

Final Report



Final Evaluation: Maximizing the Impact of Reconciliation in Rwanda

Final Evaluation Conducted by: Frances Fortune Associates

Conducted for: Search for Common Ground Rwanda

Study Dates: October 20, 2013 to December 1, 2013



**FRANCES FORTUNE
ASSOCIATES LTD**
— MEASURING WHAT COUNTS —

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of the final evaluation of the USAID funded project “*Maximizing the Impact of Reconciliation in Rwanda*”; a two and a half year project implemented by Search for Common Ground (SFCG) together with National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC) with the overall goal to “*improve coordination and use targeted bridge-building activities to catalyze meaningful reconciliation in Rwanda*”. Furthermore, this report attempts to make recommendations to contribute to the improvement of future Rwandan unity and reconciliation focused initiatives.

The project sought to improve coordination among key national level actors in unity and reconciliation in Rwanda as well as to increase the participation of targeted communities nationwide to enhance the ownership of unity and reconciliation at the grassroots level. The project also aims to establish forums to support dialogues between diverse groups around unity and reconciliation. The project, which uses a coordinated people-to-people approach, supports a range of capacity development as well as bridge-building activities to encourage the widespread public participation in reconciliation activities, namely solidarity events, participative school theaters, radio programs and their listening clubs.

The project evaluation, which aims to measure and document the project against its intended and unintended results, to report on best practices and lessons learnt and to make recommendations to support the improvement of future programming, took place between November and December 2013 with the data collection process occurring in November. Several tools were employed, ensuring a mixed methods approach to the investigation. Tools include: a) a National survey targeting 600 people across the general population as well as among NURC district forum members, b) key informant interviews and c) focus group discussions with NURC representatives at national and district level, as well as other partners involved in unity and reconciliation, e.g.: INGOs, CSOs, FBOs, clubs/associations, radio stations, schools, etc. Despite the different sampling methods applied to each study group, i.e.: random for the quantitative survey but purposive for the qualitative interviews and focus group discussions, all five of Rwanda’s provinces were represented in the study samples.

In terms of coordination of unity and reconciliation activities, when asked to rate NURC’s coordination, over 94% of those interviewed responded that NURC’s coordination was either “very helpful” or “helpful” to reconciliation in Rwanda. The evaluation focused on assessing SFCG’s assistance to NURC’s coordination by looking at the support given to the establishment of the national NGO forum and to strengthening NURC district forums. The national NGO forum experienced some delays in launching as a result of earlier hurdles in finalising the MoU between SFCG and NURC. Whilst this caused delays in the establishment of the NGO forum, which is now set up but still too young for its functionality to be assessed, the delays, and the discussions therein, could be the reason for the strong partnership that now exists between SFCG and NURC and, potentially, for restoring a long-lost trust in effective collaborations with INGOs in matters of Rwandan unity and reconciliation. The NGO forum requires further support to ensure its efficacy and sustainability although, according to those involved in its inception, its relevance is undoubted.

The NURC district forums and selected NURC national level representatives state having learnt new skills as a result of the SFCG trainings they attended. The main topics enjoyed by forum members were conflict management and resolution, as well as performance monitoring and evaluation, which they were immediately able to implement within their respective district. Systematically, members who attended trainings congratulated SFCG on the quality of the content and the professional delivery of the training.

District forum members who feel imbued with the responsibility of being the conveyor of unity and reconciliation values across grassroots communities unanimously voiced a keen interest in attending further trainings to stimulate the quality of the work produced by district forums. The wide geographical spread reached through NURC district forums together with their keenness to learn and be equipped with adequate tools should be encouraged, supported and maximised in future unity and reconciliation initiatives.

In terms of overall NURC coordination, there is no doubt that with more coherence between the strategic alignment and the operational capacities of NURC at national and at district level, NURC's coordination capacity, and thus the impact of its work, will greatly benefit. In addition, it would be advisable to develop and implement standardised tools, in addition to, or instead of, the Rwandan Reconciliation Barometer, which experiences some criticism, to assist NURC representatives in measuring progress in unity and reconciliation across Rwanda.

The project supported a range of bridge-building community or school-based activities. One such bridge building activity includes solidarity events. In this case, SFCG supports proposals put forward by CSOs planning a targeted community-based activity focused on promoting unity and reconciliation. Another such activity was the participative school theaters in which SFCG trained actors to choreograph and direct theater performances in schools, the theme of which specifically revolved around locally tailored peace-building messages. Another bridge-building activity was the establishment of listening clubs through community radios producing and broadcasting SFCG supported programs among others. Club members listen to the program together after which, they discuss the topics raised by the program in relation to their own communities. Feedback from the discussions is used to inform the content of following programs.

When both participants and organisers of these bridge-building activities were asked to rate their satisfaction with the extent to which the event reached its objective, most stated that the activity had been relevant, enjoyable, as well as helpful in contributing to bringing people together, enhancing tolerance and creating a common vision. The activities were effective in creating platforms from which individuals and groups can exchange experiences and thoughts on the genocide in Rwanda. Each bridge-building initiative seeks to promote a localised lens to the event in an attempt to enhance the relevance, and thus effectiveness of the activity to that locality, a quality recognised by interviewed participants. Unanimous was the sentiment that one activity contributes one step in the long road to achieving unity and reconciliation hence more activities are required to reach the objectives of unity and reconciliation. It is very feasible and highly advisable to replicate and further develop these bridge-building activities across communities nationwide.

Final Evaluation:

The project supported the production of a radio program called “Turumwe”, specifically developed to address unity and reconciliation issues. Radio is seen to be particularly popular and thus an effective media for widespread audience reach. This is more applicable to rural areas or areas outside the capital where more households own TVs. Around 14% of the general population interviewed report listening to Turumwe. Most (87%) “like” or “strongly like” the program and almost the same proportion could correctly describe the program content as being about unity and reconciliation. More than half of listeners feel the program is relevant to their community, almost half discuss the issues raised by the program, and 44% feel the program has created change, especially around forgiveness in the community. The listening clubs attached to the radio programs are greatly enjoyed by both members of the club and the radio producers. The members feel they have an outlet in which to discuss unity and reconciliation issues within their community. Radio producers admit benefitting from the club feedback for it allows future radio programs to be tailored to the needs of the communities it broadcasts to.

The process of unity and reconciliation is a long one; it is multi-faceted and highly delicate and sensitive in nature because it touches each and everyone in Rwanda. This evaluation, which may fall victim to responder bias in view of the sensitivity of the topic under discussion, nonetheless concludes that the steps taken over the last two and a half years in the scope of the jointly implemented SFCG and NURC project all successfully contribute towards unity and reconciliation in the country, especially at the local level by bringing capacity to eager NURC district forum members and by providing open spaces for communities to engage in dialogue, whether in schools, through community activities or through radio talk shows which allow listeners to voice opinions anonymously. At the national, and thus more strategic, level, the NGO forum will become a fruitful tool for exchanging theories and, in turn, building a unified strategic alignment between key unity and reconciliation actors and decision makers.

There is no question that unity and reconciliation activities must continue to reach the next level in the process. However, in order to keep moving forward with the progress to date, project results such as these need to be recorded and compiled to widely communicate lessons learnt as well as to support advocacy actions to ensure continued development of, and funding to, unity and reconciliation interventions. Meanwhile, donors generally understand the complications in measuring such intangible results and know that unity and the fact that reconciliation requires a long-term commitment. What remains evident from this evaluation is that actors involved in unity and reconciliation are manifold, motivated and available to continue walking the long road towards the goal of unity and reconciliation, but require support to reach it.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	v
Abbreviations.....	v
Introduction	1
Methodology.....	2
The Evaluation Sample.....	3
Qualitative Sample.....	3
Quantitative Sample	4
Methodology Limitations.....	5
Results Framework and Project Indicators	6
Findings and Analysis	8
Theory of Change	8
Project Goal (Indicator 1).....	9
Qualitative Results	9
Coordination Mechanisms (Indicator 2)	9
Peace and Reconciliation Network	10
NURC District Forums (Indicator 3).....	13
Qualitative Results	13
Quantitative Results.....	14
Bridge Building Activities (Indicator 4).....	16
Qualitative Results	16
Quantitative Results.....	17
SFCG Value to NURC	23
Indicator Summary.....	23
Conclusion.....	24
Relevance	24
Effectiveness	25
Impact	25
Recommendations	26
1. Strengthening and Aligning the Network	26
2. Keeping Unity and Reconciliation on the Agenda.....	27
3. Generational and/or Youth Issues	28
4. Diversifying Tools and Agency	28
References	28
Annexes.....	29
Terms of Reference.....	29
National and District Forum Survey Report.....	29
Qualitative Methodology	29
Inception Report	31
Field Report.....	31
List of People Met	31
List of Documents Consulted	31

Acknowledgements

The evaluators would like to acknowledge the cooperation and support of the SFCG Rwanda team as well as all those who participated in the evaluation through giving their time, observations and opinions in conducting this evaluation.

Abbreviations

CRS	Catholic Relief Services
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DM&E	Design, Monitoring and Evaluation
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GP	General Population
HQ	Headquarters
IRDP	Institute of Research and Dialogue for Peace
JADF	Joint Action District Development Forum
KII	Key Informant Interview
NDF	NURC District Forum
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NURC	National Unity and Reconciliation Commission
OECD-DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
PT	Participatory Theatre
Q	Question
SCUR	School Clubs for Unity and Reconciliation
SFCG	Search for Common Ground
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WVI	World Vision International

Introduction

Between May 2011 and November 2013, SFCG implemented a project in partnership with the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC) supported by USAID under Conflict Management and Mitigation funding. This project, entitled *Maximizing the Impact of Reconciliation in Rwanda*, sought to reinforce analysis, coordination, and innovation in reconciliation programming at the national level in order to strengthen gains already made and respond to continuing challenges. The project relies on a coordinated people-to-people approach, using catalytic peacebuilding activities to “build bridges” within underserved or hard-to-reach communities and encourage public participation in reconciliation activities.

The project’s goal is to *improve coordination and use targeted bridge-building activities to catalyze meaningful reconciliation in Rwanda*. To realize this strategic objective the project has sought to achieve three intermediate results¹:

- Greater coordination among key governmental and NGO peace actors around reconciliation initiatives;
- Increased participation of targeted groups in reconciliation activities and feelings of ownership by these groups over the process; and
- Balanced forums for national dialogue around reconciliation programming that are accessed by diverse audiences established.

Included is a cross-cutting intermediate result of reinforced technical and organizational capacity of partner organizations including NURC, its district forums, and organizations coordinating community activities to promote skills transfer and sustainability.

Search for Common Ground (SFCG) commissioned an evaluation of this partnership project. The evaluation of the project was designed to achieve the following objectives:

1. To measure and document the results achieved by this joint project—both intended within the project framework and unintended
2. To capture the best practices and lessons learned of the partnership strategy
3. To evaluate the added value of different SFCG activities and approaches, and make recommendations for future programming.

The evaluation adheres to the [SFCG guidelines](#) and utilizes the OECD_DAC evaluation criteria. Terms of Reference are in the annex.

¹ The project proposal had 3 specific objectives which were modified after project start-up into these intermediate results. The original goal and objectives from the project proposal are as follows:

To test this hypothesis, SFCG plans to organize a project that “*improve coordination and use targeted bridge-building activities to catalyze meaningful reconciliation in Rwanda*.” This project has three specific objectives:

- Improving coordination among key governmental and NGO peace actors in sharing research, best-practices and responses to deepen impact.
- Catalyzing reconciliation activities targeting groups who are not currently participating or in polarized communities.
- Encouraging national dialogue and local ownership of reconciliation programming.

The project also has the *cross-cutting* objective of reinforcing the technical and organizational capacity of partner organizations including NURC, its local forums, and organizations organizing community activities to promote skills transfer and sustainability.

Methodology

The evaluation used mixed methods and a multi layered strategy incorporating quantitative and qualitative data to evaluate the results achieved by the project. Quantitative information was collected using a national survey designed and conducted by NURC and SFCG prior to the evaluation team’s arrival in Rwanda. Qualitative information was collected from targeted stakeholders and participants in key activities at national and district level. Key activities examined include the establishment of the NURC national forum, training activities, participatory theater in schools and solidarity activities and other events at district level as well as SFCG radio programming.

The national survey was conducted with the general population (GP) and with the NURC District Forum (NDF) to gather information mainly about the impact of the radio programmes but also about awareness and benefits of NURC activities; key informant interviews (KIIs) with district and national stakeholders; and focus group discussions (FGDs) with a selected group of project participants and beneficiaries. The sampling frame for the qualitative tools was developed in collaboration with the two key staff of SFCG in Rwanda namely Mr. Theogene Mugisha, the DM&E Officer, and Mr. Narcisse Kalisa, the Programme Director.

The quantitative survey sample was purposive, designed to be representative of the overall population, and randomized at the district level. The sample is drawn from those over 18 years of age, which is a population of 5.591 million,² with a sample of 600, Margin of Error of 5% (4.75%) and Confidence Level of 98%.

Table 1 illustrates the mixed methods and multi layered sampling employed and the actual sample size. The 30 month project spanned all 30 districts of Rwanda and therefore the evaluation is national in scope.

Table 1: Sampling Methodology			
Population sample	Method	Tool	Sample Size
General population	Quantitative Random sampling	Survey	N=600
Key district stakeholders (NURC district forum members)	Quantitative targeted sampling	Survey	N=50
District participants in solidarity activities and listening club members	Qualitative	FGDs Total 156 participants	N=18
Participatory theater actors – national	Qualitative Targeted sampling of informed insiders	FGD Total 4 participants	N=1
Key national stakeholders	Qualitative Targeted sampling of informed insiders	KIIs	N=10
NURC district forum members	Qualitative Targeted sampling of informed insiders and project participants	KIIs	N=13
District level partners (solidarity activity organisers, school teachers supporting school theaters, radio directors)	Qualitative Targeted sampling of informed insiders and project participants	KIIs	N=10
			Total Data Points =702

² According to UNICEF data from 2011 http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/rwanda_statistics.html

The analysis for the report combines the data from the two surveys with the information derived from the national and district KIIs and FGDs. The methodology for the surveys is found in the stand-alone National and District Forum Survey Report which is included as an annex to this evaluation report.

The qualitative data gathering for this evaluation was conducted by Frances Fortune Associates, an organization that conducts evaluations for NGOs and donors. The team was headed by Frances Fortune who designed and conducted the national stakeholder interviews while Georgina Anderson developed district level tools as well as training and supervised a field team of 10 people to carry out the data collection which took place from 15th to 18th November, 2013. The National and District Forum Surveys were conducted by SFCG from 1st to 8th November and data analysis was done by Frances Fortune Associates consultant Susan Barclay.

The detailed methodology for the qualitative aspects of the evaluation is contained in the annex to this report.

The Evaluation Sample

The evaluation sample is drawn from three target groups, namely the general population across the country, key national stakeholders involved in reconciliation activities including NURC staff, district-level beneficiaries including district reconciliation forum members and participants of the SFCG project. Table 2 illustrates where the evaluation sample was derived from and the sections below give a detailed explanation.

	Qualitative	Quantitative
National	Kigali	Kicukiro
Province	District	
Eastern	Ngoma	Rwamagana
	Bugesera	
Western	Karongi	Karongi
	Rubavu	
Southern	Kamonyi	Huye
Northern	Gicumbi/Rulindo ³	Musanze

Qualitative Sample

The sampling frame for the qualitative work was developed using a participatory approach by the evaluation team with two SFCG staff and validated with key NURC staff. Individual respondents from key national stakeholder organisations involved in unity and reconciliation activities (and who were invited to take part in the national forum) were identified during informational interviews with SFCG and NURC staff. The district sample was identified using a purposive approach.⁴

Information from targeted participants and beneficiaries was collected in six districts using FGDs and KIIS by two teams composed of five people each (one supervisor, two note takers and two interviewers in each

³ These two districts carry the weight of one district since project activities were held in both these neighboring districts but neither fully met the criteria set out for qualifying for the sample, as such, activities from both these districts were joined to cover the full range desired.

⁴ Purposive – non random sampling methodology whereby criteria is identified to select sites for collection of data. This approach was selected as it takes into account where the key activities were conducted so the sample reflects the beneficiaries and participants of the project.

team). The two teams were gender balanced to improve the quality of the data collected. The purposive sampling selection for districts, validated with SFCG and NURC, included the following criteria:

- Where at least three USAID sponsored district level activities were implemented (primarily solidarity events, participative school theater, training for district NURC members, and listening clubs and radio programs),
- Considered areas of greatest need as well as difficult to access,
- Considered by NURC to have had a successful experience,
- Radio station based in the District, and
- At least each province represented.

The district qualitative sample is composed of a variety of individuals involved in some of the USAID supported district level unity and reconciliation activities, namely; 13 members of NURC district forums who attended SFCG trainings (32%), 3 radio directors involved in broadcasting unity and reconciliation programs and hosting listening clubs (7%), 6 groups of up to 11 members of listening clubs (29%), 3 organizers (7%) and 12 groups of between 7 and 10 participants (15%) in community solidarity events, and four teachers (10%) involved in school participatory theaters.

The qualitative sample is composed of 50% men and women in the national sample and two-thirds men and one-third women in the district sample. Forty per cent of district interviews were conducted with 18 to 35 year olds, 46% of district respondents are more than 35 years old and 12% were in focus groups with a mixture of both age groups. Of the 75% of district respondents who reported their employment status, 70% are employed.⁵

For District Forum Members, the people interviewed were chosen from the list of Forum Members provided by the NURC for each of the 5 districts. The selection was based on ensuring that all sectors of intervention such as women's organizations, local NGO, churches, and those in charge of good governance at district level as well as police or army representatives were included in the sample to ensure that diversified ideas and opinions are included in the data.

Quantitative Sample

The survey targeted NURC District Forum members and randomly sampled the general population in five districts, one from each province plus one from Kigali City. The quantitative sample had two parts: the general population and NURC district forum members. For the general population women and men were equally represented. More of the younger age group (18-35) (58%) was surveyed compared to the older group (36+) (42%) to represent Rwanda's population distribution.

For the general population the majority of respondents said they were literate (89%). This is higher than the national average⁶ of 71.1%. In terms of education level, almost one tenth (9.8%) said they did not go to school. Respondents in Huye reported having the least education overall and those in Kigali City reported having the most with almost one fifth (17.5%) reporting at least some university education. In Karongi only one respondent reported having some university while the average across all districts was almost one tenth (9%).

⁵ Efforts were made to reflect gender mainstreaming by ensuring that 50%+ of the focus group discussion participants are female. This gender balance was attempted with key informant interviews but was restricted as selection of informants was primarily based on involvement with project activities regardless of gender.

⁶ <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/rw.html> accessed Dec 3, 2013.

Definition: age 15 and over can read and write, total population: 71.1%, male: 74.8%, female: 67.5% (2010 est.)

The tools used for the FGDs and KIIs are included in the annex of the inception report and the National surveys are found in the National and District Forum Survey which is in the Annex.

Methodology Limitations

There were several limitations to the study to acknowledge. The time frame for the evaluation was very short and thus only a small sample of individuals involved in project activities was selected. The study could have been broader to encompass those who were non-participants, which would have allowed for comparison between the two groups to illuminate the impact of the project.

Because fieldwork was conducted during school holidays and overlapped with a week end, students and school staff as well as solidarity event organizers were often not available for interviews. Wherever possible, these incomplete interviews were conducted at a more suitable time and place, such as in Kigali, however reaching the student population was impossible which results in a great loss to the evaluation; the voice of school children.


The locations for focus group discussions don't always provide adequate privacy with some spaces not allowing for two discussions to occur at once without the groups overhearing each other. In some cases, organizing interviews, particularly focus group discussions, at the week-end enhanced the attendance rate of respondents however it simultaneously reduced the attendance of government and CSO participants who were not available to work on their days off. Due to the requirement for a very fast turnaround on the project, SFCG staff members supported the evaluation by arranging interviews with NURC and supporting the district field work. This could lead to some bias in terms of who was selected to participate in the study or how interviewees responded to questions although it is believed that every effort was made to ensure this is not the case.

It is believed that a general level of fear in the environment may have limited the extent to which interviewees are prepared to tell the truth. Despite interviewees being reminded of the confidential nature of their responses, there may be an element of telling the evaluation team what the respondents perceive the interviewers want to hear. The evaluation team feels that the sample was diverse enough to provide adequate information to produce this evaluation report, however, the sample may not be large enough to establish statistical correlations thus further limiting the extent to which the data can be disaggregated into relevant sub-groups.

Results Framework and Project Indicators

Figure 1 represents the project goal and four intermediate results. The goal has an indicator and the three intermediate results are measured by performance indicators. However, the evaluation team has had to reconstruct some of the indicators where appropriate due to the exigencies of the project and the evaluation timetable which undermined the ability to collect the appropriate information. In other cases, such as the case of the indicator for the goal, the sample which the evaluation team was using in gathering qualitative information was too small to be able to speak significantly to the performance against the intended indicator. The fourth intermediate result has no indicator however anecdotal responses will highlight the capacity building the project supported.

Figure 1: Results Framework



The evaluation focused on five outcome indicators as listed in Table 3 which illustrates how the indicators were defined and understood by the evaluation team and which tools were used to collect the information.⁷

⁷ The input indicators were measured through the course of the project by the DM&E team and are fully reported on in the 10th quarterly report.

Table 3: Indicators Measured During Evaluation				
Indicator	Performance Indicator	Classification	Type	Summary of Construction Measurement & Tool Used ⁸
Goal: Improved coordination and bridge-building activities in targeted locations will catalyze meaningful reconciliation in Rwanda				
1.	Indicative correlation between exposure to program activity and 'open' attitudes towards reconciliation.	Custom	Outcome	KIIs at national level (Q9) and at district level - D1 (Q8) as well as D2/D3/D4/D5/D6 (Q1). Supporting information from national KIs: N3, N5, N6 and district D1 (Q4,5,6), D2 (Q3)
IR 1: Build coordination capacity among key governmental & NGO peace actors				
<i>Sub IR 1.1 Reinforced technical and organizational capacity of partner organizations including NURC, its local forums, and organizations organizing community activities to promote skills transfer and sustainability</i>				
2.	# of conflict resolution interveners finding coordination "helpful" or "very helpful"	Custom District forums predated the project but national forum was instigated by project.	Process indicator (target 75%) Baseline measure:	National KIIs (Q4), and district KIIs D1(Q12), D2/D3/D4/D5/D6 (Q5) DF (B12 to 13)
<i>Sub IR 1.2 Collaboration between reconciliation actors improves targeting and impact</i>				
3.	% of participants citing a <u>concrete</u> example of the impact of the NGO Forum in their work	Custom	Output indicator (target 50%)	National KIIs (Q12) DF (B14 to 16)
IR 2: Targeted groups see increased participation in reconciliation activities and feel greater ownership over the process				
<i>Sub IR 2.1: Targeted communities see increased participation in reconciliation activities</i>				
4.	% of targeted communities where participation in reconciliation activity meets or exceeds national baseline	Custom (no disaggregation to types of group)	Process (target from baseline 79.1%)	Surveyed response on national survey. (QB4, Q5-11 provide additional information)
IR 3: Encourage national dialogue and local ownership of reconciliation activities				
<i>Sub IR 3.1: Rwandans feel their views are taken into account in national reconciliation</i>				
5.	% of respondents feeling that reconciliation programs take their views into account.	Custom	Process	Surveyed responses from national survey (QC14, C22, C38, C47)

In evaluating the goal and specific objectives, it is important to ensure that we are focused on measuring the right thing. While using the benchmark indicators developed by the design team as proxies for performance, in reality we want to ensure we are evaluating how the project is meeting the needs of the target population. The quantitative survey was framed in by the baseline to provide comparative data while the qualitative tools provide an opportunity to ensure the evaluation focus is not only on the achievement of goals and objectives but more importantly on the needs of the target population.

While integrating the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria into the qualitative work (see Figure 2), the evaluators were careful to ensure that success was also measured in terms of what the people of Rwanda need from investment into reconciliation and unity work.

⁸ Numbers refer to tool and question number. Legend:

N = National stakeholder KIIs

D3 = Solidarity Activity Organizer KIIs

D6 = FGDs Listening Club Members

D1 = NURC Forum Member KIIs


D4 = Teachers KIIs

DF = District Forum Survey

D2 = Radio Director KIIs

D5 = FGDs Solidarity Activity Participants

Figure 2 OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria



Findings and Analysis

The findings and analysis will be presented by looking at how well the key activities delivered through the project achieved the coordination, participation and ownership objectives. The results will be presented with an evaluation of how well the indicators were achieved. The report begins with the strategic level theory of change which underpinned the project design.

Theory of Change

Informed by the healthy relationship theory of change, this project focuses on relationship-building through intergroup contact. This intergroup contact, assumed to lead to behaviour and attitudinal change, occurs in two dimensions. One dimension occurs at the national level between key operational and strategic stakeholders. In this dimension, contact is formalized in a regular coordination forum between NGOs and CSOs with shared operational and strategic interests and NURC, the government body responsible for forwarding reconciliation. The second dimension takes place in the district solidarity events between groups directly affected by the events of the genocide. In this dimension the approach is to break down stereotypes and barriers through intergroup contact.

The Healthy Relationships and Connections Theory of Change

“Peace emerges out of a process of breaking down isolation, polarization, division, prejudice and stereotypes between and among groups. Strong relationships are a necessary ingredient for peacebuilding.” -- Search for Common Ground 2002.

This hypothesis is informed by a “Healthy Relationships and Connections” theory of change. SFCG believes that intergroup contact breaks down stereotypes and barriers, leads to behavioral and attitudinal change, and ultimately encourages reconciliation by humanizing the Other.

The process of change at the core of this project reflects what is often referred to as a “Building Bridges” model. This model holds that creating suitable forums and opportunities for interpersonal interactions will allow healthy and trusting relationships to emerge. As individuals engage in debate, dialogue, and group activities, this forms a “bridge” between communities and reconciliation can begin.¹⁴

The main theory of change underlying the project design was tested with the project participants and beneficiaries to ascertain if the rationale of the project was viable. Overall, respondents from the qualitative surveying at national and district level unanimously agreed that this assumption was true. The evidence from the national forum shows that this project has enabled a formative level of intergroup contact and an excellent starting point to move forward with the revised NURC strategy for reconciliation. At the district level, project participants and beneficiaries overwhelmingly indicated that intergroup contact has led to the formation of relationships needed to move reconciliation forward.

Project Goal (Indicator 1)

Most of the respondents (96%) said that improving coordination, establishing a standardized operational plan and creating a common vision about reconciliation are key elements to catalyzing meaningful reconciliation in Rwanda. They also suggested that improved coordination and bridge-building activities in targeted locations would decrease social conflicts and thus contribute to uniting communities. This confirms the relevance of the work.

Qualitative Results

The NURC was the main strategic and operational partner of the project. A full 6 months was taken to bring NURC on board to the project, get a MOU signed and build the relationship which permitted the roll out of the project activities.

The MOU signed by SFCG and NURC aligns the project effort with national policy, lays out clear deliverables and responsibilities of the partnership and was designed to increase confidence between the two main partners. NURC hired a focal person however the regular meetings and sharing of reporting did not happen which likely slowed the implementation of the project.

NURC established the District Forums and Reconciliation Clubs in schools (SCURs) early in its tenure to strengthen local ownership and prioritization of reconciliation and unity issues and as a mechanism to build and channel strategy.⁹

Reconciliation and unity issues are driven from the President's office and include a number of different government institutions.¹⁰ NURC responds to those demands as well as those of the operational stakeholders (INGOs, NGOs and CBOs) and their district forums. The head of NURC's peacebuilding department indicated that in four districts, reconciliation results have been mainstreamed into the JADF performance action plans.¹¹ (see below)

While many of the stakeholders interviewed didn't know about the NURC strategy and/or policy, 96% of respondents felt that a national and district level policy would be beneficial to Rwanda's reconciliation process. They suggest that having a district level policy would enhance the appropriateness of NURC's work in the districts by ensuring district interventions were tailored to the respective district context.

Coordination Mechanisms (Indicator 2)

This section will respond to Indicator 2 by describing how well the coordination mechanisms worked and suggest recommendations for change.

⁹ National Unity and Reconciliation Commission is the government institution with the constitutional obligation to mobilize Rwandans for reconciliation and unity. Established in March 1999 by the law N°03/99 of 12/03/99 by the then government, NURC has the mandate to coordinate operational stakeholders working on the issue. <http://www.nurc.gov.rw/index.php?id=69>

¹⁰ <http://www.presidency.gov.rw/component/content/article/1-latest-news/944-we-have-a-common-responsibility-to-build-a-new-rwanda>

¹¹ This was not confirmed further with the district plans or district JADFs.

When asked to characterize the coordination of NURC, just over 60% of all national and district stakeholder interviewees (i.e. all unity and reconciliation actors interviewed at both national and district level) stated that NURC's coordination is "very helpful" to unity and reconciliation activities while under a third replied that NURC's coordination is "helpful" and only 6% felt NURC's coordination is "not helpful". Respondents who felt that NURC's coordination is very helpful to unity and reconciliation cited the quality of the coordination and operationalization of unity and reconciliation activities as reasons. Examples given for respondents' rating NURC's coordination as not helpful include the fact that NURC's strategy is too conceptual and not practical for implementation as well as the fact that NURC is a national body, not yet fully integrated into local authorities. In many cases, even where the NURC district forum is active, respondents mentioned the need for a NURC structure at village or cell level.

When asked, most District Forum member survey respondents said they found NURC coordination helpful (84%) and when pressed to rate how strongly they agreed or disagreed that NURC was helpful, most said they agreed somewhat (48%) or agreed strongly (38%). Two respondents were neutral, 3 disagreed somewhat and 2 disagreed strongly that NURC was useful in coordinating unity and reconciliation activities in their District.

In terms of helpfulness, funding and training received were mentioned most frequently (both 72%) followed by 'NURC is able to bring together actors' and 'Strengthening the collaboration between actors (both 23%). Those that felt NURC is not helpful pointed to insufficient resources or funds (7 out of 7).

The characterization of NURC's coordination does not vary significantly based on the age or geographical location of respondents. It may be of value to note that a majority of radio directors, participants in community solidarity activities and members of the listening clubs found NURC's coordination to be "very helpful" as did, not surprisingly, NURC district forum members. Meanwhile, not one teacher or solidarity activity organizer rated NURC's coordination of unity and reconciliation issues in the district as "very helpful" .

Most interviewees and survey respondents rated the NURC's coordination as helpful or very helpful. Funding and training were mentioned as the areas where NURC was most helpful and, for those who rated NURC as unhelpful, funding was the reason most cited. NURC suggested that the project had stirred a demand for solidarity activities in the districts but NURC does not have the ability to respond now that the project is complete.

Peace and Reconciliation Network

A national forum for operational stakeholders existed at the start of the project but it was dormant. Working through existing structures, the project sought to support the revitalization of a national forum to effect coordination and cooperation with NGOs working on reconciliation and unity issues in Rwanda. The national forum established by NURC is called the peace and reconciliation network and has six objectives:

- Sharing information on peace building activities taking place in the country (strategies, research findings, learning opportunities)
- Organize joint actions on peace building, unity and reconciliation (mourning week, International Day of Peace etc.)
- Identification of priorities, actions/ initiatives to be taken during a set period
- Advocacy for activities of peace building organizations
- Present the position on certain issues affecting unity and reconciliation in the country

- National Mapping of all peace building initiatives and stakeholders

The network was led by NURC as the organization with the mandate for coordination supported by SFCG.

Clear terms of reference for the Peace and Reconciliation Network were developed and shared with members nevertheless the understanding of coordination was not uniform across the respondents interviewed. The national stakeholders (NGOs) spoke to the value of NURC in establishing this national forum and gave clear evidence of the benefits of networking was found. All national stakeholders interviewed agreed that the connections which the national forum had made possible were real, useable and the heart of an emerging network.

Evidence of connections and coordination resulting from the platform was noted:

- A consortium of NGOs who met at the national forum recently received funding from the Dutch government for a joint project.
- The Rwandan Barometer was shared and presented through the forum to operational stakeholders who were able to give feedback and who will (eventually) be contributing to the indicators as they are developed.
- An African Summit on Trauma and Healing will be held. This reportedly also emerged from the networking provided by the forum.

Reconciliation is defined by the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC) as:

“A consensus practice of citizens who have common nationality, who share the same culture and have equal rights; citizens characterized by trust, tolerance, mutual respect, equality, complementary roles/interdependence, truth, and healing of one another’s wounds inflicted by our history, with the objectives of laying a foundation for sustainable development.”

- Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer, p18

While the respondents said coordination by NURC was mainly helpful, a few respondents felt that time and effort was limited to the first two objectives of the forum and could have been more usefully spent balancing the other objectives.

DM&E evidence such as pre and post tests were not available from the DM&E Officer, however participants indicated the experience was valuable both for the skills and knowledge they gained and also for the opportunity for the discussion with colleagues around key sensitive issues.

As an example, the national forum provided a valuable platform for the work of Institute of Research for Dialogue for Peace (IRDPA) to present their research into key issues affecting reconciliation. The forum members were able to contribute to IRDPs methodology of participative research¹²; however the opportunity to identify or discuss key issues, find an agreement or positioning around the key issues or develop an advocacy approach was not explored in the forum which met only twice.

The national forum did not take place as frequently as was originally planned. This was due partially to the slow start up of the project as gaining traction between the two organisations took much longer than expected. This was reportedly not due to lack of will on the part of NURC but rather limited capacity and the multiple demands on the institution.

¹² IRDP – Institute of Research and Dialogue for Peace, www.irdp.rw. This institute researches key issues in reconciliation and found the national forum useful for sharing their work.

Over the course of the project, discussion on key issues and consultation on the concept of reconciliation were limited which meant the national forum did not reach the point of creating a shared vision for reconciliation and unity. They were limited as the forum did not meet as proposed in the MOU and the substance of the meeting was more operational than strategic. Nevertheless what is in place is a valuable starting point for further work. Useful information was shared such as identifying gaps or underserved areas in the country and sharing methodologies and impact. This information-sharing was important to coordinate efforts and contributions around significant national events such as International Peace Day and the Mourning period. The national stakeholder respondents indicated that, even if they did not know about the individual project, or its goals and objectives, they were able to see the imprint of the project through increased vitality of NURC as a public institution leading reconciliation and unity issues.

Elements of a shared vision were evident as respondents shared their ideas about the benefits of reconciliation with comments such as: it is a long term healing process; it is very complex; complicated and sensitive; it involves truth telling and a historical perspective; it is about building trust in 'the other' and acknowledging the pain of 'the other' and is fundamental for any sustainable or meaningful development in Rwanda. They also agreed that working in every community, with every household, is important. Healing does not occur with time alone; real hard work is required to heal the wounds and this means social investment over a long period. The respondents shared the viewpoint that reconciliation is a national project in Rwanda. While agreeing on the benefits of reconciliation, they differed on their understanding of an effective strategy for its achievement.

While National stakeholders acknowledged the orientation provided by government through NURC and other public institutions for reconciliation and unity issues,¹³ they indicated that a central coherent idea of the concept of reconciliation which should be central to the shared vision for reconciliation and unity work in Rwanda was not achieved.

Most national stakeholder respondents indicated that they were not familiar with the NURC strategy for reconciliation and unity although some said they had seen a policy booklet at some point. Nevertheless, some respondents felt the strategy for reconciliation NURC was forwarding was narrow and resulted in compartmentalization and stigmatization of groups. Others felt the focus on protection of rights of all citizens necessitated the privileging of some groups by the state. Others were not convinced of the approach obfuscating already embedded identities and denying the existence of very real cultural paradigms. Discussion of these issues was considered too sensitive and too political and thus there were no discussions at the forum level about the deeper philosophical underpinnings of reconciliation and how this gets turned into a strategy.

In summary, the forum worked toward a set of objectives, they established clear terms of reference and shared these with members, there was clear evidence of the benefits of networking such that established connections were real, usable and will be the heart of an emerging network.

A central, coherent idea of the concept of reconciliation was not established and, although not as much progress was made as expected, some gains were indeed made which is a valuable starting point established for further work. These connections should continue to be fostered and all should work toward a shared vision of reconciliation.

¹³ Civic education group, (Itorero), Student Financing Agency for Genocide Survivors, Commission for the Fight against Genocide

NURC District Forums (Indicator 3)

In this section the interviews and survey results are presented to discuss the activities organized by the NDFs and will address participation in NGO Forum and reconciliation activities as measured by indicator 3.

NURC district forums (NDFs) are organizing sites for solidarity and bridge building activities to promote reconciliation and unity. Recognising the NDF as the local site of coordination for reconciliation is important as the two dimensions of reconciliation namely the political level and the individual and interpersonal level intersect at community level. Many of the approaches to reconciliation including the traditional courts Gacaca have drawn inspiration from local culture and this is to inspire meaningful ownership of the process thus forwarding individual and interpersonal transformation.

NURC has its entire staff at HQ in Kigali and works through district forums who are chaired by Vice mayors or other dignitaries at district level. The forums are comprised of government representatives, CSO/NGOs and others interested and involved in reconciliation and unity issues at district level. The district forums were set up when NURC first began its work and seem to be in place to strengthen ownership of activities at district level (i.e. closer to the people). Usually led by the Mayor and supported by the local administration through the Good Governance Officer, NURC district forums have an overlap in terms of membership with the more prominent Joint Action Forums which have established benchmarks of performance they are accountable for to the central government.¹⁴ The NURC district forum is purposefully separate to focus on key reconciliation and unity issues as a national priority. The NURC district forums have varying levels of vitality depending on the interests and availability of the local leadership.¹⁵

In terms of profile of interview participants and survey respondents, Forum members interviewed are over two thirds male (68%) with less than half (44%) between the ages of 18 and 35 and the balance (56%) from those age 36 and over. All District Forum members surveyed except one said they can read and write and they are, on the whole, more educated than the General Population with forum members reporting higher educational qualifications. Members are experienced with most (88%) members surveyed in the position more than one year.

Qualitative Results

Most national stakeholder respondents didn't know about the NURC district forums. The forums, whose objectives are to promote and sensitize the values of unity and reconciliation at the community level, generally meet every quarter; a higher frequency would prove difficult since members are often too busy with other income generating activities. It was clear that the organisational capacity and agency of INGOs is not directly supporting or reinforcing the vitality of the NURC district forum. It could be that INGO operations in the districts are working with the membership of the district forums, however, this is not planned or necessarily part of the strategy.

¹⁴ The NURC district forum works separately but in conjunction with the Joint Action District Development Forum (JADF) which is also a multi actor forum and is tied to performance contracts with central government for development benchmarks. The JADF could have up to 70 members and works through committees. The joint action forums are put in place to achieve full participation of the citizens in the local development process through their representatives from the public, private and civil society. It is a space for inclusive dialogues and accountability where the voices of the people, including the marginalized and the vulnerable, can be heard and met by responsive authorities and service providers. The JADF is also part of a wider system of checks and balances in the planning and monitoring of services and development. The JADF aims at functional accountability in the implementation of development activities between development partners. The NURC district forum might or might not have overlap with the Joint Action Development in terms of membership and objectives however it was purposefully separate to focus on key reconciliation and unity issues as a national priority.

¹⁵ Interview with NURC staff in November 2013.

In the qualitative interviews almost 50% of forum members interviewed stated that conflict management was the most important thing they learnt about during the SFCG supported training. Similarly, around half of the members stated that they appreciated the professionalism of the trainers who facilitated the trainings. Most members asked to have more training in order to strengthen their work in unity and reconciliation.

Furthermore, when asked if partners had encountered any problems during the course of the training or activity, two thirds stated that there had been problems which most often were about a lack of resources. Forum members also pointed to lack of human and financial resources as a challenging issue (7 people).

Quantitative Results

Almost one third (31%) of the General Population respondents to the survey had heard of the NDFs in their community with respondents in Musanze reporting the highest awareness at almost two thirds of respondents (64%). Men and women and the two age groups (18-35 and 36+) had equal awareness of the NDF. Most forums meet on a quarterly basis. All members indicated they were familiar with the national NURC strategy for unity and reconciliation. Most members interviewed are familiar with the use of the Rwandan Reconciliation Barometer.

When those from the General Population survey who had heard of the NDF (31%) were asked if they were aware of Forum activities almost three quarters (70%) said yes. Respondents in Musanze were most aware (75%) while those in Rwamagana were least aware (63%) of Forum activities. Men were more aware of activities than women (76% vs. 64%) and older respondents were more aware than the younger age group (76% vs. 66%).

District Forum members were asked in the survey about training sessions organized by NURC and SFCG. Of the respondents who answered the question, just over half (55%) had attended a training. Of those who attended, most (92%) found the content relevant with just less than three quarters (72%) saying they strongly agree and one quarter (24%) saying they agree that it was relevant. When asked what they learned at the training, participants said conflict resolution techniques most often (36%) followed by stereotype management (21%), rumour management (20%) and project design (18%). When asked if they have done anything differently as a result of the training over half (60%) said yes and mentioned both conflict resolution and project management initiatives. What were particularly appreciated about the trainings received by NURC district forum members were the professionalism of the trainers and the structure of training.

Members were asked whether or not it is easy to express opinions and ideas during Forum meetings and if they felt comfortable expressing their thoughts and opinions openly and honestly during Forum meetings. Most (96%) said it was easy to express opinions and agreed strongly (58%) or somewhat (38%) that they felt comfortable being frank in discussions. Only one member strongly disagreed that this was true.

Members said they ask questions openly (77%), are encouraged to give their thoughts (23%), and have never seen anyone arrested for expressing him or herself (13%). Most strongly agree (30%) or somewhat agree (17%) that the Forums are useful sessions for open, collaborative dialogue on reconciliation issues. Only one individual disagrees somewhat that this is true.

When asked about whether open dialogue takes place in the community, most (86%) said yes, and it is done largely in meetings organized by local leaders (56%), in association meetings (47%), after umuganda community work (46%) and in the church (42%).


Final Evaluation:

From the survey, District Forum members clearly believe that the work they are doing is useful. They showed this through their agreement with the statement that the Forums are useful sessions and belief that their opinions can be expressed openly and honestly within the Forum. This is also demonstrated indirectly by their meeting attendance and tenure in the Forum. They agree that there is a place for dialogue outside the Forum, most frequently in community meetings hosted by local leaders and in association meetings. They have benefited from participation in the forum and find the role of the NURC helpful, through funding and training in particular, although several members did suggest that more resources are required as the number one recommendation on how to improve the Forum coordination.

Challenges to Unity and Reconciliation

Drawn from the Rwandan Reconciliation Barometer report were six challenges for unity and reconciliation in Rwanda.¹⁶ These issues were included in each of the tools of both the quantitative and the qualitative surveying to judge where the most work needs to be done.

The biggest challenges to unity and reconciliation as identified by the General Population are issues around land (30%) and Gacaca compensation (22%). One tenth (10%) said there are no challenges while only a few (2%) said they did not know what the biggest challenges are. The most significant output of this question was the sheer number of different responses (All Other 19%) indicating that there is a wide diversity in understanding or belief of the challenges. This has implications for how the issues are resolved. See Chart 1.




District Forum members were also asked for their thoughts on the biggest challenges remaining to unity and reconciliation. There were significant differences in the results between Forum members and the General Population. Where the General Population feels that land is still the biggest challenge, Forum members believe it is Gacaca Compensation. Ethnicity is an issue to the General Population but not seen as an issue to Forum members. Access to resources was a bigger issue to Forum members than it is to the General Population. What the two groups did have in common was a significant number of 'All Other' responses which consisted of a wide diversity of thoughts on what the biggest challenges are. These differences are both institutional and personal and must be addressed in a way that the priorities of all stakeholders are addressed. See Chart 2.

When the responses are analyzed by District the results are generally consistent with the following notable exceptions. These trends are indicative and not necessarily statistically significant.

¹⁶ The Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer (RRB) project is in line with the NURC's mandate to promote national unity and reconciliation in a post-genocide Rwanda, and represents an attempt to deepen its understanding of how ordinary citizens perceive and react to efforts aimed at promoting these objectives. The study has emerged from the need for a quantitative monitoring tool that would allow the Commission to access the most current public opinion on the progress and pitfalls of the country's national reconciliation programme. Such a tool would allow it to respond in a more targeted way to social fault lines and, in the longer term, may serve as an early warning system to potential sources of societal friction. Public opinion around national reconciliation has, thus far, been an under-researched aspect in the search to understand national unity and reconciliation processes in Rwanda, and this report presents the results of exploratory research on this area.

In different districts issues are reflected differently. Access to resources was biggest in Kigali City (12%) compared to the other Districts. Musanze (30%) and Rwamagana (27%) Districts had the largest number of All Other challenges. Huye (20%) and Karongi (30%) had the largest number of respondents who said there are no challenges. More respondents in Rwamagana (9%) than in any other District said they did not know of any challenges.



During the district FDGs and KIIs, all respondents were given the same list of six issues and asked to rank them starting with the issue representing the biggest challenge to unity and reconciliation to the issue which is the least of an obstacle to unity and reconciliation. There was no opportunity to identify any other challenges as in the 'all other'. Results corroborate the findings and show that generally land is perceived as the biggest remaining challenge to reconciliation, followed by Gacaca compensation, access to resources, regional issues, governance, and finally, ethnic divisions as the least important remaining barrier to reconciliation. This ranking does not vary according to the type of organisation to which the respondent belongs, i.e.: NURC district forum member, radio director and listening club members, solidarity event organizers and participants and teachers, nor does it vary according to age group of the respondents or geographical location.

The other challenges mentioned most frequently by respondents were around ideology differences and livelihood (poverty) issues.

Bridge Building Activities (Indicator 4)

Bridge building activities, including solidarity events, participative school theaters, radio programs and their listening clubs at district level were undertaken based on agreed criteria by SFCG and NURC. These activities were community or school initiatives that brought together diverse groups, including survivors and perpetrators and their families in the case of some of the solidarity activities, in a variety of different approaches and were implemented (generally) by local organisations.

Qualitative Results

The national stakeholders interviewed appreciated the opportunities these events provided for their local partners or their organisations. Repeatedly, it was suggested that many more such events were needed and the success of the existing activities had spawned a response that NURC was unable to attend to.

“Reconciliation is not a project (i.e. with short term time frames). It is a program requiring long term investment. There is no camera that can document the result.”

~ District Civil Society member (stakeholder)

With regards to what aspects partner organisations such as radio stations, schools and CSOs or faith-based organization involved in organizing community-based solidarity events most enjoyed about their involvement in the SFCG supported activities; the most commonly cited response was that the activity brought people together to provide an opportunity for exchanging ideas among different groups.

Final Evaluation:

Looking into the aspects of the activities that partners least enjoyed, (though a large majority stated there was nothing they did not enjoy), the most common comment referred to a lack of follow-up or further activities. A few respondents stated that some problems occurred from participants having difficulties working together.

Interestingly, 90% of district respondents interviewed stated that the activity they participated in, be it community solidarity activities, school theaters or radio programs and listening clubs changed their opinion and another 90% changed their behaviour in relation to unity and reconciliation. The most commonly cited change in opinion resulting from participation in the activity is the appreciation of the value of community involvement in unity and reconciliation activities. The next most commonly cited change in opinion is a decrease in discrimination on their part towards different groups. As for changes in behaviour, the most common behavioural changes quoted by respondents are their experience of better relationships and improved tolerance of, and dialogues with, others of different background.

There is a unanimous response from all respondents that more unity and reconciliation activities should be supported. Often, respondents would explain that one activity represents one step in the process of unity and reconciliation, a long process which requires many steps hence every activity contributes to sensitizing the concept and purpose of unity and reconciliation and enhancing the population’s understanding of unity and reconciliation but never will one activity alone achieve unity and reconciliation, perseverance is essential.

Quantitative Results

From the baseline and endline national surveys, the table below shows the level of knowledge about NURC and its activities in the general population before and after project implementation.¹⁷

Indicator 4 Participation in Reconciliation Activities		
Table 4: Comparative Knowledge levels between Baseline and Final Survey		
Question	Baseline	Final Evaluation Survey
Awareness		
Have you ever heard of NURC? (B1)	Almost all respondents (99.1%) said that they know of NURC.	Almost all (93%) respondents had heard of NURC but fewer than on the baseline.
Have you ever heard of NURC district forums? (B2)	29.1% of respondents said that they have heard of district forums of unity and reconciliation.	Almost one third (31%) had heard of the District Forum on Unity and Reconciliation in their community.
Are you aware of any activities organised by District forum? (B3)	Of those above who responded, 74.8% said that they were aware of such activities.	When those who had heard of the Forum were asked if they were aware of Forum activities almost three quarters (70%) said yes.
Result: Awareness of NURC and its activities has not changed significantly over the baseline.		

¹⁷ The Baseline Survey methodology can be found in Annex x.

Indicator 4 Participation in Reconciliation Activities		
Table 4: Comparative Knowledge levels between Baseline and Final Survey		
Question	Baseline	Final Evaluation Survey
Participation		
Have you ever participated in any reconciliation activities (organised by district NURCs)? (B4)	Of those above who responded, 79.1% confirmed that they have participated.	Of those who were aware of activities organized by the District forum, 64% have participated in any reconciliation activities (by the Forum or others). ¹⁸
Result: Participation levels have dropped from the baseline.		
Organizers		
Who were these activities organised by? (B5)	Of those above who responded, 88.2% said that the organizers were local authorities, 34.3% of the respondents said that the organizers were NURC national staff. 7.9% of the respondents said the organizers were from the district forum of unity and reconciliation, 11% reported local organizations and associations.	Over three quarters of respondents who had heard of the forum and participated in activities (Forum or otherwise) (79%) believed that local authorities are responsible for organizing activities followed by NURC national staff (37%), and the Church (19%). The District Forum (14%), local organizations (10%) and International NGOs (6%) were also identified as responsible.
Result: Local authorities continue to be seen as the key organizers of activities.		
Activities		
What type of activities were they? (B6)	80.1% of respondents reported public dialogue. 45.05% of the respondents said grassroots consultations, 11.8% said Ingando and 12.4% said Itorero. A small number of respondents reported debate (3.9%) and competition (3.4%).	Overall over half of respondents (55%) mentioned Grassroots Consultations most often followed by Public Dialogue (46%) and Training (42%). Smaller numbers reported public debates and competitions (both 8%).
Result: Public dialogue as an activity dropped significantly while grassroots consultants increased.		
Relevance		
I found the activities very relevant to issues in my community? (B7)	99.04% of the respondents (99.40%) agreed that the activities are relevant.	Three quarters (77%) of the respondents who had heard of the forum and participated in activities (Forum or otherwise) agreed that the activities are very relevant to issues in their community.
Result: Relevance of activities to community dropped from the baseline to endline.		


¹⁸ Note the wording change of the question from the baseline. The question on the final evaluation captures both NURC and non-NURC organized activities which may inflate the number.

Indicator 4 Participation in Reconciliation Activities		
Table 4: Comparative Knowledge levels between Baseline and Final Survey		
Question	Baseline	Final Evaluation Survey
Biggest Challenge to Unity and Reconciliation		
What do you think remains the biggest challenges to unity and Reconciliation? (B13)	Not on the baseline	Of all survey respondents, they identified the following as the biggest challenges to unity and reconciliation Land 30% of responses, Gacaca Compensation 22%, Access to resources 7%, ethnic divisions 6% and Regional issues 4%.
Land was identified as the biggest challenge to unity and reconciliation.		

Another dimension looked at in the National and District Forum surveys was around opportunities for open discussion on issues of unity and reconciliation. Forum members were more likely to say there are opportunities for open discussion in the community (86%) compared to the General Population (65%).

When the responses from the General Population and District Forum are compared as to where discussion on unity and reconciliation takes place, the results are interesting. While both groups agree that Local Authority Meetings are the most common place to have open, collaborative dialogue about reconciliation, and they agree that Church is a place where this happens as well, there is no alignment when comparing other opportunities mentioned by the two groups. The General Population mentioned more private venues such as with friends and family while Forum members mentioned more public arenas such as ‘After community meetings’ and ‘In association meetings’ See Chart 3.

Chart 3 Where Does Discussion Take Place?



School Participatory Theater

The General Population and District Forum quantitative surveys found over one quarter of the General Population (26%) had heard of Participatory Theater (PT) while just over one third of District Forum members (35%) had heard of it. Of those who had heard of it, over three quarters of the General Population had participated (76%) while over half (59%) of District Forum members had participated in one.

When analyzing the data further, men and women had heard of and participated in PT in equal proportion but slightly more men participated. A greater proportion of younger respondents had heard about PT but both age groups participated equally. When looking at the results at the District level, more respondents in Huye and Karongi had heard about it than in the other Districts and respondents in Karongi and Musanze were more likely to have participated.

The Participatory Theater was to be used in schools where NURC had established School Clubs for Unity and Reconciliation (SCUR). These structures had reportedly been largely ineffective due to the unique nature of the issues in schools confronting these peer clubs.

Some national stakeholders thought that the sector which had benefited the most from the project (and needed to benefit the most) was schools. Schools have unique challenges including a generational gap across which, it was reported, it is difficult to get a real conversation going. According to the respondents, due to very different viewpoints of the different age groups there are special challenges in schools between students and school authorities. Reportedly, work in schools using the tools of participatory theater was transformative in nature and opened up a valuable vantage point for NURC and authorities to understand the generational issues in the society. See text box.

Participatory theater (PT) was a tool that raised real concerns with NURC.¹⁹ Their concern was that without being able to control the message, it was possible that students or school authorities could be retraumatized during the process of using this tool. However after succeeding in piloting this, NURC became convinced that in fact their concerns were out-of-place and in fact this tool had transformative power through its participatory attributes. PT enabled questions and concerns to be aired that previously individuals were unable to voice and provided a new and revealing perspective to the reconciliation and unity work. As NURC moves to the next phase of the national strategy focusing on dialogue, NURC staff reported that they will take with them new tools they learned about in the project to use in this next phase.

Unintended Benefits of Participatory Theater

Participatory theater was a key tool to be used in the project particularly in schools where NURC had established School Clubs for Unity and Reconciliation (SCUR). As part of the evaluation the participatory theater performers provided feedback on their own extraordinary experiences using PT on reconciliation and unity issues. Two stories of transformation are revealing:

One young Tutsi man, and a well seasoned participatory theater actor, was asked to play the role of a Hutu student in the episode SFCG and NURC were planning. He was wondering how he was going to do that because his identity is rooted in the fact that he is a survivor. He wondered how he would play a Hutu student as he had no idea of their mindset. After two or three sessions, he came to realize that the Hutu student role he was playing had exactly the same hurt and pain that he as a survivor had. The Hutu student had no parents to look after him as they were perpetrators and in prison. The property of the student's family had been paid as part of the Gacaca compensation process and in fact the Hutu student was as alone as he was. It made the young actor realize that he and his fellow students shared more than he had ever imagined.

One young female actor told the story of how the work she did with PT in the thematic of reconciliation changed her life, transformed her thinking and helped her to come to terms with herself. Previously, although she had never stated it, she identified herself as a Tutsi. She always made sure that in subtle ways either through symbols, or affiliations, she would be identified as a Tutsi. She was hiding behind the Tutsi identity because she felt that the Hutu identity of her family put her to shame. She was afraid to identify as a Hutu because of the bad things her people had done. Her personal transformation was a liberating moment for her to free her from her fears of identifying who she was – a Hutu. She realized through the PT, that young people share the same burden regardless of which group they come from, it's the same weight, the same responsibility and this allowed her to let go of the shame and embrace who she was.

¹⁹ SFCG Third quarterly report to CMM.

Radio Programming

A weekly radio program highlighting themes of reconciliation, success stories and role models was a key component of the project. Therefore the quantitative research sought to capture key results of this activity. General Population survey respondents were asked if they listen to the radio and almost all (90%) said they do. When asked if they own a radio, a significant number (84%) answered in the affirmative.

District Forum members were also asked about their radio listening habits. All members have a radio and all listen to the radio – almost two thirds of them every day (61%) which is slightly lower than that of the General Population. They listen mostly at home (48%) or at work (21%) and early in the morning much more than the General Population (82%).

Some national stakeholder respondents don't use radio rather they use the television and Internet for their information sources. In terms of radio listenership, all district level respondents in the qualitative investigations report listening to the radio, two-thirds of whom listen to all types of radios (local, national, regional and international) and a quarter of whom listen to local radios only. Just over half of respondents listen to the radio at different times of the day and over a third listen in the evenings only. One hundred per cent of those interviewed agree that radio is a useful tool for unity and reconciliation, mainly because it reaches a large audience but also because it becomes an excellent platform for dialogue giving speakers the opportunity to remain anonymous.

Turumwe

Officially launched in November 2011 "Turumwe" (We are One) is a half hour radio show developed under this project to address unity and reconciliation issues. It featured case studies of reconciliation processes in other countries; provided an introduction to the NURC; the District Forum structures and their roles; featured ongoing challenges to unity and reconciliation; and the Gacaca process and its status today. Table 5 is a comparative of the general population and District Forum members' responses to the questions about the Turumwe radio program.

Table 5 Turumwe Responses		
Question	General Population	District Forum
Listened?	14% of radio listeners have listened to the program Profile – equally male and female and younger and older age groups; fairly equal distribution across districts although slightly higher in Kigali City; more popular among those with more education	44% of members have listened to the program Profile – by District the results are: Huye 20%, Karongi 40%, Musanze 60%, Rwamagana 47%
How Often?	Every Week – 35% Sometimes – 58% Once per month – 7%	Every Week – 9% Sometimes – 77% Once per month – 14%
Like?	Strongly like – 45% Like – 42% Neutral – 14%	Strongly like – 24% Like – 52% Neutral – 24%
Program Focus?	Correctly identified unity and reconciliation – 86%	Correctly identified unity and reconciliation (82%) but many also said land conflicts (27%) and Education (23%)

Table 5 Turumwe Responses		
Question	General Population	District Forum
Discuss Issues?	Yes – 47%	Yes – 73%
Reflects community issues?	Very well – 32% Well – 22% So-so – 27% Less – 11% Not at all – 8%	No scale in survey
Has program caused change?	Yes – 44% Those that identified a change in their behaviour as a result of the program were able to articulate examples particularly around forgiveness.	Yes – 73% District Forum members mentioned a number of personal and professional behaviour changes as a result of listening to the program including: understanding the concept of forgiveness, helping them to have the ability to live with others, and giving them information to educate others.
<p>Summary</p> <p>Although listenership is low among General Population respondents, it is liked among those that listen. Just less than half of listeners discuss the issues presented in the program and the feeling is that the program reflects community issues “well” (22%) or “very well” (32%). Listeners very clearly knew it was about unity and reconciliation. Recommend to promote the program to improve frequency of listening.</p> <p>Almost half (44%) of District Forum members listen to the program and most (77%) listen sometimes. More than three quarters of General Population listeners “like” or “strongly like” the program and the General Population likes it more than District Forum members by a small margin. Members identified the program as being about unity and reconciliation but also thought it was about land and education. Repositioning the program among District Forum members as ‘their program’ might increase listenership and attitude toward the program.</p>		

From the analysis it appears that the radio programs have a small reach nationally but do have a moderate impact on the audiences they reach. In general, about one third of listeners discuss the issues presented in the programs.

Turumwe radio program was getting limited feedback as was evident through the SMS and feedback telephone line. Thus, according to the DM&E manager, listening clubs were launched to facilitate participation. Set up by volunteers in the community, the listening clubs were established by the radio stations in order to get a better understanding of listenership of the station's programs as well as the perception and intake of the content of the radio programs by listening audience. Listening clubs are composed of members of the community who volunteer to join the club and sit together in their communities to listen to the radio program, after which, the club members enter into a discussion around the issues raised during the program. These discussions are then fed back to the radio station, which shares the content of the discussion with SFCG to inform future programs.

Members of the listening club are generally proactive and concerned members of the community. They enjoy debating issues and are committed to the cause of unity and reconciliation. Some clubs are predominantly formed of youths; and, others enjoy a diverse range of members thereby enriching the discussions by bringing different attitudes and experiences to the club discussion. Each club has a representative who then relays the debate content to the radio station. Without the contribution of the

Final Evaluation:

listening clubs, the radio programs would not have been as relevant or as tailored to the communities they are being broadcast to; in other words, the listening clubs greatly enriched the content of the radio programs. NURC reported that this is a participative tool which they will replicate in other districts to gather feedback on the radio programme they are producing.

SFCG Value to NURC

District Forum members surveyed identified several benefits to the working relationship with SFCG. They reported having learnt new attitudes and practical skills as a result of the training, especially in the areas of conflict management and monitoring and evaluation of their performances, both of which can be applied in their roles in communities. Members also stated that the SFCG supported activities they had witnessed, whether solidarity activities, radio programs or school theaters, had inspired them to organize more similar community or school-based events as a means to promote unity and reconciliation. NURC district forum members spoke highly of SFCG's contribution to unity and reconciliation especially in the quality of the training.

NURC national staff suggested that the partnership with SFCG set a new standard for partnership with INGOs. Initially they were skeptical that an external actor such as SFCG could play an effective role but through the project they were able to see that in fact the approach used by SFCG was effective and enabling for the issues of reconciliation. NURC suggested that they had now acquired practical experience with two new participatory tools to forward their work namely Participative Theatre and the Listening Clubs which were considered particularly valuable by NURC.

Indicator Summary

The following is a recap of the indicators the evaluation team was examining.

Goal: Improved coordination and bridge building activities in targeted locations will catalyze meaningful reconciliation in Rwanda.

Indicator 1: Indicative correlation between exposure to program activity and 'open' attitudes towards reconciliation.

Target: A target was not set.

The goal of the project sheds light on the two dimensions of reconciliation – the political dimension (improved coordination) and the interpersonal or individual dimension (bridge building). The rationale for the goal of the project was validated by all the respondents in the qualitative sample. It was recognized by national stakeholders that NURC's coordination was invigorated by the project and a formative network is in place to move forward from. As well, the evidence points to the effectiveness of solidarity events at community level in bringing together different groups to build relationships. However it was realized that this goal is long term and the two parts need to work in tandem. This project was one step on the way.

Indicator 2 - # of conflict resolution interveners finding coordination "helpful" or "very helpful"

Target: 75% **Actual:** National stakeholders 90%, District participants 84%.

When asked how they would characterize the coordination of NURC, just over 60% of all national stakeholder respondents interviewed stated that NURC's coordination is "very helpful" to unity and reconciliation activities whilst just under a third replied that NURC's coordination is "helpful" and around 6% felt NURC's coordination is "not helpful".

Final Evaluation:

When asked, most District Forum member survey respondents said they found NURC coordination helpful (84%) and when pressed to rate how strongly they agreed or disagreed that NURC was helpful, most said they agreed somewhat (48%) or agreed strongly (38%). Two respondents were neutral, 3 disagreed somewhat and 2 disagreed strongly that NURC was useful in coordinating unity and reconciliation activities in their District.

Indicator 3 - % of participants citing a concrete example of how the NGO forum impacted their work

Target: 50% **Actual:** 44% of national stakeholders and 100% of District Forum members cited a concrete example of how the forum impacted their work

Four concrete results were noted from the 9 respondents and each of the national stakeholders confirmed the usefulness of the NGO forum. All of the District forum members surveyed identified at least one thing they gained since becoming a member of the Forum. Responses included: 'skills in conflict transformation' (27%); 'the cause of war and genocide' (12%); 'why Rwandans need to be reconciled' (32%); 'discussion with others how reconciliation process should be conducted' (27%); and 'other benefits' (4%).

District forum members clearly identified benefits but not all national stakeholders did which indicates that more focus should be directed at providing concrete benefits for national stakeholders.

Indicator 4 - % of targeted communities where participation in reconciliation activities meets or exceeds national baseline

Target: Above baseline 79.1% **Actual:** 98.6%

The baseline was 79.1% and the result of the national survey (98.6%) showed that participation of communities in these events is high and increased through the project.

Indicator 5 - % of respondents who feel that reconciliation programmes take their views into account

Target: No target **Actual:** Forum members 86%, General population 65%

Forum members were more likely to say there are opportunities for open discussion in the community (86%) compared to the general population (65%). This indicates that those more closely involved feel their views are taken into account more than the general population does which would be the expected outcome. Without a target comparator it is difficult to evaluate but, in general this appears to be a good result.

Conclusion

The project was designed for a long term goal and objectives that are an important ongoing priority in Rwanda. While the deliverables in terms of outputs were achieved the more outcome oriented objectives are more difficult to assess. The implementation of the project was achieved at the activity level and many opportunities are developing at the strategic level which SFCG is well positioned to take advantage of. The impacts were positive and there were many achievements that were unintended.

Relevance

Twenty years after the genocide Rwandan history still affects most Rwandans on a daily basis it seems. The work of reconciliation is long term requiring investment by government, international and local NGOs

fostering the relationships of peaceful coexistence both at cell, district and in the national political space. Continuing vigilance is required. This project is but one step along that journey. In evaluating the project goal and specific objectives, it is clear that this project has important relevance to ordinary Rwandans and to the efforts of the Government of Rwanda on reconciliation and unity. The partnership between NURC and SFCG and other operational stakeholders both at national and sub-national level is important and a dynamic network is in its formative stage.

Effectiveness

While the project was slow to get started, it was time invested mainly in finding agreement around key priorities, the project design and building relationships with NURC staff and understanding of the NURC approach. NURC national stakeholders interviewed indicated reconciliation is highly sensitive in Rwanda, as is the involvement of INGOs. These two factors required a degree of trust-building and mutual understanding that needed time to develop. NURC indicated that the partnership with SFCG, documented in a Memorandum of Understanding, was considered to be a unique and positive experience for NURC. Their experience with INGOs had been one of maintaining arm's length from operational stakeholders who were seeking approval on paperwork requiring attendance at events only. They were skeptical of its efficacy. Working in a collaborative mode, learning and directing, balancing two very different organisational cultures, it was ultimately considered to be a beneficial experience by NURC and SFCG staff members building confidence and trust between the two organisations. Thus an unintended impact of the project is that it affirms the role of a variety of organisations including INGOs in this sensitive issue area and sets a new standard for partnership for NURC.

Impact

This project offered into the sensitive loci of reconciliation and unity work a focus not on the compartmentalized groups of survivors, perpetrators, bystanders, and the concomitant ideation, rather one on building relationships between these groups. It created platforms for these groups to come together and effect the bonds that can forward healing in communities where people have few choices but to live together. The focus on relationships began with a government institution (NURC) and an INGO (SFCG) who developed a working relationship, building trust and confidence, and making a breakthrough in what is possible for networking and cooperation. This is a good basis for NURC to work from and needs to be strengthened at district level for it to be effective.

The project was innovative in that it partnered directly with a government institution and NURC seemed to benefit the most from this project, as did SFCG through the partnership. Having overcome their initial skepticism, NURC has proposed to adopt two new tools into their work in the next phase of reconciliation and unity in Rwanda. These participatory tools which initially generated a lot of uncertainty about their impact have proven their value as tools to generate real and authentic dialogue raising important issues and voices from communities and will contribute to NURC's goal of engaging in dialogue from hill to hill in the next phase of reconciliation and unity work. Thus another unintended impact of the project is that it contributes directly to the sustainability of the action – raising diverse voices among the population in maximizing the impact of reconciliation work in Rwanda.

This project offered a revealing and valuable vantage point. It sought to expand the web of relationships between strategic national and district stakeholders, building bridges between diverse groups. Employing a strategic national lens it connected to where the real issues are felt in daily lives of people. It enabled a channel for those issues at community level to be heard inside a government institution which was also capacitated to respond. While this existed prior to the project, NURC was more visible and more

Final Evaluation:

strategically active during the project. There are opportunities for further strategic work around coordination and collaboration particularly around the monitoring and evaluation work of NURC and to support the vibrancy and effectiveness of the NURC district forums. Forum members are eager to develop their capacity to respond to unity and reconciliation needs at the sub-national level, emphasizing the scale of their responsibility being the closest NURC structure to the people.

Initially, NURC was skeptical that INGOs could effectively support reconciliation however through the act of collaboration, NURC has appreciated the importance of CSOs in reconciliation work and has moved further to acknowledge that government of Rwanda cannot shoulder the entire task of reconciliation and unity alone. The unique partnership with SFCG has helped NURC to reformulate its conceptualization of what partnership can bring and break down some barriers.

Thus, the NURC national forum has begun the process of making connections and formulating relationships and communicating more effectively in what is a very sensitive issue area around a national tragedy for which all Rwandans bear the scars, albeit some more than others. The project responded to the context in Rwanda although more time and effort needs to be planned for establishing relationships and building confidence and trust between partners. It succeeded in engaging a diverse group of participants from various backgrounds and more importantly in connecting these groups through a range of community and school-based solidarity events. These results are well documented in the SFCG quarterly reports.

The key outstanding issue much on the minds of national stakeholders is how to measure the levels of reconciliation and unity that the country is experiencing. This is part of the continuing vigilance. The heavy lifting of understanding this complex issue from the perspective of prevention (begun perhaps through the seeds this project has sown) has become tangible through the Rwandan barometer initiative. District stakeholders and NURC district forum members who are the users of the barometer were somewhat divided in their attitudes to the barometer with some complaining that it was too rigid and number-based and others expressing their gratitude for having a tool which, despite its disadvantages, contributes to the process of unity and reconciliation in Rwanda by enabling some means to measure advances in the process.

However, the feedback on the barometer was negative from national stakeholders. They were skeptical that the quantitative data measured the important transformations that are needed and the results did not align with their sense of the situation.

A lot of participation, consultation, dialogue and discussion will be required to make any prevention effort effective and to make the barometer work. While consultation and discussion about the strategy for reconciliation is limited, the NURC national forum is a key site for this work and the various platforms of dialogue including the radio, solidarity events, television and the like should all be leveraged. More communication and discussion will perhaps raise more issues but at the same time it is important that people can speak freely.

Recommendations

1. Strengthening and Aligning the Network

In this public space of what is a controversial and difficult subject, it is vital to make connections and communication, foster discussion and relationships to help heal individual and collective wounds of the genocide and other brutalities which have occurred in Rwanda. This project began that process and the network which is in its formative stage needs further investment and expanded opportunities. SFCG should

continue its work with this designing the next effort directly with NURC and other key operational partners. Connecting and invigorating strategic platforms such as the NDF and the important District Forums and diversifying tools to be applied are essential.

According to NURC, the next phase of the strategy of reconciliation and unity focuses on dialogue. For NURC to carve out its role will be very important as it can bring in the operational partners through its coordination and collaboration mechanisms. NURC would do well to support the convening of this group to forward the dialogue strategy and ensure all the operational stakeholders including CRS, WVI, Alarm, International Alert, etc. are contributing to the achievement of the strategy. Ensuring buy-in to the strategy, exploring what dialogue means and reviewing what it can accomplish – sharing participatory tools and approaches could be a very valuable next step for NURC and bring some strategic alignment among the operational and key national stakeholders around reconciliation and unity issues.

The Rwandan Reconciliation Barometer is an effort to identify indicators to benchmark improvements in the situation of reconciliation and unity. To work effectively the barometer needs the NURC peace and reconciliation network to generate discussion and dialogue to bring about some coherence and alignment around the core concepts and identification of the correct indicators.

The district forums are an important mechanism anchoring reconciliation in communities. They need to be more systematically included in all national stakeholders reconciliation work. Additionally, there is a need to work to address contextual priorities that are presenting in each of the districts. District forum members were asked for their recommendations to make the Forum coordination more useful and they had a few ideas to offer. Provision of enough funds was number one, which supports the earlier recommendation of how NURC could be more helpful, followed by better coordination, to be more proactive, and for advocacy by NURC for District Unity and Reconciliation Forums. More training was also mentioned by a couple of respondents.

2. Keeping Unity and Reconciliation on the Agenda

While development indicators are improving in Rwanda, many interlocutors suggested these are visible signs of political will but not necessarily of reconciliation and unity. Mainstreaming the long term work of reconciliation and unity runs the risk of burying it in more immediate and pressing urgencies around education, health care and perhaps regional issues. A further risk to this work in this sensitive and core issue area is that concrete results are hard to gauge, and the intangibility threatens interest of donors and others with investment into this issue.

However, there is a need to ensure long term investment into the intangible results of reconciliation and unity. This project raised the issues again, and the Rwandan barometer is another step in that investment which seeks to find a way to guide the work. However, the need for a loud and singular voice to call out for investment into this sector is urgent. Without the documentary evidence of achievements, and with the intangible outcomes that can change due to context, keeping reconciliation and healing work on the donors' agenda is an imperative. By working together, bringing together the group of operational stakeholders and forging a joint strategy, the national forum can be the beginning of advocacy work that could result in more long term investment. INGOs, national NGOs and CSOs and NURC need to work together to ensure that social and economic investments are available for the important and continuing work of reconciliation in Rwanda and all stakeholders need to speak in one voice to keep this issue area on the agenda of major donors and corporations as well as regional interlocutors.

3. Generational and/or Youth Issues

While people under 18 years of age were not part of the study, from the interviews at national and district level it was apparent that the post genocide group of young people who are a large demographic have a strong story to tell. This was apparent through the theater work in schools, as well as through youth-led listening clubs and solidarity activities where their level of enthusiasm and commitment to the cause of unity and reconciliation in their communities was extremely high; a sphere well worth maximizing in any future intervention. A generational gap exists between the 'authority' level of the population (i.e. the people who are in charge) and the post genocide populations who are young people a lot of them students and who make up a large part of the demographic. This generational gap needs examination and work as it further confounds an already complex issue in Rwandan society.

4. Diversifying Tools and Agency

The network is sowing the seeds of partnership and strategic work with other organisations doing unity and reconciliation work in Rwanda. For example, IRDP is conducting valuable work exploring on key controversial issues through research and dialogue. Already IRDP participated in a regional SFCG meeting and further value can be found to inform both SFCG's work and IRDPs work by working together. As the project shows, SFCG has some unique tools to bring to the table including the radio programmes, participatory theater and listening clubs. Of those who participated in the organisation of an event supported by SFCG, they unanimously requested further activities; a testimony to the success of the initiatives. In the continuing vigilance required, multiple tools are needed to support shifting the dynamic and SFCG can play a key role here. Employing these tools strategically to focus on specific target groups or target locations (schools) identifying the shift that is being sought and working with the groups to make that happen is important.

There is an opportunity with participatory theater to move from the pilot level to working at the national level. In this instance, building skills in districts to work with this tool could be an important contribution. The valuable and innovative trainings and skill building sessions that SFCG provided should be continued for national and district stakeholders looking into conflict management and mitigation and building skills based on expressed needs of this strategic group. Further follow up to see how stakeholders are using these skills and how further they can be reinforced will be important.

References

Joint Action Development Forum in Rwanda. Experiences and Lessons Learned. SNV, Netherlands Development Organisation, September 2009.

Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer, National Commission on Unity and Reconciliation (NURC), Republic of Rwanda., October 2011, <http://www.nurc.gov.rw/index.php?id=69>

Social Cohesion in Rwanda, An Opinion Survey 2005 – 2007. National Commission on Unity and Reconciliation (NURC), Republic of Rwanda. <http://www.nurc.gov.rw/index.php?id=69>

Annexes

Terms of Reference

Submitted

National and District Forum Survey Report

Submitted simultaneously

Qualitative Methodology²⁰

Approach

Information gathering will be done in two phases. In the first phase key informant interviews will be conducted with national stakeholders based in Kigali. In the second phase, qualitative research involving beneficiaries of activities in 6 Districts will take 2 forms – key informant interviews and focus group discussions.

Phase 1 interviews will be conducted by the lead consultant and phase 2 interviews and focus groups will be done using two teams composed of five people each (one supervisor, two note takers and two interviewers on each team). Using this approach, the teams can work simultaneously and accelerate the data collection process. As much as possible, it is important to maintain ethnic and gender balance in the teams to enhance the quality of the data collection process.

This methodology and data collection tools have been validated by the project partners in a participatory approach prior to the commencement of the work. The meeting took place on Monday, November 11th and was attended by 3 NURC partner staff and 3 SFCG staff. During this meeting the proposed methodology will be reviewed and selection criteria established for the sample – both Phase 1 key informants and Phase 2 locations and key informants.

After the meeting, data collection tools will be finalized and tested prior to the start of the field work. Interviewers will be recruited, selected and trained to undertake the data gathering process at District level. Data collection tools will be duplicated and distributed and logistical arrangements planned and finalized after which field work will be undertaken.

Sample Selection (updated November 12 2013)

Project activities (solidarity activities²¹ which include sports games, artistic competitions or joint work projects) and the Common Ground training took place in areas identified by NURC as being particularly 'difficult'. The theatre work took place in areas of "greatest need".

The evaluation is considered a national evaluation of the USAID sponsored project by Search for Common Ground (SFCG) and National Unity Reconciliation Commission of Rwanda (NURC). The 30 month project sought to improve the coordination, reinforce capacities and fill gaps in reconciliation and Peace Building programs in Rwanda entitled *Maximizing the Impact of Reconciliation in Rwanda*. The project spans all 30 districts of Rwanda.

²⁰ Taken from the project Inception Report November 12, 2013

²¹ Solidarity activities are defined as high visibility public events that radically shift individual and mass perceptions, break negative stereotypes and create a space for dialogue among groups experiencing hostility or conflict. P8 SFCG proposal

Information gathering will be done in a qualitative manner using focus group discussions and key stakeholder interviews using two teams composed of five people each (one supervisor, two note takers and two interviewers in each team). This way, the teams can work simultaneously and accelerate the data collection process. It is important to maintain some ethnic and gender balance in the teams to enhance the quality of the data collected.

The research will take place in a narrow choice of districts (6 districts) and sampling will be purposive^[1] around those districts where at least three USAID sponsored district level activities were implemented (primarily; solidarity events, theatre forums, training for district NURC members, and additionally: listeners clubs and radio programs) and that are considered areas of greatest need as well as difficult.

The selected districts are as follows:

- Eastern Province: Ngoma & Bugesera Districts
- Western Province: Karongi & Rubavu Districts
- Southern Province: Kamonyi District
- Northern Province: Gicumbi/Rulindo Districts

Catalytic peacebuilding NURC projects (solidarity activities which include sports games, artistic competitions or joint work projects) and the Common Ground training were to take place in areas identified in the conflict mapping (and by NURC) as being particularly ‘difficult’. The theatre work was to take place in areas of “greatest need”.

Sampling will also reflect the gender mainstreaming theme by ensuring that 50+% of the focus group discussion participants are female. This gender balance will be attempted with key informant interviews but may be restricted due to selection of informants being based on those individuals with the greatest involvement in project activities, regardless of whether they are male or female. In this case, questions will be included which capture a gendered point of view.

We are proposing a data set of 99 points. This includes:

Table 2 Sample	
National level	n=17 (Kigali)
KIIs with NURC: 1) Exec Sec, 2) Peacebuilding and Conflict Management Director, 3) Focal Point in Partnership, 4) Research, M&E Officer, 5) Communication Officer	5
KIIs with NGOs: Adhoc committee participants: 1) Alert International, 2) IRDP 3) ALARM 4) Episocpal Justice and Peace 5) Catholic Justice and Peace Commission	5
KIIs with other contributors: 1) Radio Rwanda Producer or Public Information Officer at NURC, Theater Actors (2/3), Benevelocenia, CRS (in forum not in steering committee)	5
SFCG staff: Christine (school performance) and Kalissa or Jean-Baptiste (2 nd half Radio program) or Jean-Paul (1 st half Radio program)	2
Total National Level	17 KIIs
At District Level (6)	n=6 (districts)
Listening Clubs/Radio Program	
FGDs – with participating members (8 to 10 members) - 1 Male, 1 Female	2
KIIs (Radio Director)	1
School Theater Activity	
KIIs (Teacher and Headmaster)	2
Solidarity Activities	

FGDs – with participants youth (8 to 10 participants) - 1 Female, 1 Male	2
KIIs (1 event organizer (CSO), 1 district representative involved in activity)	2
Training and Capacity Building	
KIIs with NURC district forum members (Good Governance Officer, 2 CSO Members)	3
Total in each District	4 FGDs & 8 KIIs
Total across 6 Districts	24 FGDs & 48 KIIs

Sampling will also reflect a gender mainstreaming theme by ensuring that 50+% of the focus group discussion participants are female. Obtaining a gender balance of key informants will be attempted but depend on selecting individuals with the greatest involvement in project activities, regardless of whether they are male or female. In this case, questions will be included which capture a gendered point of view.

Inception Report

Submitted

Field Report

Submitted

List of People Met

Confidential

List of Documents Consulted

Table 1 List of Project Documents	
CMM Rwanda Final Edited 18 April 2011	Memorandum of Understanding August 18 2011
1 st Quarterly Report	Annex 1 Success Story Kibuye
2 nd Quarterly Report	Annex 1 Success Story December 2012
3 rd Quarterly Report	Annex 2 Current Scenario for PT in Schools
4 th Quarterly Report	Annex One SFCG NURC Baseline Report
5 th Quarterly Report	Q8 Annex 1 Success Story March 2013 participatory theater
6 th Quarterly Report	Q8 Annex 2 Minutes of the ad hoc committee meeting
7 th Quarterly Report	Q8 Annex 3 Minutes of the Sector Working Group Meeting
8 th Quarterly Report	Q10 Success Story
9 th Quarterly Report	Rwanda reconciliation mapping
10 th Quarterly Report	USAID Closing Handout