

ATTACHMENT III

Notice of Funding Opportunity Number:
72051721RFA00001

ELEMENTS OF SUCCESSFUL P2P RECONCILIATION PROGRAMMING: THE ABC'S OF P2P

Addressing Root Causes. During the course of the P2P program, the health of relationships between adversarial groups and/or those individuals/key actors affected by conflict, is expected to improve. As this relationship improves and trust is built, the likelihood of the groups/individuals/key actors participating in constructive dialogues to address the underlying or root causes of the conflict increases. However, in some contexts, conflict-affected groups can come together to discuss the root causes without having worked progressively up to this point. In these instances, the P2P approach becomes part of the formal or informal peace process.

Building Confidence. There are certain situations that arise during a conflict which present opportunities to make progress towards peacebuilding by addressing relatively simple issues ("low hanging fruit"). A P2P approach to the issue can demonstrate to the conflict groups the value and feasibility of working together across fault lines towards solving problems. Success on simple problems builds confidence towards solving the more serious ones. Successful P2P programs address perceived grievances, the human experience of the impact of the conflict on both sides, and conflicting views of its history and escalation. These differences of perception do not have to necessarily be resolved by the program, but they do need to be listened to and the feelings understood and acknowledged in order to form the bedrock of building confidence.

Conflict Analysis. Conflicts are complex phenomena requiring careful analysis of the conflict drivers, key actors, and the socio-political context. Successful P2P approach programs are strategically focused programs that articulate a plan in the form of a program hypothesis describing how the intervention is intended to change the underlying conflict dynamics. The conflict analysis identifies and discusses the sources of grievances and resiliencies; the key actors to conflict and peace, and the mobilizing factors that could facilitate the transformation of grievances into violence or become opportunities to reduce violence and mitigate further conflict.

The conflict analyses of successful programs examine the causes and drivers of conflict, and how they interact with each other, including events which might trigger violence. They highlight any upcoming peacebuilding opportunities which might serve as windows of opportunity to bring adversarial individuals or groups together. They also identify those issues that are most likely to lead to (renewed) violence in a given context. In addition to outlining the broad social, economic, demographic, political and historical context of the conflict, they map out the key actors involved in fueling the conflict or in a position to promote peace, and their incentives, abilities and opportunities.

Successful P2P programs recognize that different identities experience conflict differently and face distinct challenges during and after conflict or in pursuing peace. Conflict analyses include a snapshot of how gender norms--or gaps between social norms and people's actual behaviors- -may interact with other factors to drive conflict, and how conflict influences gender behaviors and norms. Successful P2P approach programs demonstrate an understanding of

the different impacts conflict and peacebuilding can have on people along the gender spectrum, and how these different experiences may contribute to the causes and consequences of conflict. They also include analysis about how to accommodate, and work with and across identities, and gender norms to promote peace and a reduction in violence.

Conflict Sensitive Programs are essential to effective and efficient programming. Conflict sensitivity (CS) is based on a nuanced understanding of the operating environment (building on a conflict analysis), the impact of our interventions on that environment and the context's impact on the interventions. CS adapts to the symbiotic nature of development work to ensure interventions are responsive, adaptive and effective. This process is intimately tied to local engagement, adaptive management and analysis. Successful application of CS into the P2P approach results in greater efficiency, sustainability and prospects for peace.

Connectors can be used in P2P programming to maximize the potential for success of the constructive engagement. Connectors are categorized as systems and institutions, attitudes and actions, values and interests, experiences, and symbols and occasions that bring people together. P2P programs should seek out, understand and leverage the positive connectors between groups for peacebuilding programming. Alongside Connectors, communities also have dividers that are sources of tension, friction and distrust. P2P programs should be sensitive to both dividers and connectors.

Creating a Safe Purpose. At the most basic level, P2P programming increases interaction across fault lines. When the intensity of the conflict is such that there is no casual or daily interaction between the conflicting groups, one technique for bringing people together is through a safe purpose that addresses shared interests but avoids any immediate source of tension or underlying causes of the conflict. For example, two conflicting communities can be brought together to address a mutual lack of gas supplied to the communities. A committee to address this concern can be formed and engage the communities in a public dialogue regarding this concern. The most immediate objective of the engagement is to address the source of the grievance by ensuring an adequate provision of gas. Working with the local government to improve the provision of gas can serve as a tangible dividend of cooperation and increase residents' confidence that by working together, they can address shared interests. The second, equally important objective is to bring the informal and formal leadership from the conflicting communities together to begin building trust and professional relationships. The positive change in attitude occurs from repeated constructive engagement and increased cooperation around the safe purpose. Though ultimately limited, this technique creates a pocket of safe space within the conflict for healthy relationships to develop.

Do No Harm and Violence Reduction in P2P Programming. The Do No Harm (DNH) principle dictates that development interventions should not exacerbate conflict or put beneficiaries at greater risk than they would otherwise face without the intervention, and ideally contribute to peace, or *do some good*. Whenever we bring resources, ideas or staff into a situation we become part of that environment. A Do No Harm approach recognizes this and takes action to mitigate the negative and optimize the positive impacts. DNH is part of a conflict sensitive approach to programming.

❖ Given the nature of P2P programming, it is critical to strictly adhere to this principle throughout a project's lifecycle. P2P programming may have a profound effect on the relationships, dynamics, and power structures within and between the conflict groups. It is likely that the standing of the informal and formal leaders will be modified, although it can be difficult

at the beginning of the intervention to predict exactly how their standing within the community will change.

- ❖ Because of the inherent level of unpredictability, implementing partners must envision possible manifestations and repercussions from the interventions multiple steps ahead and then base programming decisions on this scenario analysis. The “winners” and “losers” of the status quo may change at any stage in the process. The marginalization of spoilers can have a similar impact, changing their relative position and standing within the group. These changes could provoke a backlash from those who perceive they stand to lose prestige or control against the perceived winners, program staff, and the process itself.

- ❖ Successful P2P programs are designed to minimize risks from harm, exploitation, and abuse for conflict-affected populations. USAID must pay close attention to protecting women, girls, men, boys, and sexual minorities from physical harm throughout the design and implementation of P2P programming.

- ❖ Successful programs focus on identity-specific concerns given the conflict dynamics, and “do no harm” approaches associated with the proposed activity design. Programs employ strategies to identify and mitigate the potential unintended (negative and positive) impacts of

the activity on target communities and populations and employ collaboration, learning and adaptation approaches to adjust and refocus accordingly.

- ❖ These programs ensure that appropriate safeguards are established and monitored to avoid intensifying the conflict or creating harmful situations for participants, either before, during or after the cross-divide interaction.

- ❖ Successful programs reflect thoughtful consideration of any risks that may result by bringing together conflicting parties or individuals and describe how the program will be monitored and adapted to keep the DNH approach current and relevant throughout all stages of design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Successful programs balance an understanding of gender norms but do not entrench gender discrimination or reinforce identity-based sources of conflict and patterns of violence.

Excerpt from the USAID Policy Framework (2019)

We will strive to **Do No Harm (DNH)**. While we ought to embrace an appetite for certain programmatic risks, we must also minimize the risk that our programs inadvertently cause harm. Several procedures are in place to do so, but we will apply these more systematically, and better integrate their guidance.

DNH processes include: maintaining zero-tolerance for sexual harassment, exploitation, or abuse among staff or partners; following standard operating procedures and field guidance to prevent and respond to human-trafficking abuses; enforcing child safeguarding standards to prevent, identify, and address child abuse, exploitation, and neglect, including in voluntary family planning, HIV/AIDS and youth programs, in partnership with the community; pursuing environmentally sound design and management of projects and conducting Environmental Impact Assessments for all activities; conducting market analyses to ensure food assistance and other humanitarian resource transfers to not undermine local production or markets; conducting Social Impact Assessments and, where relevant, seeking free, prior, and informed consent from affected indigenous peoples for activities with potential adverse impacts; and designing programs that are sensitive to conflict triggers and adhere to “**Do No Harm**” principles to reduce the risk of exacerbating conflict.

Foster the Willingness to Interact & Strengthen the Capacity to Constructively Engage. Much of the initial P2P work focuses on preparing the ground for engagement by engendering a willingness to interact among the belligerent groups. This often requires working with the single-identity groups separately before creating opportunities to interact. Once the willingness and capacity to engage constructively is fostered, P2P programming can focus on facilitating direct- and typically face-to-face engagement. They also include a clear rationale for working with single-identity groups for the purpose of trauma healing or similar work with one or a subset of one conflict-affected group.

Gender Analysis for P2P Reconciliation Programming Successful P2P programs reflect gender considerations in the conflict analysis. These programs provide gender-sensitive and conflict-sensitive tools to help better equip project managers to address the gendered consequences of conflict. Successful programs recognize that by examining the relationship between conflict, power, and gender, they can obtain greater insight into sources of tension and opportunities for peacebuilding that otherwise might be missed. They also recognize that gender inequalities and power imbalances can be key factors driving chronic poverty, food insecurity, poor health, violence against women, and violent conflict itself.

- ❖ Gender impacts conflict, and can help to shape the form that it ultimately takes. Parties to conflicts may not say they're going to war over gender roles, but gender may impact conflict when social expectations for male behavior become linked to violence, or when identity groups believe they must fight to protect "their" women.

- ❖ Conflict impacts gender, affecting the roles men and women play in society, and the relationships between them. For example, while men are away during war, or are killed, women often become heads of household and take on traditional male roles, like working outside the home to provide for their families. Even if these changes are not permanent, they are important to identify to ensure equitable participation in development efforts.

- ❖ Men and women experience conflict differently. Men and women may play unique roles during conflict. They may encourage others to fight or make peace, and they may be victims or perpetrators of violence. They may be vulnerable to gender-specific forms of harm, including sexual violence.

Hyper-Masculinity in Conflict. Masculinity and the ability to control weapons or participate in war may become closely linked, especially during conflict. Peacetime values of masculinity may also be linked to physical strength or even aggression, but in conflict, this becomes even more exaggerated. Scholars use the term "hyper-masculinity" to describe an exaggerated masculinity that defines itself against the feminine and often glorifies violence.

- ❖ Hyper-masculinity helps drive conflict by promoting violence as an ideal response to challenges. It also threatens women's security, and harms men by limiting their choices, channeling them towards violence, and encouraging them to engage in dangerous behavior. In response to the harms that hyper-masculinity can do, many organizations are investing in programs to promote "positive masculinity" or "nonviolent" masculinity. During conflict, aggression and violence are often glorified, and their links to masculinity may become more valued and exaggerated.

- ❖ **Why does hyper-masculinity happen?**

- Military/combatants become the ideal of male toughness;
- Promoted by political elites;
- In conflict contexts, men with guns have access to security, resources, and women;
- On an individual level, men may feel that hyper-masculinity promises safety, social respect, self esteem,

and possibly survival.

❖ **The Peaceful Masculinities Approach** shifts the narrative from the idea of men as inevitable perpetrators of violence to an understanding that masculinities are socially constructed and can be shaped around peace.

- Programs like the Young Men's Initiative in the Balkans aim to reshape social norms by working with young men through schools, summer youth camps, vocational training schools, and social media to promote nonviolent conceptions of manhood, including respect for individuals of diverse sexual orientation and gender identity.
- Peaceful masculinities questions men's acceptance of violence as part of their masculinity and seeks to disassociate violence from understandings of manhood or masculinity.

Perhaps most importantly, the peaceful masculinities approach does not seek to shame men and boys but to illuminate alternative, peaceful ideas of what it means to be a man. This approach bolsters the potential for men to champion peaceful masculinities and gender equality.

Implementing Partner Selection. The implementing partner may be a "partial insider" or an "impartial outsider," or there may be two implementing partners, one from each side of the primary fault line. USAID recognizes peacebuilding activities are most effective when they are locally owned, and thus engagement of local entities is essential for sustainability of programmatic goals and outcomes.

The demographic composition of the implementing partner's staff, including the lead facilitator and any translators, is important too, but there may also be risks associated with mirroring the conflict relationship among the staff. In some circumstances, elements of P2P training may be desirable for staff too.

Journey to Self-Reliance. Successful P2P approach programs can measurably contribute to a country's journey to self-reliance by focusing on resolving divided and/or fractured communities, which often work in favor of autocratic and authoritarian governments. Communities reconciling differences and working together on shared interests are more likely to effectively engage and lobby government and civil society, improving their own capacity and demanding commitment, accountability and transparency. Reconciled communities are also more likely to be inclusive, respect human rights and monitor public service delivery. They also create pockets of stability and security, establishing operating environments that foster economic growth, participatory government and return to norms and standards. By pursuing the more and key people approach (see below) P2P programs can address some of the key requirements in the social, political, and economic spheres that contribute to the journey to self reliance.

Key People or More People? Sustaining P2P Linkages. There is a choice between "more people" (i.e. large numbers and broad involvement) or "key people" (i.e. specific people, or groups of people, deemed to be critical to the continuation or resolution of conflict because of their leverage or role). Ultimately, research shows that successful P2P approaches must address both "more people" and "key people" in order to be effective. Likewise, individual change may not be sustainable without structural change, and structural change may not be possible without individual change. With this in mind, P2P programming should work across multiple levels to forge linkages between the individual and the structural levels through Track I, II, and III dialogues. USAID recognizes peacebuilding activities are most effective when they are locally owned, and thus engagement of local entities is essential for sustainability of programmatic goals and outcomes.

The exclusion or marginalization from the design process, by chance or intention, can lead to groups or subgroups attempting to undermine the peacebuilding intervention. The impact for the broader peace is more significant if these personal transformations are translated into actions at the structural and institutional levels. One key reconciliation anchor highlighted by most of the literature is the building of some kind of trust and confidence, not only in others, in terms of shared norms and values, but also in the state and its institutions.

Local Engagement. Successful P2P programs ensure an inclusive and participatory design process whereby local engagement is a central focus, as both a best practice, and also an effort to promote sustainability and country self-reliance. These programs employ strategies to sustain the activities beyond USAID's funding and demonstrate a clear understanding of the role that local organizations and institutions are playing or can play in promoting the objectives of this P2P APS. The inclusion and active participation of local partners and beneficiaries during the design phase helps foster ownership of the intervention and engenders a vested interest in the outcomes. By designing the P2P program in close consultation with local partners, a level of familiarity and trust is established during this process.

Successful programs pay careful attention to intra-group dynamics, and clearly identify which specific people and/or groups will be brought together and why those individuals/groups are most relevant to the proposed program's goals.

Mitigating Flash-Points: There are often readily identifiable flash-points or triggers for violence in any on-going conflict. A P2P approach can be a tool to bring the conflict groups together to identify triggers and flash-points, to devise strategies for preventing violence, or to develop shared plans for mitigating the spread of violence once it occurs. This process not only reduces the risk of major violence breaking out, it builds mutual understanding, and provides a basis from which to build a broader and deeper understanding.

National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security, USAID Implementation Plan (2016) → Illustrative Excerpts to Consider for P2P Reconciliation Programming (taken from Objectives 2-5 only—however, there is no need to limit reference to the other Objectives):

Objective 2: Participation in Peace Processes and Decision-Making. The USG will improve the prospects for inclusive, just and sustainable peace by promoting and strengthening women's rights and effective leadership and substantive participation in peace processes, conflict prevention, peacebuilding, transitional processes, and decision-making institutions in conflict-affected environments.

- ❖ Expand emphasis on gender analysis and support to local organizations, including women's peacebuilding organizations, in conflict mitigation and reconciliation programming. (Action 2.1.8)

- ❖ Mobilize men as allies in support of women's leadership and participation in security-related processes and decision-making. (Action 2.1.11)

Objective 3: Protection from Violence. The USG will strengthen its efforts to prevent--and protect women and children from--harm, exploitation, discrimination, and abuse, including sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) and trafficking in persons (TIP), and to hold perpetrators accountable in conflict-affected environments.

- ❖ Risks of SGBV in crisis and conflict-affected environments are decreased through the increased

capacity of individuals, communities, and protection actors to address the threats and vulnerabilities associated with SGBV. (Outcome 3.1)

- ❖ Support education and awareness initiatives for USG civilian and aid workers on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) in crisis and conflict-affected environments. (Action 3.1.5)

- ❖ Provide support for advocacy campaigns and programs designed to reduce family and community level violence. (Action 3.4.1)

Objective 4: Preventing Conflict. The USG will promote women's roles in conflict prevention, improve conflict early-warning and response systems through the integration of gender perspectives, and invest in women's and girls' health, education, and economic opportunity to create conditions for stable societies and lasting peace.

- ❖ Conflict early-warning and response systems include gender-specific data and are responsive to SGBV, and women participate in early-warning, preparedness, and response initiatives. (Outcome 4.1)

- ❖ Share and utilize relevant data from the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) and the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) in support of conflict prevention, early-warning, and response [strategies and] activities. (Action 4.1.3)

P2P Programming. All peacebuilding programs ultimately bring people together, but P2P in practice means something more specific. The P2P approach is based on the peacebuilding hypothesis that if belligerent groups within a community are given the opportunity to interact, they will better understand and appreciate one another and will prefer to resolve conflicts peacefully. Similarly, if key actors from belligerent groups are given the opportunity to interact, they will better understand and appreciate one another, be better able to work with one another, and prefer to resolve conflicts peacefully. P2P can be the goal of the program hypothesis to overcome stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination. It can also be used as an approach embedded in the program design to bring about some other outcome.

Culture of Peace. One approach to P2P programming is based on a **culture of peace**, which promotes peace education to achieve inter alia, economic and social development, equality, inclusion and women's empowerment and focuses on democratic principles including respect for human rights. This approach is underpinned by the theory fostering a cultural shift from violence ("culture of war") to peaceful approaches ("culture of peace") to handling conflict as a long-term process of transforming the attitudes and social norms that supported violent conflict in the past. A Culture of Peace is considered a mitigating and preventative measure to the culture of war.

Responsive and Purposeful P2P Programs. Conflicts are dynamic and tend to ebb and flow. What might be an appropriate response at one point in the conflict may not necessarily be appropriate at another time. The implementing partner should closely monitor the "pulse" of the conflict to identify the precious, and at times, ephemeral, windows of opportunity, and to anticipate, and help form ripe moments for intervention.

While the program hypothesis provides the overarching framework for the program, the program needs to incorporate flexibility into its design and maintain a structure capable of responding quickly to program opportunities. Recognizing that interventions become part of the conflict context, thoughtful programs reflect on the impact of planned activities and analyze their potential effect(s) on the conflict environment. A single program is likely unable to realistically address the multidimensional aspects of one conflict, so a clear, explicit and realistic focus is necessary.

Reconciliation is a community oriented process of building confidence, trust and comity between rival groups. Reconciliation is both a longer term approach to, and outcome of, conflict resolution. It goes beyond the focus on post-conflict moments leadership discussions or victim-perpetrator dichotomies. Innovative reconciliation processes are not reserved purely for post-conflict situations: early intervention models even in the midst of violent conflict have proven impressive in building bridges and repairing damaged relationships at the local level.

Select Thoughtful Indicators for the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Plan. The MEL plans of successful P2P programs consider the challenges in conflict-affected environments and ensure that the plan is conflict sensitive, through the following good practices:

- ❖ Qualitative monitoring mechanisms are established to capture unintended consequences.
- ❖ Evaluations include a review on the effectiveness of conflict sensitivity intentions and processes.
- ❖ Conflict-sensitive MEL plans consider changes in context, the effects of context on the intervention, and intervention's effects on the context when determining, for instance, who collects data, who is monitored, how indicators are measured, when, where, and how data is collected, if beneficiaries participate, and potential extra costs.
- ❖ Conflict-sensitive MEL plans also use indicators to track changes in context, the effects of context on the intervention, and intervention effects on the context.
- For example, **context indicators** measure factors outside USAID's control that affect the achievement of results and can focus on tracking conflict drivers identified in a conflict analysis that are most relevant for the intervention.
- **Process indicators** ensure the required conflict sensitivity processes (e.g., conflict analysis updates, adaptive management) are taking place.
- **Disaggregated performance indicators** can identify critical differences in the distribution of benefits across, for instance, identity groups or regions.
- **Interaction indicators** track if the intervention is causing unintended negative changes in conflict, or is contributing to positive dynamics or reducing tensions.
- ❖ Successful P2P MEL plans also use **complementary monitoring approaches** when results are difficult to predict in dynamic contexts with unclear cause-and-effect relationships.
- For instance, **complexity-aware monitoring** keeps pace with a changing context, looks broadly at unexpected project outcomes as well as alternative causes for project outcomes (e.g., systems analysis), and considers relationships, perspectives, and boundaries.
- ❖ Successful P2P programs ensure collaborative learning through conflict sensitivity through collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) as follows:
- **Collaborating:** Ensure collaboration extends to diverse beneficiaries in conflict-affected communities where activities take place to promote local ownership and learning.

- **Learning:** Continually update the conflict analysis and monitor the interaction between context and intervention. Sources include data from monitoring, portfolio reviews, research findings, evaluations, USAID or third party analyses and knowledge gained from experience.
- **Adapting:** Ensure that activities are adapted to changing conflict environments and in response to learning from monitoring the interaction and feedback mechanisms.

Theories of Change in P2P Programming

The theory of change (ToC) is a narrative description of how and why a purpose or result is expected to be achieved in a particular context. CMM and its partners developed the Theories and Indicators of Change (THINC) Matrix based upon extensive literature review and consultation with experts and practitioners. THINC captures and organizes some of the key theories of change that have informed peacebuilding projects, programs and strategies. Incorporating a ToC in P2P programs focuses efforts around the analytical understanding of the context, ensures implementation of activities flows from the context analysis, incorporates a methodology and framework for interventions, and explicitly discusses process and assumptions. Integrating MEL and CLA approaches allows for a theory that can adapt to changing circumstances.

Trauma and Psycho-Social Healing is an important aspect of national and community reconciliation. Psycho-social healing is “a process to promote psychological and social health of individuals, families and community groups.” This approach is based on the understanding that in a post-conflict situation where the social fabric has been torn apart by violence, the rebuilding of the human interactions that allow the society to function requires the healing of psychological and social wounds of individuals and society. Because trauma does not occur in a social vacuum, the healing process can only take place in the context of relationships. Psycho-social healing programmes therefore use support groups and facilitated discussion to heal individuals in the context of a group. Psycho-social healing and sustained societal support to those that directly suffered the effects of violence, is critical for the social body to effectively overcome a divisive past and re-establish foundations of trust to enable ‘positive coexistence.’

Violence Reduction is an intrinsic condition of peacebuilding, and must be a component of conflict prevention, reconciliation, and peacebuilding programming. Violence occurs in both conflict and non-conflict settings and is often linked to gangs, crime and corruption. It causes physical, interpersonal, emotional and structural harm and undermines security and stability, factors essential to development and peacebuilding.

❖ A Note on Conflict-Related Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG)

Post-conflict and peace-building environments may see communities idealizing a return to traditional gender norms that carry an inherent power disparity conducive to domestic and family violence (DFV). Gender analyses of conflict and post-conflict situations have highlighted the danger, once a society is beginning to return to some form of stability [...] of a return to what communities believe to be ‘traditional’ differentiated gender roles. Violence is a way of enforcing women’s conformity to such demands.

❖ Violence against women and girls and conflict can have many common causes and drivers, including patriarchy and gender discrimination, that impact peace and conflict at all levels. The patriarchal power structures of privilege and control that develop and thrive during conflict tend to carry over to post-conflict periods, to the overall detriment of women. Research suggests that VAWG may also act as a further driver of militarized violence and exacerbate on-going state

fragility.

Engage the Strategic “Who” & Decide “How many.” The selection of participants reflects choices of those who are considered to be agents for change (key people) and those whom the desired effect is targeting (more people). Whether formally or informally, the selection of the strategic “who” legitimizes those selected and the interests they represent; this is also a conscious and strategic decision of who is not participating. There are tradeoffs between repeat engagements with the same participants verses bringing new participants together.

Successful P2P programs ensure that implementation of activities flows from the context analysis and theory of change and includes a set of assumptions. A single program is likely unable to realistically address the multidimensional aspects of one conflict, so a clear and realistic focus is necessary.

Successful programs clearly articulate which people or conflicting groups are brought together and why those chosen groups are most relevant based on the conflict context. They also explicitly and intentionally create linkages between the immediate objectives and peace writ large and/or community- or national-level peace efforts or structural reforms. Thus, successful P2P programs will address both the attitudinal and institutional dimensions of the conflict.

Youth and Conflict. Violence disproportionately affects young people who might otherwise be productive members of society, subjecting individuals and communities to lifelong repercussions. High levels of childhood exposure to violence become even more problematic in countries with significant youth bulges which, in and of themselves, correlate with a higher incidence of ethnic conflict and political violence. Furthermore, external shocks such as food insecurity, climate change or natural disasters compound these threats and may ignite new rounds of violent conflict.