

Evaluation of Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) Research Support in Countries and Regions affected by Violent Conflict.

East Africa Case Study

Commissioned by the Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) program - International Development Research Centre (IDRC).



**Clotilde Gouley
Annina Mattsson**

April 2009

Channel Research is pleased to submit the East Africa case study report, presenting the findings of the field visit that took place in September 2008 in Kenya (Nairobi) and Uganda (Kampala and Moroto, Karamoja). This report is part of the evaluation of the Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) Research support in countries and regions affected by violent conflict, commissioned by the Peace, Conflict and Development Program of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

Please address all communications concerning this report to:

**Annina Mattsson
mattsson@channelresearch.com
45 route des Marnières
1380 Lasne – Belgium
Phone: +32 633 65 29
Fax: +32 2 633 30 92**

Table of contents

1	Background of the evaluation.....	2
1.1	Contextualized need for the evaluation	2
1.2	Intended users and uses	3
1.3	Objectives and evaluation questions	4
1.4	Values and principles guiding the evaluation process	4
2	Methodology	6
2.1	Case study approach	6
2.2	Sources and data collection method	7
2.3	Validity of the evidence and ethical considerations	8
3	Evaluation findings.....	9
3.1	On the Conflict(s) Context(s).....	9
3.2	On "What Happened" – The Partners and PCD's Intents and Achievements	13
3.3	On the "How" – Programming Modalities	21
3.4	Forward Thinking	27
4	Annexes	29
	Annex 1. List of Acronyms.....	29
	Annex 2. List of people interviewed	30
	Annex 3. Bibliography	33
	Annex 4. Maps of the area	34
	Annex 5. Terms of Reference.....	35
	Annex 6. Biography of the evaluator	44

1 Background of the evaluation

1.1 Contextualized need for the evaluation

Despite widespread research activities in conflict-affected areas around the world, there has been limited attention paid to the actual process, methods and challenges of conducting research in these contexts. There is substantial literature on research methods in general, but little addresses the ethical and methodological challenges of researching in societies experiencing violent conflict. However, researchers working in such circumstances often face significant difficulties to connect with the mainstream research community and do not receive support adapted to these specific contexts, in terms of research design and ethics.

For over a decade, through its Peace, Conflict and Development Program (PCD), IDRC has supported applied research and capacity-building on peace and conflict in Latin America and the Caribbean, in sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and South Asia, often with a view to advance global norms and learning on cross-regional analysis of peace and conflict processes.

IDRC works in partnership with institutes, universities, policymakers, civil society organizations, as well as networks of researchers. Recognizing the non-linearity of conflict, and the complexity of conflict situations and peace dynamics, IDRC aims to proactively impact these situations through its support to applied research and policy influence. PCD is a thematically focused research program that remains responsive to the priorities of southern partners and also seeks to develop south-south research programs and networks. The four broad thematic areas covered by PCD are the following:

- Democratic Processes in Governance and Peacebuilding;
- Political Economy of Peace and Conflict;
- Security and Insecurity;
- Violence, Trauma, Justice and Reconciliation.

IDRC is now preparing its Corporate Strategy and Program Framework 2010-2015.

For more than three decades, IDRC has provided significant support for research activities led by universities, research institutes, government departments and nongovernmental organizations (NGO) in **Kenya**. The Centre established its Regional Office for Eastern and Southern Africa in Nairobi in 1975. This is a key element in the process of identifying strategic areas of support in the host country in the past decades, and more recently during the democratic transition. Kenyan research partners have also led regional initiatives on issues relevant to many African countries. Early research focused primarily on agriculture, health, and education.

IDRC began to support research in **Sudan** in 1974. By the late 1980s, however, conditions for research had deteriorated as civil war pitted rebels in the south

against government forces. IDRC-supported activities in the country became sporadic, until the country emerged from this 21-year conflict with a comprehensive peace accord, signed in January 2005. While the government and southern rebels inched closer to peace, fighting broke out in 2003 in the western region, Darfur, between rebels seeking greater autonomy, Arab militia, and government troops.

IDRC has supported more than 100 activities in **Uganda** for more than three decades. Most of this research took place after the major period of violence and instability in the country, which lasted from 1971 to 1986. Much of it has been in the areas of health and agriculture.

Although the IDRC has been involved in East Africa for decades, **PCD** has only been involved in East Africa for the past 5 years. There is a Regional Office in Nairobi, Kenya, which administers the projects in this area.

1.2 Intended users and uses

According to IDRC's *Evaluation Guidelines*, "an evaluation user is one who has the 'willingness', 'authority', and 'ability' to put learnings from the evaluation process or evaluation findings to work in some way. The primary intended users are those particular individuals or groups who are affected by the outcome of the evaluation, are in a position to make decisions about the evaluation, and intend to use the evaluation process or findings to inform their decisions or actions."¹

The intended users of this evaluation are PCD program staff (primary intended users), IDRC senior management, IDRC program staff and PCD's partners (secondary users). The audience² of the evaluation also include other agencies/donors working in conflict contexts.

The evaluation seeks³ to improve PCD and other IDRC programming approaches (project and program identification and development, programming modalities, monitoring, reporting and evaluation.) in contexts of active conflict. Building on lessons learnt from previous and current programming experience, it also assesses how, when, and under what conditions, PCD could expand programming.

The evaluation also aims at increasing PCD partners' understanding of the value, utility and reach that research might have in contexts of conflict, as well as clarifying PCD and IDRC's role, and the expectations of what PCD and IDRC can and cannot do to support partners in conflict contexts.

¹ IDRC, "Identifying the Intended User(s) of an Evaluation", *Evaluation Guidelines*, p1.

² "It is important to distinguish between the intended audience and the user(s) of an evaluation. An audience is a group, whether or not they are the client(s), who will or should see and may react to an evaluation. The audience is interested in the evaluation but has a more passive relationship with it than the primary intended user(s)." *Ibid*.

³ For more details on the intended uses of the evaluation, see ToR here attached, p 345.

1.3 Objectives and evaluation questions

As stated in the revised Terms of Reference (ToR)⁴, the main objective of this evaluation is to identify the factors (conditions and programming modalities) that facilitate or hinder the research process for PCD-supported projects in countries and regions affected by violent conflict, and the advantages and disadvantages of PCD programming modalities in achieving PCD objectives in those conflict settings.

This evaluation is not an accountability evaluation, but should be considered as a **learning exercise**. Four specific objectives guide the evaluation which focuses on:

- 1) **The Conflict Context:** Get a better understanding of what conditions (security, research infrastructure, community of researchers, etc.) need to be in place, especially when a return to violence seems imminent, so that 1) PCD can feasibly support research and 2) partners can feasibly conduct research in line with PCD's program objectives. Each case study, here East Africa, outlines the actual conditions the researchers are working in and sheds light on lessons learnt.
- 2) **“What Happened” - the Partners’ and PCD’s Intents and Achievements:** Build a body of learning around the contributions PCD supported research can make in influencing policy, building research capacities, and increase domestic ownership of peace processes when taking into account the prevailing environmental conditions surrounding the research process and ethical considerations.
- 3) **The “How”- Programming Modalities:** Increase learning around the strengths and weaknesses of PCD programming modalities and its relationships to its research partners in contributing to the achievement of PCD objectives in countries and regions affected by violent conflict.
- 4) **Forward Thinking:** With a better understanding of prevailing conditions, challenges and opportunities surrounding PCD supported research as well as PCD's programming modalities: explore the implications (in terms of resources, security, institutional risks, policy influence, how we partner, etc.) of potential expansion of PCD programming into countries and regions affected by violent conflict.

1.4 Values and principles guiding the evaluation process

This evaluation is guided by the **internationally recognized standards** for evaluation quality, which include impartiality, independence, credibility, transparency and usefulness. The evaluation has been conducted under the standards of **ethics for social science research** (e.g guaranteeing the integrity of data or ensuring that there is no conflict of interest with the evaluator).

⁴ The ToR have been adjusted following the methodological workshop that was held in Ottawa on the 29th and 30th of April 2008 with IDRC staff and Channel Research team.

Given the complexity and high sensitivity of the conflict context, the evaluation has been conducted from a **conflict-sensitive approach**, at two different levels:

- First, attention has been paid to the *interaction between the evaluation process itself and the research process*, and/or the context: e.g the possibility of visiting communities involved in the research project has always been assessed together with the researchers, trusting their judgement on the negative unintended effects it could have on the research process itself.
- Secondly, the evaluation examines the *interaction of the research process with the context setting*, including policy influence, but also unintended negative and positive effects of the research process.

As stated in the guiding principles of IDRC's Evaluation Unit, the "*evaluation should be an asset for those being evaluated. Evaluation can impose a considerable time and resource burden on partner organizations (...)*"⁵. Whereas this evaluation does not aim to evaluate IDRC's partner organizations against results and is strictly orientated towards learning, the process required time from their staff and from the researchers. The evaluation team has taken this parameter into account when it has planned and conducted the field visit.

It is worth mentioning that some of the partners had not been properly informed on the purposes of the consultants' visit and that this led – in the beginning – to some confusion and even defensive attitudes from the researchers (who thought that the objective was to evaluate their research project with an accountability perspective). These were addressed and the quality of relations ensured that the team had full access to the information it required.

⁵ IDRC, Guiding Principles of IDRC's Evaluation Unit, http://www.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/12095810441Evaluation_Unit_Guiding_Principles.pdf

2 Methodology

2.1 Case study approach

According to Robert Yin (2003), “a case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident. In other words, you would use the case study method because you deliberately wanted to cover contextual conditions – believing that they might be highly pertinent to your phenomenon of study”⁶.

This report reflects the findings of the East Africa case study. Through a detailed contextual analysis of two IDRC funded research projects, this case study aims to understand what is achievable in contexts which are similar to the East Africa one. The selection of the projects for the East Africa case study has been made based on conversations with programme staff whilst in Ottawa as well as studying the project documentation. They both present a number of issues that are interesting to look at, in terms of possibly expanding IDRC investment in the region. The first project is being carried out through a Northern institute (Tufts University) which is not the usual model for IDRC. The second project is being carried out across 5 different countries (Somalia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and Sudan) in a large and very inhospitable area.

The selected projects are:

- **A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict (Phase I,II, III)**

Partner: Tufts University, (Phase I, II, III), Feinstein International Famine Center.

This is a 3 phase multi-year, regional and comparative study on the root causes and consequences of armed conflicts in Northern Uganda, Eastern Uganda and Southern Sudan. The first and second phases of this project were conducted from January 2005 to December 2007, and the third phase has been approved in March 2008 for a period of 2 years.

The *general objective* is to produce rigorous field based research to inform the policy and programming of the governments of Uganda and South Sudan, multilateral and bilateral organizations, governmental and non governmental agencies working in situations of armed conflict and post-conflict reconstruction in Uganda and Sudan. The study is intended to assist these bodies in their responsibility and efforts to protect civilian populations.

- **Comparative Research on Resolution of Pastoralist Conflicts in the East African Region: Case Studies from Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda.**

Partner: Development Policy Management Forum (DPMF), Addis Ababa/Nairobi.

⁶ Yin, Robert K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3rd ed., Applied social research methods series, vol.5, London: Sage Publications, p13..

DPMF is a regional Civil Society Organization (CSO) covering sub-Saharan African countries and with registered offices in Nairobi, Kenya and Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Since its inception in March 2005, DPMF has carried out activities that aim to deepen and institutionalize democratic governance in African countries. Comparative research is one of DPMF's five core activities, with the objective of enhancing the capacity of policymakers and civil society by generating for their use research-based information focusing on civil service and democratic governance, conflict and peacebuilding, regional integration and civil society and leadership⁷.

DPMF was awarded an IDRC grant in March 2005 to carry out a comparative study in five countries in East Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda). The *general objective* of this research project is to undertake an analysis of cross-border pastoralist conflicts in Eastern Africa, with a view to developing appropriate policies and strategies for coping with the challenges of conflict resolution and mitigation and contributing to sustainable development and peace building.

The evaluation examines whether the goals and objectives of the selected projects have been (or are) hampered or enhanced by the context in which they are being carried out. The case studies try to highlight commonalities and context-specific elements in the challenges faced by the researchers who conduct field work in conflict areas, and to what extent IDRC/PCD's modalities are adapted to these situations and provide the researchers with well-suited support.

2.2 Sources and data collection method

In order to prepare the field visit and to acquire background on the research projects, the consultants first gathered data through a **desk review of key documents**. These sources included IDRC's internal documents, reports, articles and papers sent by the research teams, as well as recent articles or UN agencies and NGO's reports on the East Africa conflict context.

During their field visit in Kenya and Uganda from the 08th to the 17th of September 2008, the consultants conducted several **in-depth personal and group interviews** with the researchers involved in the two selected research projects. The semi-structured interviews helped the consultants to gain insight on which challenges the researchers face in conflict-context such as Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda, how the researchers perceived the research-public policy articulation in those countries, what the research teams perceive as strengths and weaknesses of IDRC's modalities, and other key issues as defined in the ToR of this study. Phone interviews have also been conducted with the researchers that the consultants could not meet personally.

Direct observation of the researchers work has been possible in Karamoja (Tufts University project). The consultants had the opportunity to meet the respondents and participants to the research process, and gained a deeper understanding of context and the research conditions in this region. The time spent in Moroto also

⁷ DPMF, Program Focus, <http://www.dpmf.org/about-us.php>

allowed the consultants to go beyond formal interviews with the research team, allowing them to have informal discussions which shed light on a number of issues that we would have missed otherwise.

Due to time constraints, the consultants had to focus the field visit meetings with the research team, and could not interview many external stakeholders who could have also brought interesting conclusions, for instance on the use of the research findings, the risks to the informants or on the conditions of working in the regions where the research projects unfold. Nevertheless, the consultants met UN representatives in Kampala and Moroto (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - OCHA) who were well aware of the research process.

2.3 Validity of the evidence and ethical considerations

In order to ensure the validity and credibility of the findings, the consultants have applied a data triangulation method, commonly used for evaluation and qualitative research in social sciences. This is essentially a corroboration of key data through a second independent source.

Although it has been made clear that this study is primarily addressed to IDRC/PCD's staff in order to gather lessons learnt on their research-support modalities, the interviewed researchers expect feedback from this process.

3 Evaluation findings

3.1 On the Conflict(s) Context(s)

Objectives of this section, from the ToR: *Get a better understanding of what conditions (security, research capacity, institutional strength, ethical considerations etc.) need to be in place, especially when a return to violence seems imminent, so that 1) PCD can feasibly support research and 2) partners can feasibly conduct research in line with PCD's program objectives.*

As highlighted by Trish Silkin and Barbara Hendrie, "*the unique context of every internal war, and the institutional actors that converge around this context, create both the potential and the demand for particular kinds of information, especially when humanitarian programmes involving international donors are under way. De-contextualising research in war zones from the specific context in which it occurs, in order to derive general guidelines, can thus be problematic.*"⁸

3.1.1 Effects of conflict dynamics on the research processes

Eastern Africa has numerous **pastoral groups** contained in a broad geographical area that stretches from the Kenya-Somalia border northwards into Ethiopia, and to the northwest to encompass regions of Uganda, Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Central African Republic⁹. These regions have suffered large-scale intra-state wars that have supplied pastoral groups with modern weaponry, resulting in protracted conflicts with numerous neighbors. The Toposa of Southern Sudan for instance, have been at various times in conflict with one or a number of neighboring groups including the Turkana, Dassenach, Didinga, Dinka and some of the Karamojong sub-clans. African pastoral communities have become synonymous with high levels of armed violence (raids, counter-raids, disputes over land tenures and displacement, looting, etc) and severe under-development¹⁰.

As will be shown below in this report, the governments and military forces also contribute to the violence. For instance, many observers report rights abuses in the Karamoja disarmament program. The use of small arms in pastoral conflict has led policy-makers to focus on weapons as the primary source of violent conflict rather than as a symptom of some of the deeper social, political and economic factors. Consequently, state interventions have tended to focus primarily on disarmament, and have failed to adopt a holistic approach of demand-reduction, effective

⁸ Silkin, Trish, Hendrie, Barbara, 1997. "Research in War Zones of Eritrea and Northern Ethiopia, *Disasters*, Volume 21, Number 2, Blackwell Publishing, June 1997, pp. 166-176 (11).

⁹ The two latest countries are not covered by the research projects financed by IDRC and that we look at in this study. See annex 4, maps of the area.

¹⁰ UNDP, 2007. *Between a rock and hard place: armed violence in African Pastoral Communities*, p2.
http://www.undp.org/cpr/documents/armed_violence/AV_pastoral_communities.pdf

policing and comprehensive supply-side measures to stem the movement of weapons into these communities.

The different sides to the conflicts and the actors involved might therefore feel threatened by research findings that might expose their responsibility. Others welcome the research work as it opens new spaces for dialogue, allows them to express their concerns, build a collective memory, and contributes to draw the international attention to these regions.

Both research projects selected as case studies for the present analysis emphasize the **need for greater and deeper research** work in these regions, as well as a new focus of analysis including gender, comparative and regional perspectives. Governments and even international agencies have often isolated pastoralist groups from state-led development, violence reduction policies and peacebuilding activities. This can be "explained" by the fact that many pastoral communities function outside of the state administrative framework and that their lifestyle is seen as fundamentally incompatible with the state (e.g conflict mediation systems within pastoral communities)¹¹.

Unpredictability is one of the major challenges that researchers face in a conflict context. When peace talks between the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) started in July 2006, there was optimism that a conflict that has brought instability, poverty and a range of economic and social challenges in **northern Uganda** over the last two decades, would come to an end. As a result, some of the estimated 1.6 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) have started moving from long-term camps to transit camps closer to their place of origin. Some have fully returned to their homes, though movements are curtailed by the lack of public services, destroyed during the conflict.

Following a progressive start of peace talks in Juba, the concerns over the war in northern Uganda seemed to change from conflict management to post conflict reconstruction, reconciliation and healing of the affected communities. Unfortunately the peace process stalled and no peace deal has been reached. This has had an impact on the research agenda of research project on gender and generational analysis of armed conflict (Tufts University). Given the failure of the signing of the peace agreements in northern Uganda, they had to shift their approach for their work on traditional justice and gender issues.

In spite of the failure of the peace process, the **security situation in northern Uganda has improved** over the past year, enabling the researchers to access areas where they could not go before. On the other hand, the **return of the population from IDP** camps to their home constituted a new challenge for the team as it became more difficult to find the respondents.

¹¹ *Ibid*, p 2.

3.1.2 *Risks to the researchers and the research subjects in East Africa: from assessment to coping strategies*

The security conditions are highly context-specific, evolve and change rapidly. Regarding the impact that the security or political conditions have had on the research projects in East Africa, it is difficult to make general conclusions or describe general trends as they are highly volatile and depend on the local contexts. To minimize the **risks to the researchers**, the teams have used different strategies according to the situation. The role of local researchers is essential: they usually are the best source of information and provide sound judgment on the security situation and its evolution. Hiring armed police or army escorts to access remote and conflict-prone places is often necessary but has some implications on the research.

Karamoja is a region severely affected by a high level of insecurity due to gun trafficking, cattle rustling, looting and vehicle ambushes. Until recently, public servants and even some NGOs were unable to go to the area to monitor or implement their projects. The government disarmament process aims to stop inter-clan fighting amongst warriors and stop illegal gun trafficking, by collecting small arms that are fuelling violence in the region¹². Nevertheless, the Karamoja disarmament campaign has also triggered violence between the Karamojong (including warriors) and the Uganda People's Defence Forces (UPDF).

Many observers say that the disarmament campaign has led to human rights abuses by the army, including unlawful killings, torture and ill-treatment, arbitrary detention, theft and destruction of property¹³. In this context, using army armed escorts generates a climate of mistrust and does not allow the researchers to conduct their work in an appropriate manner. Therefore police escorts have been preferred.

Working in **South Sudan** also implies a number of risks, and the Tufts team has largely relied on the deep understanding and knowledge of the context of the team leader, a minority member from the region, fluent in Arabic and several dialects. When field visits became too dangerous, the researchers used alternative data sources data, such as information collected from community members when they came to town. As occurred in Somalia with the DPMF project, Tufts team tried to find alternative ways to disseminate their findings, and decided to limit their public briefings on the report in South Sudan. The reports have been shared through safe networks and private briefings.

In their proposal for the third phase of their project, the Tufts University team identified the **risks that the informants from the population** could run by participating in the research. Personal and collective security is already precarious in these situations, for instance in Karamoja, so the researchers need to take preventive measures to minimize the potential harms to the participating

¹² The Karamojong people are pastoralists – cattle herders often armed with AK-47s- who depend on their animals for meat and milk, and on their guns to protect them. The influx of weapons has made frequent cattle raids more deadly. Some parts of the region have become more peaceful, but in some others the disarmament operations have generated more violence.

¹³ Human Rights Watch, 2007. *Get the Gun: Human Rights Violations by Uganda's National Army in Law Enforcement Operations in Karamoja Region*.

population. The anonymity of informants, the "fully informed consent" from the informants and the confidentiality of data gathered are thumb rules when researching *on* and *in* conflict. The teams have been very cautious about recording data, not attributing quotes and not revealing sources in order to ensure the safety of their informants. They also used creative ways of disseminating information and research findings, as well as alternative mechanisms to depersonalize the information without putting their informants at risk: in the case of Tufts University research project in the Lira district in Northern Uganda, its NGO network served as a conduit for sensitive information dissemination, thus breaking the link, or rather making it impossible to establish or identify, between subjects' identity and the data.

Based on the interviews with the research teams and the analysis of their research proposal, we can confirm that they have assessed beforehand and are continuously assessing the risks, adjusting their methodology or activities. For instance, the Tufts team identified a series of ethical considerations and security risks, updated in the Phase 3 proposal including risks to informants for reporting rights violations from members of the Sudan People's Liberation Army/Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLA/SPLM) and the government of Uganda. One of their strategies to mitigate those risks is to talk about patterns in government abuse and not to attribute claims to only one ethnic/tribal group. A codification system of the information is also used to protect data.

Health risks should also be taken into consideration when working in remote areas in East Africa. For instance, researchers working in Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps in northern Uganda are exposed to greater health risks when visiting respondents. Those camps are characterized by poor living conditions and the lack of sanitation, and are subject to recurrent protracted cholera outbreaks and other health risks. It is worth noting that local researchers rarely have a health insurance or access to a health quality system.

3.2 On "What Happened" – The Partners and PCD's Intents and Achievements

Objectives of the section, from the ToR: *Build a body of learning around the ways in which PCD research partners adapt to the prevailing environmental conditions in conflict settings and address ethical considerations, and what contribution PCD-supported research can make in these conditions to influencing policy, building research capacities and increasing domestic ownership of peace processes.*

3.2.1 The Projects' Theory of Change

A *Theory of Change* describes the set of assumptions that explain both the intermediary steps that lead to the long term goal and the connections between program or research activities and outcomes that occur at each step. A Theory of Change describes the types of interventions or activities (in the case of research, e.g publications, advocacy, policy influence) that bring about the outcomes depicted in a change map. Each outcome is tied to an intervention, revealing the often complex web of activities that is required to bring about change. A Theory of Change also demonstrates the articulation of the assumptions that are used to explain the change process represented by the change framework. Assumptions explain both the connections between early, intermediate and long term outcomes and the expectations about how and why proposed activities will bring them about.

None of the research proposals present an **explicit** theory of change, clearly described and articulated around supported assumptions – neither is it a requirement from IDRC for proposal writing. Nevertheless, **fragmented and implicit** elements of theory of change are present in each proposal, such as the expected positive results that the research and its products are expected to generate. As required in IDRC guidelines for writing a project proposal¹⁴, each proposal presents a section on "results and dissemination". Expected results and impacts described in the project proposal are not explicitly articulated and linked to key assumptions that would explain the change process. They reflect expected **outputs** –here defined as the products which results from the completion of the research process, e.g publication–rather than **outcomes** –intended short-term and medium-term effects of the outputs.

3.2.2 Methodological and ethical challenges

In a conflict context such as in East Africa, the researchers need to go beyond the traditional **data collection methods** in social sciences and to develop creative and appropriate tools for socially and politically sensitive contexts characterized by a high degree of **insecurity** and **uncertainty**.

¹⁴ IDRC, Guidelines for Writing a Project Proposal, http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-57070-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html#appendices

a) Information gaps in conflict context

Both projects have adopted a **comparative approach** in their analysis of the pastoralist conflicts in East Africa and have emphasized the need to consider broad regional links among the conflicts. Both research projects in that sense provide humanitarian agencies, NGOs and governments with key information on a regional perspective. In addition, the research projects have drawn the attention of key stakeholders to areas which had been forgotten or where very few people or institutions had access.

For instance in Uganda, most of the research, social work, and international interventions focus on the Acholi region (northern Uganda). The Tufts research project insists on the need to conduct research in Karamoja which has long been isolated. Interviews with United Nations (UN) representatives (OCHA in Moroto and Kampala) confirm their high interest in the research findings and the high quality and relevance of the data gathered by the research team. Whereas there is a risk that in conflict-affected areas, research might only be driven by humanitarian agencies' needs, it is certainly a great achievement for the researchers that their findings are considered as primary and key information by those actors acting in the region.

Observing "*the lack of information on the systematic patterns and structural causes in these abuses*"¹⁵, Tufts University included in the phase III of its research project an additional component on disarmament and human rights abuses in Karamoja. The research team has indeed been among the few to provide in-depth and primary data on the negative effects of the forced disarmament in Karamoja. The research work can play an important role in assisting government officials, donors and programmatic agencies to understand these underlying issues and to respond more appropriately.

b) Overcoming suspicion and building trust relationships

Overcoming suspicion is a common challenge that researchers face in conflict settings. Suspicion and mistrust pose barriers both to the data gathering process and the capacity of policy influence. Both projects have used interesting methodologies and approaches to overcome mistrust of stakeholders and informants.

Involving key stakeholders from the onset of the research project was one of the options chosen by the research team of the Comparative Research on Resolution of Pastoralist Conflicts project. It certainly brings some positive results, but it also needs to be carefully handled in order not to raise false expectations about the research outcomes. The lead researcher, Professor Bujra, commented that given the complexity, extent (cross-border) and sensitivity of the research, they needed "*more than just researchers doing research*"¹⁶. He stressed the importance of gathering the perspectives of various actors, through involving civil society representatives, policy makers, members of the parliaments from the study areas,

¹⁵ Tufts University, 28/01/08. Research Proposal: A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict, Peace and Justice Processes, and Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration: Northern Uganda, eastern Uganda and South Sudan. Phase III.

¹⁶ Interview with DPMF team leader, Nairobi, Kenya

traditional leaders, elders and local groups in the research design and process. Therefore DPMF organized in April 2005 in Addis Ababa a participatory methodological workshop to which they invited all the previously mentioned stakeholders. After the five researchers presented their proposals and time plans for their specific region, discussions followed about the scope of the study, the project objectives and the methodological framework. The objective of this workshop was also to provide a forum for the stakeholders to comment and provide inputs on the research issues, methodology and scope. DPMF also held two other workshops (midway and at the end of the project, to which policy makers also attended. According to the researchers, these workshops have had positive effects in terms of their capacity for policy influence.

Overcoming suspicion and building trust is both an **ethical challenge** and a **time-consuming process**. Because it takes time to gain confidence, which researchers need to take into account in their methodological framework and work plan. It also means that to minimize institutional risks, IDRC needs to assess the partners' capacity to generate trust and confidence in a limited amount of time (e.g during a two-year project), and their ability to mobilize their social networks where the research unfolds. Both Tufts University and DPMF have shown this capacity, in addition to their deep understanding of the cultural and social environment of this region where they have worked for several years.

This aspect of trust building is missing in IDRC/PCD's criteria that serve as guidelines and issues to consider for program engagement in pre-conflict, conflict and post-conflict contexts¹⁷. Reference is made to the "*possibilities of research and/or researchers encouraging/strengthening the emergence of peacebuilding processes in actively violent contexts*"¹⁸, the "*research capacity*", the researchers' "*reasonable access to policy makers*" or the researchers' ability "*to access places relevant to the research for interviews*"¹⁹, but not specifically to the partners/researchers' capacity to mobilize their networks (and as demonstrated too in other conflict-affected areas – e.g Colombia – we believe it would help to minimize the institutional risks regarding the engagement with local partners).

The **role of the local researchers** in the Tufts University research project was essential to overcome mistrust from informants and stakeholders in the research areas. This aspect will be detailed in the section on the research team composition.

c) Researching on women in conflict zones

In spite of a growing interest in the role of women in conflict and peacebuilding activities in the last decades, there is still an important information and knowledge gap in many regions such as northern Uganda. Whereas the usefulness and relevance of researching these issues in East Africa is undeniable, the research process (Tufts University project) has also raised ethical and methodological concerns when working with female victims of human rights abuses or sexual

¹⁷ IDRC, 2004. Prospectus for the Peace, Conflict and Development Program Initiative for 2005-2010. Proposal submitted to the Board of Governors. Program and Partnership Branch. "Annex 1", p 47.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, p 51.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, p 47.

violence. The researchers sometimes faced negative reactions from the women they wanted to include in the research, but progressively gained their confidence, explaining the objective of the research. The feedbacks from the women seem to have been positive at the end, as they felt they had the opportunity to voice concerns that they could not express in other circumstances.

d) Social value of the research: an ethical imperative?

The short field visit does not allow us to draw strong and evidence-based conclusions on the benefits of these research projects for the population; neither is it the purpose of this study. Nonetheless, the question of the social value of research in conflict affected areas cannot be avoided when assessing donors' modalities (here IDRC) and the impact of conflict on the research process. This issue has been raised by the researchers who sometimes feel that IDRC focuses its interest on "policy-influence" and do not take enough in consideration the positive effects of the research on the research subjects, at the individual and collective levels. Nevertheless, IDRC/PCD staff highlighted the fact that their understanding of policy influence is not limited to a State-focused perspective but also takes into consideration the engagement at the local level (e.g with local leaders or opinion leaders who can contribute to policy development at the micro level.)

As observed in other case studies such as Colombia, the **social value of the research projects** financed by IDRC includes its contribution to creating new spaces of dialogue, allowing the participants to express their perceptions and building their individual and collective memory. This has been expressed in all the meetings we held with the communities affected by pastoralist conflicts that participated in Tufts University's research in Karamoja. This is why providing feedback on the research to the participants is so important, and should always be considered in the initial methodological framework. Indeed, most of the research subjects do not have access to the publications and some others are illiterate, so other creative forms of feedback need to be planned.

The possible "*fatigue*" of the population regarding their participation in interviews and workshops also constitutes a methodological and ethical challenge. In some areas, the population is continuously assailed for enquiries, and complains about the lack of tangible results. It is especially true for some groups such as the Turkana ("*favourite group of the donors*"²⁰), a pastoralist group mainly present in the arid lands of north-western Kenya (DPMF project). This issue has also been raised by the researchers on the Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict project (Tufts University)²¹ working in northern Uganda, in the Acholi region. "*What will be the benefit for us to respond to these questions?*" is a question that many researchers have heard in these areas where the humanitarian agencies, researchers, NGOs and many other international actors have done studies, assessments and research²². Managing the expectations is thus a serious ethical challenge that the researchers have faced.

²⁰ Interview with DPMF team member in Nairobi, Kenya

²¹ Interview with Tufts team member, Kampala, Uganda.

²² Not in Karamoja that has long been isolated.

3.2.3 Research team composition

There are numerous advantages, disadvantages, risks and opportunities of being an **"insider" or an "outsider" as a researcher** in conflict contexts. To what degree can an indigenous researcher study conflict in the region where he/she comes from without taking sides, without compromising his/her professional ethics, or without being perceived as biased, despite one's best intentions and precautions? What are the risks that an insider researcher exposes herself/himself to when working in a conflict settings or violent environment?²³

Especially in conflict settings, it appears that local researchers are best qualified for gathering hard data. The following qualities facilitate their access to first-hand information, primary resources and informants: proficiency in the local languages, knowledge and deep understanding of the socio-cultural and political contexts and access to individuals, grass root organizations or social networks. On the other hand, while local researchers may overly emphasize the uniqueness of the case they work on, outside researchers often focus on comparative perspectives (e.g Tufts University project).

Here is an example of the great added value of local researchers. The core research team of the project on regional gender and generational analysis of armed conflict is composed of a multidisciplinary and mixed team of *insiders* (local) and *outsiders* (northern researchers). The team leader for the Karamoja Cluster (Eastern Uganda, Western Kenya and Southern Sudan), Darlington Akabwai, based in Lodwar, Kenya, is a Senior Research associate in the Gender, Youth and Community program at the Feinstein International Famine Center at Tufts University. He is a former veterinarian, well-known and highly respected in the areas where the research takes place. Darlington has worked on community-based programs with pastoralist communities in Africa for over 25 years and is an expert on their indigenous knowledge and culture. His reputation as a peacemaker affords him great respect throughout the region. His role in the team has certainly contributed to the quality of the research process, including a deep and thorough data gathering process in a very sensitive environment. Together with the other local researchers also well respected by local institutional actors and population, the team managed to build trust relationships with the communities, allowing the research subjects to share their perceptions and knowledge of the conflicts.

During their field visit to the Karamoja region, the consultants have had the opportunity on repeated occasions to observe the trust relation established between the researchers and the research subjects. It is worth noting that the research team also strictly respects an implicit "code of conduct" while working in the communities and do meet the common ethical standards of conducting field social research (e.g not "buying" the information through providing food or goods to the visited communities).

The comparative research on resolution of pastoralist conflicts project involves five main researchers, each one being responsible for a specific geographical area.

²³ ROBINSON, Gillian, SCHNABEL, Albrecht and SMYTH, Marie, 1999. "Researching Violent Societies: Methodological and Ethical Challenges", *Work in Progress*, United Nations University, Vol 15, No.3, Summer 1999. pp 24-27.

Whereas involving local researchers strongly benefits in some cases the research process (and responds to the capacity building objective), it can in other cases have some counterproductive effects. Local researchers strongly linked to the research area might indeed encounter difficulties as they might be perceived, with or without reasons, as opponents or supporters of one side of the conflict. This situation has occurred in Ethiopia (DPMF project on pastoralist conflicts) with one of the researchers, who was identified by the Government as an activist defending the interests of one side of the conflict (belonging to the Oromo group as opposed to the Somali group). This researcher had to be replaced by another person.

3.2.4 Institutional and individual capacity building

In its 2007 prospectus, the IDRC states that one of its main goals is to ‘*build local capacity in developing countries to undertake research and create innovations, believing that people from developing countries must take the lead in producing and applying knowledge for the benefit of their own communities*’. It goes on to state that it believes that the expansion of local capability to ‘*generate, interpret and apply knowledge*’ contributes to the creation of a ‘*facilitating and enabling environment for economic growth, social progress, and greater human freedom*’²⁴. IDRC aims to do this mainly through supporting research projects developed and implemented by southern partner organisations – the main modus operandi for the Centre.

The issue of an inadequate capacity building component has been raised several times with the Tufts University team because the research project is not ran by a southern research partner as is traditionally the case with IDRC supported projects. There is therefore a concern that as Tufts has not found a partner institution in Uganda to work through but instead use non-traditional local Karamojong researchers such as a former veterinary and a local female radio personality, there cannot be a sustainable capacity building component.²⁵ However, while it is true that there is no institutional capacity building, the capacity building is, in fact, considerable on a personal and individual level, whereby a heightened self-awareness combined with a sense of empowerment arising from understanding the plight of one’s people and forming part of an effort to bring that plight to the external world, has had an immense impact on the individuals involved in the project. In addition, Tufts University has managed, through their research programme, to secure scholarships for 4 of its local researchers to study in the US to further develop their knowledge. There is therefore a definite capacity building aspect to the project that should not be ignored purely because the partnership composition is not the preferred one by the IDRC. These individuals whose capacity has been built may be able to link up to, and strengthen, local institutions and in that way take the work forward once the project is over.

IDRC has not raised the lack of a capacity building component in the DPMF led project which is ran by the southern research institute. However, the evaluation team would like to highlight that the comparative pastoralist conflict research project is carried out by 5 well established researchers, independent from each other and only linked to DPMF through the funding that comes from IDRC. Each

²⁴ IDRC Prospectus, p.2-1, February 2007

²⁵ Telephone interview with Tufts team member

of the researchers involved in the project was responsible for the writing of one chapter, defined by a geographical region, and only met the other researchers at the methodology workshop in the beginning of the research phase.²⁶ It is therefore not clear how this project a) builds the capacity of the institution as only the lead researcher is tied to DPMF, or b) builds more research capacity on the ground, as all the researchers involved were well established and tied to various established institutions such as the University of Nairobi. It is therefore worth noting that despite not being led by a southern institute, the Tufts project possibly both creates and develops more capacity on the ground than the traditionally composed DPMF project. While it is true that DPMF as an institution will stay on the ground after the project has ended and can continue research on the topic, it is also probable that the researchers from the Tufts project will be picked up by other projects in the region. Darlington Akabwe, for example, is involved in several initiatives at the same time with both NGOs and research institutes.

3.2.5 Dissemination of research findings: challenges and opportunities

The researchers on the Pastoralist Conflicts project (project led by DPMF) raised the issues of the **political sensitivity** of their research and its implications especially in Ethiopia where they had to deal with the Government and officials' suspicion *vis-à-vis* their research objectives. In some cases, the government might fear being exposed and thus will not be willing to cooperate with the researchers or worst, will pose barriers to the research process and the dissemination of the findings. Researchers also pointed out the attempts by all side of the conflict to influence the findings and outcomes of the research (e.g members of the Parliament or militaries involved in the pastoralist conflicts). Because of the political sensitiveness of the issues, it has been especially difficult to publish or disseminate research findings in Ethiopia²⁷. It was also challenging in Sudan where a border conflict occurs with Ethiopia over land issues, the State being involved in the conflict. According to the researchers, Kenya offered a less challenging settings ("*more openness*"²⁸).

The research team (DPMF project) has sent out its research findings through a series of **policy briefs** that aim to raise the awareness of governments and officials on key issues related to pastoralist conflicts. Nevertheless, they point out the need to reach a larger audience including the civil society ("*the government is very slow to react; the study needs to establish links with the civil society who works on the ground*"²⁹). The research team also published a book and IDRC agreed to fund an official presentation of the book to policy makers and representatives of the civil society from the five studied countries. The writing process took longer than expected (a full year) and the presentation project collapsed (IDRC could not support the project beyond the deadline). IDRC has been perceived, in this specific case, as lacking flexibility regarding the timeline³⁰.

²⁶ Telephone interview with DPMF team member

²⁷ IDRC Prospectus, p.2-1, February 2007

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Comments from the researchers.

³⁰ See the section 3.3 On the "How" – Programming Modalities p 21.

It has been mentioned many times in the interviews that IDRC's demands in terms of **policy influence** are not always realistic and adjusted to the reality of the context. What the researchers especially point out is that the conception of "policy influence" could be broadened so as to include positive outcomes such as the creation of new spaces or forums for dialogue (which in the long run contribute to influence policy – this could be demonstrated in a theory of change in the research proposals). It is always difficult to establish clear links between the research and its potential impacts (question of attribution), but what can be observed for both project is a growing partnership with humanitarian agencies working in these areas (e.g United States Agency for International Development (USAID), United Nations (UN) agencies and Non Governmental Organisations (NGO) such as Oxfam). The researchers from the DPMF project participated in many events related to pastoralist conflicts. They have observed that there is a growing concern about these issues and that the cross-border perspective has given increased attention (the research stresses this aspect).The research findings and their dissemination certainly contribute to it, but the extent of the impact is hard to assess.

3.3 On the "How" – Programming Modalities

Objectives of this section, from the ToR: Increase learning around the strengths and weaknesses of PCD programming modalities and its relationships to its research partners in contributing to the achievement of PCD objectives in countries and regions affected by violent conflict.

3.3.1 PCD Criteria of Involvement

Conducting research in the various conflict contexts that comprise East Africa is not easy. There are many aspects that need to be considered when planning research in the area. The PCD criteria for involvement³¹ aim to do precisely this.

It is fair to say that neither of the PDC-supported research programmes covered by this study score high on the evaluation criteria for PCD engagement. They were nonetheless selected and have been carried out successfully, and, in at least one of the cases, with significant impact. This begs the question whether these criteria, are in fact, relevant or applicable to all contexts.

In the case of Gender and Generational Analysis of Conflict project carried out in Karamoja, Northern Uganda and Southern Sudan (Tufts University), it does not score well on any of the criteria considered. There is little research capacity in any of the above mentioned regions, let alone research institutes to support. Academics and researchers are still viewed with varying degrees of suspicion in Uganda and despite there being freedom of speech, local institutions can come under considerable pressure from the government for disseminating sensitive information regarding the various conflicts in the three regions covered by the research programme. Finally, the actual physical conduct of the research in the three regions can put the researchers in considerable danger due to the constant instability, despite peace agreements in Northern Uganda and Southern Sudan, and the Government disarmament programme in Karamoja that is supposed to make the area safer but is actually achieving the opposite³².

However, the programming modality for this project differs from IDRC's usual policy of supporting southern institutes directly. In this case, the Feinstein International Centre at Tufts University is managing the project and they have hired local researchers on the ground to carry out most of the field research. They have partnered with one local organisation which is not a research institute per se, but more of an NGO. This is an approach that IDRC seems to be somewhat uncomfortable with as it is felt that the aspect of building local capacity is absent from the project. However, according to the project team leader, there simply is not enough capacity in local institutions to even start building on. This is why capacity building in places such as Uganda, and specifically in the North and the East of the country, has to start on an individual level.

³¹ IDRC, 2004. Prospectus for the Peace, Conflict and Development Program Initiative for 2005-2010. Proposal submitted to the Board of Governors. Program and Partnership Branch. "Annex 1", p 47.

³² For details, see the previous sections on the conflict context.

While it is understandable from IDRC's perspective that an institutional link be created in order to have a more long-term impact, it is however doubtful that it would be possible to conduct a traditional research project in a pastoralist setting like Karamoja where a large part of the research is being carried out. The field visit showed that it is impossible to get out to a kraal (enclosed area for cattle away from the village) or even a manyata (village) without being accompanied by people who know the Karamojong and their customs very well and who are accepted and respected by them. It is doubtful that this position could be filled by someone from Kampala or from the university. Within the country, elite researchers do not have the perspective of the war-affected community.³³ The choice of using a local Karamojong 'elder', a Teso veterinary who has vaccinated cattle for pastoralists in Kenya, Uganda, Sudan and Ethiopia for decades while combining veterinary science with peacebuilding, and a well respected Karamojong woman as local researchers has therefore been crucial for the success of the research project. Without them, access and openness of the target population could not have been achieved.

On the other hand, without the presence of Tufts University it would have been impossible to produce publishable texts. Whereas the local researchers provide the content and the knowledge for the reports, the colleagues at Tufts assist in writing a research paper. It is worth mentioning that the local researchers' role is not restricted to mere informants, but they are fully integrated in the research team as respected researchers.

The staff involved in the project at Tufts insist that they are not leading the project but act as an intrinsic part of the project providing a bridge for a more extensive voice, dissemination, media coverage, and reach. For example, the two lead researchers at Tufts carry out a considerable amount of the debriefing and dissemination of the findings, as a debriefing by locals in Uganda where the project is centered is unfortunately taken with less weight. Another important aspect of this relationship is that Tufts can disseminate and report on sensitive issues, without having to worry about backlash and persecution by whatever forces that might not have an interest in particular information being disseminated. Local researchers and small institutions would not have any protection were they to come under fire for reporting on highly sensitive topics.

Therefore, in addition to the fact that there is very little local capacity in the shape of research institutes in Uganda, especially with in depth knowledge of the Karamoja cluster, there is, in the opinion of the lead researchers at Tufts, no independent institution that would have a strong enough structure and network to sustain the possible inconveniences and even dangers that publishing on certain issues could pose. It is their opinion therefore that it would not be feasible for a local institute to take lead on several aspects of the project.

It is worth noting that, in addition to its 'criteria for involvement', IDRC carries out an institutional risk rating for its partners. If a partner is rated as a "high risk institution", it has to provide IDRC with a financial and technical report every six months, whereas if it is rated as a "medium or low risk institution" it will only have to provide these reports annually. In the case of Development Policy

³³ Telephone interview with Tufts team member

Management Forum and Tufts University, they were both rated as medium and low risk respectively.³⁴

3.3.2 *PCD Programming Approach*

While IDRC support was seen as crucial to be able to carry out ‘pure’ research on conflict related issues and irreplaceable in terms of enabling cross-border research programmes such as both of the programmes covered by this case study, some of its administrative procedures have placed some of the project staff in difficult positions. It is important to note here that both of the programmes covered by this review are being administered from the East Africa Regional Office in Nairobi.

One issue that was raised regarded the third phase of the Gender and Generational Violence project. The grant only came through ten months after the project was originally supposed to start. This was apparently because PCD had decided to move the project to the next funding cycle because of a delay in submitting the technical report and in signing the contract by Tufts University. However, the reason for this had not been fully understood by the project staff and to them it seemed as if the decision to delay the funding was done without prior warning. In practice this meant that the local researchers who rely on the project salary were unexpectedly left without income for 10 months, which led to the project almost losing them to other research teams, as they could not afford to be ‘on hold’ until further notice. This situation led to Tufts agreeing to pay for the salaries for 10 months until the IDRC funding came through.³⁵

The Pastoralist Conflict research programme led by the DPMF in Nairobi also faced difficulties due to delays because of the research process taking longer than originally planned. Although an extension was first agreed on, a further extension, crucial for the projects completions, was then denied. IDRC had agreed to fund 5 presentations in all the 4 countries covered by the research (Ethiopia, Sudan, Kenya, Uganda) but the timeline was very strict. The book, which was the final product of the research project, was only published one year after the final report and by then the IDRC timeline had passed and there was no other opportunity to disseminate through workshops. According to the researchers this had a severe effect on the potential impact of the research as it now seems inconclusive. This also hampered the credibility of the DPMF and the individual researchers. ‘Policy influence’ was here, in their view, constrained by the lack of flexibility of the IDRC. However, IDRC noted that as DPMF had not included this component in their original proposal and the funds were going to be sought and added but as the book project took too long, it would have been difficult to include this component on an already finalized grant. Therefore, while local realities are important it is also important to note that it is difficult to change grants. An adjustment to local reality is necessary if IDRC wants its programmes to have an effect on policy. Although the researchers agreed that one piece of research cannot be traced to a specific policy change, they emphasised that it can have an influence if publicised at the right moment and in the right fora.

³⁴ Interview with IDRC Nairobi staff

³⁵ Telephone interview with Tufts team member,

IDRC staff at the Nairobi office told us that Program Officers can approve extensions up to 6 months but beyond that timeline, extensions have to be approved by the Programme Area Responsible and there must be a well justified reason. Researchers for both projects stressed that access to conflict areas is very difficult and that there is nothing in IDRC programming approaches that takes into account delays for instance due to rainy season when you cannot get anywhere due to the bad condition of the roads, or periods of heightened conflict during which people are more suspicious and normally refuse to meet. These are conditions that can change unexpectedly from one day to another and cannot be foreseen in the planning phase of the project. To illustrate this further, the evaluation team was supposed to be met by the main local researcher for the Gender and Generational Violence project upon arrival to Moroto, but he was delayed by more than a day due to the bad conditions of the roads after heavy rainfall.

Additional issues that were raised regard the administrative procedures. Researchers for the Pastoralist Conflict project stressed that the budget requirements are not always possible to follow as getting receipts of everything spent while in the 'bush' is very difficult. For example, security will often have to be hired in the form of local police or local tribes-men. Receipts for this can seldom be produced, yet, it is a very necessary expense of the project.³⁶ Partners would therefore sometimes hope that budget lines could be more accommodating as there will be a lot of necessary expenses that will not be official. This is, however, not likely to occur. While IDRC recognises the difficulty producing a thorough paper trail sometimes presents for the local researchers, it is a publicly funded institution that must maintain a level of accountability that is rigorous.³⁷

Finally, the issue of salaries for the researchers was raised by researchers on both projects. Good payment of researchers is key to the success of the project otherwise there is a brain-drain to other programmes and no loyalty to the research project. The local researchers do not have the luxury to choose the most interesting project to work on as money will be their key concern. In addition, the researchers risk their lives in some instances to get the information required as carrying out research in these areas is risky in itself due to the unpredictability of the conflicts. Security cannot be guaranteed and IDRC does not offer the possibility to be covered by insurance.³⁸ In addition, extracting valuable information must be preceded with trust building which in turn takes a lot of time spent in the field talking to people, especially in conflict ridden communities. One of the researchers felt that the allocation for field expenditures was not adequate and should be viewed in this light. It is therefore the opinion of some of the researchers that the salary allocations and field research allocations set by IDRC for projects in the region should be revised.

3.3.3 Responsiveness of IDRC staff

There were two opposite views regarding the involvement and responsiveness of IDRC staff both in terms of what is expected of them and in terms of actual behaviour. The team from Tufts University was originally reporting to the Ottawa

³⁶ Group interview at DPMF Offices, Nairobi

³⁷ IDRC staff comment

³⁸ Interview with Gender and Generational Violence team member, Kampala

office until they were placed under the responsibility of the East Africa Regional Office in Nairobi. Whereas in the past IDRC staff worked very closely with the project team, facilitating debriefings and offering a lot of strategic support both on a conceptual and technical level, it was felt that since being delegated to Nairobi there has been a huge disconnect. One of the research team members noted that *'since the programme has moved out of Canada to be under the Nairobi office, there has been no other communication apart from comments regarding budgets. There has never even been a confirmation of receipt of a report'*³⁹. The researchers felt that there was no acknowledgement of important work done, as they never received a single comment on any of the reports. There is no doubt that it has not been easy for the Nairobi office to take over a project so complex at the third phase, and that this late hand-over has had an impact on the relation to the project. While the regional office staff might not be fully aware of the way the project was managed from Ottawa, the Tufts project staff would have been used to the Ottawa way and grudgingly accept a different approach or relationship.

There have, however, been enquiries as to the chosen dissemination approach and focus by the Tufts University members of the team. The focus on lobbying in Washington has been repeatedly questioned and there has been a push by the Nairobi office for local debriefings with local governments in Uganda. However, all the team members, especially those based in East Africa, reiterated that this can potentially be very dangerous for the team – an issue they feel that the staff at the Nairobi office seem unaware of. It was felt that this is why someone at the office should be reading the reports and know the full background of the work they do in order to fully understand the context and in order to be able to ask questions about the content.⁴⁰ The regional office in Nairobi notes that they are very aware of what is possible and not possible on the ground in East Africa and that dissemination in other projects has been carried out, for example in Uganda and Eastern DRC. The Tuft's team was offered to come and disseminate in Nairobi to address this concern over security but this was not seen as useful by the team. The team notes that this project could have had a deeper impact if the dissemination strategy can be agreed upon by both Tuft's and IDRC.

These kinds of misunderstandings or clarifications could be avoided if IDRC would organise debriefings at the Nairobi office, as a rule, at the end of each funding phase but this is currently not the practice, perhaps due to unavailability of resources. However, it was mentioned that the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), who fund part of the work Tufts University is carrying out in Uganda, make time for debriefings and every other donor has always had intense interest in the findings because of the very sensitive and possibly groundbreaking topic. According to the members of the Tufts' team, IDRC is currently the least engaged partner they have.⁴¹ Nevertheless, IDRC/PCD staff specified that the lack of

³⁹ Telephone interview with Gender and Generational Violence team leader. However, the IDRC commented that *'Since the commencement of the 3rd phase, no report has been received at the regional office. It should also be noted that the Regional Director and PO have asked the lead researcher on several occasion to come and disseminated their findings in Nairobi. This has never happened. During this phase the research team were expected in Ottawa for a debriefing session, a mutual agreement on when this would take place could not be reached. This was supposed to have happened last year but it has not happened'*.

⁴⁰ Interview with the Karamoja team local consultants

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

information from the regional office should be seen in the light of the administrative transition, since the second phase of the project has been managed from Ottawa. IDRC/PCD staff also stressed the fact that they have always encouraged Tufts University to disseminate their findings in the region, but with limited success.

Whereas the Tufts' team felt that they would welcome comments by IDRC on the content and approach of the reports and the research process and generally a more engaged and interested approach, the researchers on the Pastoralist conflict project did not feel this need at all. They view IDRC as a donor and do not expect them to comment on the report as it was understood that IDRC staff were not researchers but mainly administrative personnel. If they wanted constructive commentary on the report and the findings, they would have the final text peer-reviewed.⁴² Nevertheless, a better understanding of the context in which the research was being carried out was expected and therefore more flexibility with time-lines would have been desired. This could possibly have been achieved with better communication between research and IDRC staff.

The most striking absence of involvement to the evaluation team seems the complete lack of an attempt to network and provide a platform to disseminate the findings of the research by IDRC in the case of the two projects covered by this review. IDRC has leverage and could act as a mediator or help with dissemination as it has done, for example, with some of the research findings in Palestine or Colombia. Moreover, it is a shame that the two projects, touching on such similar issues (pastoralist conflicts) and conducted in many of the same areas (Karamoja, Northern Uganda, Southern Sudan) partly during the same time were not linked up. It seems obvious that both the research teams would have benefited immensely from meeting with the researchers from the other project and sharing their experiences, yet they did not even know of the existence of the other research project until informed about them by the evaluation team. This seems as a true opportunity lost in terms of possible future policy influence due to shared networks as well as capacity building through linking researchers in the region to each other and other institutions.

The IDRC Nairobi Office has explained that there are no funds available for either networking of dissemination activities beyond those allocated in the project budget.

⁴² Group interview at DPMF offices, Nairobi

3.4 Forward Thinking

3.4.1 PCD Programming modalities

IDRC has chosen as its modality to support research projects designed and proposed by developing country institutions. It is stated that northern institutions qualify for support if they are collaborating with one or more partners in the south. However, as has been seen in the Tufts University project on Gender and Generational Analysis of Conflict, an 'institution-to-institution' partnership is not always possible, and perhaps not always even desirable. In this case, the composition of the research team which is a mix of traditional and non-traditional researchers from the north and the south, but led by a northern institution has been a key factor in the successful implementation of the project. It has also built local capacity in a unique way which is that of providing tools to local project staff to view not only themselves, but also their own people in an entirely new light. It is this type of realization of one self and the auto-analysis that that might follow, which allows local people to take the lead to bring about change in their communities. Therefore, the modality applied in the Tufts University project does not contradict IDRC's view of capacity building as stated. On the contrary it is immensely valuable in planting the seed of research capacity in regions where it might be non-existent and definitely worth exploring in other conflict settings that IDRC is considering programming in.

Expanding this form of partnership will possibly allow for IDRC to program in areas previously considered not to be appropriate due to limited capacity on the ground or an openly hostile environment for academics and researchers. However, this might require a different set of criteria of involvement, mainly related to the northern institution. Tufts University is well aware of the possible imbalance in the relationship between the leading northern institute and the southern researchers and tries very hard to keep the balance in the team as equals at all times. Nevertheless, it is a very efficient way of empowering and building new capacity in the absence of existing institutions, as well as an alternative to further consolidate elite capacity already present in a country.

3.4.2 Opportunities

As in both Palestine and Colombia, linking the different research projects that focus on the same theme could be extremely enriching to PCD programming and to the researchers involved. Not to link up the two research projects seems to be a missed opportunity in expanding local research networks and especially in creating a space for the exchange of ideas regarding research on conflict related issues. By creating a space to do so, IDRC could possibly enhance the extent of both capacity building and policy influence of its programming and develop a more sustainable and empowered research base in regions engulfed in active conflicts.

Moreover, there are certain thematic focuses that repeat themselves in many conflict countries, such as DDR, gender and conflict, child soldiers, and the relationship between the formal and informal justice system. By linking up PCD research projects in different countries that deal with the same topics, not only

does it allow for a comparative approach but it also allows the researchers to share and compare experiences of working in different conflict contexts and potentially present them with new ways of tackling a specific issue, taking example from another setting.

Incorporating this approach systematically into IDRC programming obviously has budgetary implications as these research projects are carried out in different countries. However, meetings between the different research teams could be combined with de-briefings on project progress to IDRC, or joint disseminations of findings to a relevant audience, organised by IDRC.

4 Annexes

Annex 1. List of Acronyms

CPA	Concerned Parents Association
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DDR	Demobilization, Disarmament and Reintegration
DPMF	Development Policy Management Forum
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PCD	Peace, Conflict and Development Program
SPLA/SPLM	Sudan People's Liberation Army/Sudan People's Liberation Movement
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UPDF	Uganda People's Defence Forces
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Annex 2. List of people interviewed

Date and place of interview	Name	Position	Research Project (if relevant)	Institution
09/09/08, Nairobi, Kenya (DPMF)	Francis K. Wairagu Professor Addala Bujra	- Director DPMF	Comparative Research on Resolution of Pastoralist Conflicts in the East African Region: Case Studies from Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda (DPMF).	Regional Centre on Small Arms DPMF
09/09/08, Nairobi, Kenya	Rosemary Ngigi	Grants Manager	-	IDRC East Africa Regional Office
11/09/08, Kampala, Uganda	Teddy Atim	Researcher, based in Lira, Uganda	A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict (Tufts University)	
08/10/08, phone interview	Khristopher Carlson	Researcher based in Boston	A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict (Tufts University)	Tufts University
12 th to the 17 th in Moroto, Karamoja, Uganda	Darlington Akabwai	Lead researcher based in Lodwar, Kenya	A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict (Tufts University)	Tufts University
	Joyce Ilukori	Researcher	A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict (Tufts University)	
	Joshua Kideon	Researcher	A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict (Tufts University)	

Date and place of interview	Name	Position	Research Project (if relevant)	Institution
13/09/08, Moroto, Uganda	Andrew Martin	Head of Office	-	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Moroto, Uganda
03/09/08 and 14/10/08, phone interviews	Dyan Mazurana	Researcher (Boston)	A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict (Tufts University)	Tufts University
23/10/08, phone interview	Elizabeth Stites	Researcher (Boston)	A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict (Tufts University)	Tufts University
29/09/08, phone interview	Peter Otim	Researcher (Addis Ababa)	Comparative Research on Resolution of Pastoralist Conflicts in the East African Region: Case Studies from Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda (DPMF).	Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism – CEWARN, based in Addis Ababa
15/10/08, phone interview	Clements Ochan	Researcher (Boston)	A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict (Tufts University)	Tufts University
Kampala, Uganda, 17/09/08	Timm Pitt	Head of Office	-	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Uganda, Kampala
Kampala, Uganda, 17/09/08	Kirsten Knutson	Public Information and Donor Liaison Officer	-	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Uganda, Kampala

Date and place of interview	Name	Position	Research Project (if relevant)	Institution
	Njeri Karuru	Senior Program Officer		IDRC

Annex 3. Bibliography

General documentation

BRINKERHOFF Jennifer, 2002. "Assessing and Improving Partnership Relationships and Outcomes: A Proposed Framework", *Evaluation and Program Planning*, Vol. 25, Washington: Elsevier, pp 215-231.

IDRC, 2007. "Working Together to Strengthen Skills: IDRC' Strategic Evaluation of Capacity Development, Phase 3: Developing the Framework", *Evaluation Guidelines*.

IDRC, 2004. "Identifying the Intended User(s) of an Evaluation", *Evaluation Guidelines*.

IDRC, 2004. Prospectus for the Peace, Conflict and Development Program Initiative for 2005-2010. Proposal submitted to the Board of Governors. Program and Partnership Branch.

IDRC, Guiding Principles of IDRC's Evaluation Unit,
http://www.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/12095810441Evaluation_Unit_Guiding_Principles.pdf

ROBINSON, Gillian, SCHNABEL, Albrecht and SMYTH, Marie, 1999. "Researching Violent Societies: Methodological and Ethical Challenges", *Work in Progress*, United Nations University, Vol 15, No.3, Summer 1999. pp 24-27.

YIN, Robert K., 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3rd ed., Applied social research methods series, vol.5, London: Sage Publications.

Case study-specific documentation

Human Rights Watch, 2007. *Get the Gun: Human Rights Violations by Uganda's National Army in Law Enforcement Operations in Karamoja Region*.

UNDP, 2007. *Between a rock and hard place: armed violence in African Pastoral Communities*. Conference Background paper;
http://www.undp.org/cpr/documents/armed_violence/AV_pastoral_communities.pdf

Annex 4. Maps of the area

(Maps by Wikipedia)

Location of Karamoja in Uganda



Districts of Karamoja



Annex 5. Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) Research Support in Countries and Regions affected by Violent Conflict

REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE (April 2008)⁴³

1. Background:

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC)'s Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) program initiative has a long history of involvement in countries experiencing active violent conflict or war-to-peace transitions, including Guatemala, Colombia, Palestine, Sri Lanka, Kashmir, Sudan, Uganda, and South Africa. In many cases, PCD initiated programming during a time of war-to-peace transition, but the violent conflict did not always cease. In fact, PCD's name change from "Peacebuilding and Reconstruction" in 2005 is a recognition that "the peace-to-conflict is not linear, and frequently sees recidivism to violence and uneasy, unstable and partial peace". Currently, PCD is "programming in select contexts marked by armed violence (Palestine, Colombia), and will carefully consider engagement in additional such contexts"⁴⁴.

With this in mind, PCD wants to learn more on how PCD-supported research can be effectively conducted, managed and communicated in environments in which the effects of violent conflict have a significant impact upon the research process. This evaluation was first outlined in the 2005-2011 Prospectus. Also, the 2003 external review for the program initiative, then called Peacebuilding and Reconstruction (PBR), noted: "While the review found no research ethics problems in any of the projects reviewed, there is a need for PBR to develop guidelines, procedures, or "lessons-learned" addressing the particular ethical challenges of research programming in conflict-prone areas."⁴⁵ This evaluation will address some of those ethical challenges as well.

This evaluation also reflects IDRC Centre-wide programming and policy. In recent years, IDRC has become increasingly concerned about reflecting on the complexities of supporting researchers and their research institutions in politically difficult environments, including contexts where there is unstable peace or risks of recidivism to political violence. In 2005, the Centre examined its involvement in countries in transition⁴⁶. The transition study invited Centre staff to assess the prospects for change in transition contexts and to consider "the wider political, research and institutional environments [...and] to think strategically on how changing contexts may impact programming and require responsiveness and flexibility"⁴⁷. This concern is, in part, a reflection of the Canadian Foreign Policy community's increasing humanitarian, military and development assistance in conflict contexts and "fragile states".

This calls for more careful reflection on the conditions in which the diverse types of research support typically provided by IDRC is appropriate and viable, as well as determine how, when, and under what conditions PCD's programming can extend to

⁴³ The ToR have been adjusted following the methodological workshop that was held in Ottawa on the 29th and 30th of April 2008 with IDRC staff and Channel Research team.

⁴⁴ PCD Prospectus 2005-2011, p. 17.

⁴⁵ Brynen, Fox-Decent, and Brown, 2004

⁴⁶ Smyth, Nancy and Maggie Gorman (2005). Corporate Assessment Framework: Strategic Intelligence Performance Area "Understanding Local Realities in Countries in Transition", Policy and Planning Group, IDRC.

⁴⁷ *Ibid*, p. 35

additional countries where conflict is ongoing. The broader topic of IDRC support of research in conflict settings will be explored as part of IDRC's next environmental scan; and the PCD evaluation will feed into this Centre-wide discussion. The Evaluation of PCD Research Support in Countries affected by Violent Conflict will also explore questions of security and risk management to staff and project partners, which is a key concern for IDRC. Finally, the evaluation will explore some of the ethical issues involved in supporting peacebuilding research in violent conflict contexts. This evaluation should assist PCD in managing the tension between the need to be responsive in areas affected by violent conflict and being realistic in terms of both financial and human resources and political capital required.

Principles and Approaches to Programming

The **International Development Research Centre (IDRC)** is a public corporation created by the Parliament of Canada in 1970 to help developing countries use science and technology to find practical, long-term solutions to the social, economic, and environmental problems they face. Support is directed toward developing an indigenous research capacity to sustain policies and technologies that developing countries need to build healthier, more equitable, and more prosperous societies.

In carrying out its mission, IDRC provides funds and expert advice to developing-country researchers working to solve critical development problems. IDRC:

- **funds applied research** by researchers from developing countries on the problems they identify as crucial to their communities. Most projects supported result from direct exchanges between the Centre and developing-country institutions;
- **provides expert advice** to those researchers;
- **builds local capacity** in developing countries to undertake research and innovate.

Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) is an IDRC program initiative which supports research *for* specific peacebuilding processes, as well as research *on* key peacebuilding challenges. PCD mainly responds to requests from research institutes, universities, policymakers, South-South and North-South networks, and civil society organizations. PCD encourages multidisciplinary approaches, encompassing economics, political science, anthropology, law, and social and gender analysis, as well as participatory/action research and other qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

PCD aims:

- to generate evidence-based findings that can be used to inform policy and programming decisions on root causes of violent conflict, the prevention of conflict, and equitable and sustainable development
- To build domestic ownership of peace processes
- To open spaces for discussion and dialogue
- To influence global policies and practices
- To build capacity for more rigorous, methodologically creative, and collaborative research.

2. Objectives:

General Objective:

The main objective of this evaluation is to identify the factors (conditions and programming modalities) that facilitate or hinder the research process for PCD-supported projects in countries and regions affected by violent conflict, and the advantages and disadvantages of PCD programming modalities in achieving PCD objectives in those conflict settings.

Specific Objectives:

1. On the Conflict Context: Get a better understanding of what conditions (security, research infrastructure, community of researchers, etc.) need to be in place, especially when a return to violence seems imminent, so that 1) PCD can feasibly support research and 2) partners can feasibly conduct research in line with PCD's program objectives.
2. On "What Happened" - the Partners' and PCD's Intents and Achievements: Build a body of learning around the contributions PCD supported research can make in influencing policy, building research capacities, and increase domestic ownership of peace processes when taking into account the prevailing environmental conditions surrounding the research process and ethical considerations.
3. On the "How"- Programming Modalities: Increase learning around the strengths and weaknesses of PCD programming modalities and its relationships to its research partners in contributing to the achievement of PCD objectives in countries and regions affected by violent conflict.
4. Forward Thinking: With a better understanding of prevailing conditions, challenges and opportunities surrounding PCD supported research as well as PCD's programming modalities: explore the implications (in terms of resources, security, institutional risks, policy influence, how we partner, etc.) of potential expansion of PCD programming into countries and regions affected by violent conflict.

3. Users and Uses of the Strategic Evaluation:

Primary Intended Users:

- PCD program staff

Secondary Users:

- IDRC senior management and IDRC program staff
- PCD's partners
- Other agencies/donors working in conflict contexts

Uses

PCD program staff can use the evaluation to:

- Learn how to improve its programming approach (project and program identification and development, programming modalities, monitoring, reporting and evaluation.) in contexts of active conflict where PCD already programs;
- Build on previous and current programming experience to assess how, when, and under what conditions PCD could expand programming;
- Identify PCD's comparative advantage in supporting the management and dissemination of research in conflict contexts, including capacity building;
- Assess how and when can PCD-supported research can influence policy, and what particular capacities PCD can/should be supporting in such environments;
- Identify the ethical issues surrounding programming in conflict contexts, as well as assess security and risks for PCD staff and its project partners.

IDRC senior management and other IDRC program staff can use the evaluation to:

- Learn about programming in conflict contexts with a wide variety of programs, IDRC's comparative advantages, and "lessons learned" from PCD's experience;

- Assess security and risks for IDRC staff and its project partners with any project in a conflict context;
- Assess how IDRC can/should address the particular challenges of working in a conflict context, including risks to IDRC's partner organizations, in particular when expanding programming into countries affected by violent conflict.

PCD partners can use the evaluation to:

- Increase their understanding of the value, utility and reach that research might have in contexts of conflict;
- Assess the utility of different programming modalities and better understand the strengths and limitations of PCD;
- Clarify PCD and IDRC's role, and the expectations of what PCD and IDRC can and cannot do to support partners in conflict contexts.

Other agencies/donors working in conflict contexts can use the evaluation for:

- Reflection on their own programming in conflict contexts.
- Get a better understanding of PCD's comparative advantage in programming in countries and regions affected by conflict.

4. Range of Issue and Evaluation Questions to be Considered

Specific objective 1: On the Conflict Context

Get a better understanding of what conditions (security, research capacity, institutional strength, ethical considerations etc.) need to be in place, especially when a return to violence seems imminent, so that 1) PCD can feasibly support research and 2) partners can feasibly conduct research in line with PCD's program objectives.

Lead questions: What kind of challenges and opportunities did the conflict context present to the research project? What kinds of dynamics were present at the political and institutional level? What were the capacities on the ground?

Range of potential sub-questions:

- What is/was the nature of the conflict context at the time of the research? Did PCD staff and/or partners conduct a conflict and/ or risk assessment as part of the project design process?
- Was the timing of the research assessed in terms of the political context, the policy environment, etc.?
- Did the conflict context change significantly during the course of the research? If so, did this affect the research process and how?
- Was there an assessment of the sustainability of the project's objectives and/or sustainability of the institution/network?
- Did the research project encounter potential or actual ethical and/or security risks, including: risks to the researchers, including differential risks to team members in regions with varying levels of conflict, and interference or pressure by political or armed entities; risk to the research participants, including participants' right to maintain anonymity, informed consent, the safe storing of data, and the use of tapes/filming.
- Are there particular issues regarding institutional risks that are particular to conflict context, including institutional fragility, uncertain resource flow,

excessive workloads, and staff turnover? How are these addressed by PCD and PCD's partner organizations?

- What kinds of challenges, if any, are present in getting country clearance for a project, and what is the effect on the research project?

Specific objective 2: On "What Happened" - the Partners' and PCD's Intents and Achievements

Build a body of learning around the ways in which PCD research partners adapt to the prevailing environmental conditions in conflict settings and address ethical considerations, and what contribution PCD-supported research can make in these conditions to influencing policy, building research capacities and increasing domestic ownership of peace processes.

Lead questions: What did the research partners and PCD set out to do (intents)? What actually happened? Why did it happen that way? What were PCD and its partners' coping strategies? In which ways did the research partners and PCD develop and adapt research questions, methodologies and approaches, capacity building and dissemination in a conflict setting? Are there particular strategies which were more successful?

Range of potential sub-questions:

- What kind of change in the environment is envisioned in the project (i.e. the project's theory of change)? For example, would change occur through individual change? Institutional change? By addressing root causes? By withdrawing resources for the conflict, etc?
- How did the suggested research methodology take into account the conflict context? Was the methodology adapted or modified if the context changed? What is PCD's role in developing the methodology? The research partners' role?
- Were there difficulties in accessing and collecting primary and secondary data? Did the research methodology include gender and/or generational analyses, multidisciplinary or comparative approaches, and/or worked with marginalized communities?
- Were there risks highlighted (institutional, personal security, objectives maybe not attainable), and if so, in which ways were these handled by PCD and its partners?
- During the course of conducting the research, what were the other practical, financial, political, methodological and ethical challenges related to the conflict context? These could include risks and challenges associated with potential unintended uses of research findings, for example.
- Was there an aspect of capacity building (individual or institutional) build within the research project, and what was the research partners' and PCD's role in developing that capacity building element?
- What has been PCD's role in dealing with research ethics challenges from the outset of the project? How have ethical challenges (if present) affected the research process?
- How was the research team composed? Has the conflict context affected the research composition? If it was composed of researchers both in and outside of the conflict context, was there a different level of risk between the researchers?

- How was the research disseminated and communicated? Were policymakers part of the target group? What kinds of challenges and opportunities in dissemination and policy influence were present because of the conflict context? What political sensitivities existed, and how were those dealt with?
- Were there unintended consequences of the research process?

Specific objective 3: On the “How”- Programming Modalities:

Increase learning around the strengths and weaknesses of PCD programming modalities and its relationships to its research partners in contributing to the achievement of PCD objectives in countries and regions affected by violent conflict.

Lead questions: What are the different programming decisions that PCD and its partners make regarding research taking into account a context of violent conflict? What modalities seem more successful, and under what conditions? What can PCD learn about this?

Range of potential sub-questions:

- How do PCD criteria for involvement in conflict contexts fare in terms of feasibility and flexibility in conducting, managing and disseminating research, especially considering the potential “instabilities” in the context?
- How does the research team assess the strengths and weaknesses of PCD’s programming approach?
- What kind of programming modalities were considered and chosen by PCD partners and PCD staff (e.g. supporting an institution inside or outside of the conflict zone, composition of research team, research project vs. research support project, working in networks, capacity building, etc.). What adaptations have been/need to be made in design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of results? Does it differ from programming in any other contexts, and if so, how? What modalities seemed to be more successful, and under which circumstances?
- To what extent did PCD partners and PCD staff act with flexibility and responsiveness under changing circumstances? What institutional tools, mechanisms or constraints (e.g. financial constraints, institutional policies, etc.) were taken into consideration?
- During the course of managing the research, what practical, financial, political, methodological and ethical challenges came up? How were they dealt with? Are there particular strategies which were more successful?

Specific objective 4: Forward Thinking

With a better understanding of prevailing research conditions as well as PCD’s programming modalities, explore the implications (in terms of resources, security, institutional risks, policy influence, how we partner, etc.) of potential expansion of PCD programming into countries and regions affected by violent conflict.

Lead questions: What conclusions can be drawn from how external dimensions affect the research process? What are the manageable factors, through the partnership between PCD and its research partners? What are the strengths and weaknesses of PCD programming approaches to research in conflict settings? What lessons can be

drawn in terms of the opportunities, challenges, and obstacles to potentially expanding PCD's programming into context of violent conflicts where it has not previously programmed significantly?

5. Methodology

The evaluation will consist of two components:

- Four case studies that examine the challenges and opportunities of PCD's programming in countries or regions affected by violent conflict;
- A fifth paper consolidating case study findings and providing strategic forward planning on the feasibility of expanding PCD's programming, both in countries where it already programs and in new countries/regions.

Case Study Sampling:

Case study countries/regions are selected to reflect:

- Significant recent PCD involvement: several projects ongoing or approved in those regions since the start of the 2005-2011 PCD Prospectus
- Balanced geographic coverage to the extent possible
- Selected case study countries/regions: **Colombia, Palestine/Middle East, East Africa, and Sri Lanka**
-

Case study projects are selected based on:

- Ongoing or approved in current Prospectus period
- Research was managed or conducted, all or in part, in a country or region with violent conflict
- Projects that present learning opportunities on the development, conduct, management and dissemination of research in conflict contexts
- NOTE: A list of selected projects will be available to the selected consultants once hired

Evaluation Methodology:

The evaluation methodology and instruments will be developed in discussion with PCD staff and the consultants, and this will be the focus of a methodology workshop (to be held before the start of the evaluation – date TBD).

Case study authors are expected to use qualitative methods as the primary source of data collection, including semi-structured interviews with staff, partners and beneficiaries. Document review of key project documents will also be critical to gain an in-depth understanding of the research problem and of PCD/PCD partners' perceptions of how peace can best be supported through research. The case study methodology will include a desktop review of relevant project documentation, interviews with relevant PCD staff, project leaders and relevant stakeholders.

A final workshop will bring together relevant project participants to discuss the draft report and exchange experiences and insights gained from conducting, managing and dissemination research in conflict-affected countries.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

Consultants Will:

- Be available for a Methodology workshop (before the beginning of the study, date TBD) **and** a Results workshop (date TBD, after the study is completed) in Ottawa
- Develop and use high quality methods:
 - Well done surveys, interviews that follow protocols, outputs that are insightful and well-written; these instruments/methods should be detailed in the workplan developed by the author for review by the evaluation manager.
 - Conduct all communications including interviews with respect for our partners and their work.
- Produce high quality outputs:
 - Workplan (with instruments/methods, survey questions, etc.)
 - Iterative process with report draft
 - Full report and a short summary/brief of findings
- Be resourceful:
 - Search for:
 - Additional documentation
 - Additional potential interviewees
 - Get general information on:
 - The case study organization
 - Its other donors
 - Its other projects
 - On capacity development and organizational capacity

Evaluation Manager (PCD):

- PCD will provide:
 - A list of case study project
 - An initial list of contacts and documents (Project Completion Reports, project proposals, etc.)
 - Support on travel logistics
 - Input on workplan and drafts of report
 - Background documentation

7. Expected Outcomes and Outputs/Report Requirements for Complete Evaluation:

- Participation of all consultants in a methodology workshop with PCD staff and other consultants (early 2008);
- Four case studies, 20-25 pages in length each;
- A 25-30-page paper to consolidate case study findings and provide strategic forward planning assessing the feasibility of expanding PCD's programming, both in countries where it already programs and in new countries/regions.
- A total of five briefs (2-4 pages each) on studies – one for each of the four case studies and a fifth summing up the findings of the consolidating/strategic planning paper;
- Participation of all consultants in a results workshop with IDRC staff, project partners, and other donors.

9. Estimated timeline and activities (in 2008 – dates TBD with availability of hired consultants):

Case Study Authors (Per Case Study – 4 case studies total)

Activity	Timeline (by month from beginning of contract)	Billable days per activity
Methodology workshop	1 st month	Days, as follows: -1 day of workshop -1.5 days in transit
Workplan	Submitted in 2 nd month	2 days for workplan development
Background research	2 nd month	3 days
Field Work	3 rd month	7 days, as follows: -5 days in field -2 days in transit
Writing report and summary/brief	3 rd and/or 4 th month	6 days
Submission of report and brief/summary	5 th month	
Revision of report and brief/summary	6 th month	2 days
Participation in results workshop and submit final report	8 th month	2.5 days, as follows: -1.5 days in transit, -1 day of workshop
Total Billable Days per Case Study:		25 days

Author writing consolidating/strategic planning paper

Activity	Timeline (by month from beginning of contract)	Billable days per activity
Methodology workshop	1 st month	Days, as follows: -1 day of workshop -1.5 days in transit
Workplan	Submitted in 5 th month	3 days for workplan development
Developing and Writing report and summary/brief	5 th and 6 th month	20 days
Submission of report and brief/summary	End of 6 th month	
Revision of report and brief/summary	7 th month	2 days
Participation in results workshop and submit final report	8 th month	2.5 days, as follows: -1.5 days in transit, -1 day of workshop
Total Billable Days:		30 days

10. Quality of the Evaluation Report

The quality of the evaluation report produced by the evaluators will be judged by IDRC’s Evaluation Unit on four internationally recognized standards: utility, feasibility, accuracy, and propriety. A copy of IDRC’s Evaluation Guideline 3 “Formatting Evaluation Reports at IDRC” and Evaluation Guideline 4 “Quality Assessment of IDRC Evaluation Reports” will be provided to the evaluator/ evaluation team.

Annex 6. Biography of the evaluator

Annina Mattsson

Mrs Annina Mattsson holds a Masters degree in Violence, Conflict and Development from the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) at the University of London, England. She has proven knowledge and hands-on experience of conflict and development settings as she has lived and worked in Ramallah in the Palestinian territories for 16 months. She has extensive research experience of the different issues development initiatives in conflict settings are faced with, especially in the Palestinian territories, having written her Masters thesis on the various aspects of donor funding present. As a consultant for Channel Research, she has taken part in studies and evaluations related to conflict, human rights and peacebuilding in the Middle East (for example in Palestine with the Swedish Agency for International Development (Sida)) and has been involved in a number of evaluations in active conflict settings such as Sudan and Sri Lanka.

Mrs Mattsson is a Finnish national and speaks fluent Finnish, Swedish, English, Spanish and French, and can converse in colloquial arabic.

Clotilde Gouley

Mrs Clotilde Gouley holds a Master degree in International Conflict Analysis from the University of Kent at Canterbury, England. She specializes in evaluation of peacebuilding interventions and natural resource (oil and mining) conflicts. Over the past 7 years, she has carried out long term research projects and short-term consulting assignments on these conflict-related issues.

Mrs Gouley has worked four years for an NGO in Peru (2002-2006), conducting research on mining conflicts, and now works as an associate consultant with Channel Research (Belgium), covering issues in peacebuilding, conflict-sensitivity, community relations and Social Impact Assessment (in Colombia, Guatemala, Peru and New Caledonia). She combines strong research experience (desk studies and field research) and expertise in a range of analytical and participatory methodologies, such as risk, stakeholder and conflict mappings.

As a researcher, she took part for example in the Project "Conflict and Collaboration in the management of natural resources in Latin America and the Caribbean", led by the United Nations University for Peace and financed by IDRC. As a consultant, she took part in studies and evaluations related to conflict, human rights and peacebuilding in Latin America (for example in Colombia with the Swedish Agency for International Development (Sida) and in Africa (Uganda and the Democratic Republic of Congo with the OECD).

Mrs Gouley is a French national and speaks fluent French, English and Spanish.