the project’s activities contribute to this change? What change has occurred to the lives of end-beneficiaries/project participants?</td>
<td>-Change reported by the project beneficiaries in specific locations/communities. -Evidence of change happened at institutional level.</td>
<td>Surveys; Interviews with the project team and relevant stakeholders;</td>
<td>Required information is available and accessible; Access to targeted locations for interviews is possible; Informants are available, collaborate and willing to share information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the country? How did the project’s activities contribute to building cooperation among peacebuilders across the country? To what extent did the project enable the application of conflict-sensitive approaches in the work of international organisations in Libya? because of the capacity building activities |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Key Question(s)</th>
<th>Sub-question(s)</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>To what extent was the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?</td>
<td>To what extent have the program’s institutional arrangements, operational mechanisms and financial resources advanced an effective and efficient response? How were funds allocated? Would more cooperation with partners have made the activities more cost-effective? How much of the project work plan has been implemented? What are the results (achieved, not achieved, partly achieved, faced difficulties)? Why?</td>
<td>- Project organigram and staffing model&lt;br&gt;- Project financial management system (how the funds are managed, speed of disbursement, speed of payment, did it lead to delays)&lt;br&gt;- Project M&amp;E system&lt;br&gt;- Perception of stakeholders and staff about knowledge management&lt;br&gt;- Existence and use of a project website/portal/intranet/website&lt;br&gt;- Leveraging of in-house expertise and resources&lt;br&gt;- Complementarity with another project (other PCI project or any other organisation such as UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Who owns the achievements of the project? How sustainable are the project</td>
<td>Do the project stakeholders remain committed to the contract</td>
<td>-The social peace partnerships future plan to continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Key Question(s)</td>
<td>Sub-question(s)</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities results?</td>
<td>after the project ends? What are the mechanisms developed by the project to insure the commitment of project’s stakeholders including the SSP, the Trainer-Mentors, the peacebuilders’ network?</td>
<td>engaged in the process of peace building. - Availability of funding to partners beyond the life of the project - Future plans of Trainer-Mentors and peacebuilder networks to continue engaging in peace building activities in their communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Evaluation findings

This section presents the analysis of the evaluation findings according to the OECD-DAC criteria.

3.1 Relevance

In this section, the evaluation examines to what extent the project is relevant to key stakeholders, including Trainer-Mentors, members of the Social Peace Partnerships (including members of the peacebuilder’s network), members of the communities in which Social Peace Partnerships, and heads of agencies aiding in Libya.

The project “Embedding social peace and conflict transformation during the transition in Libya” is an extension of the project “Effective leadership in conflict management during the transition in Libya”, that aimed to contribute to stabilisation by building local capacity to manage conflict and improve vertical relations between communities and state institutions, as well as horizontal relations among communities in Libya.

The evaluation found that the project is highly relevant to the Libyan context and aligned with the EU and Swiss government’s strategic priorities as well as the UK government’s overall security and stabilisation programme, as it supported local interventions promoting stabilisation, resilience and inclusion. According to the project’s documents, this project is also targeting HMG strategic locations, including Souq Aljuma, Ben Ghazi, Ajdabiya, Ubari and Wadi Albawonis, where interviews and focus groups have been conducted for the purpose of this evaluation.

The interviews conducted with members of Partnerships and peacebuilders’ network as well as Trainer-Mentors and other beneficiaries and community members, showed that the project is very relevant to them. All respondents confirmed that the project is relevant to the Libyan context and to their work and role in the peace building and conflict management process. The respondents stated that, in spite of the challenging situation in the country, this project supported the peace building process at regional, national and local level, and worked with local communities, civil society organisations and local government to develop trust and decrease violence among Libyan citizens. One of the respondents from Ajdabia said: “I felt that this project touches the wounds of the citizens. I think that the fact of bringing together government institutions with civil society organisations in a partnership is a great idea”. Another member of the partnership in Obari said: “We were in a war, so we needed peace, this is why I chose to join the Partnership because it focuses on peaceful change. The Partnership is considered as the most active body in Obari”.

The Social Peace and Local Development approach proved to be relevant to the local context in Libya and successful in bringing community leaders, government representatives and civil society organisations to work together, in a time where there is no central government, with an ongoing conflict among rival factions seeking control over Libya. This approach contributed to progress towards a national political solution. Furthermore, most of the project’s activities tried to complement the effort and work of other international organisations by strengthening the capacities of local communities in peace management and reconciliation, and by avoiding overlap with other activities that are already implemented by other organisations.

The peacebuilder’s network (PBN), is considered as a unique project, whose development PCI supported from the beginning. It was culminated with the creation of a legal entity (civil society organisation) operating at national level, and gathered peace builders from different cities of Libya, representing all regions and ethnicities. The respondents reported that the PBN is highly relevant to
them and to the Libyan context, and complemented the role and the work that the partnerships are doing at local level. According to the respondents, despite the fact that the PBN is a still a new institution, it has made a remarkable impact through the few activities delivered since its creation, such as the awareness raising events and workshops organised about the constitution, the peace building process, and the role of youth and women in the national reconciliation.

As mentioned earlier, the project, including all its components, had a strong focus on youth and women, and aimed to support them to be more engaged at local and national level, through enhancing their capacities for conflict and tension management, but also by offering them a space where they can practice their knowledge and develop initiatives, supported by small grants, and impact their local communities. One of the women interviewed stated: “As a woman in Ajdabia, before PCI, I have never had the opportunity to participate in any activity, but now, thanks to PCI and the Partnership, women have more knowledge and know how they can participate in social peace”.

For the bi-monthly CSA meetings, PCI staff as well as the responsible managers with the three donors (the UK, EU and Switzerland) were interviewed. They all confirmed the relevance of the conflict sensitivity work PCI promoted. Examples were shared for how PCI’s work on conflict sensitivity presented an added value to the donors themselves, as well as to other programmes. PCI is seen as the most relevant actor currently providing that kind of advice. The CSA events have been positively evaluated by many participants and are seen both as a networking event between donors and implementers (replacing de facto an absent formal coordination mechanism), as well as a knowledge hub for working in Libya.

3.2 Effectiveness

In this section, the evaluation assesses the extent to which the project outcomes and outputs have been achieved, in terms of capacity building of SPPs, the Trainer-Mentors, and in terms of building networks among peacebuilders across the country, and raise awareness about the conflict-sensitive approaches in the work of international organisations working in and on Libya.

The evaluation found that the project was able to achieve most of its expected outcomes and outputs, albeit to different extents. According to the project’s report, the number of SPLD formed increased during project implementation, covering more than 14 target areas and reaching over 400 SPLD members. The last operational report shows that 23 new SPLD had been established during the reporting period (September-December 2018), of which 14 were self-generated (established by PCI’s Trainer-Mentors with minimal involvement from PCI - Alghraifa, Aljmeel, Almarj, Bir Lashhib, Derna, Jakharra, Jalu, Khalij Alsidra, Kufra, Sulq, Tripoli centre, Um Razam, Warshefana, Zuwara), three were formed ad-hoc to support UNDP’s stabilisation and rehabilitation projects by working as consultation and conflict sensitivity mechanisms, (Kikla, Sabha and Sirte) and six were established by Trainer-Mentors through initiatives funded by small grants for disseminating and elevating SPLD (Awata, Al Qubba, Al Qala, Al-Abyar, Hay Al-Andalus, Ragdali).

The support and capacity building activities delivered to the peacebuilders’ network members proved to be effective as it led to the creation of a legal entity (CSO) in 2018, which will allow the network to expend its presence all over Libya and provide a platform to the peace builder across Libya to cooperate and work together, and also to work with international organisations and government bodies at national level. According to the NPB members who were interviewed, the network had 25 active members, and even before the creation of the legal entity, the network managed to deliver several workshops and events in 12 cities of Libya. This notably included the city of “Derna” that was under ISIS for almost 6 years, in which they organised an event to discuss the constitution and raise people’s awareness about its importance in building a democratic society.
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When asked about the relationship between the partnerships and the PBN, the respondents reported that at the moment there is no concrete project that links the partnerships and the network. Nevertheless, some of the network members are also part of the partnerships which allow the network members to be aware of what is going on at local level in different cities and regions. All respondents mentioned that the network and the partnerships complement each other, as the latter could inform and support the work of the network at the national level.

It is worth mentioning that the work that has been done by the partnerships has a direct and concrete effect on the communities, given the number of initiatives delivered, but also because it is easier to manage a project or an initiative at local level, supported by local government and local community members, than a national project that needs more funding and logistics in order to reach different cities and regions, in addition, the PBN as an institution is relatively new compared to the partnerships.

Supporting and training of a pool of Trainer-Mentors from different regions in Libya was very effective, as it created a resource that could reach many communities across the whole country, which facilitated the creation of Partnerships in all regions. This was confirmed by respondents who were interviewed. One of the Trainer-Mentors from Derna, reported that he has been supporting the creation of two SPLD, one of them was in Ajdabia, and he was able to support the whole process of the creation of the Partnership including the delivery of training and capacity building to its members and founders. Several respondents reported that they are using PCI’s SPLD methodology in order to develop new Partnerships in different regions in Libya, even outside the project that PCI is implementing and without PCI’s direction, which shows a high level of ownership of this approach and methodology.

The interviews conducted with the project’s direct and indirect beneficiaries in Sabrata, Wadi Albawani, Obari, Ajdabiya, and Benghazi, also show that project activities were highly successful, especially the workshops that aimed to enhance the capacity of the Trainer-Mentors partnership members in the field of conflict management and social peace. Most of the respondents reported that after their participation in PCI’s workshops, that they were able to implement what they learnt in different ways, in order to promote peace and social cohesion among their community members.

A Trainer-Mentor said that the training he received from PCI on conflict management and social peace allowed him to enhance his knowledge and enabled him to support the creation of several Social Peace Partnerships between government institutions and civil society organisations, and also cascade the training in different regions of the country targeting young people and activists. The majority of participants expressed their commitment to apply the knowledge and skills they learned during the training workshops organised by PCI.

Most of the respondents mentioned that the workshops were very useful for them as they helped them to develop their skills and influenced their work within their organisations. The training workshops that were mentioned by the respondents most frequently are those that addressed “conflict management and social peace”, “strategic planning”, and “team building”.

The respondents also reported that the events organised under this project had a big impact on them and their communities. A respondent from Souk Aljuma reported that he was part of the initiative “Be a Believer” which focuses on repairing some of the towns’ main and side roads. He said, “This initiative has built trust between the community people and local government. It also removed some of the daily tensions people used to have”.
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In addition, the respondents were asked about their opinion regarding the role of Social Peace Partnership and the peacebuilders’ network. The majority of respondents (including the ones that were not part of any Partnership) reported that they considered the Partnership to be a trusted public forum that functions in an inclusive and participatory way, addressing issues that matter to the community members. Most of the respondents from the six locations shared several concrete examples where the partnership played a role in solving local conflicts and de-escalating disputes between communities, and also ensuring more stability and a sense of community belonging by all groups, men, women, and children. For instance, a respondent from Obari said: “the Partnership has greatly contributed to peace building and tension control. This is what we noticed based on the conversations between different parties that used to be conflicted (men and women). The Partnership also had a role in solving several issues in collaboration with the social councils”.

The respondents from Souk Aljuma were also very positive about the role of the Partnerships, in terms of promoting peace and strengthening relationships between parties (such as Souk Aljuma and Tajoura). However, some of them mentioned that the initiatives in their areas were very limited and not enough to bring peace to their communities, given the large number of residents as well as IDPs.

The participants in a focus group discussion in Benghazi were less enthusiastic about the Partnership formed there, and reported that the Partnership was a failure and faced several challenges, including absence of venue and support. Respondents also noted that the Partnership was not very known, because of the lack of communication, and that therefore, people did not support it.

The respondents were also asked about what they think of international organisations and the level of trust that has been built. The interviews showed that there is still a lack of trust between community members and international organisations, for a variety of reasons, including the lack of knowledge about their existence and the objectives behind their work in Libya. In a focus group discussion, the participants mentioned that people were concerned about the interests and agendas of international organisations in Libya. One of the respondents from Souk Aljuma said: “The project has not contributed to increasing trust. The trust we have is only in the Partnership members because the community does not have sufficient information about the international organizations in general and PCI in particular. There are big concerns regarding the activity of international organizations in Libya, and most people are asking the following question: “What is the interest of the international community to work and support Libya?””

From the answers of the people interviewed in the six targeted locations, it seemed that the challenge of trust between them and the international organisations is mainly due to ignorance, because they have not been part of any of their activities and have not worked with them closely. Most respondents reported that they trusted PCI because they benefited from its activities, and they were aware of its work. They could also identify concrete results and effects of its projects on their communities. Therefore, they were able to trust PCI and accept to collaborate and work with its team.

It is worth repeating that these findings should be taken carefully, as the number of interviews is not representative of all Libyan citizens, and only helped to understand why some people in Libya still distrust international organisations. In order to conduct a strong analysis on the level of trust among citizens, a large public opinion survey would produce more credible findings.

---

4 PCI responded to this point: “PCI’s own data shows some quite favourable results on this. Did the evaluation dismiss this data out of hand because of the shortcomings in sampling?”
3.3 Impact

The project’s overall objective as described in the logframe was to reduce violent conflict in Libya. However, the logframe had several impact statements, which is not considered to be good practice, because a project should have one clear overall objective (impact statement) that the outcomes and outputs will logically contribute to. Moreover, the evaluation team observed that impact indicators were not defined at the overall objective level to better assess the level of realization of the theory of change.

Despite this, the evaluation found that the project contributed to reducing violence between communities and established an infrastructure for a political settlement to take over. It did so by supporting the creation of the partnerships to operate at local level and the PNB that is operating at the national level, by building capacity throughout Libya to engage in transformational approaches to conflict management, and by building trust between the local government and local communities.

The majority of respondents who were involved in the project in a direct or indirect way, confirmed that its activities influenced their communities at different levels. This happened both through capacity building they benefited from, or grants that helped them to develop and implement small initiatives, or through big initiatives and services implemented by the partnerships in coordination with municipalities (in some regions) such as “road, lightning streets, medical services...” which contributed to the intended outcomes and impact of the project.

Furthermore, the project documentation and reports showed that other international organisations such as UNDP adopted the SPLD partnerships as a consultative and conflict-sensitivity mechanism to implement its project on “Strengthening Local Capacities for Recovery and Resilience and Stabilization Facility for Libya”. The Partnerships have been conducting community consultations to agree on stabilisation priorities, conflict analyses and conflict sensitivity assessments, as well as acting as social accountability mechanisms for rehabilitation activities.

PCI’s promotion of conflict sensitivity, mainly through the bi-monthly CSA meetings, as well as through additional advice to embassies and project implementers, presented a strong added value to the international engagement in and on Libya. The portfolio-wide advice on conflict sensitivity presented an added value to other programmes, their management and the funding organisations behind them, as the implementation of a large number of projects in and on Libya relies on conflict analysis and conflict sensitivity advice, enabling a positive impact on a broader scale. PCI was reported by the respondents to be the most relevant actor currently providing that advice. The CSA events have been positively evaluated by many participants and are seen both as a networking event between donors and implementers (replacing de facto an absent formal coordination mechanism) as well as a knowledge hub for working in Libya. In addition to the CSA meetings, PCI regularly provided informal advice to donors and implementers on how to work (in a conflict-sensitive way) in Libya.

3.4 Efficiency

Efficiency was assessed both in terms of the timely delivery of planned activities and cost efficiency, or value-for-money, of the activities. The project is considered efficient, taking into consideration the number of activities that have been implemented and the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries reached in different regions of Libya.

The methodology followed by the project in order to reach several regions, proved to be very efficient. The training of Trainer-Mentors from each region enhanced the project’s ability to reach a larger number of people in limited time, as the Trainer-Mentors supported the creation of the
Partnerships in their own communities and regions. Each of them was responsible to operate in a limited area, which was more efficient.

According to the project documents and reports, all activities have been implemented according to the planned timeline and workplan, taking into consideration all the risks and political changes that the project witnessed during its implementation. In addition, interviewees did not express any concern about the efficiency or the financial management of PCI’s work. However, it is worth mentioning that the evaluation team received only the planned budget, and could not get the expenditure report in order to be able to do a detailed budget analysis, per activity.

In comparison to other entities operating in Libya, such as the UN, embassies as well as commercial implementers and non-profit organisations, PCI’s work is assessed as efficient, given the number of activities and initiatives implemented and the number of communities reached throughout the country during the lifetime of the project. Compared to the overall cost of insecurity, conflict, and armed confrontations in Libya, this type of intervention seems to be a defendable investment.

### 3.5 Sustainability

In general, Trainer-Mentors and the project beneficiaries demonstrated ownership of the developed capacities during project implementation. They also testified to an increased engagement and commitment to apply their learning and implement peace initiatives at local level, which is an achievement that will have a lasting effect. One of the Trainer-Mentors said, “I am working with different organisations, and created partnerships outside the PCI project but we always use their approach”. A teacher from Benghazi reported that he attended several workshops about conflict management and social peace, and currently, he is organising seminars and raising awareness activities about social peace targeting around 50 people per month in his community and school. Another respondent from Ajdabia and founder of “Leading Women” organisation said: “I was part of all activities delivered by PCI and the partnership in Ajdabia, and I have trained a group of female social workers on digital security. We helped many of them with problem in cooperation with the local security agencies. We also have addressed similar problems outside our municipality. The number of direct beneficiaries was around 200 people”.

However, the evaluation could not find evidence of the Partnerships’ sustainability, at least not in the targeted locations where the interviews have been conducted. Most of the respondents that are part of the Partnerships reported that, the Partnerships needed financial support to help them sustain their activities and increase their reach. In addition, the respondents reported that the Partnerships needed to work on their communication and media coverage, to raise awareness about their work and role among the community. One of the FGD participants in Benghazi said: “the Partnership is not very well known yet. There is no sufficient media coverage. There should be more media focus in order to shed light on the objectives of the project so that people will know more about it to gain their support”.

Regarding the PBN, the respondents stated that the organisation is still new, but that they have already been approached by some international organisations, with whom they share the same vision to work together, such as Interpeace. In addition, the network members reported that they are working on a sustainability plan, aiming to approach other international organisations and government institutions, although, the latter seem to be more challenging as the network does not want to be labelled as a supporter of one side or another. The network tries not to have any political affiliation for the moment, which could damage its reputation and neutrality.
According to the project reports and interviews conducted, 40% of the partnerships supported by PCI have sustainability plans in place to support their own development by raising funding through local businesses, municipal councils and international organisations. However, the interview results showed that these sustainability plans were still in the process of implementation and no partnership was financially sustainable yet.

More broadly, PCI leaves behind a legacy of improved conflict sensitivity and understanding of Libyan local dynamics. While it is difficult to quantify this, PCI has certainly spread a culture of conflict-sensitive thinking among donors, embassy staff and implementers. As staff rotation is high, a large number of people were exposed to the importance of conflict-sensitive approaches and on how to promote them and implement them in practice.

IV. Conclusions

PCI’s work in Libya is both timely and highly relevant to donors, stakeholders and targeted beneficiaries, particularly in the context of Libya. It responds to the urgent need of building peace and a more coherent and inclusive society.

Project effectiveness was evident in all targeted locations that were evaluated. The project contributed to building trust between community members and the local government/municipalities in most of the regions where the evaluation interviews were conducted, through the initiatives implemented by the Partnerships, and also thanks to the relationship developed between the Partnerships and the community members. The Partnerships acted as a mediator and had a key role in building this trust. However, they did not influence peoples’ perceptions of international organisations and their work in Libya, which continue to be met with suspicion.

One of the main factors contributing to development of trust between people and their local government and even international organisations, are the services they deliver, and the extent to which these services are satisfying the needs of the community. The level of transparency and communication about their work also contributes to shaping perceptions.

Generally, PCI’s work is considered efficient especially when taking into consideration the number of outputs and outcomes achieved, as well as the unstable context in which the project was implemented.

In terms of sustainability, the Trainer-Mentors showed an increasing ability to operate independently of PCI and took ownership of the programme. This represents a resource to support activities across Libya not only within this programme, but also for other international organisations who are benefitting from their expertise and presence on the ground to deliver trainings and other activities. At the same time, the Partnerships still need support in order to strengthen their capacity, sustainability and independence.

V. Recommendations

All evaluation respondents agreed that the main recommendation was to continue supporting the Partnerships and the network, by providing capacity building, increasing number of trainings delivered on conflict management and social peace, increasing the number of Trainer-Mentors, and increasing the amount of the grants, which would allow them to deliver more activities and reach more people.
Based on the findings and conclusions drawn from the evaluation, the following set of recommendations may provide further impetus for improving the process and affecting change in Libya:

- PCI should continue engaging with the Partnerships formed in different regions and locations, and provide support in order to build their capacities to be more effective, independent and sustainable.
- PCI should consider providing capacity building to Partnership members and municipal councils in terms of communications (strategic communication and use of different communication tools), to help them to reach and communicate better with their target audience, in order to develop mutual understanding and trust.
- PCI should continue building the capacities of TMs, as they proved to be efficient and have a crucial role in forming Partnerships and affecting their communities through their work.
- Donor coordination for the support to PCI should be increased. PCI could consider bringing together the three main donors and organise e.g. a participatory workshop, in order to present, discuss and develop the project, its logframe, its objectives and expected results. Donor’s expectations and priorities could be discussed in more detail and synergies and complementarities between the three funding sources could be increased.
- PCI should consider to conduct a (large-scale) survey to better understand the population’s perception of local government, the Partnerships work and initiatives and services they deliver, as well as of international organisations.
- The M&E system should also be strengthened to include better outcome formulations and indicators (a proposed formulation is added to this report as an annex), a monitoring plan and more systematic follow-up on grant activities, also after they have been closed.
- Staff capacity to conduct M&E should be increased and a culture of result-based thinking as well as recording achievements better should be promoted (the outcome mapping method could be used for documenting this, for example).
- For capturing the impact of the CSA work, PCI could design an online survey and regularly send a link (e.g. with Survey Monkey) to its email distribution list for the CSA work. This would allow to capture at least anecdotal evidence of the relevance and impact of the work, as well as to collect first-hand feedback and recommendations for refining the approach.
VI. Proposed survey methodology

6.1 General survey approach

For the last several years, PCI aimed to implement a quantitative measure of local perceptions as a means of monitoring the peacebuilding process. In this, PCI purposefully followed a ‘light-touch’ approach to gathering information about views inside its target communities so that this approach could eventually be handed over to the Partnerships themselves. The reasoning behind this is to make partnerships sustainable by involving members into this process and letting them have their hands on the pulse of the peacebuilding process. In previous programming phases, PCI identified a serious shortfall in available statistics or any other form of objective data that might inform the work of the partnership or act as an evidence base on which Partnership members might build their local peacebuilding strategies.

In order to keep the method sufficiently simple but ‘good enough’ to provide some form of feedback about their work, the methodology for this was kept relatively simple. ‘Weighted samples’ of 100 persons in each target community were asked four questions about their opinion towards local authorities, the international community and relations within local communities. This was carried out in initially ten communities (later in six communities) on a quarterly to biannual basis. Even though the longer-term idea was to hand this process over to Partnership members, data has so far been collected by PCI’s Project Officers (POs). The intention behind this was to track potential changes in local perceptions and thereby judge the impact of PCI activities in respective target communities.

As part of the present evaluation, CMC was asked to explore how the surveys were conducted, what challenges Project Officers faced, how the data was used, and the perceived value of the process to the Partnerships. Particularly, CMC was to examine the shortcomings of the previous survey approach and suggest survey methodology improvements for a future tool. Due to the lack of reliable official statistics or indicators which could be used to form a baseline measure, such a survey tool is especially useful and important.\(^5\)

During the training workshop in Tunis, CMC conducted a session with some of the Project Officers who were previously in charge of collecting survey data. In this, the POs uttered several points of concern and criticism. Even though they generally appreciated the basic idea of collecting data on the peacebuilding process to observe the impact of their own work, there was a sense that this adds an additional burden on top of their regular workload. To mitigate this time-consuming process, the data collection did often not receive any careful planning, or the necessary time for a thorough implementation. For example, instead of administering the questionnaire in-person and in a private setting, the questionnaire forms were often handed over to the respondents so these could fill them in themselves at home or during training workshops. Further, POs also perceived the survey process to be challenging because the questions would often confuse respondents or were not perceived as relevant by them. POs also expressed that they themselves did not comprehend why the four questions were asked in this particular way, and expressed their frustration that the results did not make much sense.

Based on these insights and the background information on the surveys provided by the PCI team, CMC identified the following shortcomings of the previous data collection approach:

- No random sampling methodology was followed – respondents were often chosen conveniently according to the pre-defined quota, e.g. from the PO’s social environment which does not depict a representative image of the general population.

\(^5\) We understand that PCI’s preferred tool constitutes a quantitative survey for now, but alternatively we would like to point out that the monitoring process could also be achieved through a series of key informant interviews, or a so-called ‘cohort study’.
• Interviews were not always administered face-to-face. By handing questionnaires to respondents to be completed at a later point of time, there was no control of the interview process or who answered the questions.
• POs were not trained on survey research techniques and thus lacked knowledge of the study intent and had no experience or training in sampling and interviewing techniques.

As agreed throughout the inception phase, the previous approach was not repeated for this evaluation but instead CMC is to suggest how this approach can be improved for a future monitoring tool. In the following, we will thus discuss the previous approach undertaken by PCI in more detail, will refer to the identified points of concern and criticism and explain how a future ‘light-touch’ community survey tool could be improved in a realistic way.

We agree that a survey constitutes a powerful tool to a) provide critical insight on local perceptions and public opinion, b) track changes and trends of specific indicators, and c) possibly estimate the impact of PCI activities. Even when accepting a fair degree of pragmatism, the reliability and validity of such survey results is however heavily dependent on careful planning, the use of rigid survey methodology, including a robust random sampling method, and the deployment of trained enumerators. This will be explored in the following.

6.2 Questionnaire development

As a first step, before thinking about the questionnaire or designing a specific survey methodology, we advise to clearly determine the precise aim of a future survey. In the present context we understand that PCI want to use this survey tool to monitor the peacebuilding process and thereby assess the impact of their activities.

It needs to be noted that when improving the methodology of the previous ‘light-touch’ survey this means that the future rounds of community surveys cannot be used to draw comparisons to previous ones as those were based on a different data collection approach. Instead, the next future survey wave to be conducted would constitute a new baseline measure. After this, the same survey could be repeated periodically to measure the change in performance indicators and assess how program activities could be improved. We would like to point out that in order to compare the different waves of surveys against each other it is paramount to use the same methodological approach each time, because otherwise any differences found might be an artefact.

Once a research focus is set and research questions have been developed, the key aspects of importance to be measured need to be operationalized, i.e. we have to devise measures of the concepts we are interested in. In developing central indicators for hard-to-observe concepts like social cohesion or satisfaction with local governance/peacebuilding efforts, we usually advise to rely on existing sources of question designs that have already been pre-tested and vetted.

The previous monitoring tool administered by PCI staff was based on a questionnaire that comprised the following four topics, each answered on a scale which ranged from 5=strongly agree to 1=strongly disagree:

1) Trust in local authorities
2) Believe that local authorities deliver
3) Believe that relations are good
4) Trust in the work of international community

These questions were designed in consultation with project officers and several other stakeholders from the project (5 TM and 3 members of the peacebuilders' network) at the project's inception meeting in June 2017. The questions are intended to relate to the mid-term objectives that the work of the partnerships should be contributing to and which are also sources of information for indicators for the project log-frame.
When generating a survey tool, we generally suggest to devote enough time and resources to the whole process. In designing and implementing rigid survey methodology, a huge bulk of the costs is usually stemming from preparatory and logistical activities like the training of field staff, careful sampling and travelling for fieldwork. Given this, we suggest to make the intended research output more worthwhile by capturing a wider variety of topics and extend the survey questionnaire by adding additional relevant questions, which could be used to verify some of the project performance indicators.

In designing a questionnaire, we also advise to draw on qualitative research findings or set up further discussions to identify key issues, develop questions, items and appropriate response options to tailor the questionnaire to the local context and make it relevant to the respondents. This is especially useful in light of the fact that project officers reported that some respondents felt that the survey questions were difficult to answer and not relevant to them. It is also generally advisable to include a mix of attitudinal questions on subjective perceptions with experiential questions and behavioural questions on concrete actions to be able to capture multiple dimensions of a complex issue.

When asking sensitive questions in difficult environments, one should further employ strategies such as placing sensitive questions at the end of the questionnaire, if possible, to ensure that interviewers build rapport with respondents before addressing sensitive topics. The questionnaire should further capture the respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics, such as age, gender, religion, ethnicity, education, which can be used to disaggregate data during the analysis stage.

Translation and Pre-Test
Once the English version of the questionnaire is designed and approved, it needs to be translated into Arabic. We generally recommend that this first translation should be blind back-translated into English by a different translator which can help to identify points of slippage and check the questions’ overtones after translation. Any discrepancies found should then be addressed and incorporated. In our experience, the thoroughness of this process is crucial to guarantee that respondents understand each question and the nuances of their wording exactly in the way we intended.

If time and budget allow, the questionnaire should additionally be pre-tested prior to interviewer training to check the questionnaire’s flow and sequencing, evaluate question comprehensibility, identify problems respondents may face in answering and generate constructive suggestions for eliminating such problems. For this, the questionnaire should be administered among a small number of respondents who are asked to think aloud and let them explain how they understand the questions. Based on the results, the questionnaire would be revised to make it more comprehensible if needed. This revision process is particularly important in light of the fact that the questionnaire would be administered over several survey waves and as such needs to reflect a high degree of reliability.

Administration of the Questionnaire
Face-to-face surveys may be administered in the two following ways - a) paper-based: the interviewer fills in a paper questionnaire, or b) electronically (CAPI): the questionnaire is first scripted in a computer software and then administered by the interviewer using an electronic devise, such as a tablet or smartphone.

In large-scale surveys we strive to conduct fieldwork using tablets wherever possible, as this enables us to use multiple measures of quality control to ensure that the interviews took place as required (in the right location, at an appropriate time, in an appropriate manner). In the present case where we have a very brief questionnaire that is administered by project officers or partnership members, the easiest and good-enough solution will however be to use a paper questionnaire and record the answers on the forms which are subsequently collected and entered into a data programme.
According to the feedback of project officers, in previous rounds the questionnaires have not always been administered face-to-face, but sometimes respondents completed the forms themselves at a later point of time. We need to point out that this is not ideal because this way there is no control who actually answers the questions and in case of understanding problems the interviewer cannot provide any help. Even if questions are pre-tested and kept as simple as possible, probing or aiding is important to assure that respondents can answer properly. We thus strongly recommend to assure that interviews for future surveys are conducted in-person.

6.3 Target Group, Sample Size, and Sampling Approach

Before thinking about how to roll out a survey, it is critical to define the exact target population to be studied which is the larger group whose perceptions are to be observed. While a nationwide perception survey in whole Libya could serve the aim to inform on the on a broader scope, we understand that the target communities where PCI is implementing their activities, will form the geographical areas of interest.

As project activities are expected to have an impact at the society at large within the respective geographic areas (and not only at direct beneficiaries), the common approach would be to define the general adult population in these communities as the target group of interest. Alternatively, it is also possible to narrow down the target group to specific subgroups within the communities or beneficiaries, which would however affect the sample design.

The ‘normal’ approach in measuring changes within a community across time would be to randomly draw independent samples of respondents for each wave to observe the overall trend across time in each community. Alternatively, PCI might also consider a so-called “panel study” where you are asking the same respondents multiple times across a time period of months or years. While this allows for observing the processes and changes in behaviour and opinion of particular individuals, it comes along with several methodological challenges. These are namely a) the conditioning of responses (‘panel bias’) inherent to this approach which might prove particularly strong in Libya where the idea of polling is traditionally not as common as in industrialised countries, and b) panel attrition would need to be considered (respondents dropping out between survey waves – therefore it takes additional time and effort to follow up with them). Even though panel studies yield more reliable results, we thus recommend to instead draw independent samples of respondents in each survey wave.

A brief note on measuring impact – this generally is a difficult task, because when observing changes within one community across time, this effect might very well have other reasons and cannot be necessarily be attributed to the impact of the intervention. One solution for this could be a ‘control group’, or in this case, a ‘control community’. This would mean, that the same surveys would be rolled out in non-target communities that are comparable in their demographics and conflict problematics. By isolating the effect of the intervention in such a way, its impact could be identified more unequivocally.

Sample Size and Margin of Error

The objective is to collect data from a sample that is large enough to produce precise and reliable inferences about the target population, but at the same time the sample should be cost-effective. For each community of interest, we ideally recommend a minimum sample size of at least n=300 respondents. If specifics subgroups are of interest, this requires a larger sample.

The previous rounds of PCI’s data collection included a sample of n=100 respondents in each of the respective target communities. We understand the desire for a simple and cost-effective approach but we have to point out that small sample sizes come with an increased likelihood of obtaining unreliable estimates: the smaller the sample, the more variation we will find in the variables of interest across survey waves inherently.
This fact is captured by the concept of the *margin of error* which is a measure for sampling error, quantifying the uncertainty about a survey. Smaller samples bring along a larger margin of error as they are less likely to yield results that are close to the true value of our target population. If we want to measure a change in perceptions across time, we thus have to bear in mind that small sample sizes are subject to larger fluctuations per se due to a larger margin of error. The concept of a margin of error is however only valid if rigid random sampling methodology is adhered to (see the description further below).

In this logic, the analysis of $n=100$ respondents that were previously sampled in each target community yields a relatively high margin of error of $\pm 9.80$ percentage points (at a confidence level of 95 percent; and, again, the margin of error is only valid when random sampling is applied). When sampling some $n=300$ interviews from one target community or area, this would allow us to increase the associated margin of error to $\pm 5.66$ percentage points. Assuming we repeat this exercise for five more target communities or areas, an analysis of the whole sample of $n=1,800$ would yield a margin of error of $\pm 2.31$ percentage points (but on the level of one single community it would still be as high as it was previously).\(^6\)

**Sampling Approach**

After defining the target population, the next step is to determine how to derive a representative sample of this group. Developing a rigid random sampling approach is key to achieving results that are representative of the population of interest. The method that has previously been used by PCI officers to collect monitoring data can be described as convenience quota sampling where POs recruited respondents who were accessible to them and at the same time fulfilled certain quotas, i.e. they were told to reach a quota of 50% female respondents and 30% youth, or occasionally target specific tribes or ethnicities. To reach these respondents, PCI’s project officers did not employ random selection techniques, but instead they chose persons who were convenient to reach, i.e. participants of the workshops or friends/relatives.

While this approach is useful in light of a tight budget or very limited timeframe, such a survey without random sampling will most likely not produce accurate or reliable results due to the great deal of researcher’s subjectivity in selecting the respondents. This constitutes a serious source of bias and unreliability, and unlike a random sample such a survey cannot be representative of the target population.

Applying a pure and rigid sampling approach requires a lot of effort and time. To be able to yet introduce a certain degree of randomness but still keep the whole sampling process in the POs’ or partnership members’ responsibility, we suggest to adapt the rigid sampling procedure that is normally used in the industry, in the following, very pragmatic way.

For this, we firstly need to clarify or determine the boundaries of each target community, ideally using GPS coordinates. The idea is to draw a number of random starting points within these boundaries of each target community.\(^7\) An interviewer then moves to the first selected sampling point, chooses a random direction and applies a simple random walk technique to select the targeted households (knocking on every 5th household’s door in urban areas, and every 3rd in rural areas). It is recommended to only conduct about 10 interviews from any given sampling point and then move to the next random starting point.

\(^6\) Please note the following – if PCI conducts several community surveys and would want to make a statement about the overall level among *all* communities, the communities would have to be weighted according to their population sizes because otherwise those with smaller population would be overrepresented in the overall value while those with larger population would be underrepresented.

\(^7\) If the GPS boundaries of a specific target community are known, random starting points can be generated using this free online tool: [http://www.geomidpoint.com/random/](http://www.geomidpoint.com/random/)
In each household only one male or female respondent aged 18 or above should be interviewed. He or she should also be selected randomly – either by listing all household members and picking the one who had birthday most lately, or through the Kish table method which is a method of randomly choosing the respondent to be surveyed among all eligible household members.

Ideally, no substitution of respondents within a household should be allowed; therefore, if the randomly selected individual refuses to participate in the survey, the interviewer will record this, and then move to the next household to randomly select a replacement. If the norm in the community is that the head of the household (i.e. the eldest male) should always speak, we find it useful to allow several household members to be present and contribute to the discussion but essentially record the answer of the target respondent.

6.4 Field team and training

In rolling out surveys in hard-to-reach environments like in Libya, the ideal situation is to have an experienced local fieldwork partner who is overseen by an international research agency. This way one can make sure fieldwork is approached with in-depth understanding of the country and best practices in rolling out a survey in the Libyan context and thereby adhere to accepted international standards for sound survey methodology. Also, the expenditure and effort associated with normally makes working with a local fieldwork partner preferable. In the present case of PCI’s desire for a ‘light-touch’ survey with the aim to incorporate the data collection process into project work, and engage POs or ideally partnership members as enumerators, we thus have to exercise a certain degree of pragmatism.

A word of caution: when collecting data that are to measure the progress and impact your own organisation has achieved, we would normally want to guarantee a certain degree of independency. When POs or partnership members collect these data, we find ourselves in a position that those who are responsible for achieving the intended outcomes on the ground, are the very same ones who are collecting proof if they actually did a get job in this. We understand that this process is intended to form a holistic and sustainable solution but nonetheless it needs to be kept in mind that there might be a conflict of interest.

When talking to POs during the workshop in Tunis we found that, even though they have good communication skills, they were not trained on interviewing or sampling techniques. Before rolling out a new series of surveys, we thus strongly recommend to organise a special survey fieldwork training beforehand. Even when working with a competent and experienced local field team, our experience tells us that a personal face-to-face training is absolutely crucial, and this is especially the case when working with non-survey-experienced enumerators. The overall objective of such a training is to ensure that interviewers are equipped to generate data that satisfy a minimum standard of quality.

The training session should cover sampling methodology, interviewing techniques and the interview situation, a questionnaire review, and conduct mock interviews. At the end of the training a pilot should be conducted where each interviewer completes two questionnaires in nearby neighbourhoods where the training sessions are held. This pilot is as much a test of interviewer capability as it is of the field ability of the questionnaire. If questionnaire content issues still emerge after this pilot, any necessary changes to the questionnaire should be incorporated before proceeding to field. It is also important to instruct field staff on the relevance of the project’s objectives and motivate and engage them by highlighting the importance of their roles. This is key to ensure they stay committed throughout the several survey waves.
The following is an example for a field staff training agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-11:00</td>
<td>Trainer introductions / presentation of agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation terms and conditions of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives, target population, survey sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation in the field (roles and responsibilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality control measures for data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-13:30</td>
<td>Questionnaire review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-14:30</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-16:30</td>
<td>Methodology for selecting households and respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-11:00</td>
<td>Methodology for selecting households and respondents (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-13:30</td>
<td>Best practices in interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-14:30</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-16:30</td>
<td>Questionnaire simulations and roleplay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-14:00</td>
<td>Pilot study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-15:30</td>
<td>Discussion and analysis of pilot study results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-17:00</td>
<td>Discussion of remaining topics/questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also assume that all field staff originate from the region where they are assigned to interview, so they are familiar with the customs and dialects and don’t inflict an ‘outsider’ bias into the data collection. Field staff should be a mix of men, women and different tribes or social groups to make sure female respondents can be interviewed by female interviewers.

### 6.5 Ethics and risk mitigation

When conducting research in a politically sensitive context or in surroundings shaped by fragility and conflict, the principal investigator has to commit to the safety and security of those involved in the research – whether staff or participants – extremely seriously. In conducting the community surveys, we therefor suggest to use a conflict-sensitive, Do No Harm approach in order to make a positive contribution and minimize any possible negative effect on conflict dynamics.

For example, before setting up a new round of surveys, a risk assessment should be conducted at the outset of commencing fieldwork to evaluate the potential risks and make any necessary adjustments to the project plan. This includes constantly monitoring the security situation in areas in which interviewing is taking place, or areas through which enumerators will be traveling. The interviewing team should be in constant communication with management staff, such that immediate action can be taken in these instances.

Any ethical and legal concerns about confidentiality should be addressed by collecting only anonymous data from research participants. In order for research to preserve a subject’s privacy or confidentiality, sufficient safeguards need to be taken to ensure against potential harms resulting from an invasion of privacy or a violation of confidentiality. These include ensuring that no personal details of respondents are collected or stored to avoid their linkage to opinion data. Before any interviewing, respondents will be made aware that their participation is subject to their own informed consent, which they may withdraw at any stage of the interviewing process. Furthermore, it will be made clear at the introduction of interviewing that their participation is completely
anonymous and that no identifying information about them will be gathered. Respondent contact information should be stored separately on paper sheets that cannot be linked with their opinion data.

Access
Prior to fieldwork commencing it is important to clarify if any permissions need to be obtained for the fieldwork. In our experience, this should only be necessary for larger scale commercial research and research touching on sensitive topics around security, but to be on the safe side, we recommend to approach relevant local authorities for this.

We also advise to confirm the accessibility of areas just prior to the start of fieldwork. If selected areas are logistically impossible to access (due to a demonstration, road block etc.) or unsafe for field teams (due to VEO activity or local fighting), fieldwork needs to be delayed until the situation clears up, or a secure replacement sampling point that is as near and similar as possible needs to be drawn. During fieldwork it is advisable to constantly monitor the security situation and retain a list of substitute sample points ready in case any security issues render certain sampled areas unreachable or unsafe.
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Instructions and questions for KIs
Evaluation PCI Libya
“Embedding social peace and conflict transformation”

**Objective of the evaluation/KIs:**

PCI is conducting an evaluation of its work in Libya in order to learn about the impact, performance, relevance, effectiveness and challenges it faced, and to identify key lessons that will lead to practical recommendations for future work. The evaluation will answer the questions:

- To what extent are the objectives of the project relevant to its stakeholders?
- To what extent have the results included in the project proposals been achieved?
- To what extent was the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- What has been the impact of the programme’s activities in specific communities in preventing, ending and managing violence?

**KII instructions:**

A total of 42 KIs will be conducted in six locations in Libya, where the project has been implemented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>KIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrata</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabha</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubari</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajdabiya</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benghazi</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The KIs are expected to be conducted during the period 19 February to 1 March 2019. The interviewees will be selected by CMC and PCI based on selection criteria such as gender, age, occupation and place of residence, and the involvement in the project.

The KIs will collect focused and specific details of how the project contributed to reducing violent conflict in the project targeted locations in Libya, whether the work was efficient and effective and what can be learn from previous experience for future engagement.

**Instructions for enumerators:**

Each KII should be conducted in a secure public or private meeting space. The KIs will be conducted by one interviewer and usually take between 30 and 60 minutes.

During the interview, the enumerator will:

- Introduce the KII and its purpose;
- Ask about each point (below) and open the door for the KI to put forward his/her views;
• Refrain from expressing his/her own opinion or express support or lack of support to any opinion;
• Demonstrate the required flexibility during the dialogue with keeping attention to not steer away of the specific objective of the KII;
• Let the key informant choose his/her own vocabulary.

Interviews will not be recorded, but the interviewer will take detailed notes. Following the interview, the notes will be typed in Arabic, translated in English and will be shared with CMC team for analysis.

Questionnaires

Introduction:
My name is xxx. I am currently conducting interviews for an evaluation of the work of Peaceful Change Initiative in Libya, the project called “Embedding social peace and conflict transformation”. The purpose is to learn about the impact of the project on the communities and its role in decreasing violent conflict, as well as to receive your recommendations how to improve the project implementation in the future. Your participation in this interview is appreciated and voluntary. If you choose to participate, your responses will be treated confidentially and we will not quote you personally in our report without your prior consent.

About the interview:
Please record the following information about the interview/focus group:

• Date:
• Time:
• Duration:
• Location (name/description):

About each participant:
Please record the following information about each KI:

• Age:
• Gender:
• Location:
• Education level:
• Profession/Occupation:

Questions:

1. How did you learn about this project and engage with its activities?

2. Are you part of a network, institution or CSO? If yes, can you give us more details about your organization’s work and example of activities?

3. What activities have you been involved in under this project? Can you describe these more precisely?

4. As a participant, why did you choose to be part of this project and how is this relevant for you/your work and organization? Which part of the project activities did you find most relevant for you?

5. What were your expectations from this project? Were they met? If yes, how and why? If not,
why not?

6. Were there female participants in the activity? How many (approximately)?

7. Did you develop and deliver any project/activity after your participation in the training/activity that has been organized by PCI? If yes, can you describe it more precisely?

8. Approximately how many beneficiaries/participants did you reach through these initiatives (directly and indirectly/men and women)?

9. In your opinion, did the establishment of social peace partnership (SPP) contribute to the peace process and decrease violent conflict in your community? How so? Please give examples.

10. How do you see this project's impact on your community? Examples?

11. Do you have any recommendation for PCI’s future engagement in promoting peace in Libya?
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Instructions and questions for Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)
Evaluation PCI Libya
“Embedding social peace and conflict transformation”

Evaluation objective:

PCI is conducting an evaluation of its work in Libya in order to learn about the impact, performance, relevance, effectiveness and challenges it faced, and to identify key lessons that will lead to practical recommendations for future work. The evaluation will answer the questions:

- To what extent are the objectives of the project relevant to its stakeholders?
- To what extent have the results included in the project proposals been achieved?
- To what extent was the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- What has been the impact of the programme’s activities in specific communities in preventing, ending and managing violence?

Instructions of the FGDs:

FGDs allow for multiple lines of inquiry and offer a safe environment where participants can share their views and perceptions, and interact with the group, allowing the facilitator to capture relevant information.

12 FGDs will be conducted with indirect beneficiaries of the project, in six locations, during the period 19 February to 10 March 2019. Participants will be selected by CMC and PCI, to ensure a good representative sample of participants. The criteria include, age, sex, place of residence, occupation and involvement in the project. The selection will be disaggregated by gender, i.e. one FGD will be male-only and the other FGD female-one. Target individuals will be familiar with project’s activities, but from different backgrounds, to gain insights into opinions of different people. Each focus group discussion will involve a group of six to eight participants. FGDs will be conducted in the following project locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>FGDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrata</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabha</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubari</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajdabiya</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benghazi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions for enumerators:

The FDGs are expected to last about 90-120 minutes and include between six to eight participants. Each FGD should be conducted in a secure public or private meeting space. The FDGs will be facilitated by one trained facilitator who leads the session, and one note taker who will take detailed notes of all discussions.

The role of the Facilitator is to:

- Introduce the FGD and its purpose;
- Trigger and moderate a discussion between participants;
- Ensure that no participant dominates the group too strongly and that everyone is allowed to and encouraged to speak;
- Prevent copy-cat answers by addressing issues to different participants;
- Document the discussion.

During the FGD, the Facilitator will:

- Ask about each point and open the door for participants to put forward their views;
- Motivate discussion by asking questions about each point that encourage participants to delve deeper into the debate;
- Guide the discussion away from the differences and encourage participants to listen and respect the other’s opinion;
- Refrain from expressing its own opinion or express support or lack of support to any opinion;
- Give space for everyone to participate;
- Demonstrate the required flexibility during the dialogue with keeping attention to not steer away of the specific objective of the FGD;
- Let the members of the group choose their own vocabulary;
- In case of strong contrary opinions within the group, try to discover the source of disagreement and the reasons for the difference;
- Summarize in the end the results of the group to see if he/she had understood what the group said;
- Manage the debate time.

The conclusion of the FGD is as important as the beginning, and it should highlight the importance of the information provided by the participants and thank them for their time and for sharing their opinions.

It is important to capture all responses and expressed opinions for the reporting and later analysis. A summary of the discussion should be developed including points of contention and agreement between the participants as well as description of the atmosphere in the meeting room during the discussion. It is not necessary for the FGD to be recorded, but the note taker should take detailed notes of the discussion and answers.
Questionnaire

Introduction:
My name is xxx. We are currently conducting interviews and focus group discussions for an evaluation of the work of Peaceful Change Initiative in Libya, for a project called “Embedding social peace and conflict transformation”. The purpose is to learn about the impact of the project on the communities and its role in decreasing violent conflict, as well as to receive your recommendations how to improve the project implementation in the future. Your participation in this focus group discussion is appreciated and voluntary. If you choose to participate, your responses will be treated confidentially and we will not quote you personally in our report without your prior consent.

About the interview:
Please record the following information about the interview/focus group:
- Date:
- Time:
- Duration:
- Location (name/description):

About each participant:
Please record the following information about each FGD participant:
- Age:
- Gender:
- Location:
- Education level:
- Profession/Occupation:

Questions for FGDs:
1. Do you know the project “Embedding social peace and conflict transformation”? How did you know about it? What do you know about it in detail?

2. Are you part of a network, institution or CSO? If yes, can you give us more details about your organization’s work and example of activities?

3. Have you benefited directly or indirectly from the activities of the program? If yes, can you describe them more accurately?

4. In your opinion, did the establishment of the SPP contribute to the peace process and reduce the violent conflict in your community? How? Please provide examples

5. Did the project contribute to building people’s trust in the international community and its work in Libya? How?

6. Did the project contribute to raising people’s trust in their local authorities and institutions? How?

7. Do you see any impact this program has on your community? Please provide examples.

8. How do you assess the impact of the program on Libyan society, precisely in your community?

9. Do you have any recommendation for PCI’s future engagement in promoting peace in Libya?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19/02/19</td>
<td>David True</td>
<td>UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Tunis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/03/19</td>
<td>Jonas Geith</td>
<td>Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Tunis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/19</td>
<td>Edouard Belloncle</td>
<td>European Union, Regional cooperation attaché – Maghreb / Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>Anthony Foreman</td>
<td>Senior adviser – Peacebuilding, Peaceful Change Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>Erika Atzori</td>
<td>Project Manager, Peaceful Change Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>