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MAPPING OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS IN PREVENTING & COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMISM IN UGANDA

ASSESSING NEEDS, PRIORITIES, CHALLENGES & OPPORTUNITIES
KEY OBJECTIVES

• Deepen understanding of the actors, capacities, and priorities for CSOs engaged in P/CVE

• Garner feedback on how ICEPCVE and the CSO Hub can support CSOs, including the selection and role of proposed National Conveners

• Identify priority areas for joint engagement and collaboration between CSOs and government.
OVERVIEW

100,000 + CSOs operating across the country...
Uganda has one of the most robust civil societies in the developing world, with over 100,000 CSOs operating across the country. USAID’s 2011 CSO Sustainability Index report for Uganda scored it among the highest of African countries.

The CSO sector encompasses a diverse and broad range of non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, coalitions, faith-based organizations, professional associations, trade unions, labor unions, citizen’s groups, and voluntary organization.
Estimates from 2008 NGO board report indicate that 46 percent of CSOs are involved in education, 17 percent focus on civil rights and advocacy, and the remainder is engaged in social services, health, livelihood support, culture, or recreation and Peacebuilding. The majority of organizations are non faith-based, and include development organizations, media networks, and organizations specifically dedicated to conflict resolution and Peacebuilding.

When it comes to CSOs focused on Peacebuilding and countering violent extremisms, in the absence of a sustained government-led P/CVE strategy, Uganda’s civil society has played a major role in implementing Peacebuilding and P/CVE-related programming.

CSOs have done this through several key channels; relying on indigenous tools, networks, and resources including community-led approach to foster community harmony and stability with a focus on youth empowerment, vocational training, education, research, information dissemination via various channels including radio and good governance.
Data collection was carried out at the national level with organisations working in areas of Peacebuilding, Development, Human Rights and Good Governance.
QUALITATIVE APPROACHES

Semi-Structured interviews + Key Informants → Primary Data
Secondary Data

Data collection was carried out at the national level with organisations working in areas of peacebuilding, development, Human Rights and Good Governance.
QUALITATIVE APPROACHES

NEEDS
CAPACITIES
PRIORITIES

VE RELATED CHALLENGES
PROJECTS/POLICIES/PROGRAMS BY GOV'T & CSOS HELPING TO ADDRESS ISSUE
CHALLENGES/ OBSTACLES/ISSUES ENCOUNTERED IN P/CVE WORK

3 CORE PRIORITY AREAS RELATED TO P/CVE IN UGANDA
NEEDS CAPACITIES AND PRIORITIES OF CSOS ENGAGING IN P/CVE
What are the specific challenges posed by violent extremism in your country?

- Fear & uncertainty due to insecurities
- Knowledge gap on radicalization and extremism
- Government interference and this has compromised some religious leaders
- Segregation of young people especially those from the Muslim community.
- Illiterate or semi illiterate Muslim youth both in secular and Islamic knowledge
- Nonexistence of implementing agencies
- Indiscriminate killings
- Destruction of property
- Violent extremism has been used as an incitement to rebel against the sitting government
- Intolerance
- Provision of legal support
- Lack of truth and reconciliation processes
How are CSOs and the government in your country currently addressing these challenges?

- Trainings, dialogues, mediation and reconciliation measures
- Strong arm methods i.e. jails that only create hate and grudges
- Faith based approach: love & harmonious living
- Working with families so that it is all inclusive in preventing and mitigating P/CVE

CSOs are undertaking research and documenting P/CVE stories and how to mitigate them and they have gone further to disseminate this information.

Our government response to the challenges seems to be focused on criminalizing some acts and enforcing the law with little or no activities aimed at rehabilitation, prevention, early warning or actually avoiding and helping citizens from becoming violent extremists.

Providing employment opportunities
What challenges, obstacles, or issues do you encounter in your work on P/CVE?

- Lack of funds
- Lack of support from government (Failure of government to appreciate the multi-stakeholder approach which has restricted other stakeholders from participating effectively).
- Poor Governance
- Unemployment especially among the youth
- Illiteracy and ignorance
- Extreme poverty
- Recurrent violent conflict

- Religious fanaticism, intra-religious conflict, and intolerance exercised by some religious leaders and individuals in the community
- Inadequate and poorly equipped security measures
- Corruption, nepotism, and lack of transparency
- Poor infrastructure in Uganda
- Gender challenges, women are less-skilled to engage in P/CVE work
What challenges, obstacles, or issues do you encounter in your work on P/CVE?

- Being taken as agents of foreign countries against Muslims.
- Risking in transport as we use public means during our activities.
- Fear for personal security given sector we are involved in.
- Limited local research
- The lack of an accessible global knowledge platform that is designed to catalyze and disseminate local-level research to help inform policy makers and practitioners hence limiting organizations and policy makers in designing interventions that are impactful and grounded in an understanding of local realities.
• Peace building through economic empowerment
• Sensitizing the youth on the evil of VE
• Embedding Peace Education in school curriculum
• Promote a holistic and integrated response to the challenges of radicalization and violent extremism
• Promote healing and reconciliation at family and community level involving the key stakeholders and share experiences and best practices
• Dialogue to enable a stable political, social and economic environment
• Establish forums for dialogue, including the family unit and raise awareness among young people and the communities of the dangers of radicalization and violent extremism and the need to counter these using the community leaders, elders, families, and the youth themselves
• Build capacity of the religious leaders on countering radicalization and violent extremism.
What do you feel are the three biggest priority areas related to P/CVE in your country?

• Skills and value based education
• Capacity strengthening for P/CVE actors
• Promoting interfaith and intercultural competence
• Focus on prevention and means to supplement the legal processes
• Focus on rehabilitation of suspects and victims
• Focus on reconciliation for the country to move beyond its past history
• CSOs should be objective while handling PCVE i.e. avoid the bias on Islam
• Need for joint effort by all stakeholders
How would you describe the capacities of civil society organizations engaged in P/CVE in your country?
INFORMING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CSO HUB AND CSO ENGAGEMENT WITH ICEPCVE
How can the CSO Hub and ICEPCVE help strengthen civil society-led responses to violent extremism in your country and the Horn of Africa?

- Information sharing on trainings, programs that have worked for a particular community
- Sharing research
- Sharing opportunities on donor funding
- Sharing unique skills of digital narratives
- Promoting learning from each other in the region
What activities or topics could the CSO Hub or ICEPCVE focus on that would be of most interest to you?

- Peace Education i.e. capacity building
- Finance/Economic literacy
- Media programming
- Government engagement
- Interfaith work
- Outreach programs
- Preventing violent crime (sharing experiences and learning from other countries responses)
- Litigating for justice in conflict areas
- Law as a means to P/CVE
What process should be established to select National Conveners? How can we ensure they remain reflective and responsive to their constituents (peer CSOs from their country)?

• Monitoring the national conveners
• Putting country branches
• Efficient communication
• Provide capacity building
• Engage stakeholders
• Support supervision visits
• Provision of technical assistance
• Information sharing & dissemination
• Come up with a standard operation procedures for CSOs
• Through consultations with local actors
What are the key priorities for joint engagement by the government and CSOs in your country on P/CVE?

- Working together as stakeholders not competitors
- Identify and understand the causes of radicalization and violent extremism.
- Contribute to the development of localized and viable solutions to challenges relating to radicalization and violent extremism.
- Avail space and forums for other actors like policy-makers, experts, counselors to address challenges relating to radicalization and violent extremism.
- Identify people who are at risk of radicalization and violent extremism (both Perpetuators and victims) and devise early warning systems and intervention strategies.
- Safety and security of the P/CVE actors
- Trainings
• Government funding to CSOs

• Preventive measures and how government can adopt preventing measures in their intervention

• Promoting unity and diversity through understanding minority needs (including but not limited to religious, ethnic, sexual and other minorities)

• Using the law and policies as means to prevent and rehabilitate as opposed to punishing

• Revision of the curriculum prioritizing peace and religious education

• Rehabilitation of victims, those engaged directly in violent extremism to build trust and relationships

• Policy review (Violent extremism)

• Information sharing & exchange
What key areas of collaboration between CSOs and the government need to be strengthened, and why?

• The government should be open to work with CSOs though with terms to avoid

• Design local strategies and activities for prevention, mitigation of P and CVE and promote income generation for youth.

• Preventive measures and how government can adopt preventing measures in their intervention

• Promoting unity and diversity through understanding minority needs (including but not limited to religious, ethnic, sexual and other minorities)

• Using the law and policies as means to prevent and rehabilitate as opposed to punishing

• Form committees for prevention and mitigation of violent extremism and radicalization at the local and national level.
Cont’d

• Seek experiences from institutions, countries that have dealt with issues of radicalization and violent extremism.

• Encourage partnerships with private companies and agencies, schools and institutions to raise funds for the projects/programs.

• Policy advocacy
How can the CSO Hub and ICEPCVE help strengthen collaboration between CSOs and the government in your country on P/CVE? Is your organization open to engaging with Government?
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS
During the course of the mapping, CSOs put forward a range of practical recommendations to address some of the challenges and facilitate the further integration of PVE into development efforts as seen below;

1. **Develop a better understanding of drivers of extremism and align program design with existing research.**

   - Shift focus from just making institutions stronger by enhancing their project and financial management capacity.
   - Invest more significantly in developing CSO’s technical capacity to understand and undercut the drivers of violent extremism and the narratives of violent groups as well as develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of programs.
   - Investments in capacity building need to also focus on disseminating and helping CSOs understand and build links with previous research by local organizations and on a comparative basis internationally.
   - There is need to build capacity amongst CSOs to develop theories of change and program design that align with current research.
2. Don’t over-emphasize ideology

- Recognize that the grievances linked to strong perceptions of exclusion and unfairness rather than ideology (or poverty) is the primary drivers of violent extremism and development agencies should program accordingly.

- Development actors should focus more attention on those groups with the strongest feelings of exclusion and marginalization – and on building resilience within them – if they hope to reduce the likelihood of violent extremism (or conflict more broadly) from emerging.

3. Build more effective tools for learning from P/CVE programs

- Donors should also focus on refining their own internal monitoring and evaluation frameworks on P/CVE.

- Some active CSOs in the field noted that, it is impossible to effectively measure lasting change within a short time period.
Build more effective tools for learning from P/CVE programs

- However, if there is a need to provide quick data or gauge if programs are heading in the right direction, then donors should work to develop indicators that can be collected, reported, and analyzed quickly.

Currently, data collection requirements for local NGOs are quite cumbersome and should be rationalized so that organizations are collecting relevant and essential data for analytical and reporting purposes.

This should not be seen as a substitute for measuring the long-term impact of P/CVE programming, which the field requires if it is to become more effective.

LESSON/CHALLENGE

Labeling - participants recognized that actors and donors need to be cautious of how they “badge, classify, and publically present” some PVE work.

In some cases, the term “radicalization” is used instead of “violent extremism” and in others, PVE work in Uganda is embedded into larger social cohesion, youth engagement, or Peacebuilding work, without any mention of either “violent extremism” or “radicalization”.

In other instances, the donor will avoid publicly associating itself with the program it is sponsoring, recognizing the need to avoid putting implementing organizations and targeted populations at risks.
Particularly given the growing number of actors in the Ugandan PVE field, including increasing numbers from the development sector, CSOs underscored the need to elaborate a more integrated (and less fragmented) approach to problem diagnosis, programmatic and policy response, and M&E.
Participants stressed that the goal should be to arrive at a shared understanding of the drivers of violent extremism in a specific context, what interventions are needed to address them, and which actor should be responsible for funding or implementing each of them. This integrated approach, which should include involvement from the government, could be realized at a number of different, reinforcing levels (e.g., national and local).
Participants suggested that IGAD and Global center consider either the use of a “basket fund” (although the challengers to operationalizing such a fund were highlighted), where donor resources are pooled and subject to joint decision-making, based on joint analysis and monitoring or donors making separate contributions under the framework of a partner strategy (in the PVE context this could be a Uganda national PVE action plan).
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