

EN
ANNEX III

to Commission Implementing Decision on Annual Action Programme 2021 for the Conflict Prevention, Peace-building and Crisis Preparedness part of the thematic programme Peace, Stability and Conflict Prevention

ANNUAL MEASURE

This document constitutes the annual work programme in the sense of Article 110(2) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 of the European Parliament and of the Council¹ (Financial Regulation), and action plans in the sense of Article 23 of Regulation (EU) 2021/947 of the European Parliament and of the Council².

1. SYNOPSIS

1.1. Action Summary Table

1. Title CRIS/OPSYS business reference Basic Act	Tackling disinformation in conflict-affected contexts OPSYS/CRIS] ³ number: Financed under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI) – Global Europe
2. Team Europe Initiative	No
3. Zone benefiting from the action	The action shall be carried out globally
4. Programming document	Multi-Annual Indicative Programme for the Thematic Programme on Peace, Stability and Conflict Prevention 2021-2027
5. Link with relevant MIP(s) objectives/expected results	Priority 1: Continuing to enhance capabilities relating to analytical tools, methodologies, and mechanisms to better detect early signs of conflicts, monitor conflict and design appropriate responses; Priority 2: Promote conflict prevention and conflict resolution measures, including by facilitating and building capacity in confidence-building, mediation, dialogue and reconciliation processes; Priority 3: Supporting peace processes and transitions of conflict-affected societies/communities, including stabilisation and peacebuilding efforts
PRIORITY AREAS AND SECTOR INFORMATION	
6. Priority Area(s), sectors	Peace, Stability and Conflict Prevention

¹Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 July 2018 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union, amending Regulations (EU) No 1296/2013, (EU) No 1301/2013, (EU) No 1303/2013, (EU) No 1304/2013, (EU) No 1309/2013, (EU) No 1316/2013, (EU) No 223/2014, (EU) No 283/2014, and Decision No 541/2014/EU and repealing Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 (OJ L 193, 30.7.2018, p.1).

² Regulation (EU) 2021/947 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 June 2021 establishing the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe, amending and repealing Decision No 466/2014/EU and repealing Regulation (EU) 2017/1601 and Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 480/2009 (OJ L 209, 14.6.2021, p.1).

³ Depending on the availability of OPSYS at the time of encoding, a provisional CRIS number may need to be provided.

7. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	Main SDG: 16 Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies			
8 a) DAC code(s) ⁴	15220 - Civilian peace building, conflict prevention and resolution			
8 b) Main Delivery Channel @	13000 – Third Country Government (Delegated co-operation) 21000 – International NGO 41000 – United Nations agency, fund or commission (UN)			
9. Targets ⁵	<input type="checkbox"/> Migration <input type="checkbox"/> Climate <input type="checkbox"/> Social inclusion and Human Development <input type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity <input type="checkbox"/> Education ⁶ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Human Rights, Democracy and Governance ⁷			
10. Markers ⁸ (from DAC form)	General policy objective @	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Participation development/good governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Aid to environment @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Gender equality and women's and girl's empowerment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Trade development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reproductive, maternal, new-born and child health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Disaster Risk Reduction @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Inclusion of persons with Disabilities @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Nutrition @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	RIO Convention markers	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Biological diversity @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Combat desertification @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change mitigation @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change adaptation @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁴ DAC sectors (codes and descriptions) are indicated in the first and fourth columns of the tab 'purpose codes' in the following document: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/dacandcrscodelists.htm>

⁵ Actual contribution to targets will be confirmed ex-post based on a standardised methodology.

⁶ This target is specific to INTPA. If the action is marked as contributing to the Education target, please make sure the target on "Social inclusion and Human Development" is also marked.

⁷ Thematic target for geographic programmes (at least 15%) in delegated act.

⁸ For guidance, see <https://www.oecd.org/development/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/> (go to "Data collection and resources for reporters", select Addendum 2, annexes 18 (policy) and 19 (Rio) of the reporting directive).

If an action is marked in the DAC form as contributing to one of the general policy objectives or to RIO principles as a principal objective or a significant objective, then this should be reflected in the logframe matrix (in the results chain and/or indicators).

11. Internal markers ⁹ and Tags ¹⁰ :	Policy objectives	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Digitalisation @ Tags: digital connectivity digital governance digital entrepreneurship job creation digital skills/literacy digital services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Connectivity @ Tags: transport people2people energy digital connectivity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Migration @ (methodology for tagging under development)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reduction of Inequalities (methodology for marker and tagging under development)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Covid-19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BUDGET INFORMATION				
12. Amounts concerned	Budget line: BGUE – B2021-14.020230-C1 – STABILITY AND PEACE Total estimated cost: EUR 5 000 000 Total amount of EU budget contribution EUR 5 000 000			
MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION				
13. Type of financing ¹¹	Direct management through: - Grants Indirect management with the entities to be selected in accordance with the criteria set out in section 4.3.2.			

1.2. Summary of the Action

Disinformation has emerged as a critical challenge globally. In conflict-affected contexts where state structures are either weak or contested and where media and digital literacy is sometimes low, disinformation is on the rise and threatens the resilience and stability of already fragile social fabrics. Orchestrated disinformation campaigns, extremist propaganda, hate speech and incitement to violence are more and more common online and fuel conflict, triggering tensions and violence. In the longer term such campaigns undermine social cohesion and the social contract between state and citizens. Conflict parties, proxies and backers, are increasingly acquiring new digital capabilities and fight online disinformation wars that pose significant challenges to peace and security in the years to come. Peace processes have also become targets of disinformation campaigns with the aim to undermine their legitimacy and disrupt their effective proceedings and conclusion. This action aims to strengthen the resilience of conflict-affected societies to disinformation and online harm by strengthening in-country capacities to detect, monitor and respond to

⁹ The internal markers have been created to report on the implementation of the Commission’s own policy priorities in areas where no DAC reporting tool is available. For the sake of consistency and comparability, the methodology is equivalent to the DAC markers, with three possible positions (main target, significant target, not targeted)

¹⁰ Methodology for additional tagging providing granularity on internal markers is under development.

¹¹ Art. 27 NDICI

disinformation. It will also support initiatives to protect peace processes from disinformation and other harmful online content.

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Context

Disinformation has recently emerged as a critical challenge globally. Disinformation can take different forms and can be defined in different ways: the spread of mere rumours and misinformation, the dissemination of extremist propaganda or the deliberate manipulation of the information environment. The effects, intentional or unintentional, are to instil confusion within the broader public and to generate mistrust among different societal groups or between state structures and citizens. Disinformation has become a major concern for the European Union in recent years not least because it upsets the very foundations of our democratic governments and societies. Disinformation flows interfere with, and target, European fundamental values, interests abroad and represent a threat to the objectives pursued by the European external action and to the EU as a global actor. The adoption of policy frameworks like the *Communication Tackling online disinformation: a European Approach* (2018)¹², the *Action Plan against Disinformation* (2018)¹³, the *European Democracy Action Plan* (2020)¹⁴ and the *Guidance on strengthening the code of practice on Disinformation* (2021)¹⁵ demonstrates how these challenges have become critical to the EU internally and have created a momentum to foster EU responses externally.

In conflict-affected contexts where state structures are either weak or contested and where media and digital literacy is sometimes low, disinformation is on the rise and threatens the resilience and stability of already fragile social fabrics. While hate propaganda and campaigns have always been used to mobilise popular support in times of war and crises, disinformation flows have reached an unprecedented scale, in part due to the growing penetration of social media as a source of information and interface with the outside world. Orchestrated disinformation campaigns, extremist propaganda, hate speech and incitement to violence are now common online, negatively influencing conflict dynamics, triggering tensions and violence. In the longer term, this can undermine social cohesion and the social contract between state and citizens. As a result, the *Multiannual Indicative Programme 2021-2027 of the NDICI-Global Europe – Peace, Stability and Conflict Prevention Thematic Programme* envisages proactive engagement on these issues to address emerging challenges to stability and peace and further promoting a stronger Europe in the world.

2.2. Problem Analysis

Short problem analysis:

Disinformation in conflict-affected contexts thrives on a combination of several factors: the absence of effective and transparent frameworks and oversight bodies to regulate the flows of information, notably online; a weak independent media sector that struggles to provide reliable and fact-based information to the public; low levels of media and digital literacy rendering the penetration of harmful content easier; pre-existing tensions, insecurity and social divides that can be instrumentalised for political gain. These shortcomings have provided a conducive environment for all kinds of disinformation and harmful content in recent years. This includes propaganda from violent extremist groups, hate speech and incitement to violence, orchestrated information manipulation and interference. The Covid 19 pandemic has accelerated this trend to the extent that the World Health Organisation and many others spoke about an “infodemic” which not only threatened public health responses but also targeted and discredited democratic values around the globe. As global disinformation flows are increasing, getting more complex and finding fertile ground in conflict-affected contexts, it is critical for the EU to strengthen fragile states and societies’ stability and resilience. Contemporary militants are as well versed in disinformation tactics as they are in on-the-ground combat. Their foreign backers supply not just weapons, but also armies of internet trolls to influence conflict narratives. Peace processes have become a recent target of disinformation campaigns with the aim to undermine their legitimacy and disrupt their effective proceedings and conclusion. This will represent a significant challenge to peace and security in the years to come as conflict parties, proxies and backers, acquire new digital capabilities and fight online disinformation wars.

¹² <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52018DC0236&from=EN>

¹³ https://eas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/action_plan_against_disinformation.pdf

¹⁴ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0790&from=EN>

¹⁵ file:///C:/Users/babauser/AppData/Local/Temp/1/Communication_nPq9p89LZt7jJVseCUC4Ur9z9g_76495.pdf

Identification of main stakeholders and corresponding institutional and/or organisational issues (mandates, potential roles, and capacities) to be covered by the action:

- Independent journalists and media actors: The media sector is going through a profound transformation globally. The digital transition has affected traditional media such as the written press or television broadcasts and it has also enabled the emergence of new actors: bloggers, influencers, fact-checkers and new approaches to access information through online media. Radio remains a favoured and trusted medium among the public in many conflict-affected contexts and new information and communication technologies allow for wider dissemination of programmes to remote areas and audiences. Capacities of independent, investigative journalists and media actors needs to be strengthened in order to ensure reliable and fact-based information environment to the public.

- Civil society, including research organisations: Local civil society organisations play an important role to inform, complement and support activities by state and international actors in conflict-affected contexts. In order to effectively tackle disinformation over the long term, it is critical to strengthen such capacities in-country so that resilience of conflict-affected societies is built from the bottom-up helping to uphold democratic practices and values. Civil society organisations also play a role to improve media and digital literacy to raise awareness of the broader public about disinformation threats and safe use of online media.

- Social media companies: Although increasingly regulated in the EU and G7 countries, there is much less attention to the increasing problem of harmful social media content in conflict-affected contexts where legislation, governance and control institutions are weak or non-existent. Social media companies acknowledge shortcomings and some progress has been made through the development of community guidelines, corporate human rights policies and attempts to improve accountability. However, content moderation remains sensitive and challenging to undertake in a context-specific, conflict-sensitive manner while respecting freedom of expression.

- State actors and governance bodies: Capacities of state institutions in charge of media governance in conflict-affected contexts are usually weak. As a result, their actions can be erratic, ranging from a complete lack of engagement to sudden closures of access to the Internet. They can also be instrumentalised by both local and foreign stakeholders to propagate disinformation and manipulate the information environment. Despite these shortcomings, authorities must play a role in better governing the media sector, in an inclusive and transparent manner, and serve as a credible and reliable actor for others to engage with.

- Mediation and peacebuilding actors: Peacebuilding actors are alert to the importance of taking into account and responding to conflicting narratives. They can play an important role in raising awareness of other stakeholders, notably social media companies and authorities, about the way harmful content online impacts on tensions and violence offline. However, mediators themselves are not always well equipped to tackle the extent to which disinformation flows affect peace processes. They need to take these dimensions more systematically into account and develop tools and approaches to deal with these challenges more proactively.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

3.1. Objectives and Expected Outputs

The Overall Objective of this action is to strengthen resilience of conflict-affected societies to disinformation and online harm.

The Specific Objectives of this action are to:

1. Strengthen in-country capacities to detect, monitor and respond to disinformation;
2. Protect peace processes from disinformation and other harmful content online;

The Outputs to be delivered by this action contributing to the corresponding Specific Objectives are:

- 1.1 contributing to Specific Objective 1: disinformation flows are detected, analysed and monitored;
- 1.2 contributing to Specific Objective 1: independent media actors produce and broadcast fact-based and reliable information;

- 1.3 contributing to Specific Objective 1: civil society organisations, researchers and relevant state bodies capacities to tackle disinformation are strengthened;
- 1.4 contributing to Specific Objective 1: social media platforms take appropriate measures to tackle disinformation;

- 2.1 contributing to Specific Objective 2: social media platforms adopt and implement policies that minimise harm to peace processes;
- 2.2 contributing to Specific Objective 2: adoption of social media peace agreements by conflict parties;
- 2.3 contributing to Specific Objective 2: enhanced capacity of mediators to understand and address social media risks, and to utilise social media's potential to enhance mediation practice.

3.2. Indicative Activities

Activities related to Output 1.1:

- Monitoring and analysis of disinformation trends in countries of implementation through technological and human capacities;
- Production and dissemination of regular reports setting out disinformation trends and threats;
- Support the establishment of media and civil society actors undertaking disinformation analyses, research and fact checking.

Activities related to Output 1.2:

- Provision of training and other capacity building activities to journalists and media actors;
- Production of media content and broadcasting activities;
- Support to community radio networks production and broadcasting;
- Development of media regulatory frameworks and guidelines.

Activities related to Output 1.3:

- Provision of training and other capacity building activities to civil society organisations and relevant state actors;
- Support to civil society, including youth organisations, initiatives to tackle disinformation and other online harmful content;
- Provision of technical assistance to relevant and appropriate state bodies in charge of countering disinformation.

Activities related to Output 1.4:

- Advocacy, awareness raising and networking activities by civil society organisations, researchers and media actors towards social media companies and the broader public;
- Provision of expertise to support and accompany policy and regulation development at local, national and global levels to better regulate online disinformation.

Activities related to Output 2.1:

- Conduct policy dialogues with, and advocacy activities towards, social media companies;
- Provision of expertise to social media companies.

Activities related to Output 2.2:

- Policy dialogue with conflict parties in countries covered by the action;
- Facilitation of social media peace agreements in countries covered by the action.

Activities related to Output 2.3:

- Piloting of social media analyses;
- Provision of training and capacity building to mediation practitioners;
- Development and implementation of strategic communication tools and initiatives;
- Coordination of a lessons learning process.

3.3. Mainstreaming

Environmental Protection & Climate Change

Environmental and Climate Change issues are important disinformation topics globally. When livelihoods become scarce and access to natural resources contentious, related disinformation can have detrimental effects on social and

political tensions and outbreaks of violence. The action will take into account these dynamics to ensure activities address these aspects of conflicts fuelled by environment related disinformation.

Gender equality and empowerment of women and girls

As per OECD Gender DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this action is labelled as G1. This implies that the action will take into account how disinformation flows affect, and can be perpetuated by, men, women, boys and girls differently. It will also take into account differentiated needs when devising responses and initiatives. Activities to be implemented by this action will seek to achieve equal participation between men and women.

Human Rights

The rise of disinformation and harmful content online has exposed another critical challenge: ensuring that responses do not infringe on fundamental rights, notably freedom of expression. In many conflict-affected contexts where governance and oversight bodies are weak, hybrid threats such as disinformation and cyber operations can target human rights defenders and authorities can suddenly shut down Internet and other means of communications. Upholding freedom of expression will be a core aspect and underlying objective of the projects to be funded under this action. Projects will also seek to ensure that activities do not harm the situation of human rights defenders, civil society organisations and journalists, and provide a space to support their initiatives.

Disability

As per OECD Disability DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this action is labelled as D0. This implies that projects to be funded under this action should aim to tackle challenges relating to disability and enhance the participation of people with disabilities when appropriate and relevant for the objectives of each project.

Democracy

Disinformation is one of the critical contemporary challenges facing democracies globally. In many instances, the manipulation of the information environment is meant to confuse the broader public and to undermine its trust in the democratic functioning of the State. Tackling disinformation is inherently linked to promoting democratic principles such as transparent and accountable governance, participation and fair representation, respect of human rights. Projects to be funded under this action will seek to create effective governance mechanisms ensuring multi-stakeholder collaborations, and strengthen capacities to better enforce democratic responses to disinformation.

Conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience

The core objective of this action is to tackle the impact of disinformation flows on conflict dynamics and to strengthen resilience of conflict-affected states and societies. Projects to be funded under this action will be designed and implemented taking into account the risk of inadvertently fuelling divisions and tensions within the countries of implementation. They will also seek to ensure that activities aim to support sustainable capacities, mechanisms and frameworks to strengthen resilience to disinformation within the broader society and maximise opportunities to build peace.

Disaster Risk Reduction

Issues related to natural disaster will be taken into consideration by implementing partners in their activities and analyses, upon relevance.

3.4. Risks and Lessons Learnt

Category	Risks	Likelihood (High/ Medium/ Low)	Impact (High/ Medium/ Low)	Mitigating measures
1	The security and/or sanitary situation deteriorates, making it more difficult to conduct activities and to work with international staff in	M	M	Implementing partners will have security and risk management systems in place, will work with local staff and / or local partners who can ensure delivery of activities and will have the capacity to manage remotely if necessary. Several deliverables and activities can also be produced and managed at headquarters.

	the targeted countries.			
3	Unwillingness of authorities and other stakeholders to engage in envisaged activities hampers their effective implementation	L	M	Activities will be tailored to each context in order to ensure they respond to actual needs and are grounded in local realities. Choice of implementing partners will be made to ensure they already have established contacts and connections to ensure effective ownership.
1,3	Projects stakeholders are victim of threats to their work and safety. Certain activities are instrumentalised to infringe on the human rights situation in countries, notably freedom of expression and association.	L	H	Stakeholders involved in the design and implementation of activities will jointly develop the appropriate risk management frameworks to anticipate and respond to security threats. Implementing partners will carefully monitor the impact of their activities to ensure they do no harm. Regular context monitoring will also ensure that implementing partners stay alert to changes in the contexts of intervention and can take effective preventive mitigation measures.

Lessons Learnt:

This action builds on the recent experiences and lessons from several Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace-funded projects and from the collective body of work that is emerging in the peacebuilding and media-disinformation sector:

- Multi-stakeholder partnerships are critical to foster collaboration straddling different types of expertise, mandates and responsibilities. Different actors have different leverage for action and influence at local, national and global levels. Projects to be funded under this action will seek to create or strengthen those partnerships in the countries of intervention.
- A sound and thriving media sector is fundamental to address disinformation in the long run. For the public to trust information providers, they need to be perceived as reliable sources of information. Support in terms of capacity building, production and broadcast will be provided to the media actors at all levels to foster independent and investigative journalism in countries of intervention.
- Technical fixes to challenges like harmful content online should not be considered as the only solutions to inherently political struggles. In order to maximise their potential to mitigate violence and build peaceful and resilient societies, technology based responses should be informed by broader and context-specific analyses of conflict dynamics and peace-building strategies when appropriate.

3.5. The Intervention Logic

The underlying intervention logic for this action is that:

- . IF the EU strengthen capacities of in-country media actors, civil society, social media companies and relevant authorities to better understand disinformation flows and foster collaboration among themselves to tackle disinformation flows, THEN conflict-affected societies will become more resilient BECAUSE they will have access to more reliable and fact based information.
- . IF we sensitise mediation actors and social media companies about the threats of harmful content online on peace processes and if we provide the space for them to identify and implement responses, THEN conflict affected states and societies will be able to effectively transition out of fragility BECAUSE the integrity and legitimacy of peace processes will be secured and promoted.

3.6. Logical Framework Matrix

Results	Results chain (a): Main expected results (maximum 10)	Indicators (a): (at least one indicator per expected result)	Baselines (values and years)	Targets (values and years)	Sources of data	Assumptions
Impact	To strengthen resilience of conflict-affected societies to disinformation and online harm.	Levels of disinformation penetration in selected countries	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	<i>Not applicable</i>
Outcome 1	1 In-country capacities to detect, monitor and respond to disinformation are strengthened.	1.1 Number of actions taken to curb disinformation and harmful online content; 1.2 Regulatory and/or normative frameworks adopted at national and global levels.	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	
Outcome 2	2 Peace processes are protected from disinformation and other harmful content online.	2.1 Number of actions taken to curb effects of harmful online content on peace processes; 2.2 Regulatory and/or normative frameworks adopted at national and global levels, relating specifically to peace processes.	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	
Output 1 related to Outcome 1	1.1 disinformation flows are detected, analysed and monitored;	1.1.1 Number of analytical and monitoring mechanisms put in place/supported in each countries of interventions; 1.1.2 Number of reports produced.	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	
Output 2 related to Outcome 1	1.2 fact-based and reliable information is produced and broadcasted by independent media actors. ;	1.2.1 Number of media actors taking part in trainings and capacity building activities; 1.2.2 Number of media content produced in each countries of intervention. 1.2.3 Levels of audience/outreach for each supported media;	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	
Output 3 related to Outcome 1	1.3 civil society organisations, researchers and relevant state bodies capacities to tackle disinformation are strengthened;	1.3.1 Number of civil society actors taking part in trainings and capacity building activities; 1.3.2 Number of civil society actors involved in monitoring and debunking activities;	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	

Output 4 related to Outcome 1	1.4 appropriate measures to tackle disinformation are taken by social media platforms.	1.4.1 Level of interactions between platforms, media and civil society actors in each country of intervention; 1.4.2 Number of actions undertaken by platforms to curb online disinformation.	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	
Output 1 related to Outcome 2	2.1 policies that minimise harm to peace processes are adopted and implemented by social media platforms;	2.1.1 Number of policies and frameworks adopted by the platforms, globally and country-specific; 2.1.2 Number of actions undertaken by platforms to curb the effects of harmful content online on processes; 2.1.3 Level of resources/capacities dedicated to tackle the effects of harmful content online on processes.	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	
Output 2 related to Outcome 2	2.2 social media peace agreements are adopted by conflict parties;	2.2.1 Number of social media peace agreements adopted; 2.2.2 Duration of validity of the social media peace agreements;	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	
Output 3 related to Outcome 2	2.3 enhanced capacity of mediators to understand and address social media risks, and to utilise social media's potential to enhance mediation practice	2.3.1 Number of mediators/peacebuilding practitioners taking part in capacity building and lessons learning activities; 2.3.2 Number of actions taken by other stakeholders to protect peace processes from harmful content online.	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	To be defined at project level	

4. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

4.1. Financing Agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not envisaged to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country.

4.2. Indicative Implementation Period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 3 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 60 months from the date of adoption by the Commission of this Financing Decision.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's responsible authorising officer by amending this Financing Decision and the relevant contracts and agreements.

4.3. Implementation Modalities

The Commission will ensure that the EU appropriate rules and procedures for providing financing to third parties are respected, including review procedures, where appropriate, and compliance of the action with EU restrictive measures¹⁶.

4.3.1. Direct Management (Grants)

Grants: (direct management)

(a) Purpose of the grant(s)

The grants will contribute to achieving specific objective 2 "Peace processes are protected from disinformation and other harmful content online".

(b) Type of applicants targeted

The type of applicants targeted are international non-governmental and not for profit organisations.

(c) Justification of a direct grant

Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to international non-governmental and not for profit organisations selected using the following criteria: expertise on mediation and longstanding experience working on peace processes; experience and operational capacity to work in the countries of intervention; experience and track record of engaging social media platforms on peace and conflict issues; experience working on disinformation in conflict-affected contexts; capacity and credibility to foster collaborations with other mediation practitioners at country and global level.

Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because the objective pursued under this action requires specific specialisation and expertise in mediation and a good knowledge of and experience working with social media platforms, as per article 195, paragraphs a) and f) of the Financial Regulation.

4.3.2. Indirect Management

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with an entity, which will be selected by the Commission's services using the following criteria: experience working on disinformation in conflict-affected contexts; experience working with a broad range of actors, notably the media sector, international NGOs and local civil society organisations, state bodies; operational capacity in the countries of interventions; capacity to engage on

¹⁶ www.sanctionsmap.eu. Please note that the sanctions map is an IT tool for identifying the sanctions regimes. The source of the sanctions stems from legal acts published in the Official Journal (OJ). In case of discrepancy between the published legal acts and the updates on the website it is the OJ version that prevails.

these topics at the global policy level. The implementation by this entity entails strengthening in-country capacities to detect, monitor and respond to disinformation.

4.3.3. Changes from indirect to direct management mode (and vice versa) due to exceptional circumstances (one alternative second option)

In case the selection of implementing partners as per the criteria and conditions set out above might not prove successful, changes from indirect to direct management mode, and vice versa will provide the possibility to identify other types of applicants according to the same criteria.

4.4. Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

4.5. Indicative Budget

Indicative Budget components	EU contribution (amount in EUR)
Objective/Output 2 composed of	
Grants (direct management) – cf. section 4.3.1	1 000 000
Objective/Outputs 1 composed of	
Indirect management – cf. section 4.3.2	4 000 000
Evaluation – cf. section 5.2 Audit – cf. section 5.3	will be covered by another Decision
Communication and visibility – cf. section 6	N.A.
Contingencies	0
Total	5 000 000

4.6. Organisational Set-up and Responsibilities

The action is managed by the European Commission's Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI) as contracting authority, in collaboration with the European External Action Service (EEAS) and relevant EU Delegations. Relevant other services will be regularly updated in order to ensure synergies at the EU level. Implementing partners will establish and implement the necessary management and coordination mechanisms that will ensure regular information exchange within the respective projects funded under this action.

As part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests of the Union, the Commission may participate in the above governance structures set up for governing the implementation of the action.

5. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

5.1. Monitoring and Reporting

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process, and part of the implementing partner's responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the

action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (Outputs and direct Outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the logframe matrix (for project modality) and the partner's strategy, policy or reform action plan list (for budget support).

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

Roles and responsibilities for data collection, analysis and monitoring:

The selected implementing partners will be responsible to collect, analyse and monitor data based on a monitoring and evaluation plan developed prior to the start of the implementation of activities. The monitoring and implementation plan will include a baseline assessment of performance indicators. Indicator values will be measured on a country-by-country and on an aggregated basis.

5.2. Evaluation

Having regard to the nature of the action, a final evaluation will not be carried out for this action or its components. In case an evaluation is not planned, the Commission may, during implementation, decide to undertake such an evaluation for duly justified reasons either on its own decision or on the initiative of the partner.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders following the best practice of evaluation dissemination¹⁷. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a Financing Decision.

5.3. Audit and Verifications

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audit or verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

6. COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY

Communication and visibility is a contractual obligation for all entities implementing EU-funded external actions to advertise the European Union's support for their work to the relevant audiences.

To that end they must comply with the instructions given in the [Communication and Visibility Requirements of 2018](#) (or any successor document), notably with regard to the use of the EU emblem and the elaboration of a dedicated communication and visibility plan, to be completed for every action at the start of implementation.

These obligations apply equally, regardless of whether the actions concerned are implemented by the Commission, the partner country (for instance, concerning the reforms supported through budget support), contractors, grant beneficiaries or entrusted entities. In each case, a reference to the relevant contractual obligations must be included in the respective financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

Communication and visibility measures may be funded from the amounts allocated to the action. For the purpose of enhancing the visibility of the EU and its contribution to this action, the Commission may sign or enter into joint declarations or statements, as part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests of the Union. Visibility and communication measures should also promote transparency and accountability on the use of funds.

Effectiveness of communication activities on awareness about the action and its objectives as well as on EU funding of the action should be measured.

Implementing partners shall keep the Commission and concerned EU Delegation/Office fully informed of the planning and implementation of specific visibility and communication activities before work starts. Implementing

¹⁷ See best [practice of evaluation dissemination](#)

partners will ensure adequate visibility of EU financing and will report on visibility and communication actions as well as the results of the overall action to the relevant monitoring committees.

APPENDIX 1 REPORTING IN OPSYS

An Intervention¹⁸ (also generally called project/programme) is the operational entity associated to a coherent set of activities and results structured in a logical framework aiming at delivering development change or progress. Interventions are the most effective (hence optimal) entities for the operational follow-up by the Commission of its external development operations. As such, Interventions constitute the base unit for managing operational implementations, assessing performance, monitoring, evaluation, internal and external communication, reporting and aggregation.

Primary Interventions are those contracts or groups of contracts bearing reportable results and respecting the following business rule: 'a given contract can only contribute to one primary intervention and not more than one'. An individual contract that does not produce direct reportable results and cannot be logically grouped with other result reportable contracts is considered a 'support entities'. The addition of all primary interventions and support entities is equivalent to the full development portfolio of the Institution.

Primary Interventions are identified during the design of each action by the responsible service (Delegation or Headquarters operational Unit).

The level of the Primary Intervention is defined in the related Action Document and it is revisable; it can be a(n) (group of) action(s) or a (group of) contract(s).

Tick in the left side column one of the three possible options for the level of definition of the Primary Intervention(s) identified in this action.

In the case of 'Group of actions' level, add references to the present action and other action concerning the same Primary Intervention.

In the case of 'Contract level', add the reference to the corresponding budgetary items in point 4.5, Indicative Budget.

Option 1: Action level		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single action	Present action: all contracts in the present action
Option 2: Group of actions level		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Group of actions	Actions reference (CRIS#/OPSYS#):
Option 3: Contract level		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 1	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 2	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 3	
	(...)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Group of contracts 1	

¹⁸ [ARES \(2021\)4204912](#) - For the purpose of consistency between terms in OPSYS, DG INTPA, DG NEAR and FPI have harmonised 5 key terms, including 'action' and 'Intervention' where an 'action' is the content (or part of the content) of a Commission Financing Decision and 'Intervention' is a coherent set of activities and results which constitutes an effective level for the operational follow-up by the EC of its operations on the ground. See more on the [concept of intervention](#).