General Information

Fund	MPTF_00249: Complex Risk Analytics Fund (CRAF'd)
FMP Record	MPTF_00249_00008: Environmental Early Action and Risk Tracking Hub (EEARTH)
MPTFO Project Id	00140353
Start Date	18-Sep-2023
End Date	18-Sep-2025

Applicants	Status	Contact Type	Name	e-mail	Position	Telephone
	Active: 20-Feb-2023 10:26:00 AM	Project Manager	Benedicte Benoit	bbenoit@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com		
	Active: 21-Feb-2025 3:30:00 PM	Project Manager	Rose Bradbury	rbradbury@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com	Associate Director, Government and Multilateral Relations	

Signatories	Signature Process	Role	Name of Organization	Name	User Email
	Digital	Signatory	ICG: International Crisis Group	Mr Brett Moody	bmoody@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com

Contacts	Contact Type	Name	e-mail	Position	Additional e-mail	Telephone
	Project Manager	Ashleigh O'Connor Hanlon	aoconnorhanlon@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com	Senior Development Officer		
	Project Manager	Andrew Ciacci	aciacci@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com	Researcher, Future of Conflict		
	Project Manager	Ulrich Eberle	ueberle@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com	Project Director, Climate, Environment and Conflict		
	Project Manager	Robert Blecher	rblecher@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com	Program Director, Future of Conflict		
	Project Manager	Rose Bradbury	rbradbury@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com	Associate Director, Government and Multilateral Relations		
	Project Manager	Brett Moody	bmoody@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com	Chief Financial Officer		

h> D escription	The **Environmental Early Action and Risk Tracking Hub (EEARTH)** project is a climate-security early warning system for the Horn of Africa. Piloted in Somalia and South Sudan, EEARTH aims at improving stakeholder knowledge of complex risks arising from the impact of climate stress on conflict drivers and encouraging anticipatory action to head off deadly violence, resource competition, food insecurity, climate-related displacement, transboundary disputes and other ills that tend to be associated with climate fragility.
	Using an **innovative multidisciplinary approach** harnessing quantitative and qualitative analyses, the EEARTH system will ultimately illuminate pathways that lead from climate shocks to conflict risks via an interface blending visualised research with political analysis and translates technical insights into pragmatic, actionable recommendations.
	- As a first step, **two pathway assessments,** covering Somalia and South Sudan and coupling data and political analysis, will be produced to delineate the pathways linking climatic distress to deadly conflict analysing three interacting dimensions: climate fragility, livelihood and conflict. - Building on the pathway assessments, **two early warning assessments,** one each for the two pilot countries, will be produced to provide a monitoring framework for the three key elements of each pathway. This will enable us to rapidly detect the activation of a dangerous pathway so as to be able to ring alarm bells quickly. - In parallel, **needs and solutions assessments** will be conducted with stakeholders, including humanitarian, peacebuilding, civil society and multilateral organisations, and national government officials in Somalia and South Sudan. - Using data from each of these elements, **the EEARTH interface** will be "soft launched" with an initial stakeholder network of partners in the Horn, to track and anticipate likely changes to conflict dynamics. Specifically, when EEARTH identifies a potential risk or resolution opportunity, a Crisis Group political analyst – "the human in the loop" – will investigate, verifying the risk and providing insight on what should be done. Once launched, the EEARTH system will thus generate insights into complex risks aimed at guiding stakeholder decision-making within crisis-affected and fragile settings in the Horn.
	Crisis Group's Future of Conflict (FoC) Program will lead the EEARTH project. Their work on climate is distinguished by its combination of cutting-edge climate science and field-based research, supported by the latest data visualisation techniques, to help decision-makers formulate quicker, more agile policy responses to the dangers posed by global warming.

Universal Markers	Gender Equality Marker	Risk	
	GEM2 - GEWE is a significant objective of the Key Activity's overall intent	Low Risk	

Optional Markers	Fragile Context	Yes

Fund Specific Markers	Funding Window / Direct Cost	**Funding Windows** Window B: Analytics that drive critical insights for crisis anticipation, prevention, and response.
	Call for Proposals / Round	**2022** Second Call for Proposals 2022 (Analytics and AI on Climate Fragility Risks)

Geographical Scope	Geographical Scope	Name of the Region	Region(s)	Country
	Regional	Horn of Africa, including Somalia and South Sudan	Eastern Africa	

Participating Organizations and their Implementing Partners	UN Participating Organizations	Government/ Multilateral/ NGO/ Other	New Entities	Implementing Partners
		ICG - International Crisis Group		

Programme and Project Cost	Participating Organization	Amount (in USD)	Comments	
	Budget Requested			
	ICG	$700,000.00	Insert fund_requested from Quantum; Core funding	
	Total Budget Requested	**$700,000.00**		
	Tranches			
	Tranche 1		Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	ICG (43%) $301,000.00 **Total:** **$301,000.00**		ICG (36%) $252,000.00 **Total:** **$252,000.00**	ICG (21%) $147,000.00 **Total:** **$147,000.00**
	Other Sources (Parallel Funding)			
	Total	$700,000.00		

Thematic Keywords		

Programme Duration	Anticipated Start Date	18-Sep-2023
	Duration (In months)	24
	Anticipated End Date	18-Sep-2025

Narratives

Title	Text

Executive Summary	Crisis Group will build a climate-security early warning system for the Horn of Africa, the **Environmental Early Action and Risk Tracking Hub (EEARTH)**, aimed at identifying climate security risks and encouraging anticipatory action to head off deadly violence, resource competition, food insecurity, climate-related displacement, and other ills associated with climate fragility. The EEARTH system will use an **innovative multidisciplinary approach** harnessing quantitative and qualitative information, pairing climate and conflict data assessments with field-based political insight. As a first step, Crisis Group will produce two **pathway assessments on Somalia and South Sudan,** delineating pathways linking climatic distress to deadly conflict through analysing three interacting dimensions: climate fragility, livelihood and conflict. In both countries, Crisis Group will use our qualitative analysis, rooted in field interviews with affected populations, to ensure that conclusions adequately reflect socioeconomic and political conditions. Our local networks can verify that the data analysis accurately reflects how climate change acts as a threat multiplier. Building on the pathway assessments, we will produce two **early warning assessments**, one for each country, providing a standardised monitoring framework for the three key elements of each pathway: climate fragility, livelihood and conflict. This structured approach will enable us to rapidly detect the activation of a pathway in order to ring alarm bells, through: • Monitoring pathways in near-real time, identifying geographic areas prone to climatic, livelihood, and conflict vulnerability. • Making three-month climate forecasts to identify if they are anomalous, using seasonal rain and flood forecasts (GloFAS, CMIP and FLDAS), projected livelihood or food security degradation (FEWS NET) and conflict data (ACLED Early Warning). • Cross-referencing Crisis Group's analysis of local political dynamics, such as upcoming elections and humanitarian aid delivery, with the quantitative analysis to identify potential risks and incorporating into the early warning assessment. Crisis Group's political analysis by our experts – "the human in the loop"- is the critical final step in the early warning assessment process, where it provides an additional layer and verifies the data findings. In parallel with the above assessments, we will conduct **stakeholder needs and solutions** assessments, including affected communities, humanitarian organisations, government officials and regional bodies. These will assess vulnerabilities, needs, and resource constraints. They will also identify potential solutions as applicable policy recommendations, based upon stakeholders' technical expertise and our own political judgement. Stakeholder feedback will inform system design and build awareness and buy-in for the EEARTH system. The activities above will form the basis of the **EEARTH interface**, to be piloted by the end of the project. Once the system launches, we will continue to seek regular **feedback** from users in order to improve the product including through advocacy activities enabling us to identify, test, disseminate and implement solutions to anticipated problems which are then fed back into the interface. This user engagement will ensure the system responds to the needs of affected communities, local and national government officials, and humanitarian and development partners. This will be crucial for poorer areas and regions where humanitarian access is difficult, positioning EEARTH as a resource for building resilience. Lastly, Crisis Group will produce a **methodological paper** outlining the EEARTH system's methodology, protocol and mechanics to further build stakeholder knowledge. In the longer term, the project will **support evidence-based policymaking** and **strengthen local capacity for effective anticipatory action** to mitigate the suffering of the most vulnerable populations in the Horn of Africa.

| Background and General Relevance | **Climate change is accelerating and worsening certain conflicts**. From catastrophic **floods in South Sudan** to an unprecedented **drought in Somalia**, climate change already presents catastrophic consequences for peace and security.

While climate change's relationship to conflict is complex and context-specific, we have seen it fuel instability leading to conflict, for example, by exacerbating food and water insecurity, driving displacement and heightening competition over natural resources. These climate security risks can further compound social instability by limiting the operations of humanitarian aid and climate assistance providers. With half of the most climate-fragile countries also facing conflict and natural disasters and crises, there is an **urgent need** to both **rethink climate-risk management** in conflict contexts and to **develop conflict-monitoring capacities** in areas vulnerable to climate change, with the goal of strengthening communities' resilience and building peace.

Global leaders increasingly recognise the imperative of addressing climate change's implications for conflict and stability, though systematic action lags behind. In 2021, for the first time and in response to calls from members, the UN Security Council considered a draft resolution that called for a comprehensive approach to assessing and responding to climate security risks. Although the draft did not pass, many member states, both in the Security Council and around the UN more generally, are increasingly eager to nurture the **evidence base on climate security**. The UN Secretary General's Executive Action Plan calls for "Early Warnings for All" by 2027 in order to reduce climate risk in developing countries. The moment is ripe to **develop proactive early warning and early action capabilities** which prevent and mitigate the harm from climate-related conflict and violence, in order to reduce suffering in fragile states.

Despite these positive developments, there is **at present no reliable climate security information and response system,** for three main reasons:

- Firstly, *knowledge about climate change's relationship to conflict remains inadequate*. Policy research, often relying on isolated case studies, tends to neglect the latest insights of the climate and social sciences. As a result, this research frequently lacks rigour and too often oversimplifies the relationship between climate and conflict.
- Second, *existing knowledge is not effectively operationalised and analysis remains siloed in disparate disciplines and institutions*. Climate analysis and quantitative climate security assessments tend to de-emphasise local politics and in-country research, despite the highly localised nature of climate risk. This shortcoming can lead to maladaptive outcomes and play into the hands of non-state actors and others who often exploit climate fragilities to advance their own agendas. The failure of existing early warning systems to incorporate conflict analysis thus reduces their effectiveness in insecure regions. Conversely, political analysts in the climate security field have yet to incorporate cutting-edge climate data, thereby depriving themselves of the benefits of climate forecasting. The fields of climate disaster response and conflict prevention are similarly divorced from one another. Their experiments in learning from one another have largely been ad-hoc, leaving each sector unable to draw lessons across contexts and build integrated approaches to anticipatory action.
- Thirdly, when it comes to supporting resilience and stability programming, almost all *practitioners lack the data analytics to anticipate impending crises and guide rapid action*. Access to evidence-based insight on climate change and conflict would strengthen operational planning and programming on the local, national and international levels.

To fill these gaps, Crisis Group is developing **EEARTH**, which will be a **fully integrated back-to-front early warning system** that identifies potential climate security risks early to inform solutions. EEARTH will first be piloted and tested in the Horn of Africa, a region where war, extreme poverty, price volatility, long-term climate trends and weather extremes have combined to produce rapid and massive increases in food insecurity and population movement that in turn have fuelled more conflict. |

Theory of Change	The EEARTH project responds to the challenges outlined in previous sections. It assumes that the risk mitigation measures detailed in the risk management section of this proposal will be well executed.

Crisis Group **assumes:**

- that staff working on this project remain at Crisis Group to deliver the proposed activities, or that Crisis Group is able to find adequate replacements quickly
- that we are granted access to the secondary datasets necessary to produce project outputs
- that we are granted access to key stakeholders for interviews and data collection
- that our data scientists are able to cooperate with our design specialists to ensure that the EEARTH interface is user friendly
- that Crisis Group retains its positive reputation in order to facilitate the building of a partner network with key interlocutors, including government officials
- that the political constraints and humanitarian situation in the target locations does not deteriorate sharply during the project period. Access is already difficult though still manageable for Crisis Group, but a severe deterioration would obstruct field research
- that Crisis Group staff and/or its key interlocutors working on the project are able to mitigate threats to personal safety when they conduct in-person research in the field
- that Crisis Group's operational capacity and financial footing remains strong, and that neither malfeasance nor mismanagement occurs
- that donors continue to prioritise climate change and conflict commitments as they have over the past several years, which will ensure Crisis Group can continue fundraising for this project.

If these assumptions remain in place then the **logical framework** of this project would be:

IF Crisis Group produces analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response **THROUGH** (1.1) developing two pathway assessments, on South Sudan and Somalia, delineating the correlations between climatic stress factors and conflict dynamics, (1.2) conducting two early warning assessments on each pathway, (1.3) conducting two needs assessments, on South Sudan and Somalia, and (1.4) piloting the scalable EEARTH interface for the target locations, integrating qualitative and quantitative data; **THEN** the *intermediate outcome* of generating insights into complex risks aimed at guiding stakeholder decision-making within crisis-affected and fragile settings in the target locations will be achieved,

AND IF Crisis Group engages with key stakeholders working in the Early Warning and Action sector **THROUGH** (2.1) creating a stakeholder partner network, and (2.2) writing and sharing a public methodological paper outlining the EEARTH mechanics and protocol **THEN** the *intermediate outcome* of enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks created by the intersection of climate stressors and conflict drivers will be realised,

THEN improved evidence-based policymaking and strengthened local capacity for effective anticipatory action that mitigates negative impacts on the most vulnerable populations in the Horn of Africa would be possible in the *long-term (outcome)*.

Overall, the *impact* would **THEN** be more effective support to the people and our planet affected by climate and conflict to create greater resilience and stability in pursuit of Agenda 2030. |

Methodology	The project methodology is as follows (see also document - Annex 1):

1. **Two pathway assessments**—one for Somalia, one for South Sudan—delineating pathways linking climatic distress to conflict by analyzing climate shocks, livelihood impacts, and conflict risk. The Somalia assessment examines local land and water competition, how climatic distress undermines livelihoods, and its role in resource competition and food insecurity. The South Sudan assessment focuses on security implications of displacement due to droughts and flooding. The assessments, designed for ground-truthing and data validation, will be produced in two stages.

Stage I identifies relevant climate-security pathways and stakeholders through:

- **Secondary literature review** of climate-security publications.
- **Quantitative descriptive analysis** of climate-security trends, using baseline data on weather hazards (drought, floods, heat, vegetation), livelihood degradation (displacement, food insecurity, land use), and conflict (country-wide trends, actor-based assessment, land control). Analysis will be performed at a 25km-month grid cell level to capture the seasonal nature of land-related conflict. High-resolution climate data from NASA, CHC, and VIIRS will delineate climatic stress factors, while livelihood conditions (pasture, cropland productivity, displacement, food insecurity) will use historic and current data from IOM, OM, IDMC, UNHCR, ESA, FEWS NET, WRI, and UN OCHA HDX. ACLED and UCDP GED conflict data will measure conflict.
- **External expert interviews** with NGOs, multilateral and humanitarian organizations (FAO, OCHA, UNDP, Mercy Corps), climate scientists (CHC, IGAD), data specialists (ACLED, UCDP, SPARC), hydrologists, researchers, and early warning practitioners for national and local data access.
- **Conflict expert review** by Crisis Group analysts to benchmark data points, rank pathways, and assess political/social conditions under which climate change multiplies threats. Analyst input enables interim data validation.

Stage II assesses data quality, calibrates models, and validates national and local data through:

- **Quantitative pathway analysis** using econometric methods (Annex 1). Statistical modeling employs grid cell-month panel analysis, spatial spillover models, and two-way fixed effects regression. 'Heterogeneous effects' and 'reduced form' analysis (Eberle et al., 2020) will identify high-risk areas.
- **Field evidence** to complement and validate data.
- **Qualitative pathway analysis** where statistical tools or data sources are insufficient

2. **Two early warning assessments**—one for each country—monitoring climate, livelihood, and conflict factors to detect dangerous pathway activation. We will:

- **Monitor** pathways in real time, identifying geographic areas of climate, livelihood, and conflict vulnerability.
- **Perform three-month climate forecasts** using seasonal rain/flood forecasts (GloFAS, CMIP, FLDAS), projected livelihood/food security degradation (FEWS NET), and emerging conflict data (ACLED Early Warning).
- **Cross-reference Crisis Group's political analysis** (e.g., elections, humanitarian aid delivery) with quantitative analysis to verify risks—this final step adds a critical validation layer.

3. **Stakeholder needs and solutions assessments** run parallel to the above assessments. They engage affected communities, humanitarian organizations, government officials, and regional bodies to identify vulnerabilities, needs, and constraints. They also determine potential solutions based on stakeholder expertise and political judgment. Feedback informs system design and builds buy-in for the EEARTH system.

4. **Development of the EEARTH interface.** The above activities will inform the interface, which will be piloted by the project's end. Crisis Group will release a public methodological paper detailing the EEARTH system's methodology, protocol, and mechanics to enhance stakeholder knowledge.

Alignment with and Commitment to CRAF'd Principles	Crisis Group's proposed project is in alignment with the CRAF'd principles, and the design of approach has been developed to ensure commitment to each principle:

We will **prioritise the interests of populations in vulnerable situations**, in Somalia and South Sudan, to ensure no one is left behind in pursuit of the 2030 Agenda.

- We will **engage stakeholders** through the pathway assessment process, initially through stakeholder mapping to secure buy-in followed by a needs and solution assessment conducted in parallel with the early warning assessments. The mapping and engagement activities will inform the early warning assessments and will feed into the EEARTH interface.
- **Project insights will be tested and shared with local populations** before and during the soft launch of the EEARTH system. Crisis Group will engage a limited partner network of stakeholders with whom to test and share the insights, focussing as a first step on strategic partners before undertaking broader stakeholder engagement.
- **Local populations will be targeted indirectly through engagement with multilateral agencies and NGOs** (eg. UNDP, ICRC, Mercy Corps) who work directly with local populations including local political and community leaders, aid groups and civil society. In the long term, this process will build local capacity to take anticipatory action.
- As explained in question 4, Crisis Group's field-based qualitative research, to be integrated into EEARTH, will draw upon **interviews with a wide range of interlocutors** to assess their needs and concerns. To ensure that the perspectives of those from local populations and the most vulnerable voices are included in EEARTH, Crisis Group's analysts will use their trusted networks and knowledge of local dynamics, **ensuring a diverse range of voices**, including those of women and other marginalised groups, are reflected in the qualitative analysis. Consultations will provide end users with the necessary information to improve response and resilience programming.
- **The EEARTH interface will be made publicly available following the soft launch**, providing a vital service to affected populations, local and national governments, and humanitarian-development-peacebuilding agencies.
- By design, the project will aim to minimise barriers to analysis, with **outputs shared via open access**: alerts, visuals and data will be downloadable, potentially via free registration for end users.

This project is committed to **responsible use of data.**

- Outputs shared through EEARTH will be developed in-house and in collaboration with external partners, to ensure the **highest data standards**.
- EEARTH documentation will be shared within the network, with the intention to **submit pathway assessments to peer-reviewed journals**.
- **Results will be presented at conferences** and workshops at Princeton University and other universities.
- To identify and account for biases in the data, **data will be validated** with field insights and reviewed by field analysts, as well as through stakeholder assessments.
- The **two-way fixed effect panel analysis** will account for omitted-variable biases and other common sources of endogeneity.
- **Panel data used in the pathways analysis will be aggregated to the 25km-month level**, to capture local livelihood impacts, e.g. on small-scale farmers.
- The **public methodological paper** outlining EEARTH mechanics and protocol will delineate processes that ensure the system's fair, transparent, and ensure the interlocutors' privacy.

In tandem, this project will apply **interoperable and open data standards**.

- The assessments, which will provide the initial interface data, will enable **analysis and pragmatic recommendations for experts and non-technical audiences**.
- **Visuals will be provided in image and GIS compatible format**.
- **Underlying 25km-month level data** comprising key climate and conflict indices will provide researchers with **state-of-the-art data for their own analysis in CSV GIS compatible format**.
- The **data will be API readable**.
- The interface's soft launch will be an opportunity to **test** how stakeholders use it.
- **Further development** would enable the **production and dissemination of monthly updates**.

To ensure the longevity of the outcomes of the proposed project, Crisis Group will diversify funding streams to **avoid exclusive reliance on CRAF'd funding.**

- Crisis Group is currently in discussions with UNDP and other potential funders to **secure additional funding**. CRAF'd's support will enable the development of scalable analytical tools, which will make the system more competitive for additional funding.
- Momentum for climate security work is increasing, most visibly through the UN Secretary General's "Early Warnings for All Initiative". Initial **CRAF'd funding will be leveraged** by Crisis Group alongside further financing streams to develop the system infrastructure and **build additional partnerships**, positioning the EEARTH system to secure further institutional funding, including from UN agencies and member states.

CRAF'd Data Ecosystem Impact & Use Cases	The EEARTH system will be used by organisations and individuals working at the HDP nexus. Below are **examples of use cases that will enable faster and more effective ecosystem response in crisis-affected and fragile settings**. • **Development actors** could use EEARTH to identify areas vulnerable to future climatic distress and conflict to target priority areas for climate resilience programming. For example, in South Sudan, talks have restarted on constructing a canal to increase water flow and improve economic conditions along the White Nile, a project that could disrupt ecosystems, wildlife migration, and agropastoral livelihoods, which in turn could exacerbate conflict. In this case, the EEARTH system could inform development professions which particular geographies are endangered by the canal project and how at least some threats could be mitigated. • **Humanitarian actors** could use EEARTH to enhance their preparedness and implementation for disaster response. In South Sudan, aid groups could identify areas most vulnerable to climate security risks stemming from the five catastrophic flooding seasons, enabling them, for instance, to preemptively position humanitarian assistance near high risk areas, averting suffering and potentially deadly conflict over food resources. The EEARTH prototype will also granularly map the extent of floods in South Sudan, which pose significant challenges for humanitarian supply delivery. The EEARTH system's use of spatial and climate data to map flooding will enable aid providers develop delivery routes that circumvent both flooding and conflict-affected areas and to better target those most vulnerable and in need of assistance. • **Peacebuilding organisations and local government bodies** could use the EEARTH system to avoid maladaptive policy responses and improve the likelihood of peaceful resolution of conflict. For example, if the EEARTH system forecasts that floods are likely to displace a certain population onto the territory of a rival group, local government officials and peacebuilders who could notify affected communities and implement contingency programming, eg. planned migration corridors. This, in turn, will enable earlier, faster, more targeted and dignified crisis action. The project will establish the foundation for a **partner network** that will inform the EEARTH interface, to include national and local decision-makers, practitioners and advocates who will be the interface's users. The network will also include other CRAF'd partners (e.g. ACLED, UCDP, UNHCR, UNDP). We will engage stakeholders to maximise the use and visibility of the EEARTH interface and disseminate analysis, as follows: • Initial needs-and-solutions assessments will map local stakeholders and decision makers, so we can tailor it to their requirements. In 2023, we will **present potential interface prototypes and solicit feedback** from UN agencies in South Sudan (including the UN nexus advisory group on climate in South Sudan), NGOs and local community leaders and gather feedback on the proposed system components and design. A subsequent assessment for Somalia will be conducted, including engagement with UNEP's Climate Adviser for Somalia. Frequent engagement with users and other interested parties will enable regular interface updates (see question 4). • To further disseminate the analysis, we will conduct the following activities: i) **organise one or more launch event(s)** together with selected partners, to promote the system and build capacity on effective usage; and ii) **continuously promote the interface through meetings** with stakeholders as soon as the interface prototype is ready. For each of these activities, we will identify existing networks for dissemination, in order to create multiplier effects across the CRAF'D ecosystem. We will target the humanitarian sector (ICRC, Mercy Corps), meteorological services, early warning and anticipatory action spaces (FEWS NET, START Network), thematic expert groups (Coalition on Conflict and Hunger/HDP Nexus Solutions Cluster, SPARC), multilateral organisations (IGAD/CEWARN), the disaster risk reduction space (UNDRR, Anticipatory Action & Conflict Working Group), hydrology and programme evaluation experts (IPA) and country-specific working groups (UN South Sudan Climate Security Working Group). • Following the launch of the EEARTH pilot, users of the Interface will be able to sign up to **monthly updates** (likely after the project end date).
Sustainability	The scalability and cost effectiveness of the proposed project approach will enable the **sustainable delivery of outputs** beyond the project period funded by CRAF'd. • As noted in question 10, Crisis Group will **leverage multiple sources** to fund the complete roll-out of the EEARTH interface. • *After its launch*, we will disseminate **automated monthly early warning notices** on Somalia and South Sudan, which will ensure that key stakeholders have the benefit of regularly updated information to inform climate- and conflict-related programming and interventions. • Crisis Group will **work in partnership** with a range of donors, including UN bodies and donor governments, to secure funding for the entire EEARTH project. This **in turn will generate further buy-in** from other strategic donors, further increasing visibility and usage. • Additionally, the assessment protocols that will be developed during the CRAF'd project period will require the **frequent updating of the pathway and early warning assessments**. This requirement will ensure that interface remains relevant and representative of developments in the field.

Scalability	The project would see the construction of an EEARTH interface for the Horn of Africa to be piloted with a **soft launch** during the anticipated project period.
	• As described in question 7, the **subsequent full EEARTH roll-out will include monthly updates**. Activities (1.1) pathway assessments and (1.2) early warning assessments require the production of updates that offer a complete picture of the situation on the ground. • Once these protocols are developed, they will be **replicable on an annual basis**. • Additionally, the system could be **replicated across new geographies using the same methodology**, by recalibrating the pathway analysis and adding early warning assessments. Further quantitative analysis would be automated and hence flexibly scalable. • The method of obtaining **qualitative conflict expert insight is replicable as well**, since Crisis Group has analysts based in dozens of fragile and conflict-affected states. • The **public EEARTH methodological paper would further build capacity to scale the protocols across different contexts**.
Innovation	The **project's multidisciplinary approach will overcome pernicious barriers and systematically embedded problems** by innovating in three ways:
	• Firstly, no one in the peace and security space currently uses climate forecasting data and near-real time conflict monitoring to anticipate looming crises. As described in more detail above, innovative spatial and climate methods have yet to be systematically leveraged and blended with local political insights to inform early warning and response efforts. By integrating qualitative data and quantitative analysis throughout every phase of the system development, EEARTH will surpass this barrier, **pairing crisis identification with the latest advances in the social and climate sciences**. The EEARTH system's **use of quantitative methods to develop understanding of how climate hazards interact with conflict dynamics will enable replicable insights applicable in different contexts**. This represents a brand new approach to a systematic, structural problem. • Secondly, the **system will serve as a data clearing-house for practitioners across the humanitarian, development and peacebuilding nexus, with the goal of harmonising responses.** As detailed in question 2, analysis and programming in the climate security space is currently siloed within different disciplines. Through consistent, iterative engagement with relevant stakeholders, EEARTH will bring together technical and programmatic expertise to sharpen climate security tools in ways previously unimaginable. Data in the hands of humanitarian partners are often critical for peacebuilding, and vice versa, but there is neither a formal nor efficient process for sharing them, much less use them cooperatively. The EEARTH system and network will provide both a new forum for data sharing and stakeholder cooperation across the humanitarian, development and peacebuilding nexus. • Thirdly, the EEARTH system will **ensure that the human element, often missing in climate resilience research, remains central to the project approach**. Climate data must be understood in combination with local political dynamics otherwise interventions will be fruitless and potentially harmful. Crisis Group's qualitative, field-based political analysis will serve as a check on statistical assumptions and provide verification in the early warning identification and notification process.
Cost Effectiveness	The proposed project approach is cost effective because it will encourage **more efficient use of resources,** aim to **leverage other funding**, and enable other stakeholder organisations to be **more cost-effective and timely in their responses** to complex risk.
	• The budget Crisis Group proposes includes **only bottom-line start-up costs, necessary to bring the project online**. There are no bells-and-whistles included- only data collection, analysis and the design of an interface to disseminate our conclusions. The proposed **work is designed for scalability at minimal cost**, by relying on replicable quantitative methods and where possible on global, open source data. **Other donors have endorsed this approach**, including Global Challenges Foundation; we are also holding conversations with UN agencies and donor governments, some of which are close to conclusion. As mentioned in question 5, **Crisis Group will leverage other funding streams** in order to complement CRAF'd funding and increase its impact per dollar. • Once the interface is operational, **maintenance costs for EEARTH will be relatively low,** since the system is based on automated data processing and semi-automated early warning assessments. This will **enable monthly analysis of the highest standard for a low cost** after initial financing by CRAF'd and other donors. During and beyond the project period, Crisis Group will continue optimising the system to improve time and cost efficiency. The **stakeholder partner network will contribute to project impacts in the form of in-kind support, through data validation and insight-sharing**. • Cost effectiveness should also be measured in terms of how our project will make other organisations more effective. CRAF'd investment in Crisis Group will pay dividends for development and humanitarian agencies, because improved access to **better information will enable EEARTH users to better target and implement assistance to affected populations**. In the longer term, more timely intervention can head off emerging conflict and violence before it worsens or metastasizes, representing a more economic use of resources in resolving problems.

SDG Targets

Target	Description
Main Goals	
Goal 17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development	
TARGET_17.16	17.16 Enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in all countries, in particular developing countries
TARGET_17.17	17.17 Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships

Target	Description
Secondary Goals	
Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts2	
TARGET_13.1	13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries
TARGET_13.2	13.2 Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning
TARGET_13.b	13.b Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least developed countries and small island developing States, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities

SDG Indicators

Indicator Code	Description
C200303	13.1.1 Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters per 100,000 population
C200304	13.1.2 Number of countries that adopt and implement national disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030
C200305	13.1.3 Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with national disaster risk reduction strategies
C130201	13.2.1 Number of countries that have communicated the establishment or operationalization of an integrated policy/strategy/plan which increases their ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, and foster climate resilience and low greenhou
C130b01	13.b.1 Number of least developed countries and small island developing States that are receiving specialized support, and amount of support, including finance, technology and capacity-building, for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate c
C171601	17.16.1 Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals
C171701	17.17.1 Amount of United States dollars committed to (a) public-private partnerships and (b) civil society partnerships

Contribution to SDGs

Participating Organization	% TARGET_13.1	% TARGET_17.17	% TARGET_13.2	% TARGET_13.b	% TARGET_17.16	% Total
ICG	20	20	20	20	20	100
Total contribution by target	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	
Project contribution to SDG by target	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	**20**	**100**

List of documents

Document	Document Type	Document Source	Document Abstract	Document Date	Classification	Featured	Status	Modified By	Modified On
CRAF'd Steering Committee Meeting_Minutes_Oct 2023.pdf	Project Revision Form	Project Revision Form	CRAF'd SteerCo minutes (Oct 2023) delegates the CRAF'd Secretariat to handle project revisions of 10-20% between budget categories (compared to the total budget) internally through the Secretariat.	18-Oct-2023	Internal	No	Finalized	niroj.sapkota@un.org	17-Feb-2025 9:35:29 PM

[Revised_ProDoc_budget_Feb_2025.pdf](#)	Project Revision Form	Project Revision Form	Revised Project document reflecting a19% budgetary discrepancy between budget lines which is well under the 10-20% limits for CRAF'd Secretariat to process and approve internally.	17-Feb-2025	Internal	No	Finalized	niroj.sapkota@un.org	17-Feb-2025 9:30:13 PM
[Project_revision ICG 2025.xlsx](#)	Project Revision Form	Project Revision Form	Excel file comparing the approved budgets from the Project Document vs. the latest revised budgets and their % discrepancies	11-Feb-2025	Internal	No	Finalized	niroj.sapkota@un.org	17-Feb-2025 9:17:29 PM
[05 Project Document_ICG-signed_Redacted.pdf](#)	Pro Doc	Project		13-Oct-2023	External	Yes	Published	varqa.abayneh@undp.org	13-Oct-2023 3:29:40 PM
[05 Project Document_ICG-signed.pdf](#)	Pro Doc	Project		11-Sep-2023	Internal	No	Finalized	lehmann@un.org	11-Sep-2023 6:51:07 PM
[Annex 2 - EEARTH Visual for Description.docx](#)	Other Docs	Project	Annex 2 - EEARTH Visual to add in Description	06-Apr-2023	External	No	Finalized	bbenoit@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com	06-Apr-2023 3:56:48 AM
[Annex 1 - The EEARTH System_ project methodology.pdf](#)	Other Docs	Project Narrative	Annex 1 - The EEARTH System: project methodology	14-Mar-2023	Internal	No	Draft	bbenoit@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com	14-Mar-2023 11:03:31 AM

Project Results

Outcome	Output	Description
1. INTERMEDIATE: Better data, analytics, knowledge, and capacity on complex risks		Generation of insights into complex risks aimed at guiding stakeholder decision-making within crisis-affected and fragile settings in the target locations
	1.1 Analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response	Analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response through the development of 2 pathway assessments, 2 early warning assessments, 2 needs assessments and the piloting of an EEARTH interface.

Outcome	Output	Description			
	Activities				
	Title	**Description**	**Lead Participating Organization**	**Participating Organization**	**Other Organizations**
	1.1.1 Develop two pathway assessments, on South Sudan and Somalia, delineating the correlations between climatic stress factors and conflict dynamics	Two pathway assessments, one each on Somalia and South Sudan. These will delineate pathways linking climatic distress to conflict by analysing three factors: climate shocks, their impacts on livelihoods, and conflict risk. In Somalia, the assessment will look at local land and water competition, including how climatic distress undermines livelihoods and induces local resource competition and food insecurity. In South Sudan, the assessment will cover security implications of displacement due to droughts and flooding.	ICG - International Crisis Group		
	1.1.2 Conduct two early warning assessments, on each pathway	Two early warning assessments, one each for Somalia and South Sudan, monitoring climate, livelihood and conflict factors. The goal here is to rapidly detect activation of a dangerous pathway so as to be able to ring alarm bells.	ICG - International Crisis Group		
	1.1.3 Conduct two needs assessments, on South Sudan and Somalia	The needs and solutions assessments will be conducted in parallel with the above assessments. They will focus on affected communities, humanitarian organisations, government officials and regional bodies to ascertain vulnerabilities, needs and resource constraints. They will also identify potential solutions based upon stakeholders' technical expertise and our own political judgement. Finally, stakeholder feedback will inform the system design and build awareness of and buy-in for the EEARTH system.	ICG - International Crisis Group		
	1.1.4 Pilot the scalable Early Warning and Action System (EEARTH) Interface for the Horn integrating qualitative and quantitative data	This interface will integrate the information gathered from the above assessments under output 1 and the pilot will be the initial starting point for a full system that will track and anticipate likely changes in deadly conflict in climate-sensitive areas.	ICG - International Crisis Group		
2. INTERMEDIATE: Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks		Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks created by the intersection of climate stressors and conflict drivers			
	2.1 Engagement with stakeholders working in the Early Warning and Action sector	Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks created by the intersection of climate stressors and conflict drivers. This will be done through the creation of a stakeholder partner database and the dissemination of a methodological paper of the EEARTH interface.			

Outcome	Output	Description

Activities

Title	Description	Lead Participating Organization	Participating Organization	Other Organizations
2.1.1 create a stakeholder partner network database	The project will establish the foundation for a partner network that will inform the EEARTH interface, to include national and local decision-makers, practitioners and advocates who will be the interface's users. The network will also include other CRAF'd partners (e.g. ACLED, UCDP, UNHCR, UNDP). We will engage stakeholders to maximise the use and visibility of the EEARTH interface and disseminate analysis	ICG - International Crisis Group		
2.1.2 write and share a public methodological paper outlining the EEARTH mechanics and protocol	Crisis Group will release a public methodological paper outlining the EEARTH system's methodology, protocol and mechanics to further build stakeholder knowledge.	ICG - International Crisis Group		

Outcome	Output	Description
LONGTERM: Improved evidence-based policymaking and strengthened local capacity for effective anticipatory action which mitigates negative impacts on the most vulnerable populations in the Horn		Policy makers in the target locations will have access to information through this project for improved evidence-based policy making and strengthened local capacity for effective anticipatory action which mitigates negative impacts on the most vulnerable populations in response to conflict and climatic distress
	No outputs available.	
IMPACT: More effective support to people and planet affected by climate and conflict to create greater resilience and stability in pursuit of Agenda 2030.		Policymakers will be able to make informed decisions to offer effective programmes to support people and plant affected by climate and conflict to create greater resilience and stability in pursuit of Agenda 2030.
	No outputs available.	

Signature Indicators

Indicator Title	Component Title	Description	Means of Verification	Category	Cycle	Scope	Value Type	Baseline Value	Baseline Year	Target Value	Target Year	Linked Outcome / Output

No signature indicators available.

Imported Fund Outcome / Output Indicators

Indicator Title	Component Title	Description	Means of Verification	Category	Cycle	Scope	Value Type	Baseline Value	Baseline Year	Target Value	Target Year	Linked Outcome / Output
Analytics products provided by the project.		This indicator aims to measure the provision and dissemination of analytics products by the project to stakeholders.	Internal tracking.	Capacity	Yearly	Global	Number	0	2023	1	2025	**Outcome:** 1. INTERMEDIATE: Better data, analytics, knowledge, and capacity on complex risks **Output:** 1.1 Analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response

Indicator Title	Component Title	Description	Means of Verification	Category	Cycle	Scope	Value Type	Baseline Value	Baseline Year	Target Value	Target Year	Linked Outcome / Output
	Analytics products with open access.		Internal tracking.	Capacity	Yearly	Global	Number	0	2023	1	2025	
Stakeholders that use project outputs to support crisis action.		This indicator aims to measure the extent to which entities use project outputs for crisis action, including for programming, decision-making, and resource allocation.	Surveys, interviews, analysis of public policy documents/emergency response plans/reports, other documents.	Capacity	Yearly	Global	Number	0	2023	10	2025	**Outcome:** 2. INTERMEDIATE: Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks **Output:** 2.1 Engagement with stakeholders working in the Early Warning and Action sector
Downloads and/or users of project outputs.		This indicator aims to measure the use and dissemination of project outputs by tracking the number of downloads and/or users of the project outputs.	Surveys, interviews, internal statistics.	Capacity	Yearly	Global	Number	0	2023	200	2025	**Outcome:** 2. INTERMEDIATE: Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks **Output:** 2.1 Engagement with stakeholders working in the Early Warning and Action sector
	Downloads and/or users of project outputs from stakeholders in fragile and/or crisis-affected settings.	This sub-indicator aims to measure the use and dissemination of project outputs by tracking the number of downloads and/or users specifically in fragile and/or crisis-affected settings.	Surveys, interviews, internal statistics.	Capacity	Yearly	Global	Number	0	2023	150	2025	
Publications produced as part of this project.		This indicator aims to measure the number and quality of publications produced by the project, which may include scientific reports, best practices, guidelines, and other types of knowledge products. The indicator reflects the extent to which the project has generated new knowledge, shared best practices, and disseminated findings related to the project's goals and objectives.	Internal tracking.	Capacity	Yearly	Global	Number	0	2023	6	2025	**Outcome:** 1. INTERMEDIATE: Better data, analytics, knowledge, and capacity on complex risks **Output:** 1.1 Analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response

Indicator Title	Component Title	Description	Means of Verification	Category	Cycle	Scope	Value Type	Baseline Value	Baseline Year	Target Value	Target Year	Linked Outcome / Output
External reports and other tangible products that feature data or analytics from the project.		This indicator aims to measure external reports and other tangible products that feature data or analytics from the project.	Internal tracking.	Other	Yearly	Global	Number	0	2023	1	2025	**Outcome:** 1. INTERMEDIATE: Better data, analytics, knowledge, and capacity on complex risks **Output:** 1.1 Analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response
Knowledge and capacity building Initiatives conducted as part of the project.		This indicator aims to measure the provision of knowledge and capacity building initiatives by the project to stakeholders. The indicator reflects the extent to which the project has supported the development of skills, knowledge, and expertise related to the project's goals and objectives.	Internal tracking.	Beneficiaries	Yearly	Global	Number	0	2023	1	2025	**Outcome:** 2. INTERMEDIATE: Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks **Output:** 2.1 Engagement with stakeholders working in the Early Warning and Action sector
Participants in knowledge and capacity initiatives as part of this project.		This indicator aims to measure the number of individuals who have participated in knowledge and capacity building initiatives provided by the project. The indicator reflects the extent to which the project has engaged stakeholders in the development of skills, knowledge, and expertise related to the project's goals and objectives.	Surveys, registration statistics.	Beneficiaries	Yearly	Global	Number	0	2023	50	2025	**Outcome:** 2. INTERMEDIATE: Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks **Output:** 2.1 Engagement with stakeholders working in the Early Warning and Action sector
	Participants from fragile and crisis-affected settings in knowledge and capacity initiatives as part of this project.	This sub-indicator aims to measure the number of individuals from fragile and crisis affected settings who have participated in knowledge and capacity building initiatives provided by the project.	Surveys, registration statistics.	Beneficiaries	Yearly	Global	Number	0	2023	50	2025	

Indicator Title	Component Title	Description	Means of Verification	Category	Cycle	Scope	Value Type	Baseline Value	Baseline Year	Target Value	Target Year	Linked Outcome / Output
Understanding of the datasets / analytical tools by the key stakeholders.		This indicator aims to measure the level of comfortability and technical understanding of the datasets or analytical tool provided as part of the project.	Surveys, interviews, internal statistics.	Capacity	Yearly	Global	Percentage	0	2023	90	2025	**Outcome:** 2. INTERMEDIATE: Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks **Output:** 2.1 Engagement with stakeholders working in the Early Warning and Action sector

Project Indicators

Indicator Title	Component Title	Description	Means of Verification	Category	Cycle	Scope	Value Type	Baseline Value	Baseline Year	Target Value	Target Year	Linked Outcome / Output
Number of pathways assessments conducted		This indicator will measure the number of pathway assessments conducted. These will delineate pathways linking climatic distress to conflict by analysing three factors: climate shocks, their impacts on livelihoods, and conflict risk. In Somalia, the assessment will look at local land and water competition, including how climatic distress undermines livelihoods and induces local resource competition and food insecurity. In South Sudan, the assessment will cover security implications of displacement due to droughts and flooding.	Internal tracking. Internal assessment document.	Other	At closure	Others	Number	0	2023	2	2025	**Outcome:** 1. INTERMEDIATE: Better data, analytics, knowledge, and capacity on complex risks **Output:** 1.1 Analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response
	No components available.											

Indicator Title	Component Title	Description	Means of Verification	Category	Cycle	Scope	Value Type	Baseline Value	Baseline Year	Target Value	Target Year	Linked Outcome / Output
Number of early warning assessments conducted		This indicator will measure the number of early warning assessments conducted. Two early warning assessments, again one each for Somalia and South Sudan, monitoring climate, livelihood and conflict factors. The goal here is to rapidly detect activation of a dangerous pathway so as to be able to ring alarm bells.	Internal tracking. Internal assessment document.	Other	At closure	Others	Number	0	2023	2	2025	**Outcome: 1. INTERMEDIATE:** Better data, analytics, knowledge, and capacity on complex risks **Output:** 1.1 Analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response
	No components available.											
Number of early warning interfaces that offers data analysis for anticipation, prevention and response to complex risks in fragile and crisis-affected settings		This indicator will measure the number of early warning interfaces developed during this project.	Internal tracking. Internal Documents.	Other	At closure	Others	Number	0	2023	1	2025	**Outcome: 1. INTERMEDIATE:** Better data, analytics, knowledge, and capacity on complex risks **Output:** 1.1 Analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response
	No components available.											
Number of stakeholders engaged with on anticipation, prevention and response to complex risks in fragile and crisis-affected settings to develop an interface for early warning			Internal Tracking. Meeting minutes.	Other	At closure	Others	Number	0	2023	200	2025	**Outcome: 2. INTERMEDIATE:** Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks **Output:** 2.1 Engagement with stakeholders working in the Early Warning and Action sector

Indicator Title	Component Title	Description	Means of Verification	Category	Cycle	Scope	Value Type	Baseline Value	Baseline Year	Target Value	Target Year	Linked Outcome / Output
	No components available.											
Number of stakeholders accessing information on how to use data analysis for anticipation, prevention and response to complex risks in fragile and crisis-affected settings			Internal Tracking. Meeting minutes.	Other	At closure	Others	Number	0	2023	50	2025	**Outcome:** 2. INTERMEDIATE: Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks **Output:** 2.1 Engagement with stakeholders working in the Early Warning and Action sector
	No components available.											
Number needs assessments conducted			Internal Tracking. Internal assessment document.	Other	At closure	Others	Number	0	2023	2	2025	**Outcome:** 1. INTERMEDIATE: Better data, analytics, knowledge, and capacity on complex risks **Output:** 1.1 Analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response
	No components available.											

Risks

Event	Category	Level	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating Measures	Risk Owner
Staff working on this project leave Crisis Group interrupting delivery of the activities proposed	• Operational • Political	Low	Rare	Minor	Crisis Group offers a competitive compensation package to attain and retain staff. Crisis Group's HR department continually assess compensation, and working conditions to maximize retention rates. If, a staff member working on this project does leave the organisation Crisis Group is confident that through competitive compensation package, targeted recruitment strategies and our global reputation as a industry leader in the field of conflict prevention that any outgoing staff would be replaced in a timely manner.	HR

Crisis Group is not granted access to secondary datasets necessary to produce project outputs	• Operational	Low	Unlikely	Minor	The majority of secondary datasets that Crisis Group will access for this project are in the public domain and freely available. However, for a small number of datasets Crisis Group will request access from the producing organisations. Crisis Group staff have already identified datasets they would wish to access and maintain regular contact with the producing organisations. Through continued engagement and relationship building access to datasets is assured.	Programs
Crisis Group is not granted access to relevant key stakeholders for interviews and data collection	• Operational	Medium	Rare	Major	Crisis Group's established reputation as an industry leader in the field of conflict prevention enables staff and the wider organisation to maintain positive relationships with officials from governments, international organisations and civil society. If there are personnel changes across the target audience for this project, Crisis Group will make efforts to engage with new personnel. As part of the project (activity 2.1) Crisis Group will maintain a network of stakeholder partners which will permit us to regularly engage with key interlocuters who will overlap with those who will be interviewed as part of activity 1.1 and 1.2.	Programs
Crisis Group's data scientists are not able to cooperate with Crisis Group design specialists to ensure that the EEARTH interface is user friendly	• Operational	Low	Rare	Minor	Crisis Group has been working with a platform specialist for several years on a number of technological outputs. Their sustained engagement assures Crisis Group that the quality of the pilot interface will be mindful of user experience concerns. Should Crisis Group need to source additional contractors, Crisis Group is confident that through competitive compensation package, targeted recruitment strategies and our global reputation as a industry leader in the field of conflict prevention that any outgoing staff would be replaced in a timely manner.	Programs and HR

Crisis Group's reputation is jeopardized and is unable to maintain positive relationships with key interlocutors (including government officials) to remain present and able to build a network of partners to see the realization of the project outcomes. Cr	• Political • Operational	Low	Rare	Minor	Crisis Group's established reputation as an industry leader in the field of conflict prevention enables staff and the wider organisation to maintain positive relationships with officials from governments, international organisations and civil society. If there are personnel changes across the target audience for this project, Crisis Group will make efforts to engage with new personnel. As part of the project Crisis Group will maintain a network of stakeholder partners which will permit us to regularly engage with key interlocuters. Crisis Group staff regularly engage with government actors in the target locations to ensure positive relationships. Written outputs, outside of this project but that may cover these locations, are likely to be produced during this period, are mindful of how they will be received/perceived by government stakeholders are tailored delivery of these outputs (via pre-releases and closed door briefings) to ensure relationships with key government stakeholders remain in place.	Programs
The political constraints and humanitarian situation in the target locations deteriorates sharply during the project period obstructing field research	• Political • Operational	High	Possible	Moderate	Crisis Group monitors the political and humanitarian situation in the target locations on a monthly basis. Should a situation deteriorate at such an advanced level that Crisis Group staff would be unable to travel to any or some of the target locations interviews with key stakeholders would be made virtual and potential on secure platforms such as Signal. Crisis Group have explored and tested alternatives for fulfilling field research, using technology, including video/WhatsApp interviews, phone calls and emails with our extensive network of contacts and relying on local stringers and to gather information.	Research and Programs

| The personal safety of Crisis Group staff and/or interlocuters working on the project is compromised. | • Political
• Operational | Medium | Rare | Major | Crisis Group's central security team, consisting of staff with extensive experience on security-related issues in hostile environments, meets regularly to review all potential security issues and threats, and ensure that rules and protocols are followed by field offices. Field offices have additional local security guidelines to account for conditions in the relevant country and region, and staff who work in highly insecure areas and those who have a role in security management are sent to relevant training run by specialised companies. Human Resources has the responsibility to ensure that safety and health related standards in all offices are up to standard and according to local law. In the event of a critical incident, such as kidnapping, detention, disappearance, or situations where a Crisis Group staff member is at risk of death, injury, or capture, a Crisis Unit would deal with the logistics and ensure contingent operations. Lastly, the security of those we interview is prioritised. Each staff member undergoes training on protecting their sources and must comply with strict instructions to take all possible measures to ensure confidentiality. | Security Committee, HR and Programs |
| Financial malfeasance and/or the mismanagement of funds is reported by Crisis Group | • Financial | Low | Unlikely | Minor | Crisis Group's implementation of stringent financial management and budget monitoring. Financial control is assured through our policies setting out expenditure and levels of authorisation required for financial commitments and expenditures. Crisis Group regional offices prepare monthly cash requests, which are supported by a monthly forecast of anticipated expenditure. Head office transfers the cash requested each month and also monitors bank accounts of the local offices to ensure that cash reserves held in the local bank account do not exceed planned current monthly spend, plus one additional month of expenditure, in order to top local cash reserves mounting up. If an office exceeds the current month, plus one limit, the monthly cash request is either reduced by the excess cash held, or denied until the funds held balance is reduced. In addition, Crisis Group undergoes regular internal and external financial audits. The internal audit checks the operation of local internal controls on documentation submitted to Brussels, and a thorough analytical review is carried out on a monthly basis to review variances from budget. Therefore, any vast increases in costs or expenditures would be accounted for at an early basis and adjustments to cost allocations can be accounted for. | Finance |

Donors de-prioritise climate change and conflict commitments limiting Crisis Group from fundraising for this project.	• Financial	Medium	Unlikely	Moderate	Crisis Group has a dedicated development team working with governments, foundations and philanthropic individuals to develop proposals that would fund priority activities of the organisation in an effort to achieve organisational goals. Crisis Group has already sought funds for this EEARTH interface from a range of current and prospect donors to ensure a diverse revenue stream for the proposed project with Craf'd.	Developme nt, Program

Budget by UNSDG Categories: Over all

Budget Lines	ICG (7%) *	Total
1. Staff and other personnel	$339,592.00	$339,592.00
2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials	$0.00	$0.00
3. Equipment, Vehicles, and Furniture, incl. Depreciation	$0.00	$0.00
4. Contractual services	$285,614.00	$285,614.00
5. Travel	$9,000.00	$9,000.00
6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts	$0.00	$0.00
7. General Operating and other Direct Costs	$20,000.00	$20,000.00
Project Costs Sub Total	**$654,206.00**	**$654,206.00**
8. Indirect Support Costs	$45,794.42	$45,794.42
Total	**$700,000.42**	**$700,000.42**

Budget by UNSDG Categories: 2023

Budget Lines	Fiscal Year *	Description	ICG (7%) *	Total
1. Staff and other personnel	2023	Project Director, Climate, Environment and Conflict (1,2% towards project) Researcher, Future of Conflict (0,4% towards project) Project Manager % (22,8% towards project) Data Analyst (29,3% towards project) Researcher, Climate & Security (7,6% towards project) Quantitative Data Analyst (7,6% towards project)	$153,157.00	$153,157.00
2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials	2023		$0.00	$0.00
3. Equipment, Vehicles, and Furniture, incl. Depreciation	2023		$0.00	$0.00
4. Contractual services	2023	Data & Technology Consulting Firm ($46,459 for Activity 1.1, Output 1.1.4)	$46,459.00	$46,459.00
5. Travel	2023	3 trips for 1 person	$3,000.00	$3,000.00
6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts	2023		$0.00	$0.00
7. General Operating and other Direct Costs	2023	Fees for data licences	$2,917.00	$2,917.00
Project Costs Sub Total			**$205,533.00**	**$205,533.00**
8. Indirect Support Costs			$14,387.31	$14,387.31
Total			**$219,920.31**	**$219,920.31**

Budget by UNSDG Categories: 2024

Budget Lines	Fiscal Year *	Description	ICG (7%) *	Total
1. Staff and other personnel	2024	Project Director, Climate, Environment and Conflict (1,3% towards project) Researcher, Future of Conflict (0,4% towards project) Project Manager (21,6% towards project) Data Analyst (27,8% towards project) Researcher, Climate & Security (8,6% towards project) Quantitative Data Analyst (8,6% towards project)	$108,539.00	$108,539.00
2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials	2024		$0.00	$0.00
3. Equipment, Vehicles, and Furniture, incl. Depreciation	2024		$0.00	$0.00
4. Contractual services	2024	Data & Technology Consulting Firm ($79,644 for Activity 1.1, Output 1.1.4)	$239,155.00	$239,155.00
5. Travel	2024	3 trips for 1 person	$3,000.00	$3,000.00
6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts	2024		$0.00	$0.00

Budget Lines	Fiscal Year *	Description	ICG (7%) *	Total
7. General Operating and other Direct Costs	2024	Fee for Data Licences	$952.00	$952.00
Project Costs Sub Total			**$351,646.00**	**$351,646.00**
8. Indirect Support Costs			$24,615.22	$24,615.22
Total			**$376,261.22**	**$376,261.22**

Budget by UNSDG Categories: 2025

Budget Lines	Fiscal Year *	Description	ICG (7%) *	Total
1. Staff and other personnel	2025	Project Director, Climate, Environment and Conflict (1,4% towards project) Researcher, Future of Conflict (0,5% towards project) Project Manager % (19% towards project) Data Analyst (24,5% towards project) Researcher, Climate & Security (9,5% towards project) Quantitative Data Analyst (9,5% towards project)	$77,896.00	$77,896.00
2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials	2025		$0.00	$0.00
3. Equipment, Vehicles, and Furniture, incl. Depreciation	2025		$0.00	$0.00
4. Contractual services	2025	Data & Technology Consulting Firm ($NIL for Activity 1.1, Output 1.1.4)	$0.00	$0.00
5. Travel	2025	3 trips for 1 person	$3,000.00	$3,000.00
6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts	2025		$0.00	$0.00
7. General Operating and other Direct Costs	2025	Fee for Data Licences ($1,131) and audit costs ($15,000)	$16,131.00	$16,131.00
Project Costs Sub Total			**$97,027.00**	**$97,027.00**
8. Indirect Support Costs			$6,791.89	$6,791.89
Total			**$103,818.89**	**$103,818.89**

Performance-based Tranches Breakdown

Tranche			Total
Tranche 1	ICG (43%)	$301,000.00	$301,000.00
Tranche 2	ICG (36%)	$252,000.00	$252,000.00
Tranche 3	ICG (21%)	$147,000.00	$147,000.00
			$700,000.00

Programme Outcome Costs

Outcome	Output	Activity	Implementing Agent	Time Frame								
				2023		2024				2025		
				3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
1. INTERMEDIATE: Better data, analytics, knowledge, and capacity on complex risks												
	1.1 Analytical data driving insights for crisis anticipation, prevention and response											
		1.1.1 Develop two pathway assessments, on South Sudan and Somalia, delineating the correlations between climatic stress factors and conflict dynamics										
			ICG	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
		1.1.2 Conduct two early warning assessments, on each pathway										
			ICG	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
		1.1.3 Conduct two needs assessments, on South Sudan and Somalia										
			ICG	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
		1.1.4 Pilot the scalable Early Warning and Action System (EEARTH) Interface for the Horn integrating qualitative and quantitative data										
			ICG	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐
2. INTERMEDIATE: Enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex risks												
	2.1 Engagement with stakeholders working in the Early Warning and Action sector											
		2.1.1 create a stakeholder partner network database										
			ICG	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐
		2.1.2 write and share a public methodological paper outlining the EEARTH mechanics and protocol										
			ICG	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐

Signatures

ICG: International Crisis Group (Digital) Mr Brett Moody CFO bmoody@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com	**SIGNATURE:** Brett Moody **DATE:** 11-09-2023

ICG: International Crisis Group (Digital)

Mr Brett Moody

CFO

bmoody@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com

SIGNATURE:

Brett Moody

DATE: 26-02-2025

ICG: International Crisis Group (Digital)

Mr Brett Moody

CFO

bmoody@internationalcrisisgroup.onmicrosoft.com