

Appendix

TABLE 6. SUMMARY OF CLIMATE ACTIVITIES

| Activity | Summary of Activity |
|--|---|
| Climate Resilience activities | Climate resilience activities provided agricultural inputs and technical support to farmers. The activities provided farmers with access to climate-resilient seeds and fertilizers as well as training in specific sowing techniques. The objectives of the climate resilience activities were to improve crop yields, which would then decrease food insecurity and help mitigate conflict over natural resources. These activities aimed to improve crop yields and decrease food insecurity, which would also help mitigate conflict over natural resources. |
| Pastoral calendar negotiation & awareness | The pastoral awareness initiative aimed to reduce conflicts between herders and farmers by promoting inclusive management of natural resources at both local and communal levels. The objective of this activity was to help stabilize the intervention areas affected by resource scarcity. The negotiation of the pastoral calendar required active participation from a diverse set of stakeholders representing various perspectives, such as village chiefs, young people, local authorities, and farmers as well as stakeholders from often marginalized groups like pastoralists. After the calendar was finalized, it was publicized through radio broadcasting. This inclusive and community-based process helped promote acceptance and compliance with the calendar, which plays a crucial role in identifying and marking animal corridors. |
| Forage diversification | This activity was one of multiple program activities that sought to offer a positive alternative to youth at risk of violent extremism. The main aim of the forage diversification activity was to reduce pressure on agricultural land and mitigate conflicts between farmers and herders by diversifying youth livelihood activities. Specifically, this activity provided youth with increased support for agro-pastoral practices, such as training to help keep animals from straying. |
| Mobile Agricultural Micro-Insurance (MAM) for farmers | The Ben ni Baara program partnered with the insurance company OKO and microfinance institutions to pilot an initiative to help farmers adopt agricultural micro-insurance. The program raised awareness through radio and caravans about the benefits of OKO's mobile-based insurance, which offers financial compensation for farmland losses due to drought or flooding. Farmers can pay premiums and receive payouts via mobile money. The insurance package also provides access to agricultural credit, installment payment options for inputs, and expert agricultural advice. |
| Water points for grazing | The Ben ni Baara program installed boreholes as an accompanying measure to their activities to help address water shortages in market gardening and animal watering sites. Other water points have also been rehabilitated to reduce surrounding conflicts and facilitate access to water for communities and livestock. |

TABLE 7. SUMMARY OF NON-CLIMATE ACTIVITIES

| Activity | Summary of Activity |
|---|--|
| Peacebuilding (e.g., CRCs and COFOs) | <p>The Ben ni Baara peacebuilding activities focused on strengthening local conflict prevention and management mechanisms. This included revitalizing existing land commissions (COFOs) and establishing new conflict resolution committees (CRCs) and an Early Warning Early Response System (EWER). Conflicts identified through the EWER system were often managed through the efforts of local CRCs and COFOs. By resolving a variety of conflicts, the CRCs helped to promote social cohesion, resilience, and community stabilization in the implementation areas.</p> |
| Entrepreneurial activities (e.g., companies in difficulty and promotion of young trainees) | <p>The Ben ni Baara entrepreneurial activities aimed to assist entrepreneurial companies and youth entrepreneurs. Companies, and their specific needs, were identified through the program. These companies were then supported by Ben ni Baara with grants and with an entrepreneurial curriculum that focused on technical areas such as management and business plan development.</p> <p>The program's activities also focused on youth entrepreneurs. It selected 40 youth to place into internship and mentoring programs at companies working in their field. The training received through the internship lasted for four months, after which the youth received funds to help set up their own businesses and buy relevant equipment. These youth were also provided with one year of additional support to help ensure the viability of their businesses.</p> |
| Village Saving and Loans Associations (VSLAs) | <p>The Village Saving and Loan Associations (VSLAs) developed in the Ben ni Baara program aimed to overcome the financial barriers faced by communities in rural areas by strengthening their economic capacity and diversifying their livelihood opportunities. Specifically, the VSLAs mobilized and shared funds within their communities in order to generate income-generating opportunities for a number of families. The VSLAs also established successful partnerships with microfinance institutions, which enabled many people to obtain business loans and start their own businesses.</p> |
| Awareness of food supplements | <p>The food supplements activity within Ben ni Baara was an awareness campaign aimed at promoting the use of animal feed supplements to maintain production quality during climate challenges, such as irregular rainfall, prolonged dry seasons, and flooding, particularly when pasturelands are unavailable. The activity involved various stakeholders, including pastoralists, breeders' unions, chambers of agriculture, technical services of livestock, suppliers of livestock feed, and communal authorities. The program also used peer-to-peer communication, with experienced breeders leading sensitization efforts through awareness caravans and radio programs in public spaces like livestock markets and community gatherings to encourage behavior change.</p> |

TABLE 8. FULL SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

| Characteristic | <i>n</i> | % | Mean | Min | Max |
|---|----------|--------|-------|-----|-----|
| Sample Participants | 679 | | | | |
| Female | 510 | 75.11% | | | |
| Male | 169 | 24.89% | | | |
| Mean Age | | | 42.93 | 16 | 80 |
| Married | 619 | 91.1% | | | |
| <i>Main ethnic group</i> | 397 | 58.47% | | | |
| Bambara | 252 | 37.11% | | | |
| Soninke | 83 | 12.22% | | | |
| Minianka | 62 | 9.13% | | | |
| <i>Main livelihood activity¹</i> | | | | | |
| Agriculture/Agropastoralism | | 65.80% | | | |
| Small Business | | 43.00% | | | |
| Pastoralism | | 5.30% | | | |

¹ Note: Respondents were asked to list their top two livelihood activities. Only those who listed Agriculture, Small Business, and Pastoralism are included here.

TABLE 9. SURVEY QUESTIONS: MAIN OUTCOMES AND POTENTIAL MECHANISMS

| Outcome | Survey Question |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Support for Violence | "It is sometimes necessary to resort to violence to defend a political cause." Strongly agree = 0, strongly disagree = 4 |
| | "It is sometimes necessary to resort to violence to defend one's community." Strongly agree = 0, strongly disagree = 4 |
| | "It is sometimes necessary to resort to violence to defend one's livelihood." Strongly agree = 0, strongly disagree = 4 |
| Interpersonal Relationships | "I consider the members of a livelihood group other than mine as a threat to my community." Strongly agree = 0, strongly disagree = 4 |
| Mechanisms | |
| Natural Resource Management | In the past six months, has your capacity for access to resources (earth, water, pasture areas) decreased (0), remained the same (1) or increased (2)? |
| | In the past 6 months, has the management of these resources by your community have worsened (0), remained the same (1) or improved (2)? |
| Household Resilience | Have you revitalized one of your income-generating activities in the past 12 months thanks to your participation in the program? No = 0, Yes = 1 |
| | How confident are you that you will be able to cope with economic and environmental shocks or pressures in the future? Completely confident = 3 Not confident = 0 |
| Conflict Management Mechanisms | Do you think the traditional structures / mechanisms for prevention / management of functional conflicts in your community are able to resolve current conflicts? No = 0, Yes = 1 |
| | If yes, why? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are reliable. • They are just. • They are impartial. • They have the good of the community in the heart. • They find good solutions to the conflicts they must manage. |

TABLE 10. FULL SAMPLE BALANCE

| | (1) | | (2) | | (3) | | (1)-(2) | | (1)-(3) | | (2)-(3) | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------|-----------------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| | Non-Climate | | Climate | | Both | | Pairwise T-test | | Pairwise T-test | | Pairwise T-test | |
| | <i>n</i> | Mean/ (SE) | <i>n</i> | Mean/ (SE) | <i>n</i> | Mean/ (SE) | <i>n</i> | Mean/ Difference | <i>n</i> | Mean/ Difference | <i>n</i> | Mean/ Difference |
| Age | 344 | 39.31 (0.73) | 264 | 46.95 (0.79) | 71 | 45.52 (1.57) | 608 | -7.64*** | 415 | -6.21*** | 335 | 1.43 |
| Female | 344 | 0.87 (0.02) | 264 | 0.63 (0.03) | 71 | 0.62 (0.06) | 608 | 0.24*** | 415 | 0.25*** | 335 | 0.01 |
| Agriculture/ Agropastoralism | 344 | 0.36 (0.03) | 264 | 0.99 (0.01) | 71 | 0.86 (0.42) | 608 | -0.63*** | 415 | -0.50*** | 335 | 0.13*** |
| Bambara | 344 | 0.35 (0.03) | 264 | 0.39 (0.03) | 71 | 0.42 (0.06) | 608 | -0.04 | 415 | -0.07 | 335 | -0.04 |
| Soninke | 344 | 0.16 (0.02) | 264 | 0.07 (0.02) | 71 | 0.11 (0.04) | 608 | 0.09*** | 415 | 0.05 | 335 | -0.04 |
| Minianka | 344 | 0.08 (0.02) | 264 | 0.10 (0.02) | 71 | 0.09 (0.03) | 608 | -0.02 | 415 | -0.00 | 335 | 0.02 |

Robust Standard errors in parentheses
 + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE 11. LIKELIHOOD OF SUPPORTING VIOLENCE

| Probability of responding: | Political Violence | | Violence to Protect Community | | Violence to Protect Livelihoods | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| | Only Climate | Both | Only Climate | Both | Only Climate | Both |
| Totally agree | 0.005+ | -0.011* | 0.004+ | -0.018** | 0.007+ | -0.033*** |
| | (0.003) | (0.005) | (0.002) | (0.007) | (0.004) | (0.010) |
| Agree | 0.039* | -0.096*** | 0.075* | -0.328*** | 0.061+ | -0.282*** |
| | (0.016) | (0.029) | (0.034) | (0.058) | (0.032) | (0.053) |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 0.014* | -0.035** | 0.001+ | -0.006** | 0.002 | -0.007** |
| | (0.006) | (0.011) | (0.001) | (0.002) | (0.001) | (0.003) |
| Disagree | 0.022* | -0.054** | -0.020* | 0.088*** | -0.018+ | 0.083*** |
| | (0.010) | (0.018) | (0.009) | (0.022) | (0.009) | (0.022) |
| Totally disagree | -0.079* | 0.196*** | -0.060* | 0.264*** | -0.052+ | 0.239*** |
| | (0.032) | (0.053) | (0.028) | (0.043) | (0.027) | (0.042) |
| N | 679 | 679 | 679 | 679 | 679 | 679 |

Robust Standard errors in parentheses

+ $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE 12. LIKELIHOOD OF THREAT PERCEPTION

| Probability of responding: | Other groups are a threat | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| | (1) | (2) |
| | Only Climate | Both |
| Totally agree | 0.002 (0.002) | -0.006+ (0.003) |
| Agree | 0.038* (0.016) | -0.090*** (0.026) |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 0.014* (0.006) | -0.033** (0.011) |
| Disagree | 0.028* (0.012) | -0.065** (0.020) |
| Totally disagree | -0.083* (0.033) | 0.194*** (0.052) |
| N | 679 | 679 |

Robust Standard errors in parentheses
 + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE 13. PERCEPTION OF CHANGES IN NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

| Probability of responding: | How has natural resource management changed? | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------|
| | (1) | (2) |
| | Only Climate | Both |
| Decreased | -0.009 | -0.013 |
| | (0.007) | (0.011) |
| Remained the same | -0.322** | -0.481*** |
| | (0.105) | (0.117) |
| Increased | 0.331** | 0.494*** |
| | (0.101) | (0.111) |
| N | 285 | 285 |

Robust Standard errors in parentheses
 + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE 14. CONFIDENCE IN THE ABILITY TO COPE WITH CLIMATE OR ECONOMIC SHOCKS

| Probability of responding: | Confidence in ability to cope with shock | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------|
| | (1) Only Climate | (2) Both |
| Not confident | 0.036* | -0.021 |
| | (0.017) | (0.031) |
| Moderately Confident | 0.061* | -0.037 |
| | (0.026) | (0.052) |
| Confident | 0.008 | -0.005 |
| | (0.014) | (0.011) |
| Completely Confident | -0.105* | 0.063 |
| | (0.044) | (0.089) |
| N | 259 | 259 |

Robust Standard errors in parentheses
 + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE 15. CORRELATION OF THE REASONS FOR TRUSTING CONFLICT MANAGEMENT MECHANISMS ACROSS PARTICIPANTS

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Reliable | Just | Impartial | Common Good | Good Solutions |
| Only Climate | -0.031 (0.045) | -0.012 (0.044) | 0.022 (0.042) | 0.115** (0.041) | 0.147*** (0.042) |
| Both | -0.042 (0.065) | 0.066 (0.064) | 0.019 (0.064) | -0.018 (0.058) | -0.034 (0.064) |
| N | 679 | 679 | 679 | 679 | 679 |

Robust Standard errors in parentheses
 + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$