

TRAINING REPORT: DNH FOR FAITH GROUPS IN NIGERIA

Training Title: Do No Harm for Faith Groups

Training Location: Abuja, Nigeria, Hawthorn Suites Hotel

Date: 25 to 27 November, 2025

Prepared by: Jude Likita (Tearfund); Maya Assaf-Horstmeier, Independent Consultant

1. Introduction

PaRD's Sustaining Peace (SDG 16) Workstream previously undertook a study in Nigeria on the "Effectiveness of Local Faith Actors in Peacebuilding, Development, and Humanitarian Response." The findings confirmed the strategic role that local faith actors play in advancing SDG 16 and in addressing key drivers of fragility and vulnerability. In line with the study's recommendations, the Workstream is pursuing a more sustained engagement in Nigeria, with a focus on strengthening context analysis, building the capacities of local faith actors within the Humanitarian–Development–Peace (HDP) Nexus, and supporting platforms for coordinated and sustainable collaboration.

The Do No Harm (DNH) for Faith Groups was identified as an important first step in this process. Positioned as a flagship activity of the Workstream and contributing to PaRD's broader flagship initiative, the training has an objective to enhance conflict sensitivity and improve the effectiveness of partner interventions. This report outlines the purpose, implementation, and key outcomes of the DNH training for Faith Groups as a foundation for future engagement in Nigeria.

2. Training Objectives

The training aimed at:

- Deepening participants' understanding of the practical application of the Do No Harm (DNH) framework.
- Connecting DNH principles with teachings and practices rooted in holy books and scriptures relevant to the Nigerian context.
- Contributing to the development of a DNH curriculum tailored specifically for faith groups in Nigeria.

All training objectives were successfully met. The following sections present the materials covered, key results, and the outputs generated by participants during the sessions.

3. Target Group and Participants

Target Group: Faith leaders and practitioners engaged in community development and peacebuilding work from conflict-affected areas in Nigeria, including religious leaders, faith-based organisation staff and directors, community peacebuilding practitioners, women's ministry leaders, youth development workers, psychologists working with faith communities, and peace advisors and conflict resolution specialists.

Total Participants: 28

Gender Breakdown: Female 13, Male 15

Institutions Represented: Please see **Annex 1**, participant list

4. Training Content

Module 1: Conflict Sensitivity & Do No Harm (DNH)

The objectives of the module were to:

- Define conflict sensitivity and its relevance for faith actors
- Introduce the DNH framework and its practical application in the Nigeria context
- Enhance participants' capacity to analyze how their actions may unintentionally worsen or improve conflict situations.

Module 1 incorporated a wide range of adult learning tools in every session to keep activities engaging, participatory, and responsive to the diverse learning styles of all participants. During the Conflict Sensitivity and Do No Harm session, they introduced key definitions and explored the purpose of DNH principles within faith-based contexts. Participants worked in groups to assemble puzzle pieces representing elements of the DNH framework, after which the complete framework was projected for everyone to review together. For details about the session plans, please refer to **Annex 4: Training Materials**.

Module 2: Connectors and Dividers

The objectives of the module were to:

- Explain the concepts of connectors and dividers.
- Understand how connectors and dividers play a role in the Nigeria context.
- Link connectors and dividers in the Nigeria contexts to scripture/sacred text pertaining to Christianity, Islam and traditional faiths.

Module 2 applied interactive, adult-learning methods that combined presentations on connectors and dividers with illustrative examples from diverse contexts. Participants worked in small groups to analyze a case study and identify connectors and dividers within the scenario. They then drew on their own experiences to identify connectors and dividers in the Nigerian context and link them to relevant Christian and Islamic scriptures. Table groups were intentionally mixed to ensure strong representation from both faith traditions and to encourage interfaith dialogue. For more details on the module, see Annex 4, and for sample scriptures related to connectors and dividers, consult Annex 6.

Module 3: RAFT (Respect, Accountability, Fairness, Transparency)/Actions and Behaviors

The objectives of the module were to:

- Define and differentiate actions and behaviors (Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages) in DNH terms.
- To identify elements of RAFT in practical scenarios.
- To reflect on the alignment between lived experience and faith/traditional teachings.

Module 3 applied highly participatory and experiential methods, combining case study analysis, storytelling, and guided reflection. Participants shared real-life experiences of navigating conflict in the Nigeria context, identified RAFT elements within their stories, and examined how faith teachings relate to everyday actions and community impact. The learning process was further strengthened through plenary discussions, where groups compared insights, linked practical experiences to core principles, and reflected on how actions and behaviours can reduce harm within their communities. For more details on the module, see Annex 4, and for sample scriptures related to RAFT, consult **Annex 6**.

Module 4: Programme Unpacking/Programme Re-design

The objectives of the module were to:

- Understand how to apply Do No Harm principles during programme unpacking, identify potential risks, and propose mitigation strategies.
- To collectively develop community-led recommendations to reset and rectify past actions and behaviors may have implicitly sent harmful ethical messages or reinforced harmful power/resource dynamics.
- To identify appropriate and culturally relevant channels for sharing and modeling this transformation.

Module 4 used participatory, hands-on methods that guided participants through programme unpacking and analysis using the Do No Harm framework. Using a case study, participants worked in small groups to dissect project activities, identify risks, and map both harmful impacts and positive opportunities. They then engaged in collaborative problem-solving through the Options Game, encouraging creative thinking and expanding possible response pathways. Building on earlier case study analysis, groups proposed concrete recommendations to rectify harmful actions and behaviours. The sessions concluded with reflective dialogue linking programme adjustments to faith teachings, encouraging participants to ground harm-reducing actions in culturally and spiritually relevant principles. For more details on the module, see **Annex 4**, and for sample scriptures related to Programme Unpacking and Redesign, **consult Annex 5**.

5. Training Outputs

Below are the key training outputs per training day:

Day	Key Training Outputs
Day 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provided own definitions and understanding of Conflict Sensitivity and Do No Harm (DNH)• Participated in a case study group, identifying connectors and dividers.• Shared scripture (Christian and Islamic) in relation to connectors and dividers in the Nigeria context
Day 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provided storytelling summaries illustrating RAFT principles• Analysed a case study through group work, focusing on actions and behaviours (Resource Transfers & Implicit Ethical Messages)• Shared scripture (Christian and Islamic) in relation RAFT in the Nigeria context

<p>Day 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unpacked programme components: activities, beneficiaries, implementers, resources • Mapped potential harmful impacts and positive opportunities • Provided lists of alternative approaches as part of the Options Game outputs • Provided recommendations to rectify harmful behaviours and actions • Shared scripture/faith-based reflections supporting harm reduction and programme rectification
---------------------	--

6. Evaluation Methodology and Survey Results

The training evaluation applied a quasi-experimental pre-test/post-test design to assess participant learning outcomes and satisfaction. This approach was used to measure changes in knowledge and confidence related to the application of the Do No Harm (DNH) framework among participants.

A structured pre-training assessment was administered at the beginning of the workshop, followed by an identical post-training assessment at the conclusion of Day 3. The assessment consisted of seven multiple-choice and scenario-based questions designed to test participants’ understanding of core DNH concepts, including conflict sensitivity, connectors and dividers, resource transfers, implicit ethical messages, and conflict-sensitive decision-making. Out of 28 workshop participants, 25 completed both the pre- and post-training assessments, resulting in an 89.3% response rate. Responses were collected using Google Forms. All questions were scored as either correct or incorrect, with results calculated as percentages and aggregated to produce average scores across participants.

In addition to knowledge assessments, participant satisfaction and self-reported confidence were measured through an end-of-training evaluation survey. This survey included Likert-scale ratings and open-ended qualitative questions capturing perceptions of training quality, relevance, facilitation, and applicability to participants’ professional contexts. Further details on the evaluation tools, response distribution, and full survey results are provided in Annex 6: Evaluation Methodology and Survey Results.

Learning Outcomes and Knowledge Gains

The pre- and post-training assessments demonstrated significant learning gains among participants. Average scores increased from 81.6% in the pre-test to 95.8% in the post-test, representing a 14.2 percentage point improvement. This indicates strong knowledge acquisition and comprehension of key DNH concepts over the course of the training.

Pre-training results showed a moderate to strong baseline understanding of conflict sensitivity concepts, with particularly high recognition that exclusionary practices increase tensions (100% correct). The weakest pre-training area related to understanding that the same contextual factors can function as both connectors and dividers (64% correct).

Post-training results showed consistent improvement across all assessed areas. Understanding of dividers increased from 76% to 84% (+8 percentage points), understanding of connectors increased from 92% to 100% (+8 percentage points), and understanding of the dynamic nature of connectors and dividers improved from 64% to 90% (+26 percentage points). Mastery of technical concepts introduced during the training—such as Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages—reached 95% accuracy, and 100% accuracy was achieved in scenario-based questions assessing conflict-sensitive programming decisions. These results demonstrate that the training was effective not only in reinforcing existing knowledge but also in strengthening participants’ ability to apply DNH principles in practical, real-world contexts.

Participant Confidence and Satisfaction

Self-assessment results indicate a high level of confidence among participants following the training. 68.4% of respondents reported being “very confident” in their ability to apply DNH principles immediately after the workshop, while an additional 21.1% reported being “confident with practice.” In total, 89.5% of participants expressed confidence or very high confidence, with only 5.3% indicating a need for additional support.

Overall satisfaction with the training was exceptionally high. Participants rated the training 4.9 out of 5, with 89.5% awarding the highest possible rating (5/5, “Excellent”). Facilitators received an average score of 4.95/5 across criteria including subject knowledge, clarity, participant engagement, respect for different faith traditions, and responsiveness to questions.

Notably, 100% of participants indicated that they would recommend the training to other faith leaders, underscoring both the perceived quality of the training and its relevance to faith-based peacebuilding and development work.

7. Cost and Value for Money

Although a detailed cost analysis was not a primary objective of this training, consideration of cost and value for money is important for accountability and for informing decisions related to continuation, replication, or scaling of Do No Harm for faith leaders in Nigeria and beyond,

- **Economy**
The training was delivered using a cost-conscious approach, leveraging existing faith-based organisations and institutional partnerships, local expertise, and context-specific training materials. Venue selection and participant composition allowed for intensive engagement within a limited timeframe, helping to contain costs while maintaining delivery quality. The use of participatory methods and shared learning resources reduced reliance on external inputs and enhanced local ownership.
- **Efficiency**
The three-day training reached 28 faith leaders and practitioners and generated multiple outputs, including case analyses, programme redesign proposals, scriptural integrations, and practical recommendations. The training structure maximised contact time and participant interaction, enabling the production of tangible learning outputs within a short implementation period. High completion rates for pre- and post-training assessments and strong engagement across sessions indicate efficient use of time and resources relative to outputs achieved.
- **Effectiveness.**
Evaluation results demonstrate substantial knowledge gains and high levels of participant confidence in

applying Do No Harm principles, suggesting that the activity was effective in achieving its immediate learning objectives. The integration of faith-based perspectives and interfaith dialogue further strengthened relevance and uptake among participants.

8. Challenges Encountered

The overall training planning and implementation was successful overall. However, there were a few challenges encountered during the process as follows:

- **Extended planning process:**
 1. Coordination among GIZ, Tearfund, and the Independent Consultant took longer than expected.
 2. Limited budget required identifying additional resources to cover key costs.
 3. Initial planning occurred during a holiday period, delaying contracting.
 4. The consultant's unavailability in October further delayed the tendering **process**.
- **Venue and logistics:** Although the venue was comfortable and well-equipped for a conference, internet access was unreliable, causing delays and requiring session improvisation. Limited printing services meant participants accessed case studies on their mobile phones.
- **Participant punctuality:** A few participants were consistently punctual. However, more than 50% frequently arrived about 30 minutes late. Facilitators had to adjust the curriculum daily to accommodate delays while still ending sessions by 5:00 pm.
- **Post-training follow-up:** **There was no** clear follow-up plan or next steps were established (e.g., future training or continued engagement). PaRD and GIZ may consider taking this forward, given their broader interest and investment in Nigeria.

9. Recommendations

A. Planning and Implementation of Workshop:

- Establish a clear planning timeline with assigned responsibilities to prevent bottlenecks in contracting and tendering processes.
- Secure budget commitments upfront or identify contingency funding sources early in the process.
- Select venues with reliable internet connection, or arrange backup internet solutions (e.g., portable routers).
- Ensure adequate printing or document-access options, such as providing printed materials in advance or offering tablets/laptops for participant use.
- Start sessions on time regardless of attendance to encourage timely participation and protect the integrity of the curriculum.

B. Strengthen learning application, behaviour change, and evidence of impact

- Programme design and delivery: applying connectors and dividers analysis more systematically when

selecting beneficiaries, locations, and implementation partners, and adjusting activities to avoid reinforcing existing tensions.

- Organisational behaviours: increased transparency in decision-making and resource allocation, greater accountability toward communities, and more deliberate reflection on the implicit ethical messages conveyed through staff behaviour and institutional practices.
- Community engagement: more inclusive and respectful interaction with diverse faith and identity groups, improved communication across religious lines, and stronger sensitivity to local power dynamics and perceptions of fairness.
- Faith leadership and influence: faith leaders modelling conflict-sensitive behaviour within their own institutions and using scriptural teachings to promote harm-reducing practices, social cohesion, and peaceful coexistence at community level:

C. Strengthen post-training learning and application:

- Integrate structured follow-up mechanisms (e.g. reflection sessions, peer learning exchanges, practice-based case examples, or light-touch learning reviews) into future projects integrating DNH.
- Use these mechanisms to capture how participants apply Do No Harm principles in daily work and community engagement, identify barriers and enablers to behaviour change, and inform future programme design and targeting.

10. Conclusion

The Do No Harm (DNH) Training for Faith Groups in Nigeria successfully achieved its objectives and demonstrated strong potential as a foundational step toward deeper engagement with local faith actors under PaRD's Sustaining Peace (SDG 16) Workstream. Across three days of highly participatory learning, the training strengthened conflict sensitivity competencies, deepened scriptural and practical understanding of DNH principles, and generated concrete tools, reflections, and programme recommendations that participants can immediately apply in their work. The exceptionally high satisfaction rates, significant knowledge gains, and compelling participant testimonials affirm both the relevance of the training and the effectiveness of its design and facilitation. Beyond technical learning, the training fostered meaningful interfaith dialogue, strengthened trust across Christian and Muslim actors, and highlighted shared values rooted in sacred texts—demonstrating the unique ability of faith leaders to model and champion conflict-sensitive practices.

While the training was successful overall, the challenges encountered—particularly around planning timelines, logistical limitations, punctuality, and the absence of a structured follow-up plan—highlight areas for improvement in future capacity-building efforts. Addressing these issues will be essential to maximize the long-term impact of subsequent activities. The training has laid a strong foundation for continued work with faith actors in Nigeria. With clear demand from participants for further engagement and trainings, and with the strategic interest of PaRD and GIZ in strengthening local peacebuilding ecosystems, this initiative offers valuable momentum for building a sustained,

collaborative, and conflict-sensitive approach to faith-driven peace and development efforts in the country.

Annexes

Annex 1: [List of Participants](#)

Annex 2: Training Agenda

Annex 3: [Photos](#)

Annex 4: Training Materials

Annex 5: Scripture (Christian and Islamic) in relation to DNH

Annex 6: Evaluation Methodology and Survey Result

Annex 2: Training Agenda

Day 1:

Time	Session	Facilitator(s)
09:00 – 09:30	Arrival, registration, tea/coffee	Jude
09:30 – 10:30	Introduction & Setting the Stage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome (Tearfund) • Background to training, SDG 16 WS, PaRD (Jude) • Introductions, expectations, objectives, ground rules (Maya) 	Tearfund, Jude, Maya
10:30-10:45	Coffee Break	
10:45 – 12:00	What is Conflict Sensitivity? Where does DNH fit? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict Sensitivity overview (Jude) • DNH and faith actors (Maya) • DNH Framework (interactive) 	Jude, Maya
12:00-13:00	Connectors and Dividers	Maya
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch Break	
14:00 – 15:00	Connectors & Dividers (Presentation + Case Study+ Debriefing)	Maya
15:00 – 15:15	Coffee/Stretch Break	
15:15 – 16:45	Group Work: Connectors & Dividers + Scripture Links <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group discussions and presentations with links to scriptures and/or sacred texts 	Jude
16:45-17:00	Closure of the Day	Maya

Day 02:

Time	Session	Facilitator(s)
09:00 – 09:30	Recap of Day 1 + Today's Overview	Maya
09:30 – 10:45	RAFT (Respect, Accountability, Fairness, Transparency) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining and explaining the above terms with examples from different contexts 	Maya
10:45 – 11:00	Coffee Break	
11:00 – 12:30	RAFT (continued) with case study	Maya
12:30 – 13:45	Lunch Break	

13:45 – 15:15	Impact: Personal Storytelling (Small Groups)	Jude
----------------------	---	------

15:15 – 15:30	Coffee Break	
----------------------	---------------------	--

15:30 – 17:00	Reflection: Connecting Stories to Scriptures & Influencing Factors	Jude
----------------------	---	------

Day 03:

Time	Session	Facilitator(s)
09:00 – 09:15	Recap of Day 2	Maya
09:15 – 10:45	Programme Analysis based on a case study	Maya
10:45 – 11:00	Coffee Break	
11:00 – 12:30	Options Game and Scriptural Reflections	Jude
12:30 – 13:45	Lunch Break	
13:45 – 15:15	Learning and Takeaways End of Workshop	Jude
15:15 – 15:30	Coffee Break	

Annex 4: Modules and Session Plans for the Training

N.B: All the session plans are linked to a master powerpoint that can be used for facilitation purposes on the following link:

https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1cZATSOplbOZTpKDKgYmO1JXoDqHJR0P4/edit?usp=drive_link&oid=110229739759102928487&rtpof=true&sd=true

Module 1: Conflict Sensitivity and Do No Harm

- **Module 1, Session 1**

Session Plan: Participant Expectations and Ground Rules

Facilitator: Maya Assaf-Horstmeier Date:

Day 1

Duration: 40 minutes

Learning Objectives

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

1. Understand the purpose of the training as well as expected deliverables
2. Articulate expectations from their own perspective and discern which ones apply to the current workshop
3. Understand the ground rules set for the workshop for maximized learning

Session Breakdown (see examples below and make changes as needed)

Time	Activity	Description	Method/Resources
0–10 min	Participant expectations	On sticky notes, participants will be asked to write up their workshop expectations and stick them on a flipchart	Flipchart
10–20 min	Address participant expectations and frame them	Go through the expectations and clarify what will be addressed during the workshop	Plenary discussion using the above flipchart

20–30 min	Share workshop objectives and deliverables	Share workshop objectives and deliverables	PowerPoint
30-40 min	Shared Ground Rules	Invite plenary participants to suggest ground rules for effective learning.	Flipchart

Materials Needed (below are some examples)

- Projector and laptop
- Flipchart paper and a flipchart stand
- Sticky notes
- Timer or mobile device
- Permanent markers

● Module 1, Session 2

Session Plan: What is conflict sensitivity? How does it relate to Do No Harm?

Facilitator: Jude Likita Date:

Day 1, Session 2a Duration:

45 minutes

Learning Objectives

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

1. Define **conflict sensitivity** and explain its relevance in humanitarian and development work.
2. Describe how **Do No Harm (DNH)** relates to conflict sensitivity

Session Breakdown (see examples below and make changes as needed)

Time	Activity	Description	Method/Resources
0–15 min			slides, flipchart

	<p>Define conflict sensitivity: <i>“The ability of an organization to understand the context in which it operates, understand the interaction between its intervention and the context, and act upon that understanding to avoid negative impacts and maximize positive impacts.”</i></p> <p>Discuss why it matters (e.g., aid can unintentionally worsen divisions).</p>	<p>Short presentation + group brainstorm in plenary:</p> <p>“What does conflict sensitivity mean to you?”</p>	
15-35 min	<p>Introduce the three key steps of conflict sensitivity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understand the context (conflict analysis) 2. Understand the two-way interaction between intervention and context 3. Act on this understanding to minimize harm and maximize peace outcomes. 	<p>Interactive presentation + real-world examples</p>	Slides
35–45 min	<p>Discussion: Linking Conflict Sensitivity & DNH</p>	<p>Summarize linkages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conflict sensitivity is the broader principle. - Do No Harm is a practical tool to operationalize it particularly at programming level. 	Slides

Materials Needed (below are some examples)

- Projector and laptop
- Flipchart paper and a flipchart stand

- Sticky notes
- Timer or mobile device
- Permanent markers

● **Module 1, Session 3**

Session Plan: Do No Harm Framework

Facilitator: Maya Date:

Day 1

Duration: 60 minutes

Learning Objectives

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

1. Understand why the workshop addresses specifically a Do No Harm for faith actors
2. Familiarize themselves with the Do No Harm framework and its different elements

Session Breakdown (see examples below and make changes as needed)

Time	Activity	Description	Method/Resources
0–15 min	Addressing Do No Harm for faith actors	Ask in plenary why do participants think it is important to address DNH for faith actors? How does it differ from regular DNH training?	Plenary discussion
15–20 min	Addressing Do No Harm for faith actors	Using a PowerPoint, share the reasons why addressing DNH for faith actors is important in the Nigeria context	PowerPoint presentation
20-40 min	Understanding elements of the Do No Harm framework	Ask participants into 5 groups to put together a puzzle of how they imagine	5 printed copies of the DNH framework cut into separate elements

		the Do No Harm framework. Discuss findings in plenary	
40-60 min	Understanding elements of the Do No Harm framework	After the team exercise, share the DNH framework with participants using PPT	PowerPoint presentation and large printout of the DNH framework to be placed in the training room for the rest of the workshop time

Materials Needed (below are some examples)

- Projector and laptop
- Printer
- Scissors for the puzzle exercise
- One large printout of the Do No Harm framework to be shared with participants

Module 2: Connectors and Dividers

Module 2, Session 1:

Session Plan: Connectors and Dividers

Facilitator: Maya Assaf-Horstmeier Date:

Day 1

Duration: 120 minutes

Learning Objectives

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

- 1) Explain the concepts of *connectors* and *dividers*.
- 2) Understand how connectors and dividers play a role in a given context.

Time	Activity	Description	Method/Resources
0-30 minutes	Identifying connectors	Using PPT and shared examples from	PPT, storytelling

		different contexts, the facilitator will explain the different categories of connectors	
30–60 min	Identifying dividers	Using PPT and shared examples from different contexts, the facilitator will explain the different categories of connectors	PPT, storytelling
60-90 minutes	Case study to identify connectors and dividers	Participants would be divided into 4 or 5 groups and asked to read the case study. (find attached)as well as answer the questions	Case study handouts to different groups with questions
90-120 min	Plenary discussion	Ask participants to share their findings. Afterwards, ask a few reflection questions: 1. What did you learn today? 2. Why is it important to understand connectors and dividers in a working context? 3. One takeaway from the session	Flipchart with the proposed questions

Materials Needed (below are some examples)

- Projector and laptop
- Flipchart paper and a flipchart stand
- Case study handouts (depending on the number of people)
- Timer or mobile device
- Permanent markers

Suggested Case Study for Module 2, Session 1:

Case study: Community Crossroads in Nombasa Background:

Nombasa is a West African nation with a population of 18 million. Its people belong to various ethnic groups and practice a blend of religions including Islam, Christianity, and traditional spiritual beliefs. In the city of Zamuko, religious identity is woven into daily life—from the call to prayer echoing across neighborhoods at dawn to Sunday morning choirs spilling out of packed churches. While many residents emphasize that they’ve “always lived peacefully,” changes in recent years have begun to test this long-standing balance.

Zamuko is a growing urban center known for its entrepreneurial energy, especially in its bustling central market and its many youth-run businesses. The city is also home to several universities and training centers, drawing students from across the country.

In the past five years, Zamuko has seen both impressive community initiatives and moments of tension. In 2022, a flash flood destroyed homes in three low-income neighborhoods. In the aftermath, residents formed volunteer brigades to help with clean-up and temporary shelter. During this period, various religious buildings were used for multiple purposes, such as providing shelter, storing supplies, or serving food.

Several local leaders gained respect for their visible presence and hands-on support.

However, not all developments have built unity. A land dispute erupted last year over a construction project. A prominent evangelical church began building a large new facility across from a mosque that had served the community for generations. While permits had been granted legally, some residents claimed the process was rushed and ignored objections from nearby households. Protests followed, leading to delays, court hearings, and eventually, a physical altercation that made national headlines.

Meanwhile, local radio stations have grown in popularity, each one serving a particular segment of the population. A few shows openly question the intentions of rival faith groups, especially around holidays or elections. Others focus on community development but are criticized for being “too political.” One host, known for his fiery rhetoric, recently suggested that “some people think this city belongs to them alone,” which led to widespread debate on social media.

Young people in Zamuko are often caught between competing influences. While some are drawn into identity-based movements, especially online—others participate in city-wide programs like the NextGen Leadership Forum, a youth-led initiative offering

entrepreneurship training, debates, and cultural exchanges. The forum has launched projects ranging from neighborhood clean-ups to joint Eid-Christmas food drives.

However, tensions occasionally surface. One high school recently canceled a soccer match after parents raised concerns about religious chants during previous games. Teachers say students generally get along but admit that more recently, some have started eating lunch only with classmates who share their religious background.

With municipal elections approaching, campaign posters cover the walls of Zamuko. While candidates rarely mention religion directly, it is often discussed in whispers. A leaked memo from one campaign suggested certain appointments would go to “those who understand our community values.” Another candidate, from a different party, visited both a church and a mosque during the same day—earning both praise and suspicion.

A recent community dialogue, hosted at the Zamuko Civic Hall, brought together elders, students, and religious leaders. The event was tense at times, but participants agreed to continue the conversation. One imam noted, “Peace is not something we inherit—it is something we practice.” A pastor replied, “And we practice it better when we truly listen.”

For Discussion:

- What patterns of cooperation or tension can you identify in Zamuko?
- Which individuals, groups, or institutions appear to influence relationships across religious lines?
- What recent developments seem to be challenging the balance of coexistence?
- Where do you see signs of resilience or common ground in the city’s response to change?

Module 2, Session 2:

Session Plan: Linking Connectors and Dividers to scripture and/or sacred text Facilitator: Jude

Likita

Date: Day 1, Session 3b

Duration: 60 minutes

Learning Objectives

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

- Link Do No Harm to everyday situations in the context of Nigeria
- Link connectors and dividers in the Nigeria contexts to scripture/sacred text pertaining to Christianity, Islam and traditional faiths.
- Share insights across groups to deepen collective understanding of conflict dynamics.

Time	Activity	Description	Method/Resources
0–30 min	Group Work: Identifying Connectors & Dividers Each group explores local examples of connectors and dividers and brings in relevant scriptures or teachings.	Group discussion, scripture texts, flipchart paper	Flipchart Paper
30–60 min	Group Presentations Each group presents their findings, highlighting key connectors/dividers and scriptural insights. Facilitator guides a reflective discussion on common themes, tensions, and opportunities for social cohesion.	Plenary, flipchart, markers	40–70 min

Materials Needed (below are some examples)

- Projector and laptop
- Flipchart paper and a flipchart stand
- Timer or mobile device
- Permanent markers

Module 3: RAFT (Respect, Accountability, Fairness, Transparency)/Actions and Behaviors

Module 3, Session 1

Session Plan: RAFT

Facilitator: Maya Assaf-Horstmeier Date:

Day 2

Duration: 120 minutes

Learning Objectives

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

1. Define and differentiate actions and behaviors (Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages) in DNH terms.
2. Analyze how specific actions and behaviors communicate values, priorities, and power.

Time	Activity	Description	Method/Resources
0-10 minutes	Warm-Up Activity	“What message do we send?”: Show 2–3 photos of aid activities and ask, “What messages might people receive from this?”	Photos of aid programmes used for discussion
30–60 min	Concept Clarification: What Are Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages?	Using PPT and shared examples from different contexts, the facilitator will explain the different categories of RT and IEM	PPT
60-90 minutes	Case study to learn about actions and behaviors in a Do No Harm context	Using the case study provided, participants will be asked to sit in groups, read the case	Case study handouts to different groups with questions

		study and answer questions using flipchart paper	Flipchart stands and papers for 5 groups
90-120 min	Plenary discussion	Ask participants to share their findings. Afterwards, consider asking this question: What role do actions and behaviors play in reducing harm within certain communities?	Plenary discussion using flipcharts of participants

Materials Needed (below are some examples)

- Projector and laptop
- Printed photos for the first part of the session
- Flipchart papers and flipchart stands
- Case study handouts (depending on the number of people)
- Timer or mobile device
- Permanent markers

Suggested Case Study for Module 3, Session 1:

Case Study: Women's Livelihood Program in Kasima District

Context:

Kasima is a rural district recovering from drought and instability. An NGO launches a livelihoods program targeting "vulnerable women" to provide grants and business training. Beneficiaries are selected by local male leaders, resulting in 90% of recipients being widows or single mothers from the dominant ethnic group. Minority and married women are underrepresented.

Trainings are conducted in the national language by male trainers from the capital. Some women report being interrupted or dismissed during sessions. Husbands of participants express concern that the program undermines family roles. Tensions arise in households where women begin earning.

The NGO focuses on meeting donor targets and does not adjust its outreach or training style.

Group Activity: Analysis

A. Specific Resource Transfers

- What resources (grants, training, opportunities) are transferred?
- Who benefits and who is excluded?

B. Implicit Ethical Messages

- What messages are conveyed by who is selected, how the training is run, and who delivers it?
- How might these affect women's status or relationships in the community?

C. Mitigation Strategies

- How can the program design better reflect equity and local realities?
- What behaviors, facilitation changes, or communication improvements could help?

Module 3, Session 2:

Session Plan: Storytelling (RAFT)

Facilitator: Jude Date:

Day 2

Duration: 120 minutes

Learning Objectives

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

1. To explore real-life experiences of faith leaders engaging with conflict and community impact.
2. To identify elements of RAFT in practical scenarios.
3. To reflect on the alignment between lived experience and faith/traditional teachings.

Time	Activity	Description	Method/Resources
0-45 minutes	Small Group Storytelling Circles	Break into small groups (4–6 people) with a facilitator or group leader. Each person shares one real-life story	Flipchart stands and papers for 5 groups

		where they navigated conflict or tension (factoring RAFT). Encourage short, focused storytelling (~5 min per person), followed by 1–2 clarifying questions from the group.	
45-90 min	Faith and Tradition reflection Reflection and closing	Back in small groups, participants reflect on: What does my faith/tradition say about these types of impacts? Can we cite scriptures, parables, or proverbs that speak to similar situations? How do our daily actions relate to existing sacred text? How can faith representatives help reduce harm and increase conflict sensitivity in the Nigeria context?	Plenary discussion Facilitator Prompt Examples: Where have we seen actions causing harm unintentionally—what would our sacred texts say about that?

Materials Needed (below are some examples)

- ✓ Flipcharts or whiteboards for plenary notes
- ✓ Markers, pens, and paper
- ✓ Storytelling reflection guide handouts (optional)
- ✓ Copies of relevant religious texts or access to them (optional)

Module 4: Programme Unpacking/Options/Re-programming **Module 4,**

Session 1

Session Plan: Programme Unpacking

Facilitator: Maya Date:

Day 3

Duration: 120 minutes

Learning Objectives

At the end of the session, participants will be able to:

1. Understand how to apply Do No Harm principles during programme unpacking, identify potential risks, and propose mitigation strategies.

Time	Activity	Description	Method/Resources
0-15 minutes	Programme Unpacking: Why and how?	The facilitator will explain the reason why we unpack projects and programmes in DNH analysis	PPT
15-45 minutes	Unpacking a case study	<ul style="list-style-type: none">? Divide participants into 5 small groups.? Each group receives a project description to unpack? Groups “unpack” the programme by answering:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What are its core activities?2. Who are its beneficiaries?3. Who implements it?4. Where does it operate?5. What are its resources?6. What results does it seek?	Project Description sheet Flip Charts and Permanent Markers
45–75 min	Group Work: Uncovering Harmful Patterns	Go through the project and analyze each of the activities. Then create a	Flipchart and markers

		table with two columns including: Possible Harmful Impacts Positive Opportunities	
75-90 minutes	Sharing and Mapping the Harmful behavior	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Groups share key points from their project analysis 2. Reflection: “What do these actions and behaviors tell us about the system we have been reinforcing?” 	Flipchart

Materials Needed (below are some examples)

- Flipcharts or whiteboards for plenary notes
- Projector for PPT
- Markers, pens, and paper
- Sticky notes
- Whiteboard (fixed or mobile)

Suggested Case Study for Module 4, Session 1:

Case Study: Youth Skills for Peace Programme (YSPP) Programme

Summary:

The NGO ‘A brighter future’ is implementing a **12-month vocational training and mentorship programme** for unemployed youth (ages 18–25) in the fictional country of **Lumeria**, a context with rising political tension and high youth unemployment.

Context Overview:

Lumeria is currently facing increasing social and political tension. Relations between the Northland and Southland communities have deteriorated, with ethnic identity becoming a more visible source of division. Many young people from Southland feel marginalised, citing fewer opportunities and limited access to services compared to their peers in Northland. The situation is further strained by upcoming elections, which are heightening polarisation and intensifying competition between political actors. Local

youth associations have also come under scrutiny, with some community members accusing them of having political affiliations, which undermines trust and neutrality. At the same time, there is a widespread perception that NGOs, due to easier physical access, prioritise programming in Northland, reinforcing a sense of inequity and fuelling grievances among Southland communities.

Project Logframe

Overall Goal: Youth contribute to social cohesion and economic stability in Lumeria.

Outcome: Targeted youth gain improved livelihoods and strengthened intergroup relationships.

Outputs and Activities

Output	Indicators	Key Activities
Output 1: Youth have improved vocational and digital skills.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 200 youth trained (50% from each region) • At least 40% female participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 1.1: Conduct community outreach and transparent recruitment. • Activity 1.2: Deliver vocational training courses. • Activity 1.3: Provide coaching and practice sessions.
Output 2: Youth-led micro-enterprises are supported.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 youth groups receive start-up grants • 80% implement viable business plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 2.1: Business planning workshops. • Activity 2.2: Transparent grant selection. • Activity 2.3: Disburse grants & mentorship.
Output 3: Youth have improved leadership and peacebuilding skills.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 150 youth complete workshops • 60% report increased conflict resolution confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 3.1: Leadership workshops. • Activity 3.2: Youth dialogue events. • Activity 3.3: Support 6 peace projects.

Case Study Task Instructions:

1. **Unpack the programme (general questions)** Who benefits? Who might be excluded? Where and how is it delivered?
 What resources flow into the community?
2. **Identify dividers and connectors (focus on the activities)**
 What tensions and opportunities matter most?
3. **Analyse interactions (unpack every activity based on what you already know or assume)**
 How could each programme element interact with dividers/connectors?

Module 4, Session 2

Session Plan: Resetting Actions & Behavior in the Light of Do No Harm Principles

Facilitator: Jude Likita

Date: Day 3

Duration: 60 minutes

Learning Objectives

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

1. To collectively develop community-led recommendations to reset and rectify past actions and behaviors may have implicitly sent harmful ethical messages or reinforced harmful power/resource dynamics.
2. To identify appropriate and culturally relevant channels for sharing and modeling this transformation.

Time	Activity	Description	Method/Resources
------	----------	-------------	------------------

<p>0-30 minutes</p>	<p>Options Game</p>	<p>Options Game: Tell the group: "I am going to give you a context, and you need to generate as many options as possible to address the scenario, based on the information available. You will work in teams of two (pair people off before you give them the scenario). You are in A. There are hungry people in B. The road from A to C goes through B. Feed C." Give participants 2 minutes to generate as long a list as possible. After the two minutes elapse, ask the group to raise their hands if they got 5 options, keep them raised as you ask progressively higher numbers until the team with the most is identified. At the end of the round, tell the group how many options they generated as a whole.</p> <p>Debrief: What did you learn from this exercise? Why is it important to have options before re-programming?</p>	<p>PPT Flipcharts Markers</p>
---------------------	---------------------	---	---------------------------------------

30-60 minutes	Rectifying harmful behavior	Go back to the case study project of earlier. And answer the follow questions: 1. Please propose concrete recommendations to rectify the project activities in light of the Do No Harm framework.	Sticky notes and a board (can be mobile)
60-90 minutes	Reference to scripture and holy books	Before closing the session, we would like people to think about re-designing activities or repurposing resources to minimise harm from the perspective of holy books and scriptures. What traditional scriptures support the rectification of potentially harmful behavior?	Flipchart

Materials Needed (below are some examples)

- ✓ Flipcharts or whiteboards for plenary notes
- ✓ Projector for PPT
- ✓ Markers, pens, and paper
- ✓ Sticky notes
- ✓ Whiteboard (fixed or mobile)

Annex 5: TABLE OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES USED BY PARTICIPANTS DURING THE WORKSHOP

Scripture Reference	Faith Tradition	Text/Quote	DNH Topic/Module	Issue Addressed
Quran 49:13	Islam	"O mankind, indeed We have created you from male and female and made you peoples and tribes that you may know one another. Indeed, the most noble of you in the sight of Allah is the most righteous of you."	Connectors and Dividers	Unity across diversity; Human dignity regardless of tribe, ethnicity, or religion; Recognition of diversity as divine design for mutual knowledge
John 17:21	Christianity	"That they all may be one"	Connectors and Dividers	Unity among believers; Breaking down divisions; Collective identity transcending differences
Galatians 3:28	Christianity	"There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus."	Connectors and Dividers	Equality across ethnic, social, and gender lines; Elimination of discriminatory dividers; Inclusive community building

Quran 4:58	Islam	"Allah commands you to render trusts to whom they are due"	RAFT - Accountability & Transparency	Accountability in resource management; Trustworthiness in handling aid and resources; Transparent stewardship
Micah 6:8	Christianity	"Act justly, love mercy, walk humbly"	RAFT - Fairness, Respect & Accountability	Justice in resource distribution; Compassionate treatment of beneficiaries; Humility in service delivery; Overall ethical behavior
Quran 9:119	Islam	"O you who believe! Fear God, and be with those who are true (in word and deeds)"	RAFT - Accountability & Transparency	Honesty in reporting and communication; Integrity in actions matching words; Truthfulness with communities and donors
Proverbs 10:9	Christianity	"Whoever walks in integrity walks securely"	RAFT - Accountability & Transparency	Integrity in organizational behavior; Security through ethical conduct; Consistency between values and actions

Quran 17:70	Islam	"We have honored the children of Adam"	RAFT - Respect	Dignity of all persons; Respectful treatment of beneficiaries; Honoring human worth regardless of circumstances
Quran 4:135	Islam	"O you who believe! Stand out firmly for justice, as witnesses to Allah, even if it be against yourselves, your parents and your relatives..."	RAFT - Fairness & Accountability	Impartiality in justice; Fairness even when it's personally costly; Accountability that transcends loyalty to one's own group
Quran 39:53	Islam	"O My servants who have transgressed against their souls! Despair not of God's mercy. God forgives all sins, for He is the All-Forgiving, the All-Merciful."	RAFT - Respect & Accountability	Compassion toward those who've made mistakes; Hope and restoration after failure; Merciful approach to human error
Luke 6:36	Christianity	"Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful"	RAFT - Respect & Fairness	Compassionate treatment of vulnerable populations; Mercy in program implementation; Grace in dealing with beneficiaries

INSIGHTS FROM SCRIPTURAL INTEGRATION

1. Both Christian and Islamic scriptures contain remarkably parallel teachings on unity, justice, mercy, accountability, and respect for human dignity
2. Grounding DNH principles in sacred texts enhances their authority and legitimacy within faith communities, making conflict sensitivity not just a technical framework but a spiritual imperative
3. These scriptures serve as counter-narratives to divisive interpretations often spread via social media and informal channels, providing faith leaders with theological ammunition for promoting peace
4. Each scripture connects directly to specific DNH operational practices (beneficiary selection, resource management, staff behaviour, community engagement)
5. The shared ethical foundations across faiths create opportunities for interfaith collaboration on peacebuilding, as both traditions call adherents to the same core behaviors: justice, mercy, humility, honesty, and respect

Annex 6: Evaluation Methodology and Survey Results

1. Evaluation Approach

This annex presents detailed information on the evaluation methodology used to assess participant learning outcomes, satisfaction, and confidence following the Do No Harm for Faith Groups training conducted in Abuja, Nigeria, from 25–27 November 2025.

The evaluation combined:

- A **pre-training and post-training knowledge assessment**, and
- An **end-of-training participant feedback survey**.

Both tools were administered digitally using Google Forms.

2. Knowledge Assessment Design

The knowledge assessment consisted of **seven questions**, combining multiple-choice and scenario-based formats. Questions were designed to test understanding of:

- Core Do No Harm concepts and definitions
- Connectors and dividers
- Resource Transfers and Implicit Ethical Messages
- Conflict-sensitive analysis and decision-making

Each response was scored as correct or incorrect. Scores were aggregated and expressed as percentages to calculate individual and average results.

A total of **25 participants completed both assessments**, representing an **89.3% response rate**.

3. Survey Response Overview

The post-training feedback survey captured:

- Overall satisfaction with the training
- Assessment of facilitation quality
- Perceived balance between theory and practice
- Self-reported confidence to apply DNH principles

- Open-ended qualitative feedback on most valued aspects and perceived impact

4. References: Pre and Post Training Tests

A. DO NO HARM PRE-TRAINING KNOWLEDGE TEST

Welcome! Before we begin the Do No Harm training, please complete this brief knowledge test. This helps us understand your starting point. This should take 5-7 minutes.

What does "Do No Harm" mean in the context of development and humanitarian work?

- Only providing medical care and avoiding physical injury
- Ensuring projects don't accidentally make conflicts worse
- Refusing to work in dangerous areas
- Treating everyone the same way

Which statement is TRUE about well-intentioned projects?

- Good intentions automatically mean the project won't cause problems
- Even well-intentioned projects can accidentally increase tensions between groups
- Projects led by religious leaders never cause harm
- Only government projects can cause community tensions
- I don't know

"Dividers" in Do No Harm framework refer to:

- Physical barriers like walls and fences
- Things that increase tension and division between groups
- Organizations that separate religious groups
- I don't know

"Connectors" in Do No Harm framework refer to:

- People who introduce different groups to each other
- Things that bring people together despite their differences
- Religious leaders who promote unity

- Transportation systems linking communities
- I don't know

Which of the following could be either a connector and a divider depending on how it's handled?

- Distributing food aid in a mixed community
- Building a school in a village
- Organizing a community health program
- Hosting an interfaith dialogue event
- All of the above
- I don't know

A faith-based organization distributes relief materials only to members of one religious group in a mixed community. This is most likely to:

- Build trust with the community
- Increase tensions between religious groups
- Have no effect on community relations
- Encourage other groups to convert
- I don't know

As a religious leader, when planning activities for your community, which approach is most conflict-sensitive?

- Focus only on your own faith community and ignore others
- Consider how your activities might affect relationships between different groups
- Do what you've always done - tradition prevents problems
- Wait for other leaders to act first
- I don't know

B. DNH POST-TRAINING ASSESSMENT

Congratulations! This assessment measures your learning and helps us improve future training. It takes 10-15 minutes to complete.

The Do No Harm framework helps organizations:

Mark only one box for this answer

- Understand the conflict context
- Analyze project-conflict interaction
- Design activities that strengthen connectors
- All of the above
- Only the first two

Your church/mosque distributes food to 100 families in a mixed community. What is the most conflict-sensitive approach?

Mark only one box for this answer

- Give to own faith first
- Distribute equally but only announce in own place of worship
- Work on a first come, first served basis
- Work with both community leaders on fair criteria and communicate transparently
- Serve only the poorest, regardless of background

'Resource Transfers' means:

Mark only one box for this answer

- Only money and goods
- Tangible and intangible resources (goods, services, skills, legitimacy) transferred into communities
- Moving resources rich to poor areas
- Government budgets
- International Aid

Can you give an example of "Implicit Ethical Messages"?

Mark only one box for this answer

- Religious leaders hiring only own ethnic group
- NGOs distributing blankets
- Building a school
- Agricultural training
- Purchasing from local markets

A clinic hires only nurses from one religious group. This:

Mark only one box for this answer:

- Strengthens connectors via health services
- Reinforces dividers through discriminatory hiring
- Has both positive and negative impacts to analyze
- Acceptable if nurses serve everyone
- No conflict impact

Name ONE specific change you'll make in your work. (Be specific about what and why)

How is your level of confidence in applying DNH principles?

Mark only one box for this answer:

- Very confident - can apply immediately
- Confident - understand with practice
- Somewhat confident - need practice
- Not very confident - need support
- Not confident - still confused

Overall training rating:

Mark only one box for this answer:

1 2 3 4 5

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Poor Excellent

Facilitator (Maya) rating:

Rating	1 (poor)	2	3	4	5(excellent)
Knowledge					
Clarity					
Engagement					
Respect for faiths					
Responsiveness					

Content Rating:

Rating	1 (poor)	2	3	4	5(excellent)

Nigerian relevance					
Work usefulness					
Theory-practice balance					
Case study quality					
Pacing					

Daily Rating

Rating	1 (poor)	2	3	4	5(excellent)
Day 1: Understanding Conflict & DNH					
Day 2: Applying DNH					
Day 3: Action Planning					

Venue Rating

Rating	1 (poor)	2	3	4	5(excellent)
Accessibility					
Room comfort					
Equipment					
Prayer spaces					
Overall suitability					

Logistics Rating

Rating	1 (poor)	2	3	4	5(excellent)
Pre-workshop communication					
Registration					
Accommodation					
Transportation					
Materials					

Catering Rating

Rating	1 (poor)	2	3	4	5(excellent)
Meal quality					
Food variety					
Dietary accommodations (Halal/Vegetarian)					
Tea breaks					
Overall service					

How was the training duration?

- Too short
- Just right
- Too long
- Not sure

What did you like most? Be specific.

What would you like to improve? Be specific

Would you recommend it to other faith leaders?

- Definitely yes
- Probably yes
- Not sure
- Probably no
- Definitely not

Any additional comments?
