

## 2.1. Assessing and monitoring conflict risks

Capturing assumptions and risks in the results frameworks of conflict-sensitive programming does not fundamentally differ from any other WASH intervention, except for the need to **capture the two-way interaction between intervention and conflict risks**. The risk level assessment matrix shown in Table 3 can be adapted and applied to capture both the conflict risks in the context impacting the intervention AND the conflict risks arising from the intervention to inform your conflict-sensitive monitoring framework.

**Table 3: Risk-level assessment matrix – Adapted from UNICEF Results-Based Management handbook<sup>4</sup>**

Impact	1 – UNLIKELY	2 – POSSIBLE	3 – LIKELY	4 – ALMOST CERTAIN	5 – CERTAIN/IMMINENT
5 – CRITICAL	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Extreme
4 – MAJOR	Low	Medium	High	High	Very high
3 – MODERATE	Very low	Low	Medium	High	High
2 – MINOR	Very low	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
1 – NEGLIGIBLE	Very low	Very low	Very low	Low	Low

Likelihood

The table can be adapted and used to guide a consultative conflict risk assessment to rank the level of likelihood that the conflict risk will occur and the level of impact it would have on the programme results if it did occur. The outcome of the assessment should inform the focus of the intervention’s conflict sensitivity monitoring plan to support appropriate mitigation measures; e.g. if the risk level of a WASH intervention fuelling conflict or the impact of conflict on programming is on the higher spectrum, then high-frequency interaction indicators and conflict mitigation measures should be adopted and resourced. For example:

- **Very low or low conflict risks** – leverage existing/regular indicators, monitoring systems and processes to enable you to spot-check on the intervention–conflict interaction at regular and relevant points of the implementation cycle;
- **Medium to high risks** – include dedicated interaction indicators; leverage existing/regular monitoring systems and processes and community-based feedback/consultation mechanisms to enable you to spot-check on the interaction at more frequent points of the implementation cycle;
- **Very high/extreme** – include dedicated and very high-frequency interaction indicators; set up dedicated early warning systems to supplement very frequent spot checks and monitoring.

<sup>4</sup> UNICEF, ‘Results-Based Management Handbook: Working together for children’, 2017, <https://www.unicef.org/rosa/media/10356/file>, p. 57  
<sup>5</sup> UNICEF, ‘WASH Field Note: Third Party Monitoring of WASH in Pakistan’, 2018, <https://www.unicef.org/rosa/media/11756/file#:~:text=UNICEF%20Pakistan%20has%20found%20third,without%20compromising%20on%20monitoring%20quality>

Developing capacity of staff and partners for conflict-sensitive monitoring is key – for more details see the *Capacity Development Guide & Toolkit*. **Third party monitors (TPMs)** can be valuable assets to conflict sensitive M&E. They are private contractors deployed to complement the COs’ field-based monitoring capacity. The TPMs can be trained, equipped and supported to undertake CP Scans (for more details see *CPA Tool 3 – Age and Gender Sensitive WASH Conflict and Peace Scan*) and to monitor relevant WASH–conflict interactions. The primary technical requirements of TPMs relate to the area of programming they are expected to report on, but they typically also report against cross-cutting issues such as accountability to affected populations (AAP), prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA), and gender equality requirements of UNICEF-supported programmes. **Integrating the monitoring of programme-relevant conflict dynamics and interactions with WASH programming could be valuable.** TPMs could provide regular and frequent updates once a CPA and a relevant conflict-sensitive monitoring framework have been developed.<sup>5</sup>



© UNICEF/UNI329722/Haro