

EN
ANNEX II

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	Enhance EU and Local Capabilities for Early Warning and Conflict Analysis OSPYS 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 AREAS AND SECTOR INFORMATION	
6. Priority Area(s), sectors	Peace, Stability, Conflict Prevention
7. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	Main SDG : 16 Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies

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).

²Regulation (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).

8 a) DAC code(s) ³	15220 Civilian peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution			
8 b) Main Delivery Channel @	21000 International non-governmental organisations (NGO)			
9. Targets ⁴	<input type="checkbox"/> Migration <input type="checkbox"/> Climate <input type="checkbox"/> Social inclusion and Human Development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity <input type="checkbox"/> Education ⁵ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Human Rights, Democracy and Governance ⁶			
10. Markers ⁷ (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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>	
11. Internal markers ⁸ and Tags ⁹ :	Policy objectives	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Digitalisation @ Tags: digital connectivity digital governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

³ 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>

⁴ Actual contribution to targets will be confirmed ex-post based on a standardised methodology.

⁵ This target is specific to INTPA.

⁶ Thematic target for geographic programmes (at least 15%) in delegated act.

⁷ 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).

⁸ 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)

⁹ Methodology for additional tagging providing granularity on internal markers is under development.

	digital entrepreneurship job creation digital skills/literacy digital services		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input 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(s): BGUE – B2021-14.020230-C1 – STABILITY AND PEACE Total estimated cost: EUR 2 700 000 Total amount of EU budget contribution EUR 2 700 000			
MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION				
12. Type of financing and implementation modality(ies)	Project Modality Direct management through: - Grants			

1.2. Summary of the Action

As a global actor, the EU promotes prevention and resolution of conflicts as a means to support peace and prosperity around the world. Moreover, the prevention of atrocity crimes (genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and ethnic cleansing) is a key priority for the EU's action around the world.

Effective conflict prevention and resolution, related processes of peacebuilding, as well as prevention of mass atrocity crimes, rely upon a sound understanding of conflict situations and drivers. For this reason, the EU promotes the systematic use of conflict analysis, notably in fragile and conflict-affected countries, to inform its decision-making and its programming and tries to continuously improve its capacity in this field. At the same time, the EU seeks to strengthen local capacities for conflict analyses, early warning and conflict sensitive approaches contributing to the development of methodologies that can be used by regional partners, civil society, local communities and authorities.

This Action aims to enhance capabilities, tools and methodologies of the EU and local actors in non-EU countries to detect early signs of conflict, analyse conflict risk data and develop options for prevention and response to conflicts, including mass atrocity crimes. It will do so by increasing local and global awareness of conflict risks; enhancing EU tools and methodologies for data collection, conflict analysis and early warning, including in relation to mass atrocity crimes; developing in-country capacities and tools to detect, monitor, analyse and respond to conflict risks; address conflict drivers through conflict sensitive approach; and enhancing cooperation between key local and global stakeholders to identify strategies to prevent and address conflict risks.

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Context

Preserving peace, preventing conflict and strengthening international security is part of the European Union's (EU) core mandate, as set out in Article 21 of the Treaty of the European Union (TEU). In line with this and with the European Commission's priority for a Stronger Europe in the World, the EU Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe contributes to preserving peace, preventing conflicts and strengthening international security.

The EU is also strongly committed to promote the Responsibility to Protect (R2P)¹⁰ to prevent genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. As part of this commitment, the EU aims to address root causes that trigger crises; to contribute to the stabilisation of fragile countries and to prevent conflict.

Effective conflict prevention relies upon reliable analytical data, as well as upon a sound understanding of conflict situations (root causes, actors and scenarios). The EU promotes the systematic use of conflict analysis, notably in fragile and conflict-affected countries. Conflict analysis can usefully inform decision-making at different levels, as it can facilitate a common understanding of the crises among all EU actors and enhance identification of the range of options for EU action. In this way, conflict analysis can make EU diplomacy, missions and development cooperation more relevant, more effective and potentially more influential.

To be effective and provide added value, conflict analysis needs to be

- joint - with active participation of relevant EU actors;
- integrated - considering relevant economic, political, climate and environmental, social and security dynamics and trends that may escalate or drive violent conflict;
- evidence-based - focus on risks that are known to increase the possibility of violent conflict; and

timely - ideally initiated at the earliest signs or warning of future violent conflict or tension; and iterative. The *2020 guidance note on the use of conflict analysis in support of EU external action*¹¹, which updates the 2013 EU guidance note on the use of conflict analysis in support of EU external action, introduces the key principles of conflict analysis, the definition of conflict sensitivity and presents the methodology for conducting a comprehensive EU-led conflict analysis. The *Technical User's Guide: Conflict Analysis Screenings* serves as the methodological guide for the (approximately 60) conflict analysis screenings that are scheduled for 2020-2022, as a response to the NDICI requirement for conflict analysis in fragile and conflict-affected countries. Moreover, the *Joint Staff Working Document – the EU conflict Early Warning System: objectives, process and guidance for implementation 2020*¹² presents the EU Conflict Early Warning System (EWS). The EWS is a robust risk management tool that identifies, assesses and helps to prioritise situations at risk of violent conflict in non-EU countries. The EWS draws upon evidence-based risk factors, e.g. an economic shock or shrinking political space, adopting a time horizon of four years. The system also identifies conflict prevention and peace building opportunities.

Finally, the *EU Responsibility to Protect Atrocity Prevention Toolkit*¹³ proposes specific tools to help EU staff and their partners implement the global commitment of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and the Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes developed by the United Nations (UN) Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect¹⁴. The toolkit represents an important instrument for the EU to recognise and respond to atrocity crimes (genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and ethnic cleansing).

¹⁰ <https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/about-responsibility-to-protect.shtml>

¹¹ [guidance note on eu conflict analysis final -280421.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#)

¹² http://eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/jswd_eu_early_ews_from_vista.pdf

¹³ [eu_r2p_atrocity_prevention_toolkit.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#)

¹⁴ [Doc.3 Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes_EN.pdf \(un.org\)](#)

2.2. Problem Analysis

Short problem analysis:

Conflict analyses are essential for the EU to i) shape conflict prevention and conflict resolution efforts; ii) ensure effective and conflict-sensitive engagement in countries at risk of violent conflict; iii) strengthen coherence and coordination of its actions in line with the 'Integrated Approach to conflicts and crises';¹⁵ and iv) inform analytical processes, EU foreign policy and programming decisions relating to countries at risk of violence or ongoing violent conflict. In order to be effective and to provide added value the analysis needs to be joint, integrated, evidence-based, timely and iterative.

In order to be evidence-based, EU conflict analysis needs reliable, comprehensive and timely quantitative and qualitative data as well as a robust analysis of these data to determine conflict dynamics, drivers of conflict, the role of stakeholders and possible future scenarios. It is therefore crucial for the EU to build its capacities and at the same time enhance partnerships for more effective conflict analysis. As underlined by the external evaluation of the EU's Support to Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding 2013-2018¹⁶, it is crucial for the EU to undertake conflict analysis in a proactive and regular way, work with local actors in partner countries and help reinforce their capacities as a corner stone of any conflict prevention and peacebuilding strategy. Prevention of mass atrocity crimes (genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and ethnic cleansing) is crucial and detection and recognition of early signs is crucial to plan and implement preventative actions.

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

This Action will target EU policy-makers and institutions including the European Commission, European Parliament, EEAS, and EU Member States, in particular through the Council of the European Union. By supporting the dissemination of open-source information, the action will contribute to strengthening the global risk awareness benefiting the entire international community engaged in issues related to conflict prevention and peace.

Stakeholders include national and local civil society actors. The main intended final beneficiaries of the action are the civilians who live in conflict-affected areas and fragile countries, in particular vulnerable populations including children, women and minority groups.

On mass atrocity crimes, the UN Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect constitutes a crucial stakeholder. The Office supports two Special Advisers who report directly to the United Nations Secretary-General: the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide, and the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect, who leads the conceptual, political, institutional and operational development of the Responsibility to Protect.

The Global Network of R2P Focal Points represents a wide range of states with varying degrees of economic development and widely divergent histories in relation to atrocity crimes, armed conflict, and the protection and promotion of human rights. Across the network there are currently 14 members in Africa, six in the Asia-Pacific, seven in Latin America, three in North America, two in the Middle East, 12 in Eastern Europe and 17 in Western Europe. At least 18 of these countries have had direct experience with atrocities and identity-based conflict over the last few decades, and three of them are currently experiencing atrocity crimes.

A number of international civil society organisations focus on the prevention of mass atrocity crimes.

¹⁵ Council Conclusions on the integrated approach (January 2018) <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-5413-2018-INIT/en/pdf>

¹⁶ https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/external-evaluation-eus-support-conflict-prevention-and-peacebuilding-2013-2018_en

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

3.1. Objectives and Expected Outputs

The Overall Objective of this action is to enhance capabilities, tools and methodologies of the EU and third country national and local actors to detect early signs of conflict, analyse conflict risk data and develop options for prevention and response to conflicts, including mass atrocity crimes.

The Specific Objectives of this action are to

1. Increase local and global awareness of conflict risks, tools and methodologies for conflict analysis, conflict sensitivity and early warning, including in relation to mass atrocity crimes;
2. Support third country national and local actors to gain knowledge, skills and tools to detect, analyse and monitor risks of conflict and develop options for concrete early action/response and prevention;
3. Enhance cooperation between key local, national and global stakeholders to identify strategies to prevent and address conflict risks.

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

- 1.1 contributing to Specific Objective 1: Local and global stakeholders, including the EU, have access and use information on risks of violent conflicts, including mass atrocity crimes;
- 2.1 contributing to Specific Objective 2: In-country capacities and tools are available to detect, monitor, analyse and respond to conflict risks;
- 3.1 contributing to Specific Objective 3: More systematic exchanges of information and analysis between EU policy-makers, civil society organisations, the EU Early Warning Early Action Forum, as well as among EU staff on early warning and early actions take place, resulting in increased input from non-state actors of field-based information to policy-makers at EU and national level.

3.2. Indicative Activities

Activities related to Output 1.

- Robust, timely and relevant analyses of conflict risks with integrated inputs from local-level sources, and in line with the *2020 guidance note on the use of conflict analysis in support of EU external action, as well as the Technical User's Guide: Conflict Analysis Screenings*.
- ;
- Analysis and research on the risk of mass atrocity crimes.

Activities related to Output 2.

- Establishment of in-country observatories to detect, monitor and analyse risks of conflicts;
- Organisation of capacity building initiatives for civil society actors (including local journalists, human rights defenders and academics) engaged in detecting and monitoring signs of mass atrocity crimes.

Activities related to Output 3.

- Organisation of exchanges between local and global actors to discuss analysis and recommendations in relation to specific countries/contexts;
- Organisation of exchanges between local and global actors to discuss tools and methodologies to carry out analysis and identify possible response options.

3.3. Mainstreaming

Environmental Protection & Climate Change

The relationship between climate change and conflict is still being analysed and is recognised as being quite complex and multi-layered. On one side, the effects of climate change can cause sudden and unplanned movements of people, which then can cause competition over the use and availability of resources, use of land and housing. Vice-versa, conflicts often create displacements (both internally as well as across borders), which can put the environment and limited natural resources under stress. Indicators related to the effects of climate change have been recently introduced in conflict analysis methodologies. The EU itself has started to consider them in its own conflict analysis screenings and Early Warning System. This Action will consider these reflections and elements.

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 include the analysis of the impact that sexual and gender-based violence can have during conflict and, more broadly, during political violence. It will also consider the role that women have or could have in conflict prevention. The implementing partners will gather data around violence targeting women and girls and will include a gender-sensitive component in their analyses. Moreover, the networks of local partners developed by the Action will include women's organisations and/or women's members of selected organisations. The Action will also aim to integrate the existing Atrocity Prevention Toolkit by including an addendum that focuses specifically on gender and protection of women and girls.

Human Rights

Conflicts represent a significant challenge to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Violations of human rights are often considered as indicators of potential risks of conflict; moreover, violation of human rights themselves can be a conflict trigger. The Action will rely on the international human rights framework as reference framework for all types of analyses. Thus doing, the activities implemented through the Action will be able to gather and analyse a consistent amount of data on human rights violations in the selected areas.

Prevention of mass atrocity crimes (genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing) is highly dependent on the early detection of signs. Atrocity crimes do not happen as sudden, individual or random events, but are the results of a process whose warning signs or indicators can be identified in/on time. These signs and indicators are described in the Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes developed by the United Nations (UN) Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect¹⁷ and in the European Union (EU) Responsibility to Protect Atrocity Prevention Toolkit¹⁸.

Disability

As per OECD Disability DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this action is labelled as D0. This implies that project activities 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

The Treaty of the European Union recognises that in its relation with the wider world, the EU shall uphold and promote its values, including democracy, human rights, rule of law. The EU Global Strategy for Foreign and Security Policy and the New European Consensus on Development recognise the importance of ensuring that the EU's external action is conflict sensitive, especially in fragile contexts. It also confirms that exclusion, inequality, impunity and absence of the rule of law are primary drivers of conflict. In line with the EU political and policy framework, this Action will contribute to enhance democracy and rule of law by providing robust and timely conflict analyses and recommendations on how to prevent conflict and atrocity crimes.

Conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience

This action will contribute to enhance the capacity of both the EU and its local partners to carry out conflict analysis in a robust, timely and inclusive way and to integrate the results and recommendations of this analysis into programming and policy and political dialogue. Moreover, the action will contribute to develop local mechanisms and practitioners' networks for conflict analysis and early working and therefore will enhance local resilience and capacity to prevent conflicts.

Disaster Risk Reduction

Data related to natural disaster will be taken into consideration by implementing partners in their analyses.

¹⁷ [Doc.3 Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes EN.pdf \(un.org\)](#)

¹⁸ European External Action Service, September 2018, EU Responsibility to Protect – Atrocity Prevention Toolkit [eu_r2p_atrocity_prevention_toolkit.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#)

3.4. Risks and Lessons Learnt

Category	Risks	Likelihood (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Mitigating measures
1, 3	The security and political situation in selected countries deteriorates and local partners are not allowed or not able to carry out conflict analysis and data gathering without risks to people's lives.	M	H	Flexibility will be embedded in the design of the action so that sufficient levels of analysis can still take place regardless of the security situation. Partner organisations will regularly assess risks and will build in the necessary contingency plans as well as the necessary coping measures to ensure effective and timely implementation.
4	Partner organisations will not have access to quality data and will therefore struggle to produce relevant analyses.	M	M	One purpose of the action will be to support local organisations to develop tools and methodologies to gather and analyse data. Differentiation will be crucial to ensure availability of data and regularity of processes.
2	A high number of tools are put in place duplicating analyses and developing contradictory messages.	L	M	Partner organisations will fully assess the operational context and will assess which synergies can be built with other organisations operating in or on the same country/context.
2, 5	COVID-19 restrictions do not allow the gathering of data or the organisation of exchanges.	L	H	Partner organisations will be able to rely on virtual tools and platforms for both the gathering of data as well as for exchanges with other local and global actors.

Lessons Learnt:

Conflict analysis and conflict sensitivity have become essential elements of the EU's external action. One of the recommendations of the external evaluation of the EU's Support to Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding 2013-2018¹⁹ has been for the EU to develop conflict sensitivity in a more proactive way and to embed it more deeply into its external action. Two main lessons have been identified by the EU to improve its capacity and work on conflict analysis, early warning, and conflict prevention.

The first refers to the need for the EU to complement its structural risk assessments with more 'dynamic' data, such as recent events, riots and protests, and political violence. These data could help the EU better capture the complexity of conflict situations by analysing short-term changes in conflict dynamics, other types of violence than casualties, new or unknown actors, etc.

The second lesson refers to the need for the EU to work bottom-up and complement its analysis with inputs provided for example by civil society organisations on the basis of data collected at grassroots level. This would also allow the EU to better capture different perspectives on existing or emerging crises and conflicts and, at the same time, to develop local capacities for conflict analysis and conflict prevention, through for example national/local conflict

¹⁹ https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/external-evaluation-eus-support-conflict-prevention-and-peacebuilding-2013-2018_en

barometers, monitoring and critical discourse analysis in media or public discourse, observatories of conflict risk variables (including climate change and environment), etc.

3.5. The Intervention Logic

The underlying intervention logic for this action is the following:

IF local and global stakeholders, including the EU, are better informed and equipped for managing risks of violent conflicts, including mass atrocity crimes, and

IF in-country civil society have the knowledge, skills and tools to detect, analyse and monitor risks of conflict and develop options for concrete early action/response and prevention, and

IF more systematic exchanges of information and analysis take place between EU policy-makers and civil society organisations and among EU staff on early warning and early actions,

THEN the EU, as well as international and third country national and local actors will have better capabilities, tools and methodologies to detect early signs of conflict, analyse conflict risk data AND will be able to better develop options for prevention and response to conflicts, including mass atrocities.

This is BECAUSE the collection and analysis of data by local, national and global stakeholders are crucial to develop options to prevent and respond to conflicts and mass atrocity crimes; and BECAUSE creating and supporting the development of local capacities in fragile countries and contexts leads to better data and better analysis, as demonstrated by the tools and processes that the EU currently uses.

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 enhance capabilities, tools and methodologies of the EU and third country local actors to detect early signs of conflict, analyse conflict risk data and develop options for prevention and response to conflicts, including mass atrocity crimes.		To be defined	To be defined		<i>Not applicable</i>
Outcome 1	Local and global stakeholders, including the EU have access and use information on risks of violent conflicts, including mass atrocity crimes.	Number of studies and research carried out to develop methodologies and tools for conflict analysis and early warning Increased awareness of EU staff on risks of violent conflicts, including mass atrocity crimes				Continuous political buy-in and engagement of the EU policy-makers in conflict early warning, including in relation to atrocity mass crimes.
Outcome 2	In-country civil society have the knowledge, skills and tools to detect, analyse and monitor risks of conflict and develop options for concrete early action/response and prevention.	Number of local initiatives established to detect, monitor and analyse risk factors Increased knowledge of local actors according to self-assessments				Existence of a pool of civil society actors at country level that can perform a conflict prevention/early warning role. The security and political situation in selected countries allows civil society organisations to perform such role without risks to people's lives.

Outcome 3	More systematic exchanges of information and analysis between EU policy-makers and civil society organisations as well as among EU staff on early warning and early actions, resulting in increased input from non-state actors' field-based information to policy-makers at EU and national level.	Level of inputs from local-level analysis into policy making as assessed by local and global stakeholders				Continuous commitment and engagement of local, national and international stakeholders, in particular EU policy-makers, in conflict early warning related activities.
Output 1.1 related to Outcome 1	Robust, timely and relevant analysis of conflict risks which integrated inputs from local-level sources is available for local and global stakeholders	Quality of conflict risk analysis as assessed by local and global stakeholders				
Output 1.2 related to Outcome 1	Analysis and research are produced on the risk of mass atrocity crimes	Number of analysis products on the risk of mass atrocity crimes				
Output 2.1 related to Outcome 2	In-country observatories are established to detect, monitor and analyse risks of conflicts	Number of observatories Number of organisations involved in the observatories				
Output 2.2 related to Outcome 2	Capacity building initiatives are organised for civil society actors (including local journalists, human rights defenders and academics) engaged in detecting and monitoring signs of mass atrocity crimes	Number of capacity building events on atrocity crimes in support of civil society at country/regional level				
Output 3.1 related to Outcome 3	Exchanges are organised between local and global actors to discuss analysis and recommendations in relation to specific countries/contexts	Number of exchanges between the EU and civil society organisations on conflict risks, prevention and response actions				
Output 3.2 related to Outcome 3	Exchanges are organised between local and global actors to discuss tools and methodologies to carry out analysis and identify possible response options	Number of exchanges between the EU and civil society organisations on tools and methodologies				

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/regional organisation/territory.

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 measures²⁰.

Part of this action may utilise a form of financing not linked to costs but linked to the achievement of results measured by reference to previously set performance indicators.

4.3.1. Direct Management (Grants)

Grants: (direct management)

(a) Purpose of the grants

The grants will contribute to achieving specific objectives indicated in section 3.1.

(b) Type of applicants targeted

The type of applicants targeted for these direct awards are 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 non-governmental and not for profit organisations selected using the following criteria: capacity to produce disaggregated, locally informed, political violence and protest data and analysis globally in real time for academic, policy, and public use; capacity to analyse and monitor situations where populations are at risk of potential mass atrocity crimes; experience in producing reports, analysis and recommendations on conflict risks in specific countries; past experience in supporting and developing local partners on conflict analysis, early warning and conflict monitoring.

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 action requires specific technical competence, specialisation and expertise in analysis of conflict risk data and capacity development of local stakeholders in this field, as per article 195, paragraphs a) and f) of the Financial Regulation.

²⁰ 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.

4.3.2. Indirect Management with an international organisation

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: capacity to manage a multi-donor fund, policy coordination capacity; consolidated experience in building partnerships with governmental and non-governmental stakeholders; and technical capacity to operate and develop international data quality standards. The implementation by this entity entails coordinating with other early warning related funding by the EU and with strategic policy goals and priorities among different stakeholders for more effective early action; bringing together stakeholders from science and academia, data scientists and analysts, end-users and practitioners to develop innovative, scientifically validated predictive models and data-driven solutions for crisis/conflict prevention; sharing expertise to avoid duplication of efforts and investments.

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)
Objectives 1, 2 and 3	
Grants – total envelope under section 4.3.1	2 200 000
Objectives 1 and 3	
Indirect management with an international organisation	500 000
Totals	2 700 000

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.

In order to promote synergies with other actions, other relevant Commission services and the EEAS will be regularly updated.

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:

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, an 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 other key stakeholders following the best practice of evaluation dissemination²¹. 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

²¹ 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 Intervention²² (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 entity’. 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.

N.B. An individual Contract that does not produce direct reportable results and cannot be logically grouped with other result reportable Contracts is considered a ‘support measure’.

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	

²² 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](#)