



Peaceful
and Resilient
Borderlands
Programme

PEACEFUL AND RESILIENCE BORDERLANDS PROGRAMME (PRBP)

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS)



Co-funded by
the European Union



Indicator Table of Contents

Indicator: No. 1. Number of Conflict Incidents Reported	4
Indicator: No. 2. Percentage change in the number of violent conflict incidents over the reporting period	6
Indicator: No. 3. Conflict Intensity Index Score (based on frequency of incidents, number of fatalities, and scale of displacement)	8
Indicator: No. 4. GEF 2.23 Number of state institutions and non-state actors supported by the EU on security, border management and conflict prevention	10
Indicator: No. 5. GEF 2.24 Number of people directly benefiting from EU-supported interventions that specifically aim to support civilian post-conflict peacebuilding and/or conflict intervention	12
Indicator: No. 6. Extent to which cross-border coordination mechanisms between development, humanitarian and political actors (EU and MS, UN, etc.) have been established/reinforced by the EU-funded intervention	14
Indicator: No. 7. Percentage of targeted stakeholders (government officials, civil society, and local community institutions) who report being aware of IGAD cross-border policies or protocols	16
Indicator: No. 1.1.1. Number of joint cross-border coordination meetings held	18
Indicator: No. 1.1.2. Number of conflict and early warning alerts issued and responded to through coordinated action.....	20
Indicator: No. 1.1.3. Percentage of stakeholders who perceive that the intervention has enhanced inclusivity and participation in conflict management processes	22
Indicator: No. 1.2.1. Percentage of institutions that have adopted and are actively using the HUSIKA early warning application	24
Indicator: No. 1.2.2. Number of additional languages into which HUSIKA early warning information products are translated and disseminated to target communities	26
Indicator: No. 1.2.3. Number of government and civil society representatives trained through EU-funded interventions who demonstrate improved knowledge of early warning systems	28
Indicator: No. 2.1.1. Number of key policy documents translated into at least one local language and disseminated to target populations to enhance awareness and accessibility	30
Indicator: No. 2.1.2. Number of joint sensitization meetings conducted with target stakeholders (national government, local authorities, local chambers of commerce, and local NGO coordination bodies) to promote awareness and alignment on cross-border initiatives.....	32
Indicator: No. 2.1.3. Number of individuals reached through awareness and media campaigns	34
Indicator: No. 2.1.4. Percentage of stakeholders who report being aware of the existence and relevance of Informal Cross-Border Trade (ICBT), the Simplified Trade Regime (STR), and the Livestock Identification and Traceability System (LITS).....	36
Indicator: No. 3.1.1. Number of stakeholders actively engaged in the co-development of a joint actionable roadmap for the sustainable management of transboundary natural resources.	38
Indicator: No. 3.1.2. Number of transboundary natural resource management mechanisms that are formally established, operational, and demonstrating sustainable practices	40
Indicator: No. 4.1.1. Number of multi-level coordination meetings convened to enhance cross-border and inter-institutional collaboration	42
Indicator: No. 4.1.2. Coordination architecture established, formalized, and endorsed by implementing partners (IPs), the EU, and GIZ for effective joint planning and implementation	44
Indicator: No. 4.1.3. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework developed, validated, and operationalized	46
Indicator: No. 4.1.4. Knowledge Management Framework established and functioning	48
Indicator: No. 4.1.5. Number of EU-supported communication products developed and disseminated to target stakeholders to enhance awareness and engagement.....	50
Indicator: No. 4.1.6. Percentage of targeted stakeholders who report having used EU-supported communication products to inform their decisions, actions, or awareness	52
Indicator: No. 4.2.1. Number of visits to the IGAD Knowledge Management (KM) platform.....	54

Indicator: No. 4.2.2. Percentage of IGAD Knowledge Management (KM) platform users who report applying knowledge acquired from the platform to inform their work, planning, or decision-making.....56

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa Output: N/A Result: N/A Indicator: No. 1. Number of Conflict Incidents Reported
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): This indicator captures the number of conflict incidents that are both reported and verified within the designated programme areas over a defined period. A <i>conflict incident</i> is defined as a distinct event involving violence or credible threats of violence between individuals, groups, or communities that disrupt peace, public order, or stability. These incidents are often driven by political, ethnic, resource-based, or inter-communal tensions. A reported incident refers to any event documented through established early warning or response channels, including submissions via IGAD's Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN), national Conflict Early Warning and Response Units (CEWERUs), or authorised community-level monitors. Verification requires cross-checking through at least two independent sources or validation by IGAD's e-SCM system and its verification protocols. Included under this indicator are events such as inter-communal clashes, resource-related violence (e.g., over water, land, or grazing), cross-border attacks, political unrest involving violence, or organised group threats that create insecurity. Excluded are isolated criminal acts unrelated to broader tensions (e.g., petty theft), unverified rumours, or interpersonal disputes without communal, political, or structural drivers. The indicator does not capture peaceful demonstrations, natural disasters, or incidents lacking sufficient verification. Only incidents with a conflict dimension and validated through formal channels or recognised reporting mechanisms are counted. Unit of Measure: Count (number of incidents) Type of Indicator: Impact (with potential use at outcome level depending on context) Category of Indicator: Custom (or Context-Specific/Programme-Specific Indicator) Disaggregated by: Type of conflict, country, cluster, number of fatalities, sex, and age group of affected individuals, Time period (monthly, quarterly) Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. This indicator supports tracking of the early warning and response system effectiveness and helps assess changes in conflict dynamics over time. It provides actionable intelligence for IGAD, Member States, and partners to inform resource allocation, diplomatic responses, and resilience programming.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Desk review and extraction from CEWARN's conflict surveillance systems and incident reporting platforms. Incident verification is triangulated through local peace committees, field monitors, and cross-checking with open-source reports. Data Source(s): CEWARN Annual Conflict Incident Reports (electronic Conflict Surveillance and Mapping (e-SCM) platform); National Security and Police Data Reports; Verified incident data from humanitarian organizations (e.g., UNOCHA, UNHCR); Open-source datasets (e.g., ACLED); Community-based conflict reporting tool. Calculation of values: Simple count: Sum of verified incidents recorded in the e-SCM database over the reporting period. Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (aggregated monthly reporting preferred) Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – due to the need for verification, regular monitoring, and regional aggregation. Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: CEWARN (CEWARN Conflict Analyst)
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025 Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Underreporting in inaccessible or insecure regions; Possible data duplication from overlapping reports; Variations in verification rigor across Member States; Delayed reporting cycles affecting timeliness Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Implement harmonised reporting templates across CEWERUs; Standardise verification procedures in e-SCM; Introduce geo-tagged incident reporting; Strengthen field monitoring presence and training.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annual (next assessment: June 2026)			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk audit of reported incidents; Field-based verification of a sample of incidents; Cross-checking across CEWARN reports and national databases; Interviews with focal points in Member States			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Quarterly aggregation and comparison against prior reporting periods. Trend analysis to identify escalation or de-escalation. Mapping to identify hotspots and emerging trends.			
Presentation of Data: Data will be visualised through bar charts, maps, and trend lines in quarterly and annual reports. Summary tables by type of conflict, location, and frequency will accompany analysis.			
Review of Data: Quarterly review by CEWARN and the M&E 3 rd Part Firm, in consultation with national focal points.			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly to GIZ, EU Delegation, and other development partners through programme reports and dashboards.			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline: To be established using CEWARN/e-SCM data from 2024			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value TBD: Insert baseline value based on CEWARN or national data	Target 30% reduction in reported incidents from the 2024 baseline	Actual (To be reported quarterly)	Notes Initial data harmonisation needed before baseline is finalised.
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa Output: N/A Result: N/A Indicator: No. 2. Percentage change in the number of violent conflict incidents over the reporting period
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the proportional increase or decrease in the number of violent conflict incidents reported and verified within the designated programme areas during the current reporting period compared to the previous period. A violent conflict incident refers to a distinct and verifiable event involving the actual use of force or the credible threat of violence that disrupts peace, public order, or security within and across communities. These incidents typically stem from inter-communal, political, ethnic, or resource-based tensions and may involve armed groups, militias, or organised communal actors. Included under this indicator are events such as cross-border attacks, inter-communal clashes, politically-motivated violent events, and resource-related conflicts involving land, water, or grazing areas. All incidents must be reported through recognised early warning or response mechanisms, such as IGAD's CEWARN e-SCM platform, national CEWERUs, or authorised community monitors, and must be verified using at least two independent sources or through approved verification procedures. Excluded are isolated criminal acts (e.g., robbery, petty theft) that are not directly tied to broader conflict dynamics; interpersonal or domestic disputes without a community or structural conflict dimension; unverified rumours or incidents lacking triangulated confirmation; and non-violent events such as peaceful demonstrations or protests. Incidents related to natural disasters or accidents that do not result from deliberate conflict or violence are also excluded. Only incidents with a conflict dimension and validated through formal channels or recognised reporting mechanisms are counted. Unit of Measure: Percentage (%) Type of Indicator: Impact (with potential use at outcome level depending on context) Category of Indicator: Custom (or Context-Specific/Programme-Specific Indicator) Disaggregated by: Type of conflict, country, cluster, number of fatalities, sex, and age group of affected individuals, Time period (monthly, quarterly) Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. This indicator provides critical insight into whether violent conflict is increasing or decreasing in target areas, thereby reflecting the effectiveness of conflict prevention and response strategies and mechanisms supported by the programme. It enables IGAD, CEWARN, and stakeholders to assess the impact of programming, inform the allocation of resources, and trigger timely interventions in emerging hotspots.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Desk review and data extraction from verified incident reports logged into the e-SCM system. Incidents are triangulated through CEWERUs, field monitors, community informants, and validated open-source conflict databases. Data Source(s): CEWARN's e-SCM (electronic Conflict Surveillance and Mapping system); CEWARN Annual Conflict Incident Reports; National Security and Police Data Reports; Verified data from humanitarian agencies (e.g., UNOCHA, UNHCR); ACLED and similar open-source datasets; Community-based conflict reporting mechanisms Calculation of values: Percentage Change = ((Current Period Total–Previous Period Total) / Previous Period Total) ×100 A negative percentage indicates a reduction; a positive value indicates an increase in violent incidents. Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (based on monthly data aggregation) Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – due to verification needs and regional data coordination. Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: CEWARN (CEWARN Conflict Analyst)
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025 Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Underreporting in remote or insecure areas; Potential duplication if incidents are reported by multiple sources; Variability in data quality across Member States

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Implement harmonised reporting templates across national CEWERUs; Strengthen data validation protocols in the e-SCM platform; Deploy conflict analysts to verify high-priority incidents; Integrate geotagged reporting features

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk audits of source documents and incident logs; Field verification of selected incident samples; Review of consistency across monthly/quarterly submissions; Interviews with data collection focal points in Member States

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Data will be aggregated by quarter and analysed by location, conflict type, and frequency. Trend comparisons will be made against baseline and targets. Disaggregated data will support hotspot mapping and reporting by country and zone.

Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in quarterly and annual reports, dashboards, and summary tables. Visualisations will include maps, bar charts, and trend lines disaggregated by location and conflict type. Data may also be shared through briefings, policy notes, and partner coordination meetings.

Review of Data: Quarterly review by CEWARN and 3rd Party M&E Firm, with validation from national focal points

Reporting of Data: Quarterly – to GIZ, EU Delegation, and relevant stakeholders through programme reports and dashboards

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using CEWARN/e-SCM data from the last full year prior to programme inception. Target is to achieve a year-on-year percentage decrease in violent conflict incidents.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 CEWARN/e-SCM data)	20% decrease in incidents by Q4 2026	To be determined quarterly	Baseline under review following harmonisation of data systems

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Output: N/A

Result: N/A

Indicator: No. 3. Conflict Intensity Index Score (based on frequency of incidents, number of fatalities, and scale of displacement)

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator reflects a composite score designed to capture the intensity of conflict across programme areas based on three key dimensions: frequency of verified incidents, associated fatalities, and the scale of displacement linked to violent conflict. The Conflict Intensity Index (CII) consolidates these dimensions into a single score to allow for standardised comparison across geographic locations and over time.

Included in this index are all conflict-related incidents that meet the programme's verification standards and are logged in the e-SCM platform. These include incidents that result in fatalities, displacements of populations (temporary or prolonged), or repeated occurrences of violence in a specific locality. All data must be verified through at least two sources (e.g., CEWERUs, police reports, community monitors).

Excluded are incidents not verified through accepted mechanisms, events with no demonstrated displacement or fatal outcomes, and singular, isolated criminal events not linked to broader communal, political, or resource-driven conflict. Peaceful demonstrations and non-conflict related migration are also excluded.

Unit of Measure: Composite Index Score (numeric scale, 0–10)

Type of Indicator: Impact

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Country, cluster, type of conflict, displacement type, Time period (monthly, quarterly)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a management indicator. The Conflict Intensity Index Score enables a multidimensional analysis of conflict impacts, helping IGAD and its partners prioritise intervention zones and measure changes in violence severity. It supports early warning, peacebuilding response design, and programmatic resource allocation by identifying trends not evident through incident counts alone.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Desk-based compilation from CEWARN's e-SCM system and incident reporting sources. Data on fatalities and displacement will be cross-validated with humanitarian and government databases, including triangulation from community-based monitors, field missions, and media analysis.

Data Source(s): CEWARN e-SCM System; CEWARN Annual Reports; National CEWERU Reports; Verified humanitarian agency data (e.g., UNHCR, IOM, OCHA); Community and local authority reports; Open-source datasets (e.g., ACLED, media)

Calculation of values: The Conflict Intensity Index is computed using a weighted scoring formula:

$CII \text{ Score} = (W_1 \times \text{Incident Frequency}) + (W_2 \times \text{Fatalities}) + (W_3 \times \text{Displacement Scale})$

- Scores are normalised on a 0–10 scale using a predefined rubric.
- Weights (W_1 , W_2 , W_3) are assigned based on programmatic emphasis (e.g., $W_1 = 0.4$, $W_2 = 0.3$, $W_3 = 0.3$).

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (with monthly internal updates)

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – due to the need for layered verification and inter-agency coordination

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: CEWARN Conflict Analyst; IGAD Peace and Security M&E Division Officer

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Incomplete data on displacement (especially for short-term movements); Inconsistent fatality reporting across jurisdictions; Potential overrepresentation of areas with stronger monitoring presence; Delayed updates to humanitarian databases

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Establish direct data-sharing MOUs with humanitarian partners (UNHCR, IOM); Introduce a standardised scoring matrix in CEWARN's e-SCM platform; Train CEWERUs and partners on incident categorisation and weighting; Integrate geospatial mapping to support consistency in hotspot identification

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk audit of randomly sampled CII calculations; Verification of fatality and displacement estimates against field assessments; Interviews with CEWARN Situation Room and national focal points; Recalibration of weightings based on annual reviews

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Scores will be aggregated by location and quarter, then compared against baselines and thresholds to monitor shifts in conflict severity. Trend and hotspot analysis will support programme targeting.

Presentation of Data: Scores will be visualised using heat maps, radar charts, and bar graphs. Reports will include summary tables by zone, conflict type, and temporal trends.

Review of Data: Quarterly review by CEWARN and 3rd Party M&E Firm, with validation through interagency coordination forums and national CEWERUs.

Reporting of Data: Quarterly to GIZ, EU Delegation, and other relevant stakeholders via programme dashboards and analytical bulletins

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established based on 2024 CEWARN/e-SCM conflict intensity data. Targets will be progressive reductions in intensity scores in designated hotspots, depending on intervention coverage.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 e-SCM data)	20% reduction in composite index score in 5 highest-risk zones by 2026	To be reported quarterly	Index weights and scoring rubric under development and field-testing

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Result: N/A

Indicator: No. 4. GEF 2.23 Number of state institutions and non-state actors supported by the EU on security, border management and conflict prevention

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator counts the number of sub-national state institutions and non-state actors (e.g., civil society organisations, local peace committees, community-based organisations, traditional authorities) that receive direct technical, financial, or logistical support under EU-funded programming in areas of security, border management, and conflict prevention. Support may include training, provision of equipment, institutional capacity building, development of standard operating procedures (SOPs), facilitation of joint operations, or strategic planning assistance.

Included are national and subnational government agencies (e.g., border police, immigration, local administration), independent commissions, and non-governmental actors operating formally or informally in conflict prevention and border governance. Support must be traceable, documented, and attributable to EU-funded activities.

Excluded are indirect beneficiaries (e.g., citizens, trainees' organisations not directly engaged), one-time participants in general outreach events without sustained engagement, and entities benefiting only from knowledge products or mass communication campaigns without targeted institutional support. Also excluded are actors receiving support through unrelated EU thematic areas (e.g., education, health) not linked to security, border management, or conflict prevention.

Unit of Measure: Count (number of institutions/actors supported)

Type of Indicator: Outcome

Category of Indicator: GEF (Global Europe Results Framework) Indicator

Disaggregated by: Country, type of actor (State / Non-State), Sectoral focus (Security, Border Management, Conflict Prevention), Administrative level (national, sub-national, local)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a management indicator. This indicator demonstrates the reach and scope of EU support to key governance and peacebuilding actors in fragile or conflict-affected areas. Tracking the number and type of supported entities helps assess capacity strengthening, system development, and the program's contribution to sustaining peace and security. It also informs coordination efforts, highlights engagement gaps, and supports donor reporting.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Routine monitoring and verification of beneficiary records, project activity reports, training attendance logs, support documentation, partner reports, and field visit observations.

Data Source(s): Implementing partner activity reports; Official registers from CEWERUs and security institutions; M&E field visit reports and support tracking matrices; EU-funded project records.

Calculation of values: Simple count of unique, traceable institutions or actors directly supported within the reporting period. Each entity is counted once, regardless of multiple forms of support, provided support is linked to any of the three thematic areas (security, border management, or conflict prevention).

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – data drawn from existing programme monitoring systems and records

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: CEWARN, IDDRSI, ICPAC, ICPALD, GIZ (Implementing Partner M&E Officers)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Risk of double-counting institutions receiving support from multiple streams; Inconsistent classification of "non-state" actors across Member States; Weak reporting linkages between field activities and central databases

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Apply a unique identifier to each supported entity in the PRBP system; Standardise reporting templates and disaggregation criteria; Train field staff on accurate classification and reporting; Cross-reference project records with partner and institutional registers			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Random sampling of support records for verification; Field interviews with selected institutions and partners; Desk audit of implementing partner data; Review of reporting consistency and traceability			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Aggregated totals will be analysed by actor type, geographic location, and sector. Year-on-year comparisons will be conducted to assess coverage and growth in institutional engagement. Overlaps and gaps will be mapped.			
Presentation of Data: Presented in bar graphs, geographic maps, and institutional engagement tables in quarterly and annual reports. Dashboards and donor briefing decks will visualise progress.			
Review of Data: Quarterly by 3 rd Party M&E Firm in coordination with implementing partners and implementing focal points.			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly to EU Delegation and other donors through structured programme updates and dashboards.			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline is to be established using data from 2024 institutional engagement records. Targets will reflect progressive expansion of direct support, with strategic prioritisation of high-risk zones and critical actors.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 data)	15 institutions/actors supported annually	To be reported quarterly	Baseline under harmonisation; will align with implementing partner reports
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Result: N/A

Indicator: No. 5. GERF 2.24 Number of people directly benefiting from EU-supported interventions that specifically aim to support civilian post-conflict peacebuilding and/or conflict intervention

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator counts the number of individuals who receive direct support, services, or resources as a result of EU-funded interventions that are explicitly designed to support civilian-led peacebuilding, post-conflict recovery, or conflict prevention. Direct beneficiaries are individuals who participate in, access, or are directly reached by project-supported activities such as training, mediation sessions, trauma healing, social cohesion initiatives, community dialogues, local reconciliation efforts, early warning training, or other related programming.

Included are participants in structured peacebuilding activities, members of targeted communities receiving conflict prevention support, and individuals directly engaged through supported platforms or outreach, such as women's peace committees, youth peace dialogues, traditional leaders, survivors of conflict, and returnees benefiting from reintegration assistance.

Excluded are individuals who may be reached indirectly through mass media campaigns, community-wide exposure events, or infrastructure development projects without direct interpersonal engagement. Also excluded are security personnel or combatants unless explicitly participating in civilian-focused dialogue or peacebuilding reintegration activities.

Unit of Measure: Count (number of people)

Type of Indicator: Outcome

Category of Indicator: GERF (Global Europe Results Framework) Indicator

Disaggregated by: Country, sex, Age Group (Youth 15–24, Adults 25–59, Elderly 60+); Type of intervention (peacebuilding, reconciliation, conflict prevention)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. This indicator demonstrates the scope and reach of EU-supported programming in post-conflict and fragile environments. It helps measure the extent to which individuals directly engage in or benefit from activities that promote peace, dialogue, and conflict transformation. It also supports programme effectiveness, equity analysis, and donor accountability regarding inclusion and outreach.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Beneficiary registration and attendance logs; validated activity reports from implementing partners; sign-in sheets; post-activity evaluation forms; field visit verification; community and facilitator reporting.

Data Source(s): Partner implementation records and M&E reports; CEWARN field reports; Beneficiary verification lists; Community-based peace committee records

Calculation of values: Simple count of unique individuals reached through qualifying interventions in the reporting period. Each individual is counted only once, even if participating in multiple activities.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – as data is embedded in existing programme tracking systems

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: CEWARN, IDDRSI, ICPAC, ICPALD, GIZ (Implementing Partner M&E Officers)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Risk of double-counting across multiple activities; Inconsistent use of disaggregated variables across partners; Incomplete data from informal or mobile populations; Potential over-reporting from secondary partners

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Implement harmonised beneficiary registration system; Conduct periodic partner training on reporting consistency; Integrate digital tracking tools with deduplication features; Cross-check data across activities and actors			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Field validation of reported beneficiary lists; Desk audits of partner reporting systems; Beneficiary sampling interviews and spot-checks; Comparison of reported figures across disaggregated categories			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Data will be analysed quarterly by gender, age, intervention type, and geography to identify reach and trends. Disaggregation will support social inclusion and equity assessments.			
Presentation of Data: Bar charts, maps, and tables disaggregated by location and demographics will be included in quarterly and annual reports, donor presentations, and dashboards.			
Review of Data: Quarterly by 3 rd Party M&E Firm in coordination with implementing partners and implementing focal points.			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly to the EU Delegation and partners through programme reporting and coordination platforms.			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established based on 2024 community-level data. Targets will align with planned intervention coverage and geographic scale.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value TBD (based on 2024 engagement data)	Target 250,000 direct beneficiaries (disaggregated)	Actual To be reported quarterly	Notes Baseline under development; integration of partner data ongoing
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Result: N/A

Indicator: No. 6. Extent to which cross-border coordination mechanisms between development, humanitarian and political actors (EU and MS, UN, etc.) have been established/reinforced by the EU-funded intervention

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of cross-border coordination mechanisms that have **been established or reinforced** with support from the EU-funded intervention and are aimed at facilitating coordination among development, humanitarian, and political actors. A coordination mechanism is defined as a formal or informal, structured platform (e.g., task force, technical working group, inter-agency forum) with a documented purpose, membership, and activity related to cross-border planning, information sharing, or joint response.

“Established” mechanisms are those newly initiated by the EU-funded intervention. **“Reinforced”** mechanisms are pre-existing platforms that have been functionally improved, expanded in scope, or supported logistically or technically through EU-funded actions.

To be counted under this indicator, the mechanism must demonstrate:

- Active participation by at least two of the following actor types: development actors, humanitarian actors, and political/diplomatic actors (e.g., EU MS, UN agencies, IGAD, national ministries).
- A documented mandate or terms of reference (ToR), and
- Verifiable EU-funded contribution (financial, technical, facilitative, or logistical).

Inclusion Criteria:

- Structured platforms or forums that bring together actors from at least two sectors (development, humanitarian, political).
- Mechanisms addressing cross-border peacebuilding, resilience, early warning, governance, or migration coordination.
- Coordination groups supported by the EU through funding, facilitation, capacity-building, or institutional strengthening.
- Mechanisms with documented outputs (e.g., meeting minutes, ToRs, action plans) and recurrent engagement.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Platforms limited to a single sector (e.g., humanitarian-only or development-only).
- Ad hoc or one-time events lacking sustained coordination or documented outcomes.
- National-level coordination platforms without a cross-border focus.
- Mechanisms where EU participation is not linked to direct support or reinforcement.

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of coordination mechanisms)

Type of Indicator: Outcome

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Country, Sectoral composition (Humanitarian, Development, Political), Geographic scope (Bilateral, Multilateral, Regional), Type (Newly established / Reinforced)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. This indicator tracks the EU's contribution to whole-of-system coordination and coherence in fragile borderland contexts. Stronger coordination platforms enable more efficient use of resources, reduced duplication, improved early warning and conflict prevention, and alignment with national and regional peacebuilding priorities. The indicator supports programme-level learning, donor accountability, and strategic adjustments to cross-border intervention design.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Review of programme and partner reports; Verification of meeting minutes, membership lists, and coordination ToRs; Interviews with participating agencies; Field visit observations

Data Source(s): PRBP Coordination Tracker; Implementing partner M&E reports; IGAD coordination records; Records Member States, and partner NGOs; Cross-border platform meeting documents

Calculation of values: Simple count of cluster cross-border coordination mechanisms established or reinforced during the reporting period that meet the inclusion criteria. Count each mechanism only once per reporting period. .			
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly			
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – requiring stakeholder validation and cross-border verification			
Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: CBDFUs Coordinator (IDDRSI Coordinator)			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Attribution challenges in multi-donor contexts; Potential inflation of numbers from overlapping initiatives; Variability in quality/functionality of mechanisms; Language and documentation inconsistencies across countries.			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Apply a unique identifier and quality score for each mechanism; Require submission of TORs or joint action plans; Develop standard checklist for inclusion validation; Conduct triangulation with non-EU actors.			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk-based audits of reported mechanisms; Verification with participating institutions; Sample-based field visits and interviews; Comparison with national and UN coordination registries.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Mechanisms will be analysed by type, country, and sectoral composition. Trend analysis will track increase or decline in coordination density and cross-sectoral integration.			
Presentation of Data: Bar and stacked column charts by mechanism type; Heat maps for cross-border zone coverage; Tables with sectoral participation per mechanism.			
Review of Data: Quarterly review by IGAD M&E team and Implementing Partners, with feedback loops from CBDFUs.			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly – to EU Delegation, IGAD Coordination Bodies, and partners via dashboards and narrative reports.			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using 2024 coordination inventory. Targets will aim at increased number and improved quality of cross-border platforms involving at least two sectors.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value TBD (based on 2024 engagement data)	Target ≥6 fully functional multi-sectoral mechanisms/ platforms established or reinforced	Actual To be reported quarterly	Notes Quality scoring and functionality assessment to accompany numeric count
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Result: N/A

Indicator: No. 7. Percentage of targeted stakeholders (government officials, civil society, and local community institutions) who report being aware of IGAD cross-border policies or protocols

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the proportion of identified stakeholders—specifically government officials, civil society actors, and representatives of local community institutions—who self-report awareness of at least one IGAD cross-border policy or protocol relevant to peacebuilding, border governance, or regional cooperation.

Awareness is defined as the respondent's demonstrated knowledge of the **existence, purpose, or key content** of any IGAD-endorsed cross-border protocol, policy, or legal framework (e.g., protocols on pastoral mobility, transhumance, border governance, or cross-border health surveillance).

A stakeholder is considered "targeted" if they fall within the programme's designated beneficiary groups and have been formally engaged through capacity-building, sensitisation, coordination, or outreach efforts funded by the EU-supported programme.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Individuals affiliated with national or sub-national government agencies, civil society organisations, or traditional/local community institutions in targeted programme areas
- Respondents who have participated in or been exposed to programme-related information, training, dialogue, or coordination mechanisms
- Self-reported awareness is validated through structured survey tools that require identifying or describing at least one IGAD cross-border policy or protocol

Exclusion Criteria:

- Individuals not formally targeted by the programme's awareness or capacity-building activities
- Respondents who only indicate vague familiarity without being able to identify or describe any policy/protocol content
- Responses from sectors not covered under programme targeting (e.g., private sector actors not directly engaged)

Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)

Type of Indicator: Outcome

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Stakeholder group, country, cluster, sex, age group, policy/protocol

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator, and measures the programme's effectiveness in improving stakeholder awareness of IGAD's cross-border frameworks—a prerequisite for improved implementation, compliance, and harmonised responses across borders. Tracking awareness levels enables targeted adaptations in outreach, capacity-building, and coordination activities. It also supports accountability to donors and policy influence by highlighting where communication and engagement are effective or insufficient.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Structured perception surveys administered to a representative sample of targeted stakeholders during field monitoring visits or partner-led outreach events. Surveys may be conducted in-person, via phone, or online, depending on accessibility.

Data Source(s): PRBP stakeholder monitoring tool, implementing partner awareness survey reports; Field visit perception survey forms; Media Tracking, Post-training assessments and focus group discussions

Calculation of values: (Number of targeted stakeholders who correctly report awareness of at least one IGAD cross-border policy or protocol ÷ Total number of targeted stakeholders surveyed) × 100

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually (with consolidated reporting quarterly/biannually)

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – requires periodic survey implementation and field-level validation

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: GIZ/IGAD (3 rd Party M&E Firm/IGAD HM&E Unit.)			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025 Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Potential respondent bias due to self-reporting; Inconsistencies in understanding the definition of “awareness”; Difficulty accessing respondents in remote or insecure areas; Language and translation issues during survey administration. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Use of standardised, validated survey tools with clear response options; Enumerator training on probing techniques and neutrality; Translation of instruments into local languages; Use of digital tools with automated skip logic and data validation checks. Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026) Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk review of survey instruments and completed forms; Field audits and direct re-surveying of a random sample; Review of data coding and aggregation in PRBP system; Interviews with implementing partner MEL officers and enumerators			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Survey data will be disaggregated and analysed to identify patterns in awareness levels by country, stakeholder type, and type of policy. Comparisons will be made over time to assess improvement or stagnation. Gaps in awareness by geography or sector will be flagged for remedial action. Presentation of Data: Bar and pie charts showing percentage awareness by stakeholder group; summary tables by location and protocol type; brief narrative analysis in quarterly and annual reports. Review of Data: Quarterly by IGAD M&E Unit and 3rd Party M&E Provider, with implementing partner feedback and review sessions . Reporting of Data: Quarterly – through programme dashboards, narrative updates, and coordination briefings to the EU Delegation and other stakeholders			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using 2024 stakeholder survey data. Targets will reflect progressive increases in awareness across targeted clusters and stakeholder categories.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 baseline survey)	≥ 80% of targeted stakeholders aware by end of 2026	To be reported quarterly	Follow-up surveys planned annually for trend analysis
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 1. Reinforced Cross Border Coordination by Identifying and Supporting IGAD Structures (IDDRSI, CBDFU, Specialized Institutions-CEWARN, ICPAC, ICPALD) and National and Sub-National Authorities.

Result: R1.1. Established and function cross-border coordination structures enhancing regional cooperation

Indicator: No. 1.1.1. Number of joint cross-border coordination meetings held

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator counts the number of formal, documented coordination meetings held jointly across national borders that are facilitated, organised, or supported by the EU-funded intervention. "Joint cross-border coordination meetings" refer to structured, face-to-face or virtual gatherings convened for the purpose of planning, consultation, information exchange, or joint response involving stakeholders from **two or more countries** sharing a common border area.

The term "joint" implies bilateral or multilateral participation from government institutions, civil society, local authorities, or regional actors (e.g., IGAD), with active engagement from each side of the border.

To be counted, meetings must:

- Have a clear cross-border scope,
- Include documented attendance from multiple countries,
- Possess an agenda and/or meeting minutes, and
- Be supported—logistically, financially, or technically—by the EU-funded intervention.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Meetings with participants from two or more Member States addressing cross-border coordination issues (e.g., migration, resilience, peacebuilding, health surveillance)
- Meetings convened under IGAD or implementing partner frameworks with documented participation from both sides of the border
- Events that result in joint action points, resolutions, or coordination outcomes related to programme goals

Exclusion Criteria:

- National-level coordination meetings with no participation from neighbouring country counterparts
- Informal or ad hoc gatherings lacking agenda, participant list, or records
- Trainings, public awareness campaigns, or internal planning sessions not framed as coordination meetings
- Events attended by cross-border actors but unrelated to CBDFUs coordination functions (e.g., award ceremonies, field visits without agenda)

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of meetings)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Cluster, coordination level, type of coordination theme (e.g., migration, conflict early warning, border health), Convening institution (IGAD, government, implementing partner) and meeting format (virtual/in-person/hybrid).

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator, and it helps assess the extent to which the programme facilitates or strengthens structured cross-border dialogue and operational alignment. It reflects the frequency and reach of coordination processes essential for sustaining peacebuilding, early warning, joint governance, and service delivery in border areas. Tracking this indicator enables programme managers and donors to evaluate engagement levels, identify coordination gaps, and inform planning for future cross-border cooperation.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Desk review of meeting documentation, verification of participant attendance logs, review of field mission reports, and implementing partner reports.

Data Source(s): PRBP coordination module; IGAD cross-border meeting reports; Implementing partner meeting summaries; Official government records of bilateral/multilateral coordination; Field verification reports.

Calculation of values: Simple count of unique cross-border coordination meetings held within the reporting period that meet inclusion criteria. Each eligible meeting is counted once.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly			
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – information is embedded in regular programme monitoring and coordination processes			
Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: CBDFUs (Coordinators)			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Risk of double-counting multi-day meetings or repeated documentation; Inconsistent documentation across clusters or institutions; Delays in receipt of meeting reports from field offices or partners; Potential inflation of numbers due to misclassification of non-coordination events.			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Develop and apply a standardised meeting tracking template; Assign unique identifiers for each verified coordination meeting; Provide training to field and partner staff on classification criteria; Require submission of agenda, signed participant lists, and action points as evidence.			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk review of a random sample of meeting records; Verification of participation lists with focal points in each country; Spot checks through field visits or phone verification; Cross-validation with national and regional coordination calendars.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Meetings will be aggregated by cluster/location, theme, and country pair. Analysis will track changes in frequency, coverage of key thematic areas, and consistency of cross-border representation.			
Presentation of Data: Bar charts and tables summarising number of meetings by quarter and coordination theme; maps highlighting border clusters with active coordination; meeting dashboards.			
Review of Data: Quarterly by IGAD & GIZ programme teams and implementing partner M&E units, with validation during joint programme coordination meetings.			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly – through EU Delegation reports, dashboards, and inter-agency review platforms			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using 2024 records of cross-border coordination meetings. Targets will reflect scale-up of coordination across high-priority border zones, with emphasis on sustainability and inclusiveness.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 coordination records)	12 verified meetings by end of programme (at least 2 per priority cluster)	To be reported quarterly	Meeting classification checklist under development to ensure consistency
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 1. Reinforced Cross Border Coordination by Identifying and Supporting IGAD Structures (IDDRSI, CBDFU, Specialized Institutions-CEWARN, ICPAC, ICPALD) and National and Sub-National Authorities.

Result: R1.1. Established and function cross-border coordination structures enhancing regional cooperation

Indicator: No. 1.1.2. Number of conflict and early warning alerts issued and responded to through coordinated action

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator captures the total number of conflict-related or early warning alerts that are both (1) formally issued through the recognised conflict early warning system, and (2) acted upon through a coordinated response mechanism involving multiple stakeholders.

An “**alert**” is defined as a formally logged warning based on verified signals of potential conflict, insecurity, or violent escalation, generated by the e-SCM platform or through authorised national or local reporting units (e.g., CEWERUs, community monitors).

A “**coordinated response**” entails any documented action (preventive, mitigative, or reactive) taken by two or more entities—such as government actors, civil society, IGAD mechanisms, or implementing partners—in response to the alert. Actions may include joint deployments, mediation, community dialogues, temporary security arrangements, or humanitarian coordination in anticipation of conflict.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Alerts generated by the e-SCM platform and validated by CEWARN protocols
- Alerts that result in a multi-actor response recorded through CEWARN, CEWERUs, or partner reports
- Coordinated actions must be timely, relevant to the alert, and documented (e.g., field reports, response plans, joint statements)

Exclusion Criteria:

- Unverified alerts or raw incident reports not escalated through CEWARN early warning thresholds
- Responses undertaken by a single actor without documented coordination
- Delayed responses not directly linked to the timing or content of the original alert
- Alerts not followed by any traceable action (including those archived without response)

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of alerts issued and responded to)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Country, Cluster, Conflict typology (e.g., political, inter-communal, resource-based), Type of coordinated response (mediation, security, humanitarian, local dialogue), Administrative level (community, subnational, national).

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator and it tracks the performance of the early warning and early response system under the programme. It measures both the capacity to detect emerging threats and the ability to coordinate timely responses, thereby reflecting system effectiveness. It enables IGAD, CEWARN, and implementing partners to assess gaps in response protocols, improve inter-agency coordination, and allocate resources for proactive interventions.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Review of CEWARN’s e-SCM alert logs, verification through CEWARN and CEWERU reports, triangulation with implementing partner and local authority records, and analysis of response documentation.

Data Source(s): CEWARN’s e-SCM (electronic Conflict Surveillance and Mapping) platform; CEWARN response records; CEWERU early warning and response logs; Implementing partner incident and response reports; Local authority reports and community response documentation; Incident Logs; Minutes from Conflict Response Coordination Meetings

Calculation of values: Simple count of verified alerts that have corresponding, documented multi-actor responses within the reporting period.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (based on monthly input)

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – verification processes and multi-source triangulation required			
Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: CEWARN (CEWARN Situation Room Analyst, IGAD Peace and Security Division M&E Officer, National CEWERU Focal Points, Implementing Partner M&E Teams)			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Underreporting of local alerts not escalated to regional level; Inconsistent documentation of response actions; Attribution challenges in multi-stakeholder responses; Risk of counting planned responses without follow-through.			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Introduce alert-response linkage tracking in e-SCM; Require partner submission of response verification forms; Regular capacity-building for CEWERUs on timely documentation; Cross-check response timelines and joint action records.			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk audit of e-SCM alert-response pairs; Random sampling of alerts for field-based verification; Interviews with CEWARN/CEWERU staff and response partners; Comparison of alerts to activity and deployment logs.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Data will be analysed to assess frequency of alerts, types of coordinated responses, and responsiveness across countries and clusters. Trend analysis will identify delays, bottlenecks, and underperforming zones.			
Presentation of Data: Bar charts, line graphs, and geospatial mapping of alerts and responses; tabular summaries of response types; quarterly trend narratives.			
Review of Data: Quarterly review by CEWARN, CEWERUs, and IGAD M&E team, with implementing partner inputs and national stakeholder consultation.			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly – through formal programme reports, dashboards, and EU coordination meetings			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using 2024 CEWARN alert and response records. Targets will reflect an increase in both the number and timeliness of responses to verified alerts in hotspot areas.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 e-SCM alert data)	40 alerts reported and 25 responded by end of programme (with 50% response rate within 72 hours)	To be reported quarterly	Functional alert-response dashboard under development
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 1. Reinforced Cross Border Coordination by Identifying and Supporting IGAD Structures (IDDRSI, CBDFU, Specialized Institutions-CEWARN, ICPAC, ICPALD) and National and Sub-National Authorities.

Result: R1.1. Established and function cross-border coordination structures enhancing regional cooperation

Indicator: No. 1.1.3. Percentage of stakeholders who perceive that the intervention has enhanced inclusivity and participation in conflict management processes

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the proportion of surveyed stakeholders who perceive that EU-funded interventions have led to increased inclusivity and broader participation in conflict management processes in their communities or areas of operation.

“Inclusivity” is defined as the meaningful representation and involvement of traditionally underrepresented or marginalised groups—including women, youth, minority ethnic communities, displaced persons, and persons with disabilities—in formal or informal conflict management forums, peace dialogues, or decision-making processes.

“Participation” refers to active engagement in planning, implementation, or oversight of conflict prevention, mitigation, or resolution efforts.

Perception is gauged through structured surveys that ask stakeholders to assess whether participation opportunities have improved in frequency, openness, and diversity of actors as a result of programme interventions.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Stakeholders directly engaged in or exposed to programme-supported peacebuilding or conflict management activities
- Responses based on validated survey tools with question items specifically addressing perceived changes in inclusivity and participation
- Respondents representing state, civil society, community-based, and traditional institutions involved in conflict-related coordination or implementation

Exclusion Criteria:

- Individuals not reached by or involved in programme activities
- General population or random community members without peacebuilding or governance roles
- Responses without a clear link to programme influence or those failing to answer key perception questions
- Group responses that do not allow attribution of perception to individual experience

Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Stakeholder type (government, civil society, local institutions), Type of conflict management process (formal vs informal, community-based vs institutional) country, cluster, sex, and age group

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator and it provides a perception-based measure of the programme's contribution to inclusive governance and participatory peacebuilding. Stakeholder perception serves as a proxy for legitimacy, effectiveness, and social acceptance of conflict management systems. Tracking this metric enables the programme to evaluate where inclusivity efforts are succeeding and where more targeted outreach or structural reform may be needed.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Structured perception surveys using standardised instruments administered through in-person interviews, focus groups, or digital questionnaires. Surveys conducted semi-annually among sampled stakeholder groups across target border clusters.

Data Source(s): PRBP stakeholder perception monitoring module, Implementing partner survey reports; CEWARN field validation reports; Community dialogue and peace forum feedback tools.

Calculation of values: (Number of stakeholders who report enhanced inclusivity and participation ÷ Total number of stakeholders surveyed) × 100.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Biannually (consolidated in quarterly reporting)			
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – field-based surveying and disaggregation required			
Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD & GIZ (PCPD, Implementing Partner M&E Leads)			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Subjectivity of responses and influence of social desirability bias; Inconsistent understanding of “inclusivity” across cultures and stakeholder types; Low literacy levels may hinder comprehension in some clusters; Risk of non-representative sampling in remote areas.			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Enumerator training with standard definitions and culturally appropriate translations; Use of mixed methods (quantitative surveys + qualitative interviews); Pilot testing of instruments for clarity and reliability; Stratified random sampling to ensure stakeholder diversity.			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Review of survey instruments and field protocols; Re-interviews of a subset of respondents; Field observation of data collection sessions; Review of representativeness and completeness of datasets.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Responses will be aggregated and analysed by stakeholder group, gender, and geographic location. Comparative analysis will identify shifts over time, variations across clusters, and disparities between groups.			
Presentation of Data: Pie charts, bar graphs, and disaggregated summary tables in quarterly and annual reports; qualitative excerpts may accompany findings for contextual interpretation.			
Review of Data: Quarterly review by IGAD and Peace and Security Division M&E units, with validation from implementing partners and CEWERU representatives.			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly – to EU Delegation and relevant stakeholders via dashboards, programme briefs, and review workshops.			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using 2024 stakeholder perception surveys. Targets will seek progressive increases in perceived inclusivity among all major groups, with emphasis on women and youth participation.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 baseline survey results)	50% of stakeholders perceive increased inclusivity by 2026	To be reported quarterly	Midline perception survey scheduled for Q2 2026
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 1. Reinforced Cross Border Coordination by Identifying and Supporting IGAD Structures (IDDRSI, CBDFU, Specialized Institutions-CEWARN, ICPAC, ICPALD) and National and Sub-National Authorities.

Result: R1.2. Strengthened cross-border early warning systems effectively deployed to enable timely conflict monitoring and peacebuilding responses

Indicator: No. 1.2.1. Percentage of institutions that have adopted and are actively using the HUSIKA early warning application

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the proportion of targeted institutions that have (1) formally adopted the HUSIKA early warning application as part of their conflict surveillance or response workflow, and (2) are actively using it to generate, receive, or respond to alerts.

Adoption is defined as an institution's formal decision to integrate HUSIKA into its operations, confirmed through registration, installation, or institutional endorsement (e.g., MoU, SOPs, or strategic plans).

Active use is demonstrated through regular logins, data input, report generation, or response actions recorded in the e-SCM/HUSIKA monitoring backend within the reporting period.

An **institution** includes CEWERUs, subnational government departments (e.g., interior, administration, security), authorised community early warning structures, or recognised civil society organisations directly involved in peacebuilding or conflict prevention.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Institutions officially registered as users in the HUSIKA application
- Entities with documented usage logs (e.g., data entry, report download, response uploads) within the reporting period
- Institutions targeted under the programme's rollout and digital capacity-building plans
- Use must relate directly to conflict early warning or response activities

Exclusion Criteria:

- Institutions trained on HUSIKA but not actively using the application
- Single-user pilot access or testing without institutional mandate
- Non-targeted entities accessing the platform independently or for non-conflict-related purposes
- Inactive accounts without use in the current or previous reporting period

Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Type of institution (government, community-based, civil society); Administrative level (national, subnational, local); Type of use (alert generation, monitoring, response coordination); country, cluster.

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator and it reflects the programme's success in promoting institutional uptake and operational use of HUSIKA for conflict early warning and response. High adoption and usage rates indicate strengthened digital readiness, enhanced coordination, and improved surveillance of potential conflict risks. The indicator supports decision-making on where to intensify training, troubleshooting, or strategic engagement.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Systematic review of HUSIKA user registration logs, application usage reports from the backend, and triangulation with CEWERU or partner field reports to verify institutional ownership and activity.

Data Source(s): e-SCM/HUSIKA backend logs and usage dashboard; MOUs or adoption letters, HUSIKA platform analytics (Platform usage logs); CEWARN system administration reports; Implementing partner capacity-building reports; CEWERU and institutional IT usage records

Calculation of values: (Number of targeted institutions that have adopted and are actively using HUSIKA ÷ Total number of targeted institutions) × 100

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – automated data available via system backend and ongoing M&E tracking

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD (CEWARN & ICPAC) [CEWARN HUSIKA System Administrator; IGAD Peace and Security Division Digital Integration Focal Point; Implementing Partner ICT or MEL Officers]

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Inactivity due to temporary connectivity or staffing gaps may be misinterpreted as non-use; Shared institutional accounts may obscure actual user engagement; Misreporting from manual field reports when backend data is not synchronised; Use for non-conflict purposes may inflate usage statistics.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Standardise definition of “active use” across reporting levels; Introduce usage frequency thresholds in backend tracking; Conduct user verification and account validation biannually; Link usage metrics to response records in CEWARN reporting.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Audit of backend logs against institutional activity records; Interviews with focal points at selected institutions; Spot checks of institutional dashboards and account history; Triangulation with CEWERU quarterly performance reports.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Analysis will assess trends in HUSIKA uptake by institution type and geography. Time-series analysis will monitor changes in active use across quarters, with special focus on newly onboarded institutions and usage consistency.

Presentation of Data: Summary tables, pie charts, and bar graphs showing percentages by country and institution type; usage heatmaps overlaid on intervention areas; usage trends visualised over time.

Review of Data: Quarterly review by CEWARN IT team, IGAD M&E unit, and implementing partners, with system-level validation during technical working group meetings.

Reporting of Data: Quarterly – via digital adoption dashboards, EU donor reports, and coordination briefings

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using 2024 data from initial HUSIKA rollout in target institutions. Targets will scale according to phased expansion strategy and digital engagement plans.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 system registration data)	60% of targeted institutions actively using HUSIKA by end of 2026	To be reported quarterly	Backend usage dashboard under development for real-time tracking

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 1. Reinforced Cross Border Coordination by Identifying and Supporting IGAD Structures (IDDRSI, CBDFU, Specialized Institutions-CEWARN, ICPAC, ICPALD) and National and Sub-National Authorities.

Result: R1.2. Strengthened cross-border early warning systems effectively deployed to enable timely conflict monitoring and peacebuilding responses

Indicator: No. 1.2.2. Number of additional languages into which HUSIKA early warning information products are translated and disseminated to target communities

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of **additional languages** into which early warning products generated through the HUSIKA system are translated and distributed to improve understanding and response at the community level.

“Information products” include alerts, advisories, risk bulletins, response recommendations, maps, and summaries prepared through the HUSIKA platform or integrated into CEWARN’s e-SCM output for public or community dissemination.

“Additional languages” refers to any language not previously used in the dissemination of early warning products by the programme at baseline, and which is newly adopted to reach linguistic groups in the cross-border communities targeted by the intervention.

“Dissemination” means verifiable distribution through appropriate channels (e.g., printed material, community radio, SMS, social media, town hall announcements), targeting local end-users.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Languages used in newly translated products produced after the baseline year
- Languages into which standardised HUSIKA early warning content (alerts, bulletins, community advisories) is translated and distributed within target programme zones
- Translations with documented dissemination to communities (e.g., through media logs, distribution records, or partner reports)
- Languages selected based on local linguistic mapping or stakeholder demand

Exclusion Criteria:

- National or regional languages already used in baseline dissemination
- Translations produced but not disseminated (e.g., draft materials not shared with communities)
- Informal, oral interpretation during meetings or events not tied to a standardised product
- Languages targeting audiences outside of the programme area

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of additional languages)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Country; cluster; Method of dissemination (print, radio, SMS, etc.); Type of product (alert, bulletin, map, etc.); Target population (e.g., pastoralists, women’s groups, youth)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. This indicator reflects the programme’s commitment to equity, inclusion, and cultural-linguistic responsiveness in early warning communication. By tracking the expansion of languages used, the indicator ensures that life-saving information is accessible to linguistically diverse communities in conflict-prone border areas. It helps identify coverage gaps and supports accountability to vulnerable or marginalised groups.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Desk review of HUSIKA output products, partner dissemination reports, translation records, and field verification of local distribution efforts

Data Source(s): e-SCM/HUSIKA dissemination logs, Translated material archives; Radio station logs; SMS/USSD logs; Implementing partner translation and outreach reports; CEWARN/ICPAC communication products database, Field-level feedback from CEWERUs and local monitors.

Calculation of values: Count of distinct languages into which HUSIKA early warning products were newly translated and disseminated in the reporting period, excluding previously used languages at baseline

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – translation and dissemination records are integrated into programme operations

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD (CEWARN & ICPAC) [CEWARN HUSIKA System Administrator; IGAD Peace and Security Division Digital Integration Focal Point; Implementing Partner ICT or MEL Officers]

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Incomplete documentation of informal dissemination (e.g., oral translations by local leaders); Potential double-counting if multiple formats use the same language; Delayed reporting of community-based translations conducted by partners; Risk of misclassification of dialects vs. separate languages.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Introduce a standardised translation and dissemination tracking form; Coordinate with community radio networks to document broadcasts; Distinguish between written and oral formats in reporting templates; Validate language selections with community linguistic mapping tools.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Audit of product archives and media logs; Interviews with translators, radio stations, and community dissemination agents; Spot checks in target communities for confirmation of access and comprehension; Comparison of language tracking records with field-level outreach reports.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Analysis will include comparison of linguistic reach across countries and product types. Quarterly trends will be used to assess scale-up progress and alignment with local language needs.

Presentation of Data: Tables summarising language coverage by country; bar charts of product types by language; maps overlaying language groups with dissemination zones.

Review of Data: Quarterly review by CEWARN and IGAD Communications and M&E Units, with inputs from implementing partners and field outreach teams.

Reporting of Data: Quarterly – through programme briefs, communication strategy updates, and donor reports

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using 2024 CEWARN/HUSIKA dissemination records. Target is to increase the number of additional local languages used to ensure broader reach in underserved cross-border clusters.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 dissemination review)	6 additional languages adopted and used by 2026	To be reported quarterly	Community language preference assessment underway in 5 clusters

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 1. Reinforced Cross Border Coordination by Identifying and Supporting IGAD Structures (IDDRSI, CBDFU, Specialized Institutions-CEWARN, ICPAC, ICPALD) and National and Sub-National Authorities.

Result: R1.2. Strengthened cross-border early warning systems effectively deployed to enable timely conflict monitoring and peacebuilding responses

Indicator: No. 1.2.3. Number of government and civil society representatives trained through EU-funded interventions who demonstrate improved knowledge of early warning systems

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator captures the number of government and civil society representatives who, after participating in EU-funded training activities on early warning systems (including the HUSIKA application and CEWARN mechanisms), demonstrate a measurable improvement in their knowledge and understanding.

“Improved knowledge” is defined as an increase in post-training assessment scores or validated learning outcomes compared to a baseline (pre-test) or self-assessment benchmarks. Knowledge areas may include early warning principles, data reporting procedures, digital tools use, alert generation, and response coordination.

“Trained representatives” include individuals from ministries, CEWERUs, local government, and civil society organisations (e.g., peace committees, NGOs, CBOs) who complete structured capacity-building sessions funded under the programme.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Participants who complete a formal EU-funded early warning training (in-person or virtual) with documented attendance
- Participants who complete both pre- and post-training assessments and show a positive change in knowledge score
- Individuals affiliated with institutions operating in early warning, response, or peacebuilding in target areas
- Training content must align with CEWARN/HUSIKA systems, early warning protocols, or coordination practices

Exclusion Criteria:

- Participants who attend training but do not complete assessments or lack sufficient data for comparison
- Individuals from private sector or other sectors not directly engaged in early warning or conflict response
- Repeat participants counted more than once in a single reporting cycle
- Individuals trained outside the EU-funded programme framework

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of individuals with demonstrated improvement)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Type of institution (government, civil society); population group; Training theme, country, cluster, sex

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. This indicator provides a measure of capacity strengthening effectiveness, tracking whether training translates into actual learning. It supports programme accountability by focusing on learning outcomes rather than participation alone. The data guides decisions on training design, delivery methods, and follow-up support for personnel engaged in early warning operations.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Administration of standardised pre- and post-training tests or self-assessment tools; verification through training attendance sheets; partner reporting and M&E validation of learning outcomes

Data Source(s): e-SCM/HUSIKA training and capacity-building records; Implementing partner training reports and assessment summaries; CEWARN/ICPAC Training Unit reports; Pre-/post-test databases or digital learning platforms.

Calculation of values: Simple count of individuals who (1) completed an eligible training, and (2) showed demonstrable improvement in knowledge between pre- and post-assessment scores Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (following each training cohort or cycle) Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – requires standardised assessments, scoring, and verification of institutional affiliation Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD (CEWARN & ICPAC) [Implementing Partner Training and M&E Officers]

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025 Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Inconsistent use of assessment tools across training sessions; Low literacy or language barriers may affect participant understanding of questions; Inflated self-assessments where no testing is conducted; Potential double counting if participants attend multiple sessions. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Deploy harmonised and validated assessment templates across partners; Translate training materials and tests into local languages; Deduplicate participant lists using unique IDs; Train facilitators in test administration and scoring procedures. Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026) Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Review of training logs, test results, and score analysis sheets; Interviews with a sample of participants and facilitators; Audit of implementing partner training databases; Spot checks on score data entry and interpretation.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Pre- and post-test scores will be analysed to identify performance trends by training topic, institution type, and geography. Aggregated results will be used to refine training content and methods. Presentation of Data: Bar graphs of participants by type and performance change; pie charts by sectoral affiliation; trend lines of cumulative results over time. Review of Data: Quarterly by CEWARN/ICPAC, IGAD M&E Unit, and implementing partners in training coordination meetings Reporting of Data: Quarterly – through capacity-building dashboards, programme reports, and EU Delegation updates
--

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using 2024 training records and pre/post-test results. Targets aligned with the number of trained personnel in early warning focus areas..

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 training data)	150 representatives (minimum 40% women trained individuals with improved knowledge by 2026)	To be reported quarterly	Assessment scoring standardisation underway across partner trainings

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 2. Raising awareness of cross-border policies with national governments, local authorities, the private sector, and civil society in the three IGAD Clusters.

Result: R2.1. Relevant stakeholders engaged and informed through the dissemination of cross-border coordination and cooperation policies and protocols

Indicator: No. 2.1.1. Number of key policy documents translated into at least one local language and disseminated to target populations to enhance awareness and accessibility

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of **key policy documents** relevant to cross-border governance, conflict prevention, peacebuilding, and development that are (1) translated into at least one locally spoken language and (2) disseminated to targeted populations through appropriate communication channels.

“Key policy documents” refer to strategic legal or policy texts, frameworks, protocols, or guidelines that guide cross-border governance and peacebuilding efforts and are endorsed by IGAD, Member States, or EU-supported initiatives. These may include protocols on pastoral mobility, conflict early warning, natural resource management, gender-responsive peacebuilding, or cross-border health.

“Local language” refers to a non-official, widely spoken language used by target populations in programme areas, distinct from regional or national official languages (e.g., English, French, Arabic).

“Dissemination” includes the active and documented sharing of the translated material through media (print, digital, radio), public forums, community networks, or institutional channels, with evidence of outreach.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Official policy documents endorsed by IGAD or national authorities and supported under the EU-funded intervention
- Translations into at least one new local language not previously used for that document
- Products that have been disseminated to communities via recognised channels (e.g., printed copies, community radios, public readings, digital platforms)
- Documentation confirming both translation and dissemination (e.g., dissemination report, media log, partner verification)

Exclusion Criteria:

- Draft documents or internal working papers not officially endorsed
- Documents translated but not disseminated to target populations
- Translations into national/official languages already in wide circulation
- Informal, verbal interpretations during events not based on standardised, written translation

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of translated and disseminated documents)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Country, cluster, language of translation, type of document, target audience; dissemination channel (radio, print, community meeting, digital).

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. This indicator ensures the programme supports inclusive access to policy information by overcoming language barriers in borderland communities. It promotes local ownership, informed participation, and accountability by translating often technical frameworks into culturally and linguistically accessible formats. The indicator enables tracking of outreach scope and supports equity in communication strategies.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Review of translation contracts, dissemination activity reports, media logs, and verification with field-level implementing partners

Data Source(s): PRBP communication and knowledge dissemination records; IGAD publication logs; Implementing partner media and outreach reports; Copies of translated documents with language and audience identification.

Calculation of values: Simple count of unique policy documents that have (1) been translated into at least one additional local language and (2) disseminated to target communities			
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly			
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – costs associated with translation, verification, and community-level dissemination tracking			
Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD (IGAD Knowledge Management and Communications Officer, IGAD Communications and M&E Officers)			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Inconsistent documentation of local dissemination events; Difficulty verifying whether materials reached intended populations; Risk of double-counting if the same document is translated into multiple languages without distinction; Variation in classification of "policy documents" across Member States.			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Introduce standard translation and dissemination tracking forms; Require partner documentation of distribution channels and recipient groups; Use local validation methods (e.g., feedback forms, community verification); Standardise the definition of "key policy document" across all implementing partners.			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk review of translated documents and dissemination logs; Spot verification in target communities; Interviews with local leaders and dissemination partners; Review of translation quality assurance and feedback from end-users.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Analysis by country, language, theme, and dissemination method; comparison of policy types prioritised for translation; gap analysis in underserved linguistic zones.			
Presentation of Data: Bar graphs by theme and country; tables of languages and document types; geographic maps highlighting dissemination coverage.			
Review of Data: Quarterly by IGAD Communications and M&E units, with validation from field partners and IGAD implementing units			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly – via dashboards, donor updates, and thematic communication strategy reports			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using 2024 records of disseminated translations. Targets will increase year-on-year, focusing on linguistic diversity and underserved cross-border communities.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value TBD (based on 2024 communications audit)	Target 3 key documents translated and disseminated in local languages by 2026	Actual To be reported quarterly	Notes Mapping of local language needs under way to guide translation priorities
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 2. Raising awareness of cross-border policies with national governments, local authorities, the private sector, and civil society in the three IGAD Clusters.

Result: R2.1. Relevant stakeholders engaged and informed through the dissemination of cross-border coordination and cooperation policies and protocols

Indicator: No. 2.1.2. Number of joint sensitization meetings conducted with target stakeholders (national government, local authorities, local chambers of commerce, and local NGO coordination bodies) to promote awareness and alignment on cross-border initiatives

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the total number of joint sensitization meetings convened under the EU-funded programme to raise awareness among and promote alignment between target stakeholder groups on cross-border initiatives, policies, and operational frameworks.

“Sensitization meetings” are structured, documented sessions (physical or virtual) aimed at informing, clarifying, and promoting dialogue among institutional stakeholders regarding cross-border programmes, strategies, or protocols relevant to governance, security, mobility, economic integration, or resilience.

“Joint” refers to the participation of at least two different stakeholder categories (e.g., national government, local administration, civil society, private sector) within the same event, discussing shared objectives around cross-border engagement.

“Target stakeholders” include:

- National government ministries or agencies (relevant to peacebuilding, trade, interior, health, environment)
- Local authorities (county, district, municipal representatives)
- Local chambers of commerce or trade associations
- Local NGO or CSO coordination bodies involved in governance, service delivery, or peacebuilding

Inclusion Criteria:

- Meetings convened under the EU-funded programme framework with clear agendas and participant records
- Events that include representatives from at least two distinct stakeholder categories
- Sensitization sessions focused on IGAD, national, or programme-related cross-border initiatives
- Events with evidence of joint participation and dissemination of key information materials (e.g., policy briefings, programme updates)

Exclusion Criteria:

- Sector-specific meetings without cross-stakeholder engagement
- Informal gatherings or ad hoc consultations without documentation
- Internal project planning sessions or closed-door government-only briefings
- Sensitization events not linked to cross-border or regional coordination themes

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of meetings)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Stakeholder type, country, cluster, sectoral theme, meeting level, and meeting format

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator and it helps track the extent to which the programme fosters multi-sectoral engagement and coherence among institutional actors at multiple levels. Sensitization meetings are essential for promoting understanding of cross-border initiatives, ensuring local ownership, improving implementation coordination, and increasing the visibility of IGAD and EU support. The indicator enables programme managers to assess coverage, gaps in outreach, and stakeholder participation trends.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Review of meeting agendas, participant attendance lists, dissemination materials, and event reports from implementing partners or IGAD conveners

Data Source(s): PRBP activity tracking and outreach module; IGAD programme reports; Implementing partner sensitization meeting summaries; Field visit reports and coordination meeting records; Attendance lists.

Calculation of values: Simple count of unique, eligible sensitization meetings conducted within the reporting period that meet the inclusion criteria.			
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly			
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – meetings are tracked as part of routine programme activity monitoring			
Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD (IGAD Programme Implementation Unit (IDDRSI Coordination Lead; Implementing Partner M&E and Coordination Focal Points)).			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Risk of over-reporting informal or internal meetings as sensitization events; Gaps in documentation from decentralized or partner-led meetings; Inconsistent disaggregation by stakeholder type or sector; Variation in quality or depth of sensitization across events.			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Adopt standard event reporting template and attendance sheet; Require documentation of cross-stakeholder participation; Include sensitization activity validation during field monitoring; Train partners on classification and reporting protocols..			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk review of meeting reports and attendance records; Spot checks and interviews with participants and conveners; Cross-checking of e-SCM entries with partner field records; Random selection of events for field verification.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Analysis by country, sector, and stakeholder mix; trend comparisons across reporting periods; mapping of coverage by administrative and border cluster areas.			
Presentation of Data: Tables and bar charts by sector and stakeholder type; geographic maps of meeting distribution; narrative summaries in programme coordination updates.			
Review of Data: Quarterly by IGAD Programme Management Team, and implementing partners			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly – in narrative progress reports, dashboards, and donor coordination platforms			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established using 2024 records of sensitization activities. Targets will reflect expansion of multi-sectoral coordination across border clusters.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value TBD (based on 2024 outreach reports)	Target 12 joint sensitization meetings conducted by 2026	Actual To be reported quarterly	Notes Meeting verification checklist in development to ensure cross-stakeholder inclusion
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 2. Raising awareness of cross-border policies with national governments, local authorities, the private sector, and civil society in the three IGAD Clusters.

Result: R2.1. Relevant stakeholders engaged and informed through the dissemination of cross-border coordination and cooperation policies and protocols

Indicator: No. 2.1.3. Number of individuals reached through awareness and media campaigns

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the total number of **individuals reached** through programme-supported awareness and media campaigns designed to increase knowledge, shift attitudes, or promote behavioural change on issues related to cross-border governance, peacebuilding, mobility, security, or public health.

“Reached” refers to individuals who are estimated or verified to have been exposed to a message or media product (e.g., radio spot, television message, social media content, printed material, billboard, SMS) disseminated as part of a structured campaign.

“Awareness and media campaigns” are defined as coordinated, time-bound outreach efforts—supported through EU-funded interventions—that use mass media, digital platforms, interpersonal communication, or print to deliver targeted messages.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Individuals reached through campaigns that are clearly branded and documented under the EU-funded programme
- Media campaigns using radio, TV, mobile messaging, newspapers, posters, flyers, street theatre, or social media
- Reach numbers derived from verifiable distribution logs, radio station listener estimates, media analytics, or survey-based exposure assessments
- Multi-channel campaigns or single-medium efforts with a defined theme (e.g., early warning awareness, peace messaging, cross-border cooperation)

Exclusion Criteria:

- Participants in general public meetings, trainings, or consultations not explicitly conducted as part of a media or awareness campaign
- Impressions or views on digital platforms not originating from the programme’s campaign materials
- Individuals indirectly exposed through hearsay or informal channels without traceable dissemination
- Outreach events not linked to a structured messaging or behaviour change effort

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of individuals)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Country, cluster, type of media used (radio, print, social media, SMS, etc.), Gender (where known), Age group (if available), Thematic focus of the campaign

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. This indicator captures the programme’s public engagement footprint and the extent to which key messages on cross-border cooperation and peacebuilding are being disseminated. It supports strategic communication planning, ensures equitable outreach across regions and populations, and enhances transparency in reporting public-facing activities.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Review of media plans, broadcasting logs, social media analytics, distribution records, outreach reports, and population-based survey data (where applicable)

Data Source(s): PRBP communications tracking module; Radio/TV logs; Implementing partner media and outreach reports; Community radio broadcast reports; Digital platform analytics (Facebook, Twitter/X, YouTube); Field visit reports and media monitoring services; Feedback and survey reports

Calculation of values: Sum of individuals reached through each verified campaign channel, using:

- Listener/viewer estimates (radio/TV)
- Digital engagement metrics (unique users/reach)
- Distribution counts (flyers/posters)

Community feedback and sampling surveys Double-counting across channels to be minimized using conservative estimates or unique reach modelling. Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (per campaign or per reporting cycle) Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – requires triangulation of analytics, partner reports, and sometimes third-party verification Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD (IGAD Communications Lead; Implementing Partner Communications and M&E Teams).
--

DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Risk of double-counting individuals reached across platforms; Inaccurate or inflated audience estimates, especially in rural or low-connectivity areas; Incomplete tracking of community-based distribution or informal channels; Disaggregation by gender or age often unavailable for mass media.			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Use of standardised media campaign reporting templates; Triangulation of audience estimates using external data sources (e.g., station listenership surveys); Training implementing partners on realistic and conservative estimation methods; Engagement with local media providers to obtain verifiable reach estimates.			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot audits of campaign documentation and logs ☐ Review of broadcast and distribution records; Interviews with implementing partner communication focal points; Field-based validation through rapid surveys or focus groups.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Aggregated by campaign, location, and media type; analysis of cumulative and unique reach; identification of outreach gaps by geography or target group			
Presentation of Data: Bar and pie charts by channel and thematic focus; geographic heat maps of coverage; narrative summaries of campaign objectives and reach.			
Review of Data: Quarterly by IGAD M&E Unit and Communications Team, in consultation with partners and field offices			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly – through programme dashboards, strategic communications briefs, and EU Delegation updates			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be determined based on media coverage and reach during 2024 programming. Targets will reflect annual growth and diversified messaging reach across platforms and geographies.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 campaign reach data -if available)	250,000 individuals reached by 2026	To be reported quarterly	Channel-specific tracking dashboards under development for radio and digital campaigns
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 2. Raising awareness of cross-border policies with national governments, local authorities, the private sector, and civil society in the three IGAD Clusters.

Result: R2.1. Relevant stakeholders engaged and informed through the dissemination of cross-border coordination and cooperation policies and protocols

Indicator: No. 2.1.4. Percentage of stakeholders who report being aware of the existence and relevance of Informal Cross-Border Trade (ICBT), the Simplified Trade Regime (STR), and the Livestock Identification and Traceability System (LITS)

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the proportion of surveyed stakeholders who self-report awareness of the existence and relevance of three priority cross-border trade frameworks or tools supported under the programme:

1. Informal Cross-Border Trade (ICBT) – small-scale trade activity across borders not regulated through formal customs channels;
2. Simplified Trade Regime (STR) – an official mechanism simplifying clearance procedures for small-scale traders, particularly women and youth; and
3. Livestock Identification and Traceability System (LITS) – a regional system for tracing animal origin, movement, and health certification to improve disease control and market access.

“Awareness” is defined as the ability of the respondent to correctly identify or describe at least one of the frameworks, its purpose, and/or its application in their area or trade activity.

Stakeholders include national and sub-national government officials, border control officers, local administrators, traders, community leaders, CSO representatives, and members of border-based business associations or cooperatives.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Stakeholders who have been engaged directly or indirectly in EU-funded programme activities related to cross-border trade, livestock systems, or trade facilitation
- Respondents who correctly identify the existence and basic function or importance of ICBT, STR, or LITS
- Surveys using a validated tool with standardised awareness questions on all three thematic areas
- Data collected within target geographic areas identified in the programme framework

Exclusion Criteria:

- Respondents outside the defined target groups or programme geographic areas
- Stakeholders who indicate only vague or partial familiarity without naming the system or policy purpose
- Survey tools not containing structured questions aligned to all three thematic components
- Responses based on hearsay or assumption not verified through probing questions

Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Country, cluster, Country, Stakeholder type (e.g., government, private sector, CSO); Gender; Age group; Thematic area (ICBT, STR, LITS)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. This indicator reflects the reach and effectiveness of awareness-raising, policy engagement, and communications interventions on regional trade and livestock frameworks. Stakeholder awareness is a prerequisite for system uptake, compliance, and cross-border policy harmonisation. The results inform outreach strategies, institutional engagement priorities, and resource targeting to fill awareness gaps.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Structured perception surveys administered to a sample of stakeholders across programme zones using standardised tools and validated interview techniques. Surveys may be conducted in-person, digitally, or by phone depending on access and context.

Data Source(s): PRBP Awareness/perception surveys reports; IGAD border cluster activity reports; Feedback and reporting from trade associations, local chambers, and veterinary units.

Calculation of values: (Number of respondents who correctly report awareness of at least one of the three systems ÷ Total number of eligible stakeholders surveyed) × 100
Separate percentages may be calculated for ICBT, STR, and LITS, then averaged or reported disaggregated as needed.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Biannually (preferably post-campaigns or targeted training sessions)

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – requires field data collection, stakeholder sampling, and translation of survey tools

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD (Trade officer; Implementing Partner M&E Teams).

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Risk of respondent bias (overstating awareness due to perceived expectations); Inconsistency in interpretation of terminology across contexts or languages; Challenges in disaggregating results by system when multiple are discussed together; Limited survey access to mobile or informal stakeholders (e.g., small-scale traders).

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Use of carefully translated and pre-tested tools with examples and visual aids; Enumerator training on neutral probing and clarification; Partner-led outreach to support respondent sampling and validation; Alignment of survey timing with major outreach events and campaigns.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk review of survey instruments and datasets; Field validation with a sub-sample of respondents; Interviews with enumerators and local implementation partners; Cross-checking with participation data from awareness and training events.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Analysis by stakeholder type, location, and thematic awareness (ICBT, STR, LITS); identification of patterns in knowledge gaps; comparison over time and across intervention zones

Presentation of Data: Tables and bar graphs by theme and geography; stacked percentage charts; narrative analysis in quarterly and annual reports

Review of Data: Quarterly review by IGAD M&E and programme teams, with feedback loops from field implementers and sectoral leads

Reporting of Data: Quarterly – through programme dashboards, donor briefings, and stakeholder engagement summaries

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established based on 2024 stakeholder perception and engagement survey. Targets will reflect growth in awareness across key groups and geographies, prioritising areas of economic and livestock trade.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 survey data)	70% of surveyed stakeholders report awareness of at least one of ICBT, STR, or LITS by 2026	To be reported quarterly	Initial awareness campaign evaluation to refine thematic focus and survey language

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 3. Strengthening the Management of Transboundary Resources

Result: R3.1. Stakeholder-endorsed frameworks for transboundary resource management adopted, formalized, and integrated into relevant institutional processes

Indicator: No. 3.1.1. Number of stakeholders actively engaged in the co-development of a joint actionable roadmap for the sustainable management of transboundary natural resources.

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator captures the number of unique stakeholders who directly and consistently participate in the structured, documented co-development process of a joint, actionable roadmap aimed at sustainable transboundary natural resource management.

Stakeholders include representatives from national and sub-national government institutions, regional organisations, civil society organisations (CSOs), community-based organisations (CBOs), academia, private sector actors, and local communities with a demonstrated stake in the management of shared natural resources (e.g., land, water, forests, fisheries, rangelands).

“Actively engaged” refers to individuals who:

- Attend and participate in at least two substantive roadmap co-development sessions, consultations, or technical workshops; **and**
- Contribute inputs, validations, or sign-off to the roadmap’s design, priorities, or implementation modalities; **and**
- Are documented through attendance logs, validated meeting reports, and/or endorsed stakeholder contribution records.

“Co-development” refers to a structured and participatory process, facilitated under the programme framework, that includes joint analysis, priority setting, planning, and validation of a roadmap.

“Joint actionable roadmap” is a multi-stakeholder plan with defined objectives, timelines, roles, and geographic or thematic scope addressing shared transboundary natural resource governance issues.

Inclusion criteria:

- Stakeholders formally invited and documented as participants in roadmap sessions;
- Participants contributing to consultations, validation workshops, or technical working groups;
- Organisations or institutions represented consistently across at least two stages of roadmap development.

Exclusion criteria:

- Observers, one-time participants, or note-takers not contributing substantively;
- General audience of awareness-raising events;
- Stakeholders who attend but are not documented in project records.

Unit of Measure: Count (number of individuals or institutional representatives)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Stakeholder group, country, cluster, sex, resource system type (e.g., water, rangeland)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator and it assesses the inclusiveness, relevance, and scale of stakeholder participation in designing shared responses to complex natural resource challenges across borders. It supports programme objectives around inclusive governance, stakeholder ownership, and joint planning. The indicator helps managers and donors evaluate engagement breadth and the legitimacy of the resulting roadmap.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Desk review and extraction from project reports, participant registers, roadmap development reports, validated attendance sheets, stakeholder contribution forms, and facilitator reports.

Data Source(s): Programme activity reports and stakeholder engagement logs; Roadmap consultation and validation meeting minutes; Institutional partner submissions; Attendance registers signed by stakeholders.

Calculation of values: Simple count of unique stakeholders who meet the inclusion criteria within the reporting period. If individuals represent institutions, they are counted per institution unless separate contributions are made.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (with updates based on roadmap development milestones) Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – due to the need for stakeholder verification and cross-checking of participation data. Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD/ICPALD (Focal point, M&E Officer).			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025 Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Potential overcounting if stakeholders attend multiple events under different institutional identities; Incomplete disaggregation in partner registers; Stakeholder substitution not always captured (e.g., replacement by colleagues); Variability in documentation quality across programme areas. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Introduce stakeholder engagement database with unique identifiers; Harmonise registration templates across events; Assign focal persons to verify participation during and after events; Cross-reference participation with institutional representation logs. Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026) Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Random sample verification of attendance logs; Desk audits of roadmap consultation documentation; Field interviews with participants; Reconciliation of participation lists with partner institutions.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Data will be aggregated by country, cluster, and stakeholder type. Comparative analysis across roadmap stages will reveal levels of sustained engagement and representation. Presentation of Data: Presented in summary tables, pie charts, and bar graphs in quarterly and annual reports. Disaggregated figures will support inclusion analysis and visualise participation trends across clusters. Review of Data: Quarterly by IGAD M&E Unit and Programme Implementation Team, in coordination with partner institutions and technical facilitators. Reporting of Data: Quarterly through programme dashboards, EU and donor updates, and regional coordination review meetings.			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established through stakeholder mapping in 2025. Targets will reflect growth in inclusive participation across key stakeholder groups and transboundary clusters involved in natural resource governance.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 engagement review)	200 stakeholders actively engaged by 2026 (minimum 40% women, with representation across all target clusters)	To be reported quarterly	Stakeholder mapping tool under development to establish baseline by Q4 2024
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 10, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 3. Strengthening the Management of Transboundary Resources

Result: R3.1. Stakeholder-endorsed frameworks for transboundary resource management adopted, formalized, and integrated into relevant institutional processes

Indicator: No. 3.1.2. Number of transboundary natural resource management mechanisms that are formally established, operational, and demonstrating sustainable practices

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator counts the number of distinct transboundary natural resource management (NRM) mechanisms that (1) have been formally established; (2) are demonstrably operational; and (3) have adopted at least one recognised sustainable practice in line with IGAD or partner programme goals.

A transboundary NRM mechanism is defined as a formal institutional arrangement, platform, or multi-stakeholder body—such as a joint management committee, cross-border technical working group, or bi-/multi-lateral governance entity—tasked with planning, regulating, or overseeing the use, conservation, or restoration of shared natural resources (e.g., water basins, rangelands, forests, fisheries, wetlands) that span international boundaries within the IGAD region.

“Formally established” refers to the existence of legally or administratively endorsed instruments (e.g., MoU, joint declaration, by-laws, operational charter) approved by relevant cross-border authorities or recognised institutions.

“Operational” means the mechanism meets regularly, has documented actions or decisions, and engages members from both (or all) sides of the border.

“Demonstrating sustainable practices” requires verifiable implementation of at least one activity or measure aligned with environmental sustainability, such as community-based conservation, ecosystem restoration, seasonal resource planning, water-use efficiency, land degradation control, or adherence to ecosystem-based management principles.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Mechanisms covering shared ecosystems in IGAD member states
- Entities with cross-border representation and decision-making capacity
- Mechanisms with formal governance documentation and ongoing implementation of resource management actions
- At least one documented sustainable practice implemented and monitored during the reporting period

Exclusion Criteria:

- Ad hoc or informal coordination groups lacking formal terms of reference or government recognition
- Mechanisms operating only at national level without cross-border engagement
- Groups that have not yet implemented a sustainable NRM practice
- Dormant platforms with no evidence of activity during the reporting period

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of mechanisms)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Resource type, country cluster, level of implementation, and Gender composition (where applicable)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator and tracks the institutionalisation and functionality of cross-border NRM mechanisms, which are key to achieving sustainable, cooperative governance of shared resources. It enables programme managers, donors, and national stakeholders to measure systemic progress in transboundary cooperation, ensure ownership, and promote environmental stewardship across borders. It also helps identify which mechanisms are effectively translating agreements into practice.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Desk review of mechanism charters, meeting minutes, and implementation reports; field verification of operational status; interviews with coordinating institutions; review of sustainability action plans and activity logs.

Data Source(s): Programme implementation reports; Official declarations or agreements (MoUs, ToRs); Field monitoring reports and partner submissions; Records from IGAD technical divisions and Member State institutions; Reports from community resource user groups or watershed committees.

Calculation of values: Simple count of transboundary mechanisms that meet all three criteria (established, operational, and implementing sustainable practices) during the reporting period. Each mechanism is counted only once.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (with verification semi-annually)

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – requires both document review and periodic field verification

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD/ICPALD (Focal point, M&E Officer).

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Attribution complexity where multiple donors support the same mechanism; Inconsistent classification of "sustainable practices" across regions; Limited documentation of informal practices at community level; Risk of overreporting inactive platforms without rigorous verification.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Develop standardised verification checklist and scoring tool for "operational" and "sustainable" status; Require submission of evidence (e.g., meeting minutes, activity logs); Conduct site visits for high-priority mechanisms; Align classification of sustainable practices with regional ecosystem management guidelines.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Desk-based audit of sampled mechanism files; Field verification missions to review governance and activity evidence; Key informant interviews with implementing authorities; Reconciliation with PRBP monitoring dashboard and programme field teams

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Mechanisms will be analysed by country pair, resource type, and sustainability focus. Time-series comparisons will track trends in formalisation and functionality across clusters.

Presentation of Data: Tables and charts by ecosystem and mechanism type; geographic maps highlighting operational zones; summary dashboards for stakeholder updates.

Review of Data: Quarterly by IGAD M&E Unit in coordination with AED, partner institutions (ICPALD), and implementing field teams (CBDFUs).

Reporting of Data: Quarterly – via programme reports, dashboards, and updates to development partners and Member States.

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established based on 2024 institutional mapping and mechanism functionality assessment. Targets will reflect incremental growth in the number of cross-border mechanisms that not only exist but meet minimum criteria for operationalisation and sustainability, with emphasis on ecological relevance and geographic equity across transboundary clusters.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 inventory of transboundary mechanisms)	10 fully established, operational, and sustainability-oriented mechanisms by 2026	To be reported quarterly	

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 12, 2025

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 4. Coordination of components and clusters by establishing and hosting steering committees and other coordination mechanisms as well as developing and conducting Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Result: R4.1. Strengthened coordination mechanisms enabling effective implementation of the PRBP

Indicator: No. 4.1.1. Number of multi-level coordination meetings convened to enhance cross-border and inter-institutional collaboration

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator counts the number of formal coordination meetings that bring together actors from different governance levels (e.g., national, regional, local) and institutions across borders to improve collaborative planning, decision-making, and implementation in relation to shared challenges.

“Multi-level coordination meeting” refers to any structured and agenda-driven gathering—physical, virtual, or hybrid—convened under the programme framework that involves at least two levels of governance (e.g., national and local, or regional and national) **and** at least two distinct institutional or organizational types (e.g., government and civil society, or police and border health services).

“Enhance cross-border and inter-institutional collaboration” refers to the meeting’s core objective to foster information exchange, harmonisation of protocols, joint planning, or policy dialogue on issues with a cross-border dimension, such as health, migration, trade, security, or natural resource management.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Meetings with participation from at least two governance levels (e.g., regional-national, national-subnational)
- At least two institutions or sectors represented (e.g., immigration and customs; health and livestock)
- Meeting agenda, participant list, and minutes documented
- Convened or facilitated with programme support or under programme mandate

Exclusion Criteria:

- Internal planning meetings without multi-level or cross-border scope
- Bilateral meetings with only one level of governance or same-institution participation
- Meetings with no formal record (e.g., agenda, minutes, participants)

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of meetings)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Coordination level, country, cluster, sectoral theme, format (in-person, virtual, hybrid)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. Cross-border challenges require multi-level and multi-sectoral responses. This indicator captures the intensity and consistency of structured dialogue platforms that promote policy coherence, improve coordination, and reduce institutional fragmentation. It enables programme managers and partners to monitor the effectiveness of facilitation roles, engagement strategies, and emerging governance arrangements.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Review of meeting documentation including agenda, attendance sheets, minutes, and action plans; cross-check with partner institutions and CBDFUs.

Data Source(s): Programme (CBDFUs) reports; Meeting facilitation records; Partner institutional reports; IGAD cluster coordination updates; Minutes and validated participant list.

Calculation of values: Each qualifying meeting is counted once per reporting period, regardless of number of participants or duration. Recurrent meetings are counted individually if they meet inclusion criteria each time.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (with verification semi-annually)

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – primarily involves document review and internal verification

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD (CBDFUs Coordinators, IDDRSI Coordinator, M&E Officer).

DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025 Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Variation in how meetings are documented across programme areas; Risk of double counting follow-up meetings or sector-specific workshops without cross-border focus; Virtual meetings may lack comprehensive records. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Standardised meeting documentation template to be deployed; Unique meeting ID and tagging system in PRBP database; Periodic verification with implementing partners and institutional stakeholders; Integration of cross-border coordination checklist in M&E field tools. Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026) Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Review of sampled meeting files and e-SCM records; Interviews with meeting conveners and participants; Verification of cross-border and multi-level participation; Assessment of meeting outputs and follow-up actions.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Analysis will focus on frequency and type of coordination mechanisms, thematic focus, and geographic spread. Comparative trend analysis across clusters and reporting periods will assess consistency and expansion of dialogue. Presentation of Data: Tables and charts disaggregated by theme and country pair; summaries in coordination dashboards and governance briefs. Review of Data: Quarterly by IGAD M&E Unit and Programme Technical Leads in collaboration with partners' regional and national focal points. Reporting of Data: Quarterly – via programme reports, dashboards, and updates to development partners and Member States.			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established based on 2024 cross-border coordination mapping. Targets will reflect increased frequency and thematic diversity of coordination meetings across programme clusters and institutional levels.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD (based on 2024 cross-border coordination mapping)	18 multi-level coordination meetings convened by 2026, including annual convenings in each target cluster	To be reported quarterly	
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 12, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 4. Coordination of components and clusters by establishing and hosting steering committees and other coordination mechanisms as well as developing and conducting Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Result: R4.1. Strengthened coordination mechanisms enabling effective implementation of the PRBP

Indicator: No. 4.1.2. Coordination architecture established, formalized, and endorsed by implementing partners (IPs), the EU, and GIZ for effective joint planning and implementation

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator tracks the formal establishment and endorsement of a coordination architecture that facilitates structured collaboration among key stakeholders—specifically IGAD, implementing partners (IPs), the European Union (EU), and GIZ—aimed at enabling effective joint planning, resource harmonisation, and implementation oversight of cross-border interventions.

Coordination architecture refers to a clearly defined governance framework, including institutional roles, reporting mechanisms, joint decision-making protocols, and operational platforms that guide cooperation between stakeholders. It may consist of technical committees, thematic working groups, coordination secretariats, or other joint bodies backed by terms of reference (ToRs), meeting schedules, and defined coordination procedures.

“Established” implies the architecture has been designed, documented, and agreed upon.

“Formalized” indicates that relevant protocols or ToRs have been adopted and approved by institutional leadership.

“Endorsed” means there is documented support—such as signed agreements, communiqués, or formal acknowledgments—by implementing partners, the EU, and GIZ.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Existence of a documented coordination framework or architecture
- Endorsement or formal support from at least one representative institution each from IPs, the EU, and GIZ
- Clearly defined modalities for joint planning, communication, and review
- At least one functional coordination mechanism operational under the framework

Exclusion Criteria:

- Informal or ad hoc arrangements without documented governance structure
- Unilateral frameworks developed without partner consultation or endorsement
- Coordination bodies without a defined mandate or terms of reference

Unit of Measure: Yes/No (Milestone-based status)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Not applicable (binary indicator; however, process milestones can be tracked separately for internal management)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a management indicator. This indicator measures progress in institutionalising a high-level coordination mechanism that is essential for coherence, efficiency, and accountability across implementing entities. It provides assurance that mechanisms for joint oversight, planning alignment, and policy harmonisation are not only established but supported and utilised by key programme partners.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Desk review of endorsed coordination documents, signed MoUs or ToRs, meeting records, communiqués, and official partner correspondence.

Data Source(s): Signed coordination framework documents; IGAD–EU–GIZ joint statements; Reports from coordination meetings; Endorsement letters or meeting communiqués from IPs

Calculation of values: Binary determination (Yes/No) based on the presence of all three criteria: established, formalized, and endorsed. Status must be substantiated by documentation.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly review with milestone tracking

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – primarily desk review of programme and partner documents

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: GIZ (Focal Point: Programme Coordinator)			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025 Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Delays in formal partner endorsement processes; Differences in understanding of “endorsement” across partners; Risk of over-attribution if interim coordination activities are counted. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Development of a checklist for each endorsement criterion; Maintain documentation trail of all formal communication and decisions; Regular joint reviews with EU and GIZ focal points. Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026) Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Verification of supporting documentation against indicator checklist; Review of meeting records and partner communications; Consultation with IGAD's partnership and governance leads			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Progress tracking against milestone stages: (1) Draft framework, (2) Formalisation, (3) Endorsement by partners. Used to inform joint planning and programme governance reviews. Presentation of Data: Narrative reporting supported by milestone tables, status checklists, and timelines. Review of Data: Quarterly (once) by IGAD/GIZ Coordination and M&E teams, in consultation with IPs and donors. . Reporting of Data: Quarterly in coordination meeting updates, donor progress reports, and programme governance reviews.			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established based on 2024 review of existing coordination structures and consultations with partners.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
No (as of 2024, no unified coordination architecture had been endorsed by all stakeholders)	Yes – Coordination architecture fully established, formalized, and endorsed by 2026	To be reported quarterly (Once)	Target reflects achievement of a shared and documented coordination mechanism backed by formal partner commitment.
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 12, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 4. Coordination of components and clusters by establishing and hosting steering committees and other coordination mechanisms as well as developing and conducting Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Result: R4.1. Strengthened coordination mechanisms enabling effective implementation of the PRBP

Indicator: No. 4.1.3. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework developed, validated, and operationalized

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the completion and application of a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework for the programme or initiative, assessed against three sequential milestones: (1) developed, (2) validated, and (3) operationalized.

- **Developed** means a comprehensive M&E framework document exists that outlines the programme's theory of change, results framework, performance indicators, data sources, collection tools, roles, timelines, and reporting structures.
- **Validated** implies that the draft framework has been reviewed and formally endorsed by relevant programme stakeholders, including IGAD, implementing partners (IPs), and donors.
- **Operationalized** means the framework is being actively used to guide data collection, analysis, reporting, learning, and adaptive management.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Finalised M&E framework document available and approved
- Formal validation or endorsement documented (e.g., meeting minutes, communiqués)
- Evidence of active use (e.g., indicator tracking, data reports, learning reviews) during reporting period
- Uploaded in the e-SCM system or equivalent programme knowledge repository

Exclusion Criteria:

- Draft frameworks not endorsed or lacking stakeholder review
- Frameworks not applied in practice or disconnected from programme management
- Generic M&E plans not tailored to programme-specific results or indicators
-

Unit of Measure: Yes/No (binary status) (Milestone-based status)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Not applicable (binary indicator); however, stages of progress can be tracked for internal management

Justification & Management Utility: This is a management indicator. An effective M&E framework is essential for results-based management, donor accountability, and adaptive programming. This indicator reflects the programme's readiness to systematically monitor progress, assess outcomes, and inform decision-making. It also provides confidence to stakeholders regarding programme transparency and learning.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Desk review of M&E framework documentation, stakeholder validation records, and evidence of use in implementation and reporting.

Data Source(s): M&E framework documents; Stakeholder validation meeting reports; Data tracking tools and indicator dashboards; Monitoring reports and learning briefs.

Calculation of values: Binary determination (Yes/No) based on verification that all three criteria—developed, validated, and operationalized—have been met and documented.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (until operationalized); thereafter, annual confirmation

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – requires document review and confirmation from M&E and programme teams

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: GIZ (Focal Point: Programme Coordinator; 3rd Party M&E Firm; PCPD M&E)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Inconsistent interpretation of "operationalization" across stakeholders; Delays in validation or limited documentation of approval processes; Potential mismatch between framework content and actual implementation.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Develop checklist to assess progress across the three framework stages; Document all validation milestones in official minutes or communiqués; Integrate framework review into programme steering and planning cycles.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Review of final framework version and validation records; Sampling of implementation reports to confirm use; Interviews with M&E focal persons at regional and country level.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Analysis will focus on progress against three milestone stages. If reported as "Yes," supporting documentation must verify full operationalization.

Presentation of Data: Narrative summaries and milestone tables with status indicators.

Review of Data: Quarterly by IGAD/PCPD M&E and Programme Coordination Teams

Reporting of Data: Quarterly, with supporting evidence shared during review meetings and in donor reports

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established through a 2024 review of existing M&E guidance and reporting practices.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
No (as of 2024, no comprehensive M&E framework validated or in use)	Yes – M&E framework fully developed, validated, and operationalized by 2026	To be reported quarterly (Once)	Targets reflect progress toward a robust and institutionally embedded framework that supports ongoing monitoring, learning, and accountability.

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 12, 2025

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 4. Coordination of components and clusters by establishing and hosting steering committees and other coordination mechanisms as well as developing and conducting Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Result: R4.1. Strengthened coordination mechanisms enabling effective implementation of the PRBP

Indicator: No. 4.1.4. Knowledge Management Framework established and functioning

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator assesses whether a Knowledge Management (KM) Framework has been both **established** and is **functioning** to systematically capture, store, share, and use information, lessons, tools, and evidence generated through programme implementation.

"Knowledge Management Framework" refers to a formal system comprising policies, procedures, tools, and institutional arrangements that support knowledge generation, documentation, dissemination, and learning within and across implementing partners.

"Established" means that the KM Framework has been formally developed, reviewed, and adopted by the programme's leadership or governance structure.

"Functioning" means the framework is in active use, with knowledge products being regularly captured, organised, stored (digitally or physically), and disseminated to relevant internal and external stakeholders.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Existence of a validated KM framework or strategy document
- Designated structures or personnel responsible for KM functions
- Active use of a KM platform, repository, or system (e.g., e-SCM)
- Evidence of knowledge product generation and dissemination (e.g., briefs, reports, case studies, learning events)

Exclusion Criteria:

- Draft frameworks not validated or adopted
- Ad hoc knowledge sharing without a formalised structure
- Systems without clear responsibility or mechanisms for dissemination
- KM tools not integrated with programme learning cycles

Unit of Measure: Yes/No (binary)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Not applicable; however, internal KM system performance can be tracked by domain (e.g., peace building, health, NRM, governance) for internal use

Justification & Management Utility: This is a management indicator. A functioning KM framework enhances institutional memory, supports learning and adaptive management, and strengthens visibility and evidence use. This indicator enables tracking of systematisation and utility of programme knowledge for better coordination, innovation, and accountability across partners and regions.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Review of programme documentation, KM platform activity logs, content repositories, and learning events; interviews with KM focal points and users.

Data Source(s): KM Framework and operational plan; Reports on knowledge product development and dissemination; KM platform usage reports; Training or learning event records

Calculation of values: Binary classification (Yes/No) based on evidence that the framework is both formally adopted and actively functioning during the reporting period.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly (initially); thereafter annual confirmation

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – requires document and system usage review

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: GIZ (Focal Point: Programme Coordinator; 3rd Party M&E Firm; PCPD M&E)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025 Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Lack of standard performance benchmarks for "functioning"; Risk of reporting bias based on qualitative judgments; Inconsistent use of KM tools across institutions or regions. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Develop a KM functionality checklist and performance log; Require quarterly reporting on KM platform activity; Provide training to focal persons on use and reporting expectations. Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026) Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Verification of KM outputs and records; Assessment of KM platform usage metrics; Review of learning and dissemination events; Interviews with partner KM focal points.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Status will be tracked across the two milestones: (1) Framework established and adopted, (2) Framework in active use. Supplementary analysis may assess number and type of products generated and shared. Presentation of Data: Narrative summaries with evidence annexes; checklists and status tables Review of Data: Quarterly by IGAD KM and M&E teams in coordination with implementing partners Reporting of Data: Quarterly – through KM performance updates and programme reports			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established based on 2024 KM systems and learning practices assessment.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
No – as of 2024, no formal KM framework had been adopted or implemented across the programme	Yes – KM framework established and fully functioning by 2026	To be reported quarterly	Target reflects development, adoption, and institutional use of a KM framework that supports programme-wide learning and adaptive implementation.
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 12, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 4. Coordination of components and clusters by establishing and hosting steering committees and other coordination mechanisms as well as developing and conducting Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Result: R4.1. Strengthened coordination mechanisms enabling effective implementation of the PRBP

Indicator: No. 4.1.5. Number of EU-supported communication products developed and disseminated to target stakeholders to enhance awareness and engagement

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of distinct communication products developed with EU support and disseminated to defined target audiences with the intent to increase awareness, understanding, or engagement around programme activities, achievements, and cross-border priorities.

“Communication products” refer to materials produced in various formats—including but not limited to—brochures, policy briefs, newsletters, infographics, press releases, radio messages, videos, social media content, reports, toolkits, and fact sheets.

“Developed and disseminated” means the product must be both (1) created with EU financial or technical input and (2) formally shared with one or more target stakeholder groups through defined channels (e.g., print distribution, radio broadcast, online publication, public events).

“Target stakeholders” include programme beneficiaries, Member State institutions, civil society organisations, local communities, technical partners, and donors.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Products produced under the programme with direct EU funding or branding
- Content tailored for awareness creation, engagement, or knowledge-sharing
- Documented dissemination to stakeholders via appropriate channels
- Products tracked, archived, or referenced in programme communication reports or e-SCM

Exclusion Criteria:

- Internal memos, working drafts, or products not disseminated externally
- Products produced outside the EU-funded initiative
- Reposted third-party content not developed by the programme team

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of communication products)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Product type, Communication channel (print, digital, broadcast, social media); Stakeholder group (e.g., local communities, CSOs, government, youth, women), Country, cluster

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. Effective communication enhances stakeholder ownership, programme visibility, and policy uptake. This indicator provides insights into outreach efforts, inclusivity, and the relevance of programme messaging to diverse stakeholder groups. It also demonstrates accountability to donors and the public..

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Review of communication logs, media tracking sheets, social media analytics, dissemination records, and PRBP system product entries.

Data Source(s): Communications unit reports; Product archives and media toolkits; social media and website analytics; Broadcast or print distribution records.

Calculation of values: Simple count of unique communication products that meet the inclusion criteria within the reporting period. A product reused across multiple platforms counts once; translated versions are counted separately if tailored for distinct stakeholder groups.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – tracked by communications team and through digital systems

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: GIZ (Focal Point: Programme Coordinator; 3rd Party M&E Firm; PCPD M&E)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025 Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Inconsistent reporting across programme units; Under-reporting of informal dissemination (e.g., WhatsApp groups, ad hoc meetings); Difficulty tracking audience reach and feedback in remote areas. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Introduce standard product tracking template; Centralise digital archiving of communication materials; Provide training to field staff on documentation and PRBP system entry Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026) Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Review of product archive and publication logs; Spot-checking of dissemination records; Cross-validation with social media and analytics dashboards; Interviews with target users and programme field officers.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Analysis will assess volume, diversity, and reach of products by theme, geography, and audience. Trends over time will inform communication strategy refinement. Presentation of Data: Bar charts and tables disaggregated by media type and target group; summary infographics in communications dashboards Review of Data: Quarterly by the Communications Unit in collaboration with M&E and programme leads Reporting of Data: Quarterly – in visibility reports, EU donor briefs, and programme progress updates			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established through 2024 review of past communication outputs and stakeholder engagement records. Targets will prioritise diverse formats and channels tailored to rural, cross-border, and marginalised communities.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD – to be determined based on 2024 communications audit and mapping of existing EU-funded outreach efforts	30 communication products developed and disseminated by 2026, with coverage across all programme clusters and key stakeholder groups	To be reported quarterly	
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 12, 2025			

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 4. Coordination of components and clusters by establishing and hosting steering committees and other coordination mechanisms as well as developing and conducting Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Result: R4.1. Strengthened coordination mechanisms enabling effective implementation of the PRBP

Indicator: No. 4.1.6. Percentage of targeted stakeholders who report having used EU-supported communication products to inform their decisions, actions, or awareness

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the proportion of stakeholders targeted by the programme who report that they have accessed and used communication products supported by the EU to shape or influence their knowledge, decisions, or actions in relation to programme objectives.

“Targeted stakeholders” include government officials, civil society actors, local community representatives, technical partners, implementing partners (IPs), and beneficiaries identified in the programme’s communications strategy.

“Used” refers to direct application, referencing, or engagement with EU-supported products—such as applying insights in planning processes, referencing data in presentations or meetings, or adapting community practices in response to materials disseminated.

“EU-supported communication products” include leaflets, videos, policy briefs, toolkits, newsletters, audio-visual content, or social media outputs that were designed or disseminated with EU support and intended to raise awareness or promote learning.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Stakeholders who confirm use through structured surveys, interviews, or focus group discussions
- Communication products that are clearly identifiable as EU-supported
- Stakeholders included in programme-defined target audience groups

Exclusion Criteria:

- Stakeholders who only received but did not use or engage with the content
- Unsolicited or informal references to products not directly supported by the programme
- Usage claims not supported by direct feedback from stakeholders

Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Country or cluster, Stakeholder group (e.g., government, CSO, community, media); Gender, Type of communication product used, Sector or thematic area (e.g., peacebuilding, migration, resilience, NRM)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a performance indicator. This indicator measures the perceived utility and relevance of communication products, providing insights into how well information is reaching and influencing stakeholders. It supports learning on content effectiveness and stakeholder engagement, and guides refinement of communication and outreach strategies.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Structured stakeholder survey, focus group discussions, or key informant interviews conducted post-dissemination; complemented by communication feedback tools (e.g., online polls, feedback forms).

Data Source(s): Stakeholder perception surveys; Meeting and training evaluation forms; Digital analytics; ; Focus group reports; Communication M&E logs.

Calculation of values: (Number of targeted stakeholders who report using EU-supported communication products ÷ Total number of targeted stakeholders surveyed) × 100.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Bi-annually (if resources are available) (mid-year and end-year)

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – requires survey design, administration, and analysis

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: GIZ (Focal Point: Programme Coordinator; 3rd Party M&E Firm; PCPD M&E)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Self-reported data may be subject to social desirability bias; Sampling limitations may affect representativeness; Difficulty isolating the influence of EU-supported products when multiple sources are used.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Use of anonymous feedback tools to reduce bias; Stratified sampling to ensure representation across stakeholder types and regions; Triangulation with usage analytics (e.g., video views, downloads).

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Survey instrument validation; Field data spot-checks; Comparison of reported usage against actual access records (where available); Qualitative follow-ups to deepen understanding of use.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Analysis will include percentage breakdowns by product type, geography, and stakeholder group. Trends over time will be analysed to assess improvement in product reach and usability.

Presentation of Data: Bar charts and tables in reports and dashboards; stakeholder quotes and case examples in learning briefs

Review of Data: Bi-annually by the Communications and M&E Teams, with feedback loops to the Programme Steering Committee

Reporting of Data: Bi-annual reporting in programme communications reports, EU donor briefs, and performance updates

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be established through structured perception survey in 2025. Target reflects expected improvements in relevance, accessibility, and utility of communication products among priority audiences.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD – to be determined through the first stakeholder perception survey in 2025	50% of targeted stakeholders report using EU-supported communication products by 2026	To be reported quarterly	.

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 12, 2025

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 4. Coordination of components and clusters by establishing and hosting steering committees and other coordination mechanisms as well as developing and conducting Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Result: R4.2. Enhanced capacity for data, information, and knowledge management to support evidence-based planning and decision-making

Indicator: No. 4.2.1. Number of visits to the IGAD Knowledge Management (KM) platform

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator counts the total number of individual visits to the IGAD Knowledge Management (KM) platform within a given reporting period. A “visit” is defined as a user session initiated when an individual accesses the KM platform, regardless of the number of pages viewed during that session.

The **KM platform** refers to the designated digital portal or web-based repository (e.g., e-SCM or equivalent) where IGAD hosts its programme-related resources, knowledge products, reports, toolkits, data, and communications content for internal and external stakeholders.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Visits tracked through web analytics tools (e.g., Google Analytics, server logs)
- Both internal (IGAD and IPs) and external users accessing the platform
- Includes unique and repeat visits from all devices and locations
- Applies to all languages and sub-sites under the official IGAD KM domain

Exclusion Criteria:

- Visits to other IGAD portals not linked to the KM system
- Background system calls or bot traffic not classified as human interaction
- Sessions with duration under 5 seconds (to exclude accidental or irrelevant visits)

Unit of Measure: Count (Number of visits)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Country or cluster of users (where available), Stakeholder category (e.g., internal staff, implementing partners, academia, public), Type of content accessed (e.g., report, toolkit, video), Device type (e.g., mobile, desktop, tablet)

Justification & Management Utility: This is a management indicator. This indicator provides a proxy for knowledge access, demand, and visibility. Tracking user visits helps programme managers and communicators understand stakeholder engagement trends, inform content strategies, and identify capacity needs for knowledge dissemination.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Automated collection through embedded analytics tools and periodic system usage reports; supplemented by access logs where necessary

Data Source(s): KM Platform usage dashboard; Web analytics platform (e.g., Google Analytics, Matomo); KM platform access logs; Digital engagement reports

Calculation of values: Total number of verified visits to the KM platform during the reporting period, as recorded by the analytics system. Sessions must meet inclusion criteria.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low – automatically generated by digital systems

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD(Focal Point: Programme Coordinator; PCPD M&E)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Inability to disaggregate visits by user intent or depth of engagement; Risk of inflated visit counts due to bots or system errors; Limited data from low-connectivity regions where access is constrained.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Filter out non-human or bot traffic using analytics settings; Set session duration thresholds to exclude invalid visits; Periodic manual validation of platform access logs; Supplement quantitative data with user feedback and qualitative insights

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026)

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Reconcile analytics reports with server access logs; Spot-check user activity patterns; Engage independent technical review of analytics settings and outputs

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Data will be analysed for trends over time and by geographic and stakeholder segment. Content popularity and bounce rates may be reviewed to assess user experience and content relevance.

Presentation of Data: Line graphs and bar charts disaggregated by user type and content accessed; integrated into quarterly performance dashboards and communication briefs

Review of Data: Quarterly by the Communications and M&E Units in consultation with platform administrators

Reporting of Data: Bi-annual reporting in programme communications reports, EU donor briefs, and performance updates

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be determined through 2024 usage analysis of the e-SCM and related portals. Target reflects increasing engagement, stakeholder reach, and accessibility of the platform as the primary knowledge-sharing tool for EU-supported interventions.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD – to be established through 2024 analytics of KM platform usage	15,000 verified visits by 2026 across programme priority clusters	To be reported quarterly	

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 12, 2025

PRBP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Project Objective: To enhance the effectiveness of conflict prevention and mitigation in cross-border communities in selected border areas in the Horn of Africa

Outcome: Reinforced coordination on cross-border management, including with local authorities and IGAD as well as enhanced sharing of information to mitigate conflict and promote socio-economic development.

Output: 4. Coordination of components and clusters by establishing and hosting steering committees and other coordination mechanisms as well as developing and conducting Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Result: R4.2. Enhanced capacity for data, information, and knowledge management to support evidence-based planning and decision-making

Indicator: No. 4.2.2. Percentage of IGAD Knowledge Management (KM) platform users who report applying knowledge acquired from the platform to inform their work, planning, or decision-making

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the proportion of users of the IGAD KM platform who report that they have applied knowledge, information, or resources accessed through the platform to inform their technical work, institutional planning, programme design, or strategic decision-making.

“**KM platform users**” include any individual with access to and interaction on the IGAD KM system (e.g., related portals), such as government officials, implementing partners, technical experts, researchers, and community-based organisations.

“**Applied knowledge**” refers to the meaningful use of information gained via the KM platform in a professional context—such as referencing data in reports, using guidance documents in programme planning, or adapting practices based on shared toolkits or lessons.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Users who confirm application of knowledge via structured survey, focus group discussion, or interview
- Application within the context of the user's professional or institutional role
- Use of EU-supported or IGAD-endorsed KM resources

Exclusion Criteria:

- Users who only accessed content but did not report use
- Non-professional or casual engagement with content (e.g., browsing with no reported intent to apply)
- Responses lacking sufficient clarity to determine meaningful application

Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)

Type of Indicator: Output

Category of Indicator: Custom (Programme-Specific Indicator)

Disaggregated by: Country or cluster, User type (e.g., IGAD staff, government, CSO, private sector, academic); Sector or theme (e.g., migration, climate resilience, trade); Gender

Justification & Management Utility: This is a management indicator. This indicator tracks the effectiveness and relevance of the KM platform in influencing planning and practice. It informs strategic improvements in content design, targeting, and digital outreach, and provides evidence of the platform's contribution to evidence-informed decision-making.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Structured surveys administered through the KM platform, email, or events; complemented by interviews and focus groups with selected users.

Data Source(s): Online/post-use feedback surveys; User satisfaction and utilisation surveys; Meeting and training evaluation forms; Interview and FGD transcripts; Communications M&E dashboards.

Calculation of values: (Number of KM users reporting application of platform-acquired knowledge ÷ Total number of KM users surveyed) × 100

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Bi-annually

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium – due to need for user follow-up and analysis

Responsible Institution & Individual(s) at the Programme: IGAD (Focal Point: Programme Coordinator; PCPD M&E)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2025 Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Self-reporting may be biased or exaggerated; Sampling may under-represent remote or low-access users; Attribution challenges where knowledge overlaps with other sources. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Use of anonymised digital feedback tools to improve honesty; Triangulate survey data with user activity logs and content analytics; Develop clear criteria for defining and validating “application” in responses. Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Annually (next scheduled: June 2026) Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Validation of survey instruments and sampling protocols; Spot-checking through in-depth interviews and case studies; Cross-referencing reported usage with specific platform content accessed.			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Data will be analysed by stakeholder group, sector, and geographic area to identify usage trends, barriers to application, and effectiveness of content dissemination.. Presentation of Data: Pie charts and bar graphs in dashboards; use cases and quotes featured in KM learning products Review of Data: Bi-annually by KM and M&E teams in collaboration with technical programme teams Reporting of Data: Bi-annually – through learning briefs, programme reports, and donor updates			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline will be determined using a structured survey tool in 2025. Target reflects expected improvements in usability, access, and relevance of KM platform content across key user groups and regions..			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Baseline Value	Target	Actual	Notes
TBD – to be established through first user utilisation survey in 2024	50% of KM platform users report application of acquired knowledge by 2026	To be reported bi-annually	
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10 July 12, 2025			