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Dear Prospective Applicants:

The US Agency for International Development (USAID) is issuing this Annual Program Statement (APS) pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) of 1961, as amended. The Agency will administer any resulting awards in accordance with Parts 200 and 700 of Title 2 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards; Standard Provisions for US/Non-US Organizations; as well as the additional requirements in this APS and any Rounds. The Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation (CMM) in the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance is pleased to announce this People-To-People (P2P) Reconciliation Fund APS (known hereafter as P2P APS).

Through the P2P APS, USAID announces its desire to engage in a diverse range of partnerships, including with new and underutilized development actors (namely local and locally established organizations) to expand and amplify the Agency’s work in the peacebuilding sector. This APS is designed to support specific Administration and Agency priorities in conflict prevention, mitigation, management and peacebuilding.

Since 2004, CMM has managed the P2P Reconciliation Fund in accordance with a Congressional appropriation to provide a central source of funding for reconciliation-related programming. These programs create opportunities for communities in conflict to build mutual understanding, trust, empathy, and resilient social ties by addressing divisions that may be rooted in group differences such as ethnicity, religion, status, gender, class, or political affiliation.

The P2P APS is not a Request for Applications (RFA) or a Request for Proposals (RFP). Rather, the P2P APS requests Concept Papers in response to Rounds published to this APS. Based on the review of those Concept Papers led by a USAID team, USAID will determine whether to request a full Application from the successful applicants. To be competitive in a particular Round, applications must be fully responsive to all directions under this APS as well as any additional directions detailed in the Round.

USAID reserves the right to fund any or none of the concept papers and applications submitted under this APS and its respective Rounds. USAID also reserves the right to not conduct a co-creation phase and request full applications from successful Applicants at the Concept Paper stage.

USAID is available to respond to questions from applicants about the process. Applicants should submit questions by email to the point of contact (POC) identified in the specific Round through which they are considering submitting a Concept Paper. Applicants should send general questions about the below information by email to the P2P general inbox at FY19CMMP2P@usaid.gov by the deadline specified above. As Rounds occur, notifications will be posted on www.grants.gov.

USAID sincerely hopes that your organization will consider submitting a Concept Paper to a Round of the P2P APS.

Sincerely,

Mir Ershadullah
Agreement Officer
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SECTION I: FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. BACKGROUND AND AUTHORITY

BACKGROUND
USAID’s Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation (CMM) strives to create programming that effectively prevents, mitigates, and manages the causes and consequences of violent conflict, instability, and extremism. CMM leads USAID’s efforts to identify and analyze sources of conflict, supports early responses to address violent conflict, and seeks to integrate conflict mitigation and management strategies into USAID’s programming worldwide.

With active programs in over 30 countries, the People-to-People (P2P) Reconciliation Fund is improving individual and community capacity to effectively manage, mitigate, resolve, transform, and prevent the recurrence of violent conflict. CMM has managed the P2P Reconciliation Fund program since its inception in 2004, and currently supports over 50 active P2P programs worldwide.

In the FY 2019 funding cycle, a congressional directive valued at approximately $30 million is anticipated (this includes funding for the Global and Middle East programs, pending funds availability). Participating USAID Missions will generally be eligible to receive only one (1) award at a value not to exceed $1,200,000, resulting from this competition.

AUTHORITY
Since 2004, CMM has managed the P2P Reconciliation Fund program in accordance with a Congressional appropriation to provide a central source of funding for reconciliation-related programming, as noted below:

Section 7060(g) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116-6), Division F (“FY 2019 Act”), states:

RECONCILIATION PROGRAMS.— Funds appropriated by this Act under the headings “Economic Support Fund” and “Development Assistance” shall be made available to support people-to-people reconciliation programs which bring together individuals of different ethnic, religious, and political backgrounds from areas of civil strife and war: Provided, That the USAID Administrator shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations, prior to the initial obligation of funds, on the uses of such funds, and such funds shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That to the maximum extent practicable, such funds shall be matched by sources other than the United States Government: Provided further, That such funds shall be administered by the Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation, USAID.

AND, the Joint Explanatory Statement Regarding H.J. RES. 31 (i.e., Statement of Managers), which states:

Reconciliation Programs.—In lieu of the directives on reconciliation programs in the House and Senate reports, $30,000,000 is included for people-to-people reconciliation programs to be carried out in a manner consistent with long-standing congressional intent. Not later than 60 days after enactment of the Act, the USAID Administrator shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations on the proposed uses of such funds and the amounts to be made available for such purposes.
B. PURPOSE
Lasting peace largely depends on the willingness and capability of society members to re-forge their relationships in the wake of violent conflict, in effect reweaving the social fabric shredded by violence. In these difficult contexts, the CMM People-to-People (P2P) Reconciliation Fund program helps individuals and societies to heal, by addressing divisions within a community that may be rooted in group differences such as ethnicity, religion, status, gender, class, or political affiliation.

C. PROGRAMMATIC GOALS & GEOGRAPHIC PRIORITIES
This umbrella APS establishes the overall purpose, eligibility criteria, and process, under which specific and yet-to-be-determined requests will be issued (referred to as Rounds).

USAID will express specific programmatic and geographic priorities through individual Rounds, issued on an as-needed basis, which reflect the particular programmatic or geographic focus of a USAID Mission, or B/IO. This approach will ensure that specific Rounds reflect the objectives and nuances of each unique environment, and that USAID Missions or B/IOs are in a position to review concept papers and potentially issue awards (with assistance from USAID Washington when necessary).

USAID expects to make significant progress toward achieving the following goals in the areas in which it programs the P2P Reconciliation Fund:

- Bringing together representatives of conflicting groups to interact purposefully in a safe space, in order to address patterns of prejudice and exclusion that reinforce the perceived differences between groups and hinder the development of relationships in communities experiencing conflict-related violence;

- Supporting peacebuilding and reconciliation by creating opportunities for communities in pre-conflict, conflict-affected and post-conflict situations to build mutual understanding, trust, empathy, and socio-economic resilience to resolve past grievances and mitigate conflict and violence;

- Addressing the factors that reinforce competition, distrust, or fear between and within groups in conflict. The P2P approach hypothesizes that as engagement, trust and interdependency is developed between groups, the health of relationships improves and the likelihood of violence declines.

An Important Note on Individual and Institutional Change. 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.

One of the most important lessons learned from peacebuilding practice is that there is no single solution to resolving violent conflict. Peace processes that address behaviors and attitudes but ignore the social structures that generate grievances are unlikely to be effective. Likewise, fixing inequities enshrined in laws, institutions, and traditions may fail to change individual motivations for violence. The Reflecting on Peace Practice (RPP) Matrix, developed by Mary Anderson and Lara Olson, reflects this finding. One dimension of the matrix sorts interventions between those that focus on changing attitudes of the parties in conflict or on changing institutions—the rules, procedures, and practices—that give rise
to their grievances. The other dimension of the matrix identifies whether the intervention is directed at key people, whose roles are critical to the conflict dynamics, or at more people, large groups of people who can provide broad-based support for peace processes.

This type of work addresses **drivers of conflict** within and across communities. Drivers may be real, such as ethnic or religious tension, historic, including injustices stemming from past violence, or perceived, such as comparisons of relative wealth, rights or status. Existing or recently concluded conflicts may create additional complications. For example, the integration of ex-combatants into a victimized community or the benefits and services offered to internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees in a host community can create tensions, and contribute to perceptions of even greater inequality or marginalization or even contribute to retraumatization.

**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

---

1 https://www.interpeace.org/2017/02/building-focusing-resilience/
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 fuelling 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.² 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.

---

3 Do No Harm Project. CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, Inc. [http://www.cdainc.com](http://www.cdainc.com)
Excerpt from the USAID Policy Framework (2019)\(^4\)

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**\(^5\) 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.

---


\(^5\) Please see the Gender Analysis for the P2P APS in Annex 1 and the USAID ADS 205 Policy on Gender Equality and Female Empowerment
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.
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)\(^8\) Matrix based upon extensive literature review and consultation with experts and

\(^8\) THINC: Theories and indicators of change in conflict management and mitigation: concepts and primers [https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTcxMjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MTczMzk4](https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTcxMjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MTczMzk4)
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 militarised 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

---

9 The Kofi Annan Foundation *Challenging the Conventional: Making Post-Violence Reconciliation Succeed.*
10 Intersections of violence against women and girls with state-building and peace-building: Lessons from Nepal, Sierra Leone and South Sudan
https://globalwomensinstitute.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs1356/f/downloads/P784%20IRC%20What%20Works%20Report_LR.pdf
11 Alliance for Peacebuilding: Violence Reduction Subsector Review & Evidence Evaluation
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.

**Zero-Tolerance for Sexual Harassment, Exploitation, or Abuse Among Staff or Partners.**
D. PROCESS AND TIMELINE

OVERALL PROCESS

USAID has outlined the process through which potential applicants may apply under potential Rounds in Section IV of this APS. The diagram in Figure 1 below is a summary:
Extensive Partnership: Co-Creation and Shared Responsibility

In order to foster sustainable and transformational development impact, P2P APS award(s) shall entail extensive partnering and collaboration between USAID Missions or B/IOs and the applicant from design to implementation. Ideally, the applicable USAID Mission or B/IO will jointly identify and define with the applicant(s) the development problems to tackle in the program and then collaborate to determine whether and how to solve those problems and achieve the greatest degree of measurable, sustainable impact. USAID Missions or B/IOs will work with the applicant(s) to mobilize, leverage and more effectively apply each other’s respective expertise. Awards should be co-created, co-developed, and co-implemented. This means that, rather than telling applicants how USAID wants to solve a problem, the Agency presents a challenge and solicits the best ideas for how to address it and works from concept to issuance and management of awards in an iterative, participatory, and collaborative process.
SECTION II: FEDERAL AWARD INFORMATION

The P2P APS is not a request for concept papers. Concept papers must be submitted in response to, and in accordance with the instructions provided in, a specific Round. Specific information and instructions for awards under this APS will be provided in individual Rounds, which can be found under the APS funding opportunity posting on Grants.gov by clicking on the “Related Documents” tab. USAID is under no obligation to review general concepts submitted under this umbrella APS, or to provide feedback for such submissions.

USAID intends that this APS will be used to provide for full and open competition for responsible qualified applicants.

A. FUNDING

This APS is unfunded and represents the framework through which later, funded Rounds will be constructed. CMM will collaborate with Missions and other USAID operating units to post specific funding opportunities through organized Rounds for this APS. Rounds will be the exclusive source of funding through this APS and will be posted on www.grants.gov for no less than 60 days.

As determined by the source of funding, awardee(s) will be expected to comply with the legal and USAID policy requirements that govern the Agency’s programming.

Participating USAID Missions should expect a maximum of $1,200,000 in P2P Reconciliation funding from CMM, which will likely fund only one (1) application subsequent to the competitive process (pending funds availability).

B. START DATE AND PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE FOR FEDERAL AWARDS

Concept papers must offer a period of performance in accordance with the guidance provided in the Round. The initial period of performance must be at least 24 months and no more than 60 months.

Multiple awards may be made as a result of the Round(s) of this APS. The actual number of awards under the Round(s) of this APS is subject to the availability of funds and the viability of concept papers/applications received. Accordingly, USAID reserves the right to award multiple awards, one award, or no awards at all under each Round.

C. EXPECTED IMPLEMENTING MECHANISM

Awards resulting from this P2P APS may take the form of a grant (including but not limited to a fixed amount award) or cooperative agreement (including but not limited to framework agreements and Leader with Associates awards.) Each Round will define the types of award instruments available for potential awardees. If a Round anticipates awarding a cooperative agreement, the expected USAID substantial involvement will be included in the Round. Please see Section VI for more information on each type of potential assistance mechanism. An acquisition mechanism will not be awarded under any Round of this APS.
D. AUTHORIZED GEOGRAPHIC CODE

The authorized geographic code for the procurement of services and commodities is 937. If a Round wants to utilize a geographic code 935, a waiver in compliance with 22 CFR 228 must be approved prior to the Round document being released.

E. BENEFITING GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

Participating countries will be listed in each Round document.

[END OF SECTION II]
SECTION III: ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

U.S. and Non-U.S. Non-Profit Organizations (NGOs)

Qualified U.S. and non-U.S. private non-profit organizations may apply for funding under this APS. Foreign government-owned parastatal organizations from countries that are ineligible for assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) or related appropriations acts are ineligible.

U.S. and Non-U.S. For-Profit Organizations

Qualified U.S. and non-U.S. private for-profit organizations may apply for funding under this APS. Foreign government-owned parastatal organizations from countries that are ineligible for assistance under the FAA or related appropriations acts are ineligible. Potential for-profit applicants should note that, pursuant to 22 CFR 226.81, the payment of fee/profit to the prime recipient under grants and cooperative agreements is prohibited. However, if a prime recipient has a subcontract with a for-profit organization for the acquisition of goods or services (i.e., if a buyer-seller relationship is created), fee/profit for the subcontractor may be authorized.

U.S. and Non-U.S. Colleges and Universities

Qualified U.S. and non-U.S. colleges and universities may apply for funding under this APS. USG and USAID regulations generally treat colleges and universities as NGOs, rather than governmental organizations; hence, both public and private colleges and universities are eligible. Non-U.S. colleges and universities in countries that are ineligible for assistance under the FAA or related appropriations acts are ineligible.

Private Voluntary Organizations (PVO)

A local or indigenous PVO, which by definition is a non-U.S. PVO operating in the same foreign country in which it is organized, is eligible to receive funding. Local PVOs are not required to register with USAID. In accordance with 2 CFR 203, a U.S. PVO and an “International PVO,” which by definition is a non-U.S. PVO that performs development work in one or more countries other than the country in which it is domiciled, must be registered with USAID to be eligible to receive funding.

Public International Organizations (PIOs)

PIOs are eligible to apply for funding under this APS. Please see Automated Directives Series (ADS) 308 for USAID policy on defining PIOs. http://www.usaid.gov/policy/ads/300/308.pdf

New Partners

USAID encourages applications from new partners. Resultant awards to these organizations oblige USAID to undertake necessary pre-award reviews of these organizations to determine their “responsibility” in regards to fiduciary and other oversight responsibilities of the grant/cooperative agreement. In order for an award to be made, a USAID Agreement Officer must make an affirmative determination that the applicant is “responsible,” as discussed in ADS 303.3.9. Please also consider recent announcements on www.grants.gov such as The New Partnership Initiative (Annual Program Statement Number 7200AA19APS00012).
Prior to making an award under this competition, USAID may perform a pre-award survey for organizations that are new to working with USAID (“NUPAS”) or for organizations with outstanding audit findings. Accounting systems, audit issues and management capability questions may be reviewed as part of this process. If notified by USAID that a pre-award survey is necessary, applicants must prepare in advance the required information and documents. A pre-award survey does not commit USAID to make an award to any organization.

B. Cost Share

There is no requirement for cost sharing or matching in the P2P APS as it is not a funding opportunity itself. However, Rounds issued under this APS may require cost sharing or matching. Any instructions on such cost sharing or matching will be provided in the Round. Cost sharing will not be required under a fixed amount award mechanism. For guidance on cost sharing in grants and CAs, please see the ADS 303.3.10 and 2 CFR 200.306 for US NGOs. For non-US NGOs, all cost sharing would be subject to the Applicable Provision “Cost Sharing” in ADS 303mab.

[END OF SECTION III]
SECTION IV: CONCEPT PAPER SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Concept papers will be accepted under issued Rounds of this APS. Please refer to specific Round documents for detailed information on any concept paper submission guidance including concept paper requirements and merit review/evaluation criteria for the specific Round, as applicable. General guidance for all Rounds under this APS is provided below.

NOTE: Organizations may only submit one (1) concept paper per participating country identified in Rounds to this APS. However, organizations may submit a concept paper to as many countries as they are eligible for in a given Round.

A. AGENCY POINT OF CONTACT

Questions and Answers: All questions regarding this APS should be submitted in writing to Mr. Michael Kwaw via email at FY19CMMP2P@usaid.gov by the deadline on the cover page. USAID is under no obligation to review general concepts submitted under this overall APS, or to provide feedback for such submissions. Any information given to a prospective applicant concerning this APS will be furnished promptly to all other prospective applicants as an amendment to this APS, if that information is necessary in submitting applications or if the lack of it would be prejudicial to any other prospective applicant.

Concept Paper submissions must be submitted to each of the e-mail addresses/points of contact specified in each separate Round. Issuance of this APS does not constitute an award or commitment on the part of the USG, nor does it commit the USG to pay for costs incurred in the preparation and submission of a concept paper or an application. Applicants submit Concept Paper applications at their own risk and all preparation and submission costs are at the applicant's expense. USAID reserves the right to close or amend the APS on or before the closing date, stated on page 1. Therefore, for each issued Round, organizations are encouraged to apply as soon as possible to be considered for review to maximize the possibility of receiving available funding.

B. CONCEPT PAPER AND APPLICATION PROCESS

Each Round will outline a three-phase process. Under the P2P APS Rounds, there will be a three-phase process where applicants first submit a concept paper for an initial competitive review:

1. All concept papers received during a Round will be evaluated by a USAID Merit Review Committee (MRC) for responsiveness to the merit review/evaluation criteria outlined in each Round.

2. After the concept papers are evaluated, successful applicants may be invited to continue the co-creation and collaboration process to identify and develop the activities that will help achieve the results desired under this APS and specific Round(s); identify and incorporate additional partners; and determine respective roles and responsibilities related to the implementation of those activities.

3. If there is a co-creation phase, additional instructions and criteria for full application submissions will be provided after evaluation of concept papers, co-creation workshop (if necessary), and when full applications are requested.
The application and award process under this APS has the following steps:

PHASE 1: CONCEPT PAPER SUBMISSION

Interested Applicants are invited to submit a Concept Paper based on the Core Elements of Successful P2P Reconciliation Programming which are explained in detail in Section I.C. Concept Papers must respond to a specific Round under this APS and should be prepared and submitted according to the specific instructions in the APS and as relevant in the Round of interest. Applicants should not submit any alternative document or narrative as a substitute for a Concept Paper. Application materials in any other format than that described in Section IV.D will not be accepted or reviewed. All Concept Papers must be in English and submitted electronically according to the instructions in this APS. Concept Papers must be submitted to the names indicated in the specific P2P APS Round and to the CMM POC. Concept Papers sent by any other means (including on www.grants.gov) will not be considered. The Concept Paper submission deadline for each specific P2P APS Round will be indicated in that Round. Each Round will be posted on www.grants.gov for a minimum of 60 days. All Concept Papers will be evaluated based on the criteria and considerations set forth in the “Concept Paper Evaluation Criteria and Considerations” section below.

A Concept Paper is a short, five (5) page document where the applicant provides an overview of its idea. Applicants must submit a Concept Paper in response to an active Round by the deadline specified in the Round document. The USAID Operating Unit that issued the Round will acknowledge Concept Paper submission within 3 business days. Each Round will review Concept Papers against merit review criteria detailed in the APS and Round document, as applicable.

USAID will notify potential applicants of significant changes in the review process timeline through a written amendment to the Round. USAID, at its sole discretion, reserves the right to review Concept Papers out of cycle. USAID reserves the right to pose clarifying questions and conduct discussions with any Applicant, but may not opt to do so if it believes it has sufficient information in the concept paper itself. Posing clarifying questions and conducting discussions with one Applicant does not obligate USAID to do so with all Applicants.

CONCEPT PAPER REVIEW

Concept Papers will be evaluated according to the criteria and considerations set forth in this P2P. Each Round will review Concept Papers against the merit review criteria in the P2P APS and as detailed in the Round document, as applicable. The purpose of the technical review is to determine whether USAID wishes to invite the Applicant to submit a Full Application.

USAID anticipates two (2) possible results from the Concept Paper merit review process:

A. Conditional Acceptance - Invited for Co-Creation: Concept Paper generally meets Round objectives and receives a PASS when evaluated against the Round merit review criteria. Additional clarity is needed. USAID invites the Applicant to engage in co-creation or to submit a full application if co-creation is determined to not be necessary.

OR

B. Rejection: Concept Paper does not meet Round objectives and receives a FAIL when evaluated against the APS and Round merit review criteria, as applicable. The USAID Mission or B/IO rejects the Concept Paper. Not every organization that submits a concept paper through a Round of this APS will automatically be selected to participate in co-creation.
NOTE: Due to the number of concept papers received, USAID is not able to provide details on why concept papers were not selected.

USAID also reserves the right to make an award without discussions if determined to be in the Government’s best interest.

NOTE: A decision to engage in more in-depth and/or specific co-creation discussions is not a commitment to funding, nor is it a commitment that USAID will request a Full Application. If an Applicant is invited to engage in co-creation and further discussions, additional guidance with respect to expectations during the co-creation process will be provided to the Applicant. There is no guarantee that participation in the co-creation phase will lead to an award from USAID.

Proposed concept papers must not exceed maximum funding amounts as described in each Round. Applicants may submit concept papers during a particular time period designated within the Round document. The number or limitation on Concept Papers that will be reviewed will depend on the details within the Round. If there is a ceiling on the number of concept papers to be reviewed in a particular Round, it will clearly state how many concept papers will be accepted. Further, if an organization does not submit a successful concept paper and is not invited to attend the co-creation workshop/submit a full application in a specific Round then that organization may still submit another concept paper in a future Round(s), if one occurs. Merit review/evaluation criteria will be revised to the specifics of the Round; another submission in another Round does not guarantee a successful concept paper and invitation to attend the co-creation workshop/submit a full application.

PHASE 2: CO-CREATION

Applicants that have successful Concept Papers may be invited for co-creation, and will engage with USAID Missions and CMM, or another B/IO, and/or possibly other successful Concept Paper Applicants. The co-creation process with USAID only builds on a Concept Paper that has strength and potential; it is not intended to develop new concepts from the ground up. During this phase, applicants will work with USAID technical teams to address issues. Another option for co-creation is for a workshop with all of the successful concept paper applicants in one Round. In such a case, USAID’s discussions with those Applicants will take place within the parameters of publicly available information. These parameters provide ample room for extensive, robust discussions regarding the development problem/goal in question, best practices, lessons learned in the relevant technical sectors, and pertinent research and evaluations and various other matters. This option is not anticipated at this time.

After concept papers have been submitted, USAID personnel can have highly specific, detailed activity design discussions with the Applicants throughout the remainder of the process, e.g., up to and through any award that might be issued under a Round of this APS. Concept papers should be free of any intellectual property that the Applicant wishes to protect, as the concept papers may be shared with other organizations as part of the co-creation process.

However, once potential partners have been invited to engage in further discussions, they will work with USAID to identify proprietary information that requires protection. Therefore, organizations submitting concept papers provide USAID a royalty free, non-exclusive, irrevocable right to use, disclose, reproduce, prepare derivative works, and to have, or permit others to have, use of any information contained in the concept paper submitted under each Round(s) of this APS. If USAID engages with the organization regarding its concept paper, the parties can negotiate further intellectual property protection for the organization’s intellectual property. Organizations must ensure that any submission
under all Round(s) of this APS is free of any third party proprietary data rights that would impact the license granted to USAID herein.

The goals of a co-creation workshop would likely be to explore and validate key challenges and problems, and then jointly develop promising solutions or adapt and expand upon existing solutions. Ideas described within the Concept Papers may be discussed and further developed in the workshop, but workshop thinking, and possible eventual full applications, will not be limited to these ideas. The workshop is also intended to help identify potential consortia and partnerships to support these new or existing solutions and activities.

**NOTE:** None of USAID’s communication during the co-creation process in all Rounds of this APS should be interpreted as a commitment to making an award of USAID funding. Regardless of the co-creation approach, USAID envisages a product of the co-creation process to be a strong draft project description from each selected Applicant/Consortium for the full application phase, as well as quantitative and/or qualitative indicators or performance milestones.

**Note on additional partners/resources:** Until full applications are submitted, both the Applicant and USAID may identify and include potential additional technical partners and/or potential resource partners. All additional sub-partners may be included as part of a subsequent full application if there is an agreement to do so between the potential sub-partner, the original Concept Paper Applicant, and USAID, but this is not guaranteed. Discussions with potential resource partners may continue throughout each Round’s process and during implementation. If an applicant does not succeed at the co-creation phase, the process ends for that applicant. USAID reserves the right to remove any co-creation participant from award consideration should the parties fail to reach agreement on activity concept, design, award terms, conditions, or cost/price within a reasonable time, the participant fails to provide requested additional information in a timely manner, or the U.S. Government believes it is in its best interest.

Concept papers that are submitted late or are incomplete may not be considered for the co-creation workshop or request for full applications (if co-creation workshop is not held).

Additional information in the concept paper not requested by each Round of the APS may be removed and may adversely affect an applicant’s evaluation/review. USAID also reserves the right to not conduct a co-creation phase and request full applications from successful applicants at concept paper stage.

**PHASE 3: REQUEST FOR FULL APPLICATION**

After the co-creation phase, if the Merit Review Committee decides a full application(s) is warranted, full application instructions and criteria will be provided to the selected applicant(s) or groups of applicants that are proposing to work together. The RFA will provide complete instructions for submission of a full application. The full application will detail and expand upon the concept(s) developed through co-creation. The full application also requires the applicant to complete specific USG forms and to provide additional information that the USAID Mission or B/IO will need to move forward with an appropriate implementing instrument. All full applications will be reviewed for their technical merit against the full application merit review/evaluation criteria by the Merit Review Committee. Using its technical expertise, the Merit Review Committee may suggest revisions and additions to the proposed project as well as potential partners and resources. USAID will continue to have robust communication with applicants, potential partners, and other key stakeholders regarding the technical substance of the evolving approach, as well as the identity and roles of proposed or additional partners. USAID may request that key personnel of applicants deemed responsive and eligible deliver an oral presentation describing their proposed technical approach to inform the technical merit review.
If the Merit Review Committee selects application(s) for funding, its review will be shared with the Agreement Officer for cost analysis, final approval and award negotiation. During this stage, the Apparently Successful Applicant(s) and USAID can further design the technical approach, and clarify general resource requirements, additional partner involvement, and management control of the project under the guidance of the Agreement Officer. The Apparently Successful Applicant(s) may also be asked to provide additional information about its technical approach, capacity, management and organization, proposed cost and budget, responsibility, and representations and certifications.

The Agreement Officer will engage in final review, negotiation, and determinations of award responsibility, and cost reasonableness, and will draft an assistance mechanism, to be reviewed by the Apparently Successful Applicant. Information regarding possible award provisions will be offered to the applicant, as well as the final award provisions when the award is drafted. USAID reserves the right to accept applications in their entirety or to select only portions of the application to award.

USAID reserves the right to make no award under this APS or any Round at any stage of the process.

If requested to submit a full application, the applicant(s) (unless the applicant is an individual or Federal awarding agency that is excepted from those requirements under 2 CFR 25.110(b) or (c), or has an exception approved by the Federal awarding agency under 2 CFR 25.110(d)), is required to:

1) Be registered in SAM (System for Award Management) before submitting its application;
2) Provide a valid DUNS (Data Universal Numbering System) number in its application; and
3) Continue to maintain an active SAM registration with current information at all times during which it has an active Federal award or an application or plan under consideration by a Federal awarding agency.

USAID will not make a Federal award to an applicant until the applicant has complied with all applicable DUNS and SAM requirements and, if an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time USAID is ready to make an award, USAID may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a Federal award and use that determination as a basis for making a Federal award to another applicant.

Per 2 CFR Appendix I to Part 200, Full Text of the Notice of Funding Opportunity, Section E, 3, USAID informs all potential applicants:

“i. That the Federal awarding agency [USAID], prior to making a Federal award with a total amount of Federal share greater than the simplified acquisition threshold, is required to review and consider any information about the applicant that is in the designated integrity and performance system accessible through SAM, currently Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) (see 41 U.S.C. 2313);

ii. That an applicant, at its option, may review information in the designated integrity and performance systems accessible through SAM and comment on any information about itself that a Federal awarding agency [USAID] previously entered and is currently in the designated integrity and performance system accessible through SAM;

iii. That the Federal awarding agency [USAID] will consider any comments by the applicant, in addition to the other information in the designated integrity and performance system, in making a judgment about the applicant's integrity, business ethics, and record of performance under Federal awards when completing the review of risk posed by applicants as described in CFR 200.205 Federal awarding agency review of risk posed by applicants.”
C. FUNDING RESTRICTIONS

Construction is not an allowable activity under this APS. Relevant risk assessments must be completed before the awardee(s) can incur costs for any minor renovation work that does not qualify as construction. Also, USAID does not allow reimbursement of pre-award costs under any Round of this APS.

D. CONCEPT PAPER CONTENT

No additions or modifications to Concept Papers will be accepted after the submission date for each Round of this APS. Applicants must submit only the information and materials requested and in the format specified below.

NOTE: Round documents can revise the Concept Paper Template below, as needed.

Concept Papers in response to P2P APS Rounds must include the following three components, and are described in further detail below: Cover Page, Attachments, and Technical Section. The Concept Paper and supporting information must use the format described below. Please organize the Concept Paper according to the outline below.

Format
The main body of the Concept Paper must not exceed five (5) pages and must use 1” page margins and 12pt Times New Roman font. Concept Papers MUST be in English and submitted electronically via e-mail in Word 2000 or Word 2003 text accessible or Adobe PDF. Clarity and specificity are important as is ensuring that the Concept Paper narrative addresses the criteria outlined in each Round that will be used to review the Concept Paper. During the merit review process, the USAID Mission or B/IO may reject for funding those Concept Papers that are vague or merely restate language found in the Round. The required supporting information must not exceed two (2) pages in total as follows: one (1) Cover Page and one (1) Institutional Capacity page. The Concept Paper must be submitted to the Mission or other USAID operating unit which is issuing the Round via FY19CMMP2P@usaid.gov as well as copied to: joconnor@usaid.gov

1. Cover Page Must Include the Following (1 page total)
   - USAID Round Reference;
   - Name and address of organization (physical and electronic, as applicable);
   - Contact person (lead contact name, telephone number, and e-mail Information);
   - Period of performance: Minimum is two (2) years and maximum is five (5) years in duration;
   - Total program amount (in USD)
   - Total amount of funding requested from USAID and total amount leveraged (if applicable), including from what source(s) in the form of a notional budget;
   - Type of organization (e.g., US, non-US, multilateral, private, for-profit, nonprofit, etc)
2. Technical Section (Limited to five (5) Pages)

- **Concept Introduction and conflict analysis** (approximately 1 page). Identify the problem your organization will address, linking it to the relevant country information provided in the Round. Identify the sources of conflict, impediments to reconciliation, windows of opportunity and potential triggers as they relate to the proposed activities. Incorporate gender and key stakeholder considerations as well.

- **Theory of change** (approximately ½ page). The assumed connections and logic between the conflict analysis, the proposed program’s actions, and the goal of reducing violence and conflict and/or building peace is clearly explained by the theory of change (ToC)

- **P2P Approach and Implementation Plan** (approximately 1 ½ pages). Building on the introduction, propose a P2P approach for how this intervention will produce the desired impact in the focus area(s) identified. Briefly describe critical barrier(s) or problem(s) related to the focus area(s) that your organization’s concept addresses. Be sure to include information describing why the approach is creative or innovative, how it is potentially scalable, and evidence to support it as a tested solution or as an intervention likely to have a significant impact, and how it will be sustained.

- **Intervention Results** (approximately 1 page). As specifically as possible, describe the anticipated outputs, outcomes, results and/or impact of the proposed intervention. What are the key, quantifiable metrics related to your organization’s project’s performance or expected performance? What is the scale needed to achieve results sufficient to address the identified problem? What programs are already providing such or (similar) interventions? Please include a detailed map of the focus area(s) of the intervention.

- **Risks/Assumptions** (approximately ½ page). Clearly state any assumptions regarding the conditions, behaviors, or critical events outside the control of the program that must hold true for results to be achieved, as well as risks in the program context that could have negative consequences on the achievement of results, which may include those that may result by bringing together conflicting parties. Provide sufficient explanation of risk mitigation measures, including appropriate safeguards to avoid intensifying the conflict or creating harmful situations for participants.

- **Beneficiaries** (approximately ½ page). Describe the types of benefits the intervention will produce and the types and range of people who will benefit from this intervention. Has it been, or can it be adapted to reach women and men, indigenous people, ethnic and/or religious minorities, and youth? How can the concept be scaled up to reach more
people? What are the baselines that your organization will measure before the project begins?

3. **Institutional Capacity (Limited to one (1) page)**
   
   - **Applicant Capacity and Partner Roles** (approximately 1 page). Describe organizational capacity—technical, managerial, financial, etc.—to carry out the proposed intervention. What is the business model for your organization’s intervention? Have you worked in this sector previously? Please describe your organization’s credibility within targeted communities, and a demonstrable commitment to coordinating your organization’s efforts within the context. Please note the extent to which the proposed program is supported by local organizations.

[END OF SECTION IV]
MERIT REVIEW CRITERIA
USAID Missions and B/IOs will review for merit all Concept Papers that comply with the instructions in this APS and relevant Round document(s). Each Round may specify merit review criteria appropriate for their context.

In addition, all Rounds must include the following review criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merit Review Element</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Approach Advances the purpose of P2P Reconciliation Programming</td>
<td>The extent to which the proposed program exemplifies the people-to-people approach by creating opportunities for communities in conflict to build mutual understanding, trust, empathy, and resilient social ties by addressing divisions that may be rooted in group differences such as ethnicity, religion, status, gender, class, or political affiliation. This is established through the following core programming principles:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The <strong>conflict analysis</strong> identifies the sources of conflict, impediments to reconciliation, windows of opportunity and potential triggers as it relates to the Applicant’s proposed activities, as well as incorporates gender and key stakeholder considerations and is responsive to the country-specific information in the Round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The assumed connections and logic between the conflict analysis, the proposed program’s actions, and the goal of reducing violence and conflict and/or building peace is clearly explained by the <strong>theory of change</strong> (TOC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The proposed program has a focused and realistic <strong>implementation</strong> plan, where activities flow from the context analysis and theory of change in a logical and clearly discernible way. Also, a single program is likely unable to realistically address the multidimensional aspects of one conflict, so a clear explicit focus and justification of that focus is part of a successful program design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The proposed program ensures the safety of all participants and mitigates the risk of intensifying the drivers of conflict or worsening tensions by applying the <strong>Do No Harm</strong> principle throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Capacity</td>
<td>The proposed program is carried out by and/or promotes and strengthens local organizations. A commitment to engaging local actors is evident in the conflict analysis, activity design, implementation plan, and the monitoring, evaluation, and learning plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[END OF SECTION V]
### A. FEDERAL AWARD NOTICES

The Agreement Officer (AO) is the only individual who may legally commit the USG to the expenditure of public funds. Applicants are prohibited from charging or incurring costs to the proposed award prior to receipt of either a fully executed Award or a specific, written authorization from the AO. Awards will be administered in accordance with 2 CFR 200, 2 CFR 700, and Standard Provisions for US/Non US organizations as applicable.

### B. TYPES OF AWARD

USAID has a number of assistance award types to choose from when providing funds under a Round of this APS to Apparently Successful Applicants. The type of award and terms and conditions included therein is based upon the recipient organization type, programmatic factors, and other due diligence matters (including a pre-award risk assessment) determined by the AO (in consult with the MRC). Following is a matrix of commonly used awards, their general prescription for use and key characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Type:</th>
<th>Generally used when:</th>
<th>Characterized by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Amount Award (FAA)</td>
<td>Milestones can be defined; Adequate pricing information is available; Recipient has limited financial and management capacity. Must be a grant – not a cooperative agreement.</td>
<td>Advantages for both USAID and the recipient (when used appropriately). Milestones with fixed amounts assigned to each. Focus is on outputs and results, limits risk for both parties. Grantee is paid when USAID concurs the milestone is completed. Minimizes administrative burden on USAID and the grantee since payment is not cost-reimbursement. Assists in building institutional capacity of new grantees. More information: <a href="https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/300/303saj">https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/300/303saj</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Agreement</td>
<td>Recipient has adequate financial and management capacity to operate on a cost-reimbursement basis with the USG</td>
<td>Recipient is free to pursue its sponsored program with USAID AOR and AO involved in defined technical areas (referred to as “substantial involvement”). Such involvement may include but is not limited to: approval of annual work plans, approval of key personnel, authority to halt a construction project, and joint collaboration and participation (defined in the award and specific to the project).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Agreement/Grant with Continuing Application</td>
<td>Recipient has adequate financial and management capacity to operate on a cost-reimbursement basis with the USG and USAID will engage in</td>
<td>Characteristics are the same as above but the “continuing application” feature of this award (for those initial awards that are less than a 5 year period) means that implementers will “re-apply” for continuation of the program through an oral presentation of the annual report of previous years’ results and work plan for the next year. This type of award allows USAID to easily extend and expand the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Cooperative Agreement/Grant with Adaptive Modules**

Recipient has adequate financial and management capacity to operate on a cost-reimbursement basis with the USG and USAID will engage in multiple years/expanded program based on the success of the efforts and program during the initial year of the award.

A grant or cooperative agreement using a modular construct consists of a series of blocks of work -- modules. Each module stands alone and produces some results -- these results may be administrative or technical, they may be deliverables or simply indicators that the intervention is on the right track. The important point is that the module can be defined by when it starts and when it stops. It can be time based (six months long) or event based (when the materials are ready). Each module is unique -- the type of result, method of measure, and time or event based depends on the needs of that specific module. At the conclusion of each module is a decision point. The data, assessment, stakeholders, recipient, and USAID arrive at that decision point to determine the direction of the subsequent module. During the implementation of the module, there is a parallel assessment, learning, and design of the subsequent module going on. Module 2 is designed based on what was learned in Module 1.

**Grant**

Recipient has adequate financial and management capacity to operate on a cost-reimbursement basis with the USG and USAID will not be “substantially involved” in selected programmatic elements.

A grant is a legal instrument used when the principal purpose is to transfer anything of value (i.e. money, property, or services) to a recipient in order to accomplish a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by Federal statute. Grants are appropriate when substantial involvement by USAID is not anticipated. More information: https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/300/303
Award Discretion

USAID reserves the right to make or not to make awards under Rounds of this APS. The actual number of assistance awards, if any, under Rounds of this APS is subject to the availability of funds and the interests and requirements of Missions and Bureaus/Independent Offices (B/IOs) as well as the viability of concept papers received. There is no predefined minimum or maximum number of partners or partnerships USAID Missions and B/IOs will support through Round(s) of this APS. However, USAID will not provide funds under any Round of this APS for products and services that would be purchased through a contract.

C. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
These will be specified in the Round documents, or at the request for full application stage.

D. PROGRAM INCOME
Program income may be generated under awards resulting from this APS. Program income for all award(s) resulting from Rounds under this APS may be used for cost-sharing or matching in accordance with 2 CFR 200.307(e) for US NGOs and the Required as Applicable Provision “Program Income” (December 2014) in ADS 303 for non-US NGOs. If the program income is to be utilized in a different way, the Round document will include this information. It must be used in a manner allowable under the CFR and ADS references above.

E. INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXAMINATION
Program activities are not likely to result in any direct impact on the environment. At the time of issuance of the RFA to the apparently successful Applicant, Per 22 CFR 216.2(2)(c)(2)(i), Missions and/or B/IOs will need to conduct the initial environmental examination to ensure that activities have appropriately integrated environmental factors and considerations.

[END OF SECTION VI]
ANNEX 1: GENDER ANALYSIS FOR THE FY 2019 P2P RECONCILIATION ANNUAL PROGRAM STATEMENT (P2P APS)

Gender Inclusive Framework and Theory

Violent conflict upends and often polarizes societies—it disrupts social structures, especially men’s and women’s roles and the relationships between them. Mass displacements following conflicts, poor social conditions, trauma, and shifting socio-economic roles of women, men, and gender minorities particularly affect those groups and individuals who are already negatively affected by gendered dynamics. Communities often became exposed to an increased risk of various forms of gender based violence (GBV), including intimate partner violence (IPV), economic discrimination, and lack of influence in public decision making. Violations of women’s rights in patriarchal societies often go in tandem with ineffective modes of redressing GBV incidents, including discrimination in the judicial process. Women are rarely involved in decision-making processes or assuming leadership roles. On the other hand, the risks for conflict-affected men and boys include ones relating to violence, accidents, alcohol consumption and substance abuse, and related health and social problems, including trauma, shame, physical ailments, mental health conditions, etc.

In fragile and conflict-affected environments, peacebuilding practitioners must address the drivers and consequences of violent, fragmented societies. Peacebuilding and P2P programs and interventions should be based on a thorough understanding of male and female roles and experiences in the given context, and consider how to leverage all groups in preventing or mitigating conflict. The analysis should include an understanding of the different roles, cultural norms, and identities of men, women, and other gender minorities, and how these different experiences may contribute to the causes and consequences of conflict or can be drivers for peace.

Conducting gender analysis during the design phase will better equip project managers to address the gendered consequences of conflict when implementing changes to the work based on these analyses. It will also make projects more resilient to societal and institutional shocks during implementation because the work will already be aligned with and attuned to community dynamics. Examining the relationship between conflict, power, and gender offers greater insight into sources of tension and opportunities for peacebuilding that otherwise might be missed. **Additional rationale for gender analysis:**

- During the initial planning of any project, gender analysis can illuminate additional areas for intervention, sources of tension, and drivers of conflict.

- The gender analysis will illuminate the broader context of a project, no matter its objectives and goals.

- A gender analysis will at a minimum ensure adoption of a “do no harm” approach if implemented into action.

- Gender inequalities and power imbalances can be key factors driving chronic poverty, food insecurity, poor health, violence against women, and violent conflict itself.

- When approaches to peacebuilding take gender into account, they will help reduce gender-based violence, enhance gender equality, defuse conflict, and lead to more sustainable peace.

---

Men, women, girls, and boys experience conflict and violence differently, potentially as witnesses, victims and/or perpetrators. When violence changes a society, so do beliefs about how women and men should behave. The beliefs, norms, and/or expectations of women, men, boys, girls, and sexual and gender minorities is known as a “gender mindset.”

### Defining Gender and Gender Mindsets

**Gender** is best described as a dynamic organizing principle in society. It is more than an individual’s biological sex (male/female). Gender is a learned pattern of behavior that is embedded in everything we do at the individual, community, and institutional levels.

**Gender mindset** is the socialization and internalization of the described roles and expectations that a society finds most appropriate and valuable for a person—men, women, girls, boys, and sexual and gender minorities. A person’s gender mindset can alter during societal change based on new community values, norms, and expectations.

### USAID Policy Guidance

USAID provides guidance for how to approach gender in conflict contexts as well as development more broadly and has issued a number of policies, some of which are highlighted here. Taken together, these policies affirm the importance of recognizing and addressing gender dynamics in conflict contexts. USAID’s **Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy** (2012) calls for: reducing gender disparities in access to and control over resources, opportunities, and services; addressing gender-based violence; and increasing the capacity of women and girls to realize their rights, determine their life outcomes, and influence decision-making.

Other important policies to be aware of include the **LGBTI Vision for Action**, which represents the Agency’s commitment to promoting equity for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people and including their needs and perspectives in development initiatives. **The United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally** (2016) promotes the prevention of GBV, the protection of survivors, and accountability for perpetrators. USAID’s **Counter-Trafficking in Persons Policy** (2012) calls for increased C-TIP activities in conflict-affected areas, as well as a recognition of the specific vulnerabilities of women and girls to trafficking. **The Ending Child Marriage & Meeting the Needs of Married Children: The USAID Vision for Action** (2012) recognizes that girls may be more vulnerable to early marriage during and after conflict.

Recent legislation and policy address gender and conflict issues even more directly, and are important to be familiar with. **The 2017 Women, Peace and Security Act** serves to strengthen efforts to prevent, mitigate, and resolve conflict by increasing women’s participation in negotiation and mediation processes. The Act mandated the creation of a government-wide strategy to increase the participation of women in peacekeeping, conflict mitigation, and security operations.
The United States Strategy on Women, Peace, and Security was issued in June 2019. The strategy "promotes the meaningful inclusion of women in processes to prevent, mediate, resolve, and recover from deadly conflict or disaster." It lays out four “lines of effort” that together represent the USG’s recognition of the importance of addressing gender in conflict:

- Supporting the meaningful participation of women in decision-making related to conflict and crisis;
- Promoting the protection of women and girls human rights, access to humanitarian assistance, and safety from violence;
- Adjusting USG international programs to improve outcomes in women’s empowerment and equality;
- Encouraging partner governments to adopt policies and plans and build capacity to improve the meaningful participation of women in peace and security processes and decision-making.

These policies send a clear message that USAID takes gender issues seriously and recognizes the importance of gender in understanding and addressing conflict.

Excerpt from the USG National Strategy on Women, Peace and Security (WPS)

The WPS Strategy aims to make meaningful progress around the world to empower women in preventing conflict and building peace, while endeavoring to rectify the disproportionate, adverse impacts of armed conflict on women and girls. The United States embraces these concepts and recognizes the powerful role that women can play as peacemakers and political agents in societies that are transitioning out of conflict and toward peace. It is therefore crucial that ongoing United States efforts to engage in preventing and mitigating conflict around the world strategically factor in the participation, perspectives, and interests of women, including those from under-represented groups.

When and where the USG does choose to engage, the WPS Strategy will help inform how the USG approaches and prioritizes its involvement, including in coordination with like-minded partners, to secure more effective and lasting gains.

In these instances, women and girls are often targeted for various forms of violence, exploitation, and abuse. Oftentimes, their physical vulnerability can be directly traced back to their politically and socially disadvantaged place in society. We must... ensure that we mitigate conflict at its source — including the role that systemic inequality faced by women and girls serves as a known driver of conflict.

Changing Gender Norms

When speaking about gender as a social construction, scholars often use the terms masculinity and femininity. Masculinity refers to the meanings a society attributes to being male, while femininity refers to the meanings a society attributes to being female. These meanings shape what are considered to be

---

proper gender roles for men and women, and influence how strictly a society limits the possibility of non-binary gender, or gender that does not conform to a rigid male-female dichotomy.

Gender is almost always about power: In most societies, power is distributed differently among men and women and other gender minorities. It is also important to note that gender can be imputed on others because of other identities or dynamics, as often seen in the homophobia or transphobia affecting LGBTI people.

This may mean unequal access to resources (money, food, jobs, education), decision-making (government, markets), protection from violence (equality before the law, violence in the home), and mobility (freedom to leave the home). This does not mean that men always hold all the power – in some places, women may have primary control over household finances or family decision-making, while in others, men may have lower rates of education. But we do find in many settings that women and LGBTI people have been marginalized from access to important forms of power.

In times of conflict, gender norms often change. They may become more pronounced, or they can shift. For example, aggression and violence may be linked to “manhood,” or one’s enemies may be seen as a threat to women’s purity or tradition. Discrimination against LGBTI people may increase when adherence to idealized gender norms becomes part of how identity groups define themselves against an “other.” Conflict can also allow space for gender patterns to change, for example, when women leave the home to become combatants or take up jobs that men can no longer do because they are away fighting.

In conflict contexts, the social characteristics that intersect with gender are especially important. For example, we can’t assume that only women are victims of conflict-related sexual violence or that all women are peaceful. Some women may support their identity group in its efforts to assert its grievances. Similarly, men may take on different roles in promoting violence or peace depending upon factors such as education, ethnicity, and or other identities. One person’s perspective does not represent all who identify with that gender.

**ADS 205** on “Integrating Gender Equality and Female Empowerment into USAID’s Program Cycle” emphasizes this. In its guidance for gender analysis, it requires that the descriptive statistics gathered for gender analyses should not treat women and men as monolithic categories but should reflect the intersection of sex with other characteristics in order to capture the extent to which intersecting identities may heighten marginalization or exclusion.\(^{15}\)

---

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. This body of research indicates that post-conflict communities regularly see a distortion of gender dynamics and a re-emergence of patriarchal power structures that may work to condone and perpetuate violence women experience in the private sphere.

Why Does Gender Matter in Conflict-Affected Settings?

Gender dynamics are an important facet of conflict that must be assessed. There are a number of important reasons why it is important to understand gender in conflict contexts:

❖ Gender impacts conflict, helping to shape the form it 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.

Concepts of 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.

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.

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.

**Peaceful Masculinities Approach**

This sociocultural approach examines how violence affects norms of masculinity and the consequent normalization of violence by men and boys for solving problems. Masculinity is the behaviors, attitudes, and values that societies expect of men and boys. Most of the combatants in war are men, and they perpetrate most of the violence in times of peace. However, men are not inherently violent. This approach acknowledges that violence and violent conflict—including sexual and gender-based violence—have long-term harmful impacts on men and boys and therefore need to be addressed.

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. This 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.

**Peaceful Masculinities Approach Guiding Questions:**

- What are the key expectations that a young man must meet to be considered “an adult male” in society? Is there a gap between expectations and reality?
- What are the gendered messages used to recruit men into rebel groups, militias, or violent extremist groups? Are these messages different from those for the recruitment of women?
- To what extent are notions of masculinity based on the use of violence? In what ways?
- What are the key priorities of men in negotiations? How do these differ from those of women?
● To what extent are men supportive of or resistant to women’s leadership and gender equality?
● What strategies may work to encourage them to fully support women’s and other gender minorities’ empowerment?

Conflict and Femininity

During conflict, women’s domestic roles may become idealized, and their social and political power limited, just like male violence may become idealized. Patriarchal societies often enforce norms that keep women out of the public sphere and in the private sphere of the home, where they are responsible for domestic duties. Their reproductive role is seen as critical to maintaining the society’s culture and well-being. Anti-women’s rights activists often say that when women work outside the home, the family, and by extension the entire society, is at risk of collapse. This reflects patriarchal thinking.

At the same time, conflict may also provide a pretext for instituting new controls over women’s rights and bodies, whether these involve limiting their public roles, or controlling their fertility. Conflict may lead to limitations in women’s roles, or the idealization of traditional femininity. When divisions between us and them harden, the protection of “our women” may become a pretext for conflict. In addition, attacks on women in this context may be intended to ethnically cleanse certain groups, by stymieing reproductive power or using sexual violence.

Intersecting Identities Approach

This transformational approach recognizes that gender identities are malleable and that each society’s structures, norms, and rules create these identities. The approach takes a relational view of the dynamics in a community, knowing that problems cannot be solved within a silo but must be addressed from multiple perspectives. All individuals have a gender identity. It is important to consider how such factors as a person’s age, marital status, race, sexuality, class, caste, ethnicity, religion, and abilities affect their experiences in society. By seeking understanding of power dynamics, the intersecting identities approach can help challenge societal norms that cause or perpetuate inequalities, especially gendered inequalities.

The intersecting identities approach draws from the analytical framework of intersectionality: the idea that a person’s marginalized identities interact and cannot be understood in isolation. With an understanding of the importance of these diverse experiences, this approach analyzes the broader relationships and power dynamics across a society and the implications for control over resources, movement, and other factors. Social norms—specifically the roles and expectations of men and women that a society deems appropriate or desirable—are often most resistant to change. This approach seeks to better understand how a person’s multiple identities act on their influence and power in a given situation and thus to better understand how society may or may not be addressing their grievances.

Intersecting Identities Approach Guiding Questions:

17 Please also see USAID's help document: Development ADS here: https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/additional_help_for_ads_201_inclusive_development_180726_final_r.pdf
Do structures at the family, community, or national level reinforce or challenge norms that contribute to violence?

How do media portray norms and attitudes about men, women, boys, and girls? Are sexual and gender minorities represented in the media?

How do the informal roles that men and women hold contribute to conflict?

What happens to women, men, and sexual and gender minorities who do not conform to gender norms?

What aspects of nonconformity are most (un)acceptable?

What existing laws and practices—formal and informal—codify gender discrimination or can be used to discriminate?

To summarize, a project can integrate one or multiple approaches. Projects may begin with the women, peace, and security approach but come to realize that the intersecting identities approach offers additional benefits. When deciding on an approach, it is important to consider the goals and objectives of a project, the sociocultural dynamics of a context, and the added value each approach can bring to a project. It is likely that some approaches will be more relevant than others. Peacebuilding is always context dependent. No single rule can determine which approach is best. But by beginning to ask questions and analyze gender dynamics using these approaches, project planners will strengthen their project’s design and increase the likelihood that it will meet its goals.

It’s easy to miss the voices of women and LGBTI rights advocates, though, if attention to gender is ignored and we instead rely on our own stereotypes about other cultures or the statements of more traditional elites. Think about U.S. politicians’ talk about “American family values” – not everyone in the U.S. agrees. Likewise, it’s important to ask who is empowered to define culture in other societies and understand whether or not they speak for everyone in their society.

In sum, gender issues are often controversial – but so is peacebuilding. Some people in conflict contexts want the conflict to continue, as they may be profiting from it, or perceiving themselves as defending their values or livelihoods. Similarly, some people don’t want gender norms to change. They may see gender norms as “natural” or “biological,” or deeply embedded in their religious or cultural beliefs.

**In Focus: Timor-Leste**

Considered a post-conflict country, Timor-Leste endured decades of occupation leading up to a brutal conflict in 1999, when many Timorese men and children lived alone while men joined resistance movements in the jungle. After the 1999 crisis, when men rejoined the peaceful society in the newly independent state of Timor-Leste, many brought the violence home with them. A 2015 study found that more than 33% of ever-married Timorese women experienced domestic and family violence (DFV) at the hands of their most recent partner. Hall points out that “the terminology of ‘post-conflict’ is problematic as it hides the reality of conflict for many East Timorese women who have endured domestic violence.” Indeed, high rates of DFV in Timor-Leste are believed to be an echo of the conflict.

USAID/Timor-Leste’s 2018 County Level Gender Analysis, found that, in Timorese communities, there is generally a culture of violence at the family and community level that is the legacy of a
traditional conquer-and- control political system, colonialism, the independence struggle, and overarching patriarchal social structures. Violence is used as a tool to force behavior change to avoid shaming the family.

In 2016, the Asia Foundation released a groundbreaking study on violence against women and children in Timor-Leste. The study found that 59 percent of women had experienced physical or sexual violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime, with 47 percent reporting such violence in the previous 12 months. The study revealed important aspects of violence in TL:

- It is used primarily against women, children, LGBTI people, and people with disabilities.
- Men, and especially male partners, are the primary perpetrators of violence against women.
- While not all men use violence, the prevalence of male violence against women reflects narratives of masculinity that rationalize and celebrate male strength, the use of violence, and men’s power over women.
- Men who had perpetrated intimate partner violence were more likely to engage in transactional and/or commercial sex, and to have had more than four lifetime sexual partners. Men also reported very low condom use and rates for sexual health screening.
- Rape perpetration (partner and nonpartner) was reported by one in five men in Dili, and one in three men in Manufahi. Gang rape perpetration was also relatively high (6 percent in Dili and 12 percent in Manufahi) The most common motivations that men reported for perpetrating rape were sexual entitlement and for entertainment or out of boredom.
### Recommended Gender and Conflict Analysis Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFLICT DIMENSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>GENDER DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Are resources vulnerable to theft or diversion? (Do potential thieves have opportunity, knowledge, and impunity? Do goods have value?)</td>
<td>THEFT</td>
<td>● Are women and other gender minorities more vulnerable to theft because of their participation in the intervention?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Are local communities vulnerable to theft as a result of their involvement with the intervention?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Is the intervention operating (distributing resources, hiring, partnering) in the vicinity of an existing conflict?</td>
<td>DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>● Do men, women and other gender minorities participate in decision-making processes about resource distribution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Who is included and who is left out?</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Is the intervention operating (distributing resources, hiring, partnering) with consideration for gender identity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● What are the needs of other communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● How does or will the intervention affect the prices of goods and services — immediately or longer-term (raising/lowering prices)?</td>
<td>MARKET EFFECTS</td>
<td>● How does the intervention intentionally or unintentionally affect economic activities and opportunities — immediately or longer-term — of men, women and other gender minorities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does this affect certain groups more than others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does the intervention overwhelm, undermine or replace functioning systems and structures in the context (formal and informal)?</td>
<td>SUBSTITUTION</td>
<td>● Does the intervention affect the inclusion of men, women and other gender minorities into systems and structures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Which authorities, groups, institutions, or individuals attain a higher status through their involvement with the intervention?</td>
<td>LEGITIMIZATION</td>
<td>● Does engagement of certain authorities, groups, institutions or individuals affect the participation of men, women, and other gender minorities? Does it change their relationships (based on access to resources and decision-makers, control of resources, responsibilities, roles, mobility)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Are these the appropriate authorities (i.e., truly representative), groups, institutions, or individuals with which to work?</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Are these changes likely to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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generate risks for any specific gender group?

## ANNEX 2: GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptive Management</strong></td>
<td>True conflict sensitivity requires a degree of flexibility that may not be required in countries that are not conflict- or violence-affected. Missions must be able to pivot quickly as country or regional dynamics demand. Similarly, understanding the potentially destabilizing effects of our assistance on partner capacity and commitment can help minimize unintended consequences and maximize potential. Strategies should build in adaptation from the start through a collaborating, learning and adapting (CLA) plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen Security</strong></td>
<td>Multisectoral in nature, citizen security programs engage a broad swath of government and civil society actors and institutions across disciplines, including governance, security and justice sector reform, education, health, and poverty reduction. Using an epidemiological, problem-solving approach, projects identify and attempt to redress intrapersonal, interpersonal, community, or macro-level environmental risk factors in the general public and in specific categories of at-risk individuals or communities. Many USAID programs have adopted a place based strategy (PBS) that layers interventions in areas where crime and violence are most significant. <strong>The right of individuals to live free from violence or the threat of violence.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Violence</strong></td>
<td>The use of force/violence by one group in a community to assert power over or intimidate another group within the community, or interpersonal violence which has a demonstrable effect on community cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Management Activities</strong></td>
<td>Conflict management activities explicitly aim to address the causes and consequences of conflict, but they are often implemented within a traditional development sector, such as within programs that address democracy and governance, environment, or economic growth. Many of these activities also lay the groundwork for significant longer-term results, and work to build the underlying institutions and systems of resilience that provide alternatives to violence. For example, conflict management efforts might include improving the governance of high-value natural resources that are linked to existing political or armed conflict; employment programs designed to reduce the number of available recruits for militias; or post-conflict reconstruction efforts to restore livelihoods. Such activities can also operate as a stand-alone program within a development portfolio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conflict Mitigation
Conflict mitigation activities seek to reduce the threat or impact of violent conflict, religious and political extremism, and widespread instability. Such activities promote peaceful resolution of differences, mitigate violence if it has already broken out, or establish a framework for peace and reconciliation in an ongoing conflict. Many, but not all, mitigation activities phase out shortly after the instability, or conflict, has abated and stability is reestablished. Projects that strengthen conflict early warning or response, formal and informal peace process undertakings, and various types of reconciliation programs serve as examples of conflict mitigation activity.

### Conflict Prevention
Conflict prevention activities attempt to resolve incompatibilities between groups in conflict before outbreaks of violence. From a long-term structural perspective, conflict prevention activities attempt to address the root causes of conflict by ameliorating the deleterious impact of poverty, gender inequalities, or grievances related to access to natural resources. There can sometimes be considerable overlap between the concepts of conflict prevention and conflict mitigation. Specifically, conflict prevention is defined as deliberate efforts to support peace and disrupt likely pathways to the outbreak, escalation or recurrence of violent conflict.

### Conflict Sensitivity
Conflict sensitivity refers to the ability of an organization to: (1) understand the context in which it is operating, particularly with respect to inter-group relations; (2) understand the interactions between its interventions and the context/group relations; and (3) act upon these understandings in a way that avoids negative impacts and maximizes positive impacts vis-à-vis the conflict.

### Conflict-Aware and Conflict-Sensitive Theories of Change
Theories of change in countries affected by conflict and violence should aim to reduce factors that stimulate violence and reinforce sources of resilience and peace in a given community, region, or country. Building on the findings from a detailed assessment, USAID theories of change should target the attitudes, behaviors, or institutions of the individuals or groups involved. To aid in the formulation of theories of change designed to reduce conflict and violence, For more information, please see THINC [https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNTcxMjIzMTc2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MTczMzk4](https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNTcxMjIzMTc2NDBmY2Uy&rID=MTczMzk4)

### Context
Fixed or slowly changing structural conditions in the environment, such as history, natural resources, socio-economic conditions and external influences. These can be risk factors for conflict, if not managed effectively, but are not in themselves causes of conflict.

### Countering Violent Extremism (CVE)
CVE refers to proactive actions to counter efforts by violent extremists to radicalize, recruit, and mobilize followers to violence and to address specific factors that facilitate violent extremist recruitment and radicalization to violence. This includes both disrupting the tactics used by violent extremists to attract new recruits to violence and building specific alternatives, narratives, capabilities, and resiliencies in targeted communities and populations to reduce the risk of radicalization and recruitment to violence.

### Do No Harm
The Do No Harm (DNH) principle is an essential element of a peacebuilding and...
conflict sensitive development practice. DNH mandates that people to people (P2P) interventions must not put those living in a conflict context, or participating in a peacebuilding activity, to a greater risk than they would otherwise face without the intervention. DNH principle also implies that proposed interventions, inadvertently, should not reinforce estrangement, tensions or protracted conflict. Strict adherence to this principle is imperative throughout the project or program. The DNH approach anticipates and mitigates risks and spoilers while maximizing and reinforcing peace.

| Fragility | Fragility is a condition of vulnerability to a range of bad outcomes. Fragile countries generate stresses internally and lack the capacity to prevent or respond to external stresses and shocks. Fragility is measured in terms of the state-society relationship and resulting patterns of governance which enable (or impede) countries to prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from all but the most extreme stresses on their own. |
| Human Security | Human Security is an approach to assist Member States in identifying and addressing widespread and cross-cutting challenges to the survival, livelihood and dignity of their people. It calls for “people-centered, comprehensive, context-specific and prevention-oriented responses that strengthen the protection and empowerment of all people.” (UN Trust Fund for Human Security) |
| Means | Key actors may have particular aims and the resources and capacities to mobilize people around grievances using violent means, or to mobilize people to pursue peaceful approaches to push for change. |
| Mitigating factors | Directly addressing grievances, moderating behavior of key actors, supporting alternatives to violence and local peace initiatives, or influencing trigger events are examples of mitigation factors that can reduce the likelihood of violence. |
| Motives | Threats to beliefs, dignity, security or livelihoods can emerge through exclusion and marginalization. These can provide powerful grievances or motives for violence. Alternatively, inclusion can generate resilience to violence. |
| Opportunities | Actions and events can be opportunities that trigger conflict or can be catalysts for peaceful mobilization. |
| Peacebuilding | Includes measures designed to consolidate peaceful relations and strengthen viable political, socio-economic, and cultural institutions capable of managing conflict, and to strengthen other mechanisms that will create or support the necessary conditions for sustained peace. Peacebuilding involves a range of measures targeted to reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities at all levels for conflict management, and to lay the foundations for sustainable peace and development. Peacebuilding strategies must be coherent and tailored to specific needs of the country concerned, based on national ownership, and should comprise a carefully prioritized, sequenced, and therefore relatively narrow set of activities aimed at achieving the above objectives [https://gsdrc.org/document-library/a-distinction-with-a-difference-conflict-sensitivity-and-peacebuilding/](https://gsdrc.org/document-library/a-distinction-with-a-difference-conflict-sensitivity-and-peacebuilding/) |
## Peacebuilding Programs

Peacebuilding programs (sometimes referred to as direct conflict programs), by design, actively address conflict dynamics, either by reducing the severity of the conflict or by helping address its causes, driving factors and effects. These programs explicitly work on conflict dynamics, as in USAID's people-to-people reconciliation programs and activities. Peacebuilding programming refers to programming that aims to influence the key drivers of conflict and conflict dynamics. This might include measures designed to consolidate peaceful relations and strengthen viable political, socio-economic and cultural institutions capable of mediating conflict, as well as strengthen other mechanisms that will either create or support the creation of necessary conditions for sustained peace (Materials adapted from USAID’s Conflict Sensitive Development Training, CSAID).

## People-to-People

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.

## Political Violence

The use of force/violence used with a political motivation, to achieve a political goal, to assert political power over another group, or to disseminate a political message to an outside audience.

## Protection Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming protection in humanitarian and development assistance means implementing activities in ways that take into account and mitigate the risks for harm, exploitation, and abuse facing the target populations. Protection mainstreaming does not change the objective of the assistance but does change how the assistance is implemented.

## Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)

Violence that is directed at an individual based on his or her biological sex, gender identity, or perceived adherence to socially defined norms of masculinity and femininity.

## Social Cohesion

Social Cohesion is often defined simply as the bonds between people. Social cohesion is a process which includes consistent, positive interactions between groups that build trust and lead to consistent and constructive engagements. This process allows groups to work together and resolve differences in nonviolent ways, and be less likely to perpetrate violence against one another. Interdependency and trust are key elements in social cohesion.

## Violence

In recognition that all forms of violence have implications for stability, this review recommends that the WHO’s definition of violence is adapted for the peace and

---

security realm as such: Violence is the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, mal-development or deprivation to the societal, political, or communal fabric of a society. (World Health Organization, 2014)

Building upon the WHO definition of violence, this sub-sector review’s proposed definition of violent conflict recognizes that non-physical cues of violence are violence nonetheless. Approval of violence, willingness to commit violence, and perceptions of levels of violence threaten the security and stability of a community to the same extent as actual acts of physical violence (Alliance for Peacebuilding: Violence Reduction Subsector Review & Evidence Evaluation)


| Violence Prevention | A broad concept that includes efforts to avert, interrupt or suppress all forms of interpersonal and group-based violence (including gangs), and violent crime. |