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I. Introduction and Background

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

“Promoting Participatory Approaches to Peace-building in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) of Pakistan” is a project funded by the European Union (EU) which is being implemented by Community Appraisal and Motivation Programme (CAMP) and its partner in, Saferworld UK. The two main aims of the project are as follows:

1. To enhance the institutional and operational capacity of civil society actors active in the field of peace-building in KP
2. To develop EU partnerships with and between non-state actors active in the field of peace-building at the operational level in KP

The expected outcomes include strengthening the institutional and operational capacity of civil society actors in mediation and dialogue; enhanced civil society engagement in peace building, including better understanding of gender sensitivity, and, a more coherent and consistent EU approach to peace building efforts in KP.

The following activities will be conducted in pursuit of the aforementioned objectives during the project period (January 2012 – 2015):

- Undertake a qualitative and quantitative needs assessment of CSOs existing capacity to engage in mediation and dialogue in KP;
- Share findings of the needs assessment;
- Develop a needs assessment report for wider dissemination;
- Develop a ‘people-focused peace-building’ trainer of trainers (TOT) manual for CSOs;
- Capacity building TOT workshops for CSOs active in the field of peace-building; and
- Provide funding to CSOs to implement community driven ‘development initiatives for peace’.

This document is among a series of reports which have been compiled under the project’s first objective: a quantitative and qualitative needs assessment of CSOs’ existing capacity in the fields of peace-building, mediation and dialogue in the target area. Details of the approach and methodology during the assessment process are provided below.

B. ASSESSMENT PURPOSE & METHODOLOGY

1. Background to Needs Assessment of CSOs:

The purpose of this needs assessment is to analyse the peacebuilding capacity of civil society organisations (CSOs) in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) province of Pakistan, identify the challenges they face in engaging in peacebuilding activities, and provide practical recommendations to build CSOs’ capacity and promote their strengths in this field. In so doing, the assessment seeks to establish a
baseline of the peacebuilding capacity of the 58 assessed CSOs in KP, which would build on the assessment conducted by the project in 2012.

In the initial stages of the project, 121 CSOs from FATA and KP were assessed by the project team. The assessment took into account the CSOs’ experience in peace-building and conflict transformation and how these non-state actors can contribute to peacebuilding efforts in the north-west of Pakistan. The assessment also looked into the management and operational capacities of the CSOs. A detailed needs assessment report was published and distributed by CAMP and Saferworld. It is also available on the website: http://www.camp.org.pk/CSO%20Needs%20Assessment%20Report_English.pdf

Unfortunately, due to non-issuance of No-objection Certificate (NOC) for working in FATA, the FATA component of the project was discontinued. After discussion with the EUD and their approval, the project plan was revised to be implemented only in the seven districts of KP.

To this end, another assessment of CSOs in KP was planned to further identify 35 CSO partners in the same seven districts, in order to bring the total number of partners in the project to 70. This report is a summary of the assessment which was conducted with 58 CSOs(of which 35 were selected) and includes their main areas of work; strengths and gaps in programme and operational challenges.

While initially ‘short listing’ CSOs, CAMP recognises that very few had experience of engaging in peace-building or conflict resolution at a large scale. Most CSOs have been involved in resolving conflict at the village level, while others have carried out peace campaigns in their communities. Keeping this in mind, CAMP will assess the overall capacity of the organisation by including questions on governance of the organisation, linkages and networking, monitoring and evaluation systems, reputation in the communities and among partners/donors etc.

The assessment will also take into account ‘qualitative’ aspects including the kind of projects the organisation has implemented, particularly around peace related work, the impact of these projects, challenges and lessons learned.

2. Approach & Methodology:

Given the focus on participatory approaches to peacebuilding, the needs assessment engaged exclusively with local, community-based CSOs in KP. The criteria for selection of participating CSOs were as follows:

i. Community-based local CSOs

ii. At least one to two years’ experience in implementing peacebuilding or conflict resolution-related projects

iii. Operating in KP

iv. Representation of ethnic and religious minorities, women and/or youth.
CAMP and Saferworld began the assessment process in the field in September 2014, and the field work was completed in October 2014. A brief orientation was conducted on the questionnaire to ensure that all team members were clear about the questions and overall methodology. The assessments were carried out at the CSOs offices which allowed CAMP and Saferworld to verify the existence of the organisation, and where possible visit their ongoing programmes and projects.

The number of CSOs interviewed in each district were seven in Buner, eight in Shangla, 13 in Swat, 10 in Malakand, six in Upper Dir, nine in Lower Dir, and 10 in Chitral. These CSOs were assessed through the detailed questionnaire by the teams of CAMP and Saferworld.

The assessment of 58 CSOs in KP was done through a semi-structured questionnaire which formed the basis of the methodology and was the basis for selection of the CSOs. The team also used observation while visiting the CSOs and took notes accordingly.

II. Summary of Findings

The assessment report presents CSOs’ existing capacities and challenges under the following themes:

i. Organisational;
ii. Financial and management-related;
iii. Project implementation-related; and
iv. External relations-related. Following is a summary of the findings of 58 CSOs’ assessed:

- Only 16 out of the 58 CSO were formed within five years of the date of survey. The rest have a presence in the area, with three of these CSOs working in the area since 1987 and 88. The CSOs were all registered under the Society Welfare Act 1961 or under the Companies Ordinance 1984. Only 2 of the CSOs interviewed were not registered.
- Most of the 58 CSOs assessed are fairly inexperienced in terms of funded projects from external/international donors except a few medium-large organisations. Two organisations in Shangla, and five each in Malakand, and Swat have worked with international donor agencies.
- All the CSOs interviewed, work at the district level and they have presence and recognition in the communities. They work with women, youth groups, media and IDPs. However, in terms of their influence on external actors (such as government authorities, national/international donors), very few can actually claim to have any recognition or interaction beyond their target areas.
- It is clear that organisations in KP find it challenging to employ women – less than one third of the organisations have employed permanent female staff. The major reasons for this may be the issue of security and the conservative environment of the areas they work in; nevertheless, most of these organisations have listed lack of female staff as a main cause of concern. This hinders the CSOs to work on women-related projects and to reach out to women in communities.
The biggest challenges these organisations face are misconceptions about NGOs in general which have hindered their work. However, it is heartening to observe that despite this, organisations managed to gain a positive reputation and change the views of locals through their peace-building activities such as holding dialogues with local *Jirga* elders and peace assemblies, while respecting cultural sensitivities.

For sustainability, most of these organisations have identified planning and strategic development as crucial in the long term.

Almost all of the organisations that were interviewed during the assessment had some experience in implementing peace-building work, and this was also reflected in examples they shared of resolving local disputes through mediation and dialogue. Some of them have experience of working in human rights, emergency relief, and protection issues, as well as counter-terrorism and/or countering extreme violence.

In general, most of these organisations identified gaps in processes such as staff orientation; limited expertise and skills among staff; hiring of skilled and expert human resource, capacity and training of staff, financial management, and strengthening external relations.

Funding and fund raising is a foremost and real concern for the organisations across the board; in addition to donor fatigue and preferences, this may be attributed to their limited capacity for accessing and approaching donors, which in turn, points to the lack of strategic planning by them.

Most of these organisations are well-experienced in advocacy activities, raising public awareness, community empowerment (including youth, women, IDPs, children and minorities), and some have been involved in dissemination of information (through IEC material). This is evidenced by the fact that their work is both acknowledged and appreciated amongst the communities.

### III. Assessment Findings

#### A. TECHNICAL EXPERTISE

1. **Geographical Coverage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Geographical Coverage of CSOs</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tehsil Level</td>
<td>Town/ Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUNER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHITRAL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER DIR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As illustrated above, most CSOs in the seven areas work only at the district level with only a few from Chitral, Malakand and Swat which have a larger outreach at the provincial level.

2. Areas of Focus

Majority of CSOs’ work focuses on conflict prevention, peace-building and mediation and dialogue, in addition to human rights, development, access to justice, emergency and protection issues. The other areas of focus for the CSOs assessed included health, education, and disability, preservation of language and culture for those working in Swat, and private sector, women skills, empowerment and gender-based violence for CSOs operating in Chitral.

3. Target Groups
4. Areas of Expertise/Knowledge

In terms of their areas of expertise/knowledge, the CSOs work in the areas as illustrated in the table below. The ratings provided are an average for each of the seven districts in key thematic areas:

(1= very poor, 2 = weak, 3 = average, 4 = good, 5 = excellent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMATIC AREAS</th>
<th>BUNER (7)</th>
<th>CHITRAL (10)</th>
<th>LOWER DIR (9)</th>
<th>MALAKAND (10)</th>
<th>SHANGLA (8)</th>
<th>SWAT (8)</th>
<th>UPPER DIR (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Prevention</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The highest averages for CSOs assessed are in the areas of community empowerment, rural development and social services while the weakest areas are donor funding, policy formulation and international institutional frameworks. The table above shows that although the CSOs are very actively involved at the grassroots level, they have few opportunities to engage in or contribute to policy level processes etc. This may be both due to access and capacity issues.

5. Case Studies

The case studies from the CSOs assessed are summarised according to their area as follows:

- **Buner:** CSOs have organised ‘grand jirgas’ for dispute resolution and raised awareness on peace through *mushairas* (poetry recitation sessions). In particular Anjumane Al-Fayaz Samaji Bahbood Sura (AFSBS) has established a skill centre for youth; Ulesi Khegra helped a girl who was a victim of domestic abuse obtain justice through a jirga; and, Elum Rural Development Organisation (ERDO) established a camp in Peer Baba which helps people search for lost relatives in Malakand & Peshawar through its network.

- **Chitral:** CSOs in this district are also involved in raising awareness on peace and harmony through different activities such as school debates, *mushairas* and peace walks. One of the women organisations provided a woman legal aid where she was married against her will and with help of local authorities she obtained justice after which she was given sewing machine to earn a living for herself and her children.
• **Lower Dir:** CSOs have been involved in conflict resolution through jirga; peace promotion through walks and mushaira, as well as through seminars and dialogues on peace. Malakand Rural Support Program (MRSP) organised a campaign against child labour as well as a youth cultural harmony program.

• **Malakand:** CSOs in Malakand have also been involved in peace-related activities such as formation of aman or peace committees and raising awareness through sensitization in schools, sports and IEC material. In particular, Centre for Peace and Rural Development (CPRD) has been involved in promoting political participation of women, conflict resolution and social services.

• **Shangla:** In addition to activities on peace and harmony, CSOs in Shangla have resolved conflicts over electricity supply (NICE); set up free medical camps to address endemic diseases (PKK); and monitored polling stations during the 2013 elections (AWAZ).

• **Swat:** Most CSOs have been involved in training and sensitization of locals on various topics such as peace-building, conflict resolution, women empowerment and community mobilization in Swat.

• **Upper Dir:** CSOs here have organized peace walks and mushairs and conducted awareness sessions on education, health and child rights.

6. **Challenges**

The main challenges for all CSOs included the general security situation, militancy and reluctance of community to accept the NGOs. Due to security risks and militancy, CSOs find it difficult to mobilise their staff members and have limited outreach in communities; however this was not as big a challenge in 2014 as compared to the assessment conducted in 2012 when communities’ acceptance was a major concern.

CSOs working in Swat especially pointed out that their staff members had been threatened by militant groups to prevent them from continuing their work.

CSOs have attempted to win communities’ confidence through regular networking with Jirga elders and involvement of religious leaders in their activities, which has showed positive results. In some cases, CSOs complained that the local government authorities did not cooperate and seemed reluctant to assist them in any way. Most CSOs except those working in Chitral have faced procedural delays in obtaining official permission for their activities which has affected their work.

7. **Long Term Impact**

The main long term impact that CSOs’ highlighted from their programmes included the awareness and empowerment of communities, which will be a positive influence in promoting peace and harmony amongst different religions, ethnicities and communities. CSOs have also managed to increase women’s’ participation in community meetings, events and other spheres which was absent
previously. They have also managed to sensitize communities in order to provide them with better opportunities for livelihoods in future.

8. **Linkages**

Almost all the CSOs assessed have good linkages with government departments, especially social welfare, zakat and other line departments as well as contacts with other local and national CSOs and NGOs working in PATA. However, very few have any linkages with international donors or I/NGOs apart from some CSOs working in Buner, Chitral, Swat and Malakand which have either worked with international agencies such as USAID, UNICEF, WHO and SDC.

9. **Lessons Learnt**

The main lessons learnt included networking and establishing contact with community level organisations and opinion leaders (elders, religious leaders etc) which have helped CSOs’ to maximise their impact and strengthen linkages.

CSOs from Swat, Malakand and Shangla also pointed out the significance of community participation, capacity building, and a needs assessment for information on perceptions of people and ground realities. This has helped CSOs to have a stronger and diverse impact because gathering information and engaging with the community at this stage greatly influences the design of any future intervention.

10. **Sustainability**

“Planning and strategic development” and “Project planning and design” along with better fund raising skills are the top three areas which CSOs highlighted for improving sustainability. Other important issues identified by CSOs included networking with other CSOs/NGOs and collaboration with donor communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning &amp; strategic development</th>
<th>Networking with CSOs/NGOs</th>
<th>Collaboration with...</th>
<th>Internal finance</th>
<th>Project planning &amp; design</th>
<th>Contact with communities</th>
<th>Higher profile in community</th>
<th>Improved financial mgt</th>
<th>Better fund raising skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUNER (7)</td>
<td>CHITRAL (10)</td>
<td>LOWER DIR (9)</td>
<td>UPPER DIR (6)</td>
<td>SHANGLA (8)</td>
<td>SWAT (8)</td>
<td>MALAKAND (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

1. Staffing

Most CSOs assessed have very few full time (or part time) paid staff and most rely heavily on recruitment of volunteers who are usually men. Due to the conservative environment of some areas such as Lower and Upper Dir, it is difficult for CSOs working there to hire women staff members or to work directly with the female community. The highest number of female staff is working for the CSOs in Malakand, Lower Dir and Swat (mostly volunteers) where despite a traditional environment the literacy and employment rate of women is relatively high compared to other areas.

2. Orientation of Staff Members

Out of the 58 CSOs assessed, only 19 provide its staff with job descriptions, 21 provide its staff with contracts and 14 with staff policies. Most of these CSOs rely on verbal agreements as they heavily depend on volunteers and do not hire regular staff members.

3. Frequency of Staff Meetings

The majority of these organisations stated that they held their staff meetings on a monthly basis, with room for more meetings if and when needed.

It was assessed that the CSOs held their staff meetings according to the organisational capacity. Those with comparatively more volunteers had lesser number of staff meetings then those that had a regular staff. A majority of organisations with regular staff held meetings on a monthly basis.

4. Organisational Board

In addition to being asked whether a board was present and functional, organisations were also queried about its composition (ratio of male to female members), frequency of board meetings, as well its significance and contributions to general areas of operations. Although 18 of the 58 CSOs have boards or executive bodies which perform the same function, their members are mostly male who meet at least once on an annual basis.

5. Impact of Change of Leadership

Taking into account the fact that the leadership of an organisation is key in strategic planning and long term management, this question pertained to taking the opinion of staff as to the significance of their leaders and if any change in leadership would negatively impact their work and future. All organisations stated that any change in leadership would not adversely affect their future, which shows that all of them have the capability to absorb any drastic change in the higher management.

6. Reporting

When asked about whether they had provided any reports to certain groups within the last 12 months, it was observed that most reports were provided to partners and donors; two CSOs each in Buner, Shangla and Malakand, 11 in Swat, six in Chitral and three in Lower Dir develop internal reports for board and staff members.

7. Finance Staff & Book keeping
The majority of these organisations employ a finance secretary to manage their finances with the exception of some CSOs in Chitral, Swat and Malakand which use the services of a finance manager. The reason for this is lack of resources or funding and some smaller CSOs even use administration officers to look after their finances. Most organisations use Excel or manage their accounts manually in registers or vouchers. However 35 of the 58 organisations have developed financial plans as part of their long term strategy.

8. Consultation with Key Stakeholders
All organisations stated that they consulted with key stakeholders while planning programmes which is a positive step towards participation of beneficiaries themselves, ranging from local communities to the common people in development work that affects them. This denotes an affinity between the organisations’ and the beneficiaries and illustrates that the opinions and feedback of the communities is valued and taken on board for the management and planning of programming.

9. Frequency of Evaluation
The majority of CSOs conduct evaluations only during or at the end of a project, while one each from Shangla, Malakand and Lower Dir and three from Swat stated that they conducted evaluations only when asked by their donors. Four CSOs from Lower Dir and three from Swat have never conducted any formal evaluation of their activities till the assessment date. Some CSOs also mentioned that their evaluation were mostly verbal or verified through pictures. This practice clearly points to a lack of M&E capacity of the CSOs.

10. Training Experience
Most organisations interviewed for the assessment have experience in training their own staff or other stakeholders (such as communities, other CSOs etc). CSOs said they had conducted training in a range of topics including human rights, health and hygiene, disaster risk reduction, emergency preparedness and protection issues. It was interesting to note that CSOs in Buner said they did not have the capacity nor the experience in training. This may be because of the lack of exposure to capacity building workshops, or because these CSOs are relatively new.

11. Areas of Concern
Organisations were asked to select three main areas of concern, apart from budgetary problems, which were affecting their performance at present. The majority of CSOs have pointed out record keeping and communication as the main areas of concern, as well as the availability of female and expert staff members. All CSOs except those from Buner and Upper Dir also pointed out they were concerned about knowledge of management issues, organisational policies and turnover of staff.

C. EXTERNAL RELATIONS

1. Work with External Actors
When working with communities, it is important for CSO/CBOs to partner with other likeminded individuals/groups so as to gain more ground in their sphere of activities. In this vein, organisations
were asked which three groups/individuals they worked with the most and/or the least during their developmental activities. Their responses were as follows:

- Local communities averaged the highest amongst the categories of work these organisations included in the top three actors they work with;
- The second most work these organisations carried out external actors are local government, and youth women’s groups; and
- The least amount of work that these organisations carry out on average is with national government and policy makers.

2. **Influence on Donors and Decision Makers**

In answering the question on how they shaped the opinions of decision makers, the organisations undergoing assessment selected a range of activities. The most common three categories through which they attempt to sway policy decision makers are:

- Raising public awareness by conducting various activities such as health & hygiene workshops/seminars, peace assemblies, etc;
- Facilitating dialogue between policy decision makers and other CSOs working on mediation and dialogue/peace building and conflict prevention; and
- Raising public awareness to promote the significance of mediation and dialogue, peace building and conflict prevention.

Similarly, the top three responses in answer to how these organisations influenced donors are as follows:

- Facilitating dialogue between policy decision makers and other CSOs working on mediation and dialogue/peace building and conflict prevention;
- Working for raising awareness on issues such as education, providing livelihood, agriculture, and children’s rights under the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC); and
- Advocating for and making efforts for improving and/or strengthening policies on mediation, dialogue, peace building and conflict prevention.

3. **Media and other sources to promote work**

All the organisations have acknowledged the significance of utilising media while attempting to influence decision makers and donors. However, only a few mentioned that they actually employ media tools such as television and/or radio programmes to promote their work; this may be attributed to lack of resources and/or planning on the part of these organisations. However, most of the CSOs assessed utilise peace sessions or seminars, walks and assemblies for their work and some have also mentioned the use of IEC material such as banners, posters and pamphlets to promote their work.

D. **FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**
1. **Funding and Projects**

Organisations were asked to list the three largest projects they had implemented taking into account the funding received. As expected, keeping in view the earlier limitations and issues highlighted in relation to funds and accessibility to donors, most of these organisations have only implemented very small scale projects and/or activities such as peace sessions/assemblies, seminars, multiple day workshops, and other activities such as female voter registration, relief distribution at camps, disaster management in general, and advocacy campaigns.

The funds, in general, of all of these small scale activities start from as low as Rs. 8,000/-, ranging on an average between Rs. 15,000/- to Rs. 20,000/- going up to the highest of 2 to 64 million for CSOs in Malakand and Swat. The smaller scale activities include awareness seminars or sessions for community while the bigger interventions included infrastructure and developmental projects.

2. **Financial Managers**

As mentioned above, most of these organisations employ a finance secretary to handle finances, but in general lack a properly structured finance department to manage the cash flow and project funds. This may be attributed to less experience, poor structure and planning, and/or difficulty in obtaining the requisite staff.

3. **Plans for Generating Funds**

By cross referencing the responses from previous questions such as lessons learnt, it can be observed that most of the organisations are faced with a serious lack of funding and thus they realise the significance of the fund raising process.

As a result, almost all of these organisations have acknowledged that they are working on a plan for the generation of fund in the future by either strengthening their own capacity to raise money or by developing project proposals to submit to donors that show interest in their work. Meanwhile, some have stated that they did not have a specific plan for fund raising in terms of approaching donors but instead will attempt to improve techniques of generating money for their sustainability.

4. **Main Limits for Fundraising**

Apart from a general decrease in funds for CSOs, there seems to be a consensus regarding the main limits to fund-raising for these organisations. Most of the 58 CSOs have included lack of contact and collaborative partnerships with donors, as well as donor priorities to be the main hindrance in generating funds when it comes to external sources. On the other hand, internally these organisations also lack in relation to knowledge of fund raising strategies for the long term. The fact that the CSOs do not have detailed records of financial transactions also limits fundraising.

5. **Ways to Improve Finances**
The three main ways to improve finances pointed out by CSOs assessed are the hiring of an experienced finance manager (except CSOs in Swat); better record keeping of expenses and incomes (all 58 CSOs), and, training on financial management for their staff (all 58 CSOs assessed again). In addition, a few CSOs from Chitral, Lower Dir, Shangla, Swat and Upper Dir stated that they could improve their finances by developing a business plan which can help them in managing their financial aspects properly.

**Validation Workshop**

The executives of the selected 34/35 CSOs were called to Islamabad on 23rd November for validating the findings of the needs assessment survey. The workshop was also followed by a Grant Orientation meeting in which the guidelines for the small grants were shared. Later a five-day training workshop on ‘Conflict Transformation and Peace-building’ was held for the same participants.

The CSOs validated the finding of the assessment and endorsed the results. During the discussion, the participants said that they needed security training to improve protection for their own staff and communities, as well as how to involve communities better in their work. A woman representative also said that it is hard to attract people, especially women, for “soft activities” of projects such as this one since they have become dependent on aid.
Recommendations

Communication and Outreach

- To increase the impact of local CSOs and their projects, outreach efforts are required targeting more influential stakeholders and those in a position to provide support – including local and national government, the media, national and international NGOs, donors, and the private sector. These stakeholders should be reminded of the value of active engagement with and support for these CSOs in peacebuilding in KP
- In order to reach out to more influential stakeholders and those in a position to provide institutional and operational support, CSO reporting and communications skills need to be improved.

Media Liaison

- The many activities CSOs engage in to influence external actors should be used to provoke media interest and help broaden the impact of these activities. Media contacts could be kept informed of events and activities, and activities could be developed to increase the likelihood of media interest.
- CSOs may want to investigate the viability and usefulness of promoting media liaison within their organisation and launching media campaigns with a view to targeting and influencing a wider audience and key external actors. There needs to be very careful consideration of the way this should be done, because of the security risks that may present themselves as a result of increased visibility.
- CSOs should be supported in accessing print and electronic media outlets, where appropriate, and, through information sharing and training, in developing media liaison, communication, and outreach skills.

Government and other Stakeholder Support

- CSOs should identify the external actors whose opinions and support are key to their organisation and each project, identify the specific form of support that is required, and ascertain how best to establish good relationships with these key stakeholders. Networking, media liaison, and outreach activities are particularly important here.
- Conversely, external actors should be reminded of the role they play in creating a vibrant civil society and, in so doing, contributing to participatory and sustainable peacebuilding initiatives. The government and other key stakeholders should review the extent to which they can and do support local CSOs and wider civil society.