

International Crisis Group (ICG)

Environmental Early Action and Risk Tracking Hub (EEARTH)

FINAL NARRATIVE PROJECT REPORT

18 September 2023 - 18 September 2025



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PROJECT INFORMATION.....	1
2. PROJECT SELF-ASSESSMENT SURVEY.....	2
2.1. Data quality.....	2
2.2. Ecosystem and collaboration.....	4
2.3. Data update and use.....	8
2.4 Contribution of CRAF'd funding.....	11
3. KEY ACHIEVEMENTS AND RESULTS.....	13
3.1 Key achievements.....	13
3.2. Ecosystem partnership and outcomes.....	15
3.3. Results from data uptake and use.....	19
4. LESSONS LEARNED.....	21
5. VISIBILITY AND EXTERNAL ENGAGEMENT.....	24
5.1 External coverage and engagement.....	24
5.2 Leadership testimonial.....	28

1. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project title	Environmental Early Action and Risk Tracking Hub (EEARTH)
MPTFO project number	00140353
Organization name	International Crisis Group
Organization website	http://www.crisisgroup.org
Project duration [months]	24
Grant size [USD]	\$700,000
Implementing partners	International Crisis Group (ICG)
Report submission date	20 Mar 2026
Authorization	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> We grant the Complex Risk Analytics Fund (CRAF'd) a non-exclusive, worldwide, royalty-free, perpetual license to use, reproduce, adapt, distribute, and publicly display the submitted quotes, photographs, videos, and other communication materials solely for communications, outreach, advocacy, and reporting purposes.</p> <p>We confirm that we hold all necessary rights and have obtained required consents from any individuals or third parties featured, in line with applicable laws and ethical standards. Ownership remains with the originating party. Where feasible, CRAF'd will provide attribution as specified, except where impracticable or inconsistent with the format or purpose of use. Materials shall not be used in a misleading or defamatory manner.</p>

2. PROJECT SELF-ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Use this section to self-assess your project's performance across the **reporting period** in four areas: **data quality, ecosystem and collaboration, data uptake and use, and the contribution of pooled funding**. For each question, select a rating and explain your choice clearly and concisely, using evidence from the project period. Keep **responses short (2-3 sentences)** and **focused on what changed, improved, or was enabled**. Avoid lengthy narrative or descriptions of activities alone.

2.1. Data quality

#	Question	Rating	Justification (evidence-based)
a.	To what extent did the project ensure transparency and public accessibility of its data, insights, and methodologies?	5 - Very great extent -	Since the system's launch in September 2025, all eEARTH products and datasets are publicly available online. We published a comprehensive data catalogue and an open-access methodology note outlining key findings, data usage considerations, and limitations. To promote transparency and accessibility, all charts and analytics featured on the platform can be downloaded directly from the website. Registered users can also export high-resolution maps and charts for use in presentations and reports. By combining clear visual storytelling with direct access to underlying data, the platform serves both general audiences seeking insight and advanced users requiring analytical depth.
b.	To what extent did the project apply open standards, machine-readable formats , and interoperable approaches (e.g. APIs)?	5 - Very great extent -	The eEARTH interface disseminates all data in multiple formats. All data outputs are machine-readable and follow open standards. Time-series data, AI-generated text, and risk ranking data are stored in CSV format, while geospatial data is stored in TIF and SHP formats. Files are consistently structured and named, facilitating interoperability and enabling the development of an API in the near future.

c.	To what extent did the project ensure the accuracy, completeness, and reliability of its data or insights through validation or peer-review processes?	5 - Very great extent -	During the pilot phase, the project embedded multiple validation and peer-review mechanisms to ensure the robustness of eEARTH's analytical outputs. We conducted systematic data quality assessments and subjected the monitoring framework to external review and stress-testing, including by experts from the Climate Hazards Center, Princeton University's Empirical Studies of Conflict (ESOC) program and Columbia University's Climate School. This review confirmed indicator reliability, methodological assumptions and risk classifications. To assess completeness and potential bias, we undertook detailed dataset audits in South Sudan and Somalia, cross-checking reported climate-related events and fatalities, analysing deviations from historical baselines, examining the share of resource-related conflicts and reviewing month-on-month trends. These checks strengthened confidence that the platform's visualisations and risk rankings reflected observed conflict dynamics. To further promote transparency, we published a methodology note detailing data sources, analytical approaches and known limitations. Since the platform's release in September 2025, all outputs have been reviewed and validated by Crisis Group country and regional analysts prior to publication, ensuring that quantitative findings were grounded in contextual expertise.
d.	To what extent did the project implement responsible data practices, including informed consent, privacy, confidentiality,	5 - Very great extent -	eEARTH uses public, relatively coarse data that pose low risk to individual privacy. For the qualitative research conducted by Crisis Group that informs eEARTH analysis, we apply strict protocols, monthly reviews, and expert engagement to protect sources, and align with evolving safety standards for all data. For all external datasets integrated into the platform, we engage directly with data-publishing

	<p>fairness, and risk mitigation?</p>		<p>organizations to understand methodological limitations, potential biases, and appropriate conditions of use. These are systematically documented and communicated through the “Important Considerations” footnote accompanying each dataset within the eEARTH interface, supporting transparency and responsible interpretation by users. In addition, Crisis Group maintains policies and procedures to ensure that the handling of eEARTH users’ data complies with all relevant legal and regulatory frameworks, including the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and applicable data protection laws in the jurisdictions where we operate. Our external privacy notice serves as the primary policy governing these practices.</p>
<p>e.</p>	<p>To what extent was gender expertise or inclusive analysis (e.g. sex, age, disability) incorporated into the design, collection, or validation of the data or insights?</p>	<p>4 - Great extent ▾</p>	<p>Crisis Group recognises the differentiated impacts and effects of climate change and environmental degradation on the security of women and girls, minorities and other vulnerable groups. As part of the pilot phase, the pathway assessments analysed gendered roles in climate- and resource-related conflicts in South Sudan and Somalia, while the early warning assessments reviewed the availability of gender-sensitive secondary datasets to integrate into eEARTH. Although the team explored several options, we found that gender-specific data suitable for real-time monitoring remains limited. We continue to monitor developments and will incorporate such analytics as they become available. In the meantime, eEARTH draws on ICG’s gender-sensitive field inputs to help bridge this gap, supported by institutional protocols that systematically consider a gender perspective into research design, analysis and policy recommendations.</p>

2.2. Ecosystem and collaboration

#II	Question	Rating	Justification (evidence-based)
f.	To what extent did the project strengthen data-or insights-sharing and collaboration among ecosystem partners?	5 - Very great extent -	eEARTH's methodology builds on and integrates data from a range of organisations across the climate, social science, humanitarian, and peacebuilding sectors. It draws on third-party sources, including ACLED for conflict data, IDMC for displacement, and ICPAC for climate forecasting and early warning. Throughout the project, we maintained regular engagement with all CRAF'd partners, having collaborated with them throughout the prototype development to identify early warning gaps, facilitate research exchange and explore areas for collaboration. In addition, eEARTH provides complementary insights: for instance INFORM primarily looks at country-wide trends, whereas eEARTH focuses on the micro-foundations and subnational analysis. eEARTH's real time focus, for example, complements PRIO-VIEWS's emphasis on predictions. As outlined further below, Crisis Group also partnered with CRAF'd itself to multiply the reach and impact of our advocacy on eEARTH.
g.	To what extent did the project strengthen sustained partnerships with organizations operating in fragile and crisis-affected settings?	4 - Great extent -	Throughout implementation, Crisis Group has sustained collaboration with national authorities, regional bodies, UN agencies, donor governments and NGOs operating in the Horn of Africa, building a durable partner network around the eEARTH interface. In South Sudan and Somalia, we identified concrete synergies and areas for research and policy collaboration with key climate security stakeholders. Notably, Crisis Group signed a memorandum of understanding with IGAD/ICPAC, which fostered regular technical exchanges on climate security risk forecasting

			<p>and provided a regional platform for eEARTH's insights. We also sustained engagement with policymakers, like Somalia's Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), the African Union or the European Union, to the World Bank, the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, IRC, UNDP and UNMISS. These exchanges moved beyond ad hoc consultation and laid the groundwork for sustained collaboration, data-sharing and joint analytical work in fragile contexts.</p>
h.	<p>To what extent were local and national actors meaningfully involved in the design, collection, validation, or use of the project's data or insights?</p>	<p>5 - Very great extent -</p>	<p>Crisis Group adopted a participatory approach in developing eEARTH, engaging closely with locally based missions, NGOs, regional organisations and national governments in the Horn of Africa.</p> <p>The interface was co-developed through consultations with more than 100 climate, conflict and humanitarian professionals working in Somalia and South Sudan, who are closest to climate-related violence and best positioned to mobilise quickly to prevent it. Through these Needs and Solutions Assessments, participants mapped existing early-warning initiatives, identified gaps the system could address, and highlighted opportunities to strengthen the impact of current efforts. Their inputs directly informed the design of the eEARTH prototype, which was presented to local and national actors in Nairobi in October 2024 for feedback. Participants' suggestions were incorporated into the final interface, including features that allow users to overlay multiple data layers to explore correlations, download maps, and visualise additional livelihood indicators such as cropland data within the dashboard.</p>

			<p>To ensure that the perspectives of local populations and vulnerable communities were reflected in Crisis Group’s publications, our analysts also drew on trusted local networks to complement eEARTH’s data insights and conducted interviews with flood-affected communities in South Sudan’s Jonglei state, as well as with people displaced by climate change, drought and Al-Shabaab’s governance in camps in Baidoa, Somalia. These lived experiences informed the project’s analysis and recommendations, strengthening local ownership of the platform, enhancing the credibility of its insights, and laying the groundwork for future policy and programmatic use by regional actors.</p>
<p>i.</p>	<p>To what extent did the project build or strengthen partnerships with women-led or feminist organizations that influenced the analysis or use of data or insights?</p>	<p>3 - Moderate extent ▾</p>	<p>While developing eEARTH’s pathway assessments and interface, we consulted with CSOs working on women’s and girls’ socioeconomic empowerment, including ASEP and Zamzam in Somalia, and CEPO in South Sudan, to better understand how climate-related tensions and conflicts affect their activities and where eEARTH could support their work. These discussions highlighted the specific ways climate security risks affect women, girls and other vulnerable groups, and underscored the value of eEARTH’s subnational and real-time analytics for planning disaster risk reduction activities in remote areas.</p> <p>However, the current lack of gender-disaggregated data within eEARTH’s dashboard limited opportunities to formalise deeper partnerships with these organisations. The consultations nevertheless helped inform the project’s analysis and ensured that gender-related climate security risks were reflected in the project’s insights and recommendations.</p>

2.3. Data update and use

#III	Question	Rating	Justification (evidence-based)
j.	To what extent did project's data or insights inform funding or resource allocation decisions that improved timing, targeting, or dignity of crisis action in fragile and crisis-affected settings?	4 - Great extent ▾	The project generated regularly updated analytics on climate-related conflict risks in the Horn of Africa, alongside recommendations on how to prevent climate-related violence. These insights have informed discussions with development and humanitarian actors on how to better target resources to emerging climate-conflict hotspots. The World Bank, ACTED and UNEP's Climate Security Advisors have expressed interest in using future eEARTH analytics and risk scores to identify priority areas and guide resource allocation to mitigate spillover risks. The European Commission and the European External Action Service have also listed eEARTH as a reference resource for their climate-security trend reports, which support strategic foresight and funding decisions. In addition, the Foreign Policy Instrument has expressed interest in integrating eEARTH insights into its risk assessments and programming, and is considering a proposal to finance the platform's expansion. Norway's Special Envoy for Climate and Security similarly noted that the Foreign Ministry could use eEARTH's analytical capabilities to support better integrated implementation of its new Climate Strategy across different departments.
k.	To what extent did the project's data or insights strengthen anticipatory action or early warning / early action	4 - Great extent ▾	While eEARTH data was only released in September 2025, interest from ecosystem partners including ICPAC, IRC, FAO, WFP and IOM in using its assessments to strengthen conflict analysis indicates demand for these insights to support anticipatory action. Since the platform's public launch, users who have downloaded eEARTH maps, charts and data include humanitarian and policy actors working

	capabilities of partners?		on access, disaster risk management and early warning analysis, including staff from Action Contre la Faim, the World Food Programme, Kindernothilfe, UNESCO and the Jennifer Etuh Foundation. This early uptake suggests growing interest in applying the platform's analytics to anticipatory planning and risk monitoring.
i.	To what extent did the project's data or insights contribute to earlier, faster, or more targeted assistance to affected populations?	4 - Great extent ▾	eEARTH's real-time data, subnational focus and forecasting analytics were designed to support humanitarian actors in anticipatory action, including decisions on pre-positioning aid and ensuring conflict-sensitive programming. Crisis Group partnered with ICPAC to integrate climate-conflict analytics into regional early warning systems and share eEARTH assessments in policy forums. The South Sudan Conflict Sensitivity Resource Facility (CSRf), FAO and WFP also expressed interest in disseminating future risk alerts through their networks and invited eEARTH contributions to the Food Security and Nutrition Working Group (FSNWG), helping strengthen anticipatory action and more targeted responses across the region.
m.	To what extent did the project's data or insights enable partners to analyze and address the gendered impacts of crises ?	4 - Great extent ▾	While, as noted above, real-time gender-disaggregated data remains limited, the project enabled partners to better analyze the gendered impacts of climate-related crises through the production of Crisis Group's gender-sensitive field research protocols, bolstered by eEARTH insights. Over the reporting period, our publications " <i>Fighting Climate Change in Somalia's Conflict Zones</i> " and " <i>The Stakes of Stripping Climate from UN Peacekeeping in South Sudan</i> " highlighted how disaster-related displacement, food insecurity and livelihood loss exacerbate risks of sexual exploitation and violence against women and girls. The research also showed that women

			<p>are disproportionately affected by water and food scarcity due to their roles as primary providers of these resources, limited livelihood alternatives, and increased exposure to risk when travelling further to access water or other essentials. Future written publications will continue to reflect the gendered impacts of crises, with plans to integrate disaggregated analytics into the dashboard as data improves.</p>
--	--	--	--

2.4 Contribution of CRAF'd funding

#IV	Question	Rating	Justification (evidence-based)
n.	To what extent did CRAF'd funding enable your organization to pursue new or expanded areas of work that would otherwise not have been possible?	5 - Very great extent ▾	CRAF'd funding has been instrumental in expanding Crisis Group's capacity to deliver near-real-time insights on the links between natural resources, climate stress, food security and conflict through advanced data analysis. We were able to develop and scale the data monitoring infrastructure underpinning the eEARTH platform—an investment that would not have been possible without CRAF'd funding. This infrastructure has strengthened our ability to combine satellite imagery, geospatial data and field-based analysis to track emerging risks and support more timely policy engagement. As a result, Crisis Group is now able to expand its analytical work into new and underexplored areas of resource-related conflict, including mining activities in contested areas, transboundary water disputes, and satellite-enhanced monitoring of infrastructure damage and commodity flows. By connecting diverse datasets and creating new analytical tools, eEARTH will enable more integrated insights on how environmental, economic and security risks interact across fragile contexts. These capabilities are expected to broaden the thematic scope and geographic reach of Crisis Group's analysis and support more systematic, forward-looking insights that can inform more timely and targeted crisis prevention and response.
o.	To what extent did CRAF'd funding strengthen your organization's data, analytical, or technical	5 - Very great extent ▾	Investments in eEARTH's data infrastructure have enabled Crisis Group to integrate analysis across regions, time periods and conflict scenarios in our publications, strengthening the evidence base on climate-related security risks. For example, in our report " <u><i>Fighting Climate Change in Somalia's Conflict Zones</i></u> ", we


<p>capabilities and the overall quality of your work?</p>		<p>incorporated eEARTH analytics, combined precipitation, vegetation and conflict data with geospatial mapping of water infrastructure to show how Al-Shabaab exploits drought cycles for social control. The platform's scalable architecture has also supported a wider range of publications on environmental and resource-related risks beyond the Horn of Africa, including analysis covering Somalia, South Sudan, Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and the Amazon. eEARTH's use of advanced data analytics and AI has further enhanced our capacity to produce multi-hazard and near real-time analysis, improving the depth, geographic scope and timeliness of our research.</p>
--	--	--

3. KEY ACHIEVEMENTS AND RESULTS

Use this section to highlight your project's **key achievements** and **results** from the **reporting period**. Focus on **key milestones, decision-linked use of data or insights, and partnership outcomes**. For each entry, clearly explain **what was achieved, why it mattered, and what changed as a result**. Emphasise results and decisions enabled, not activities alone, and keep responses concise and evidence-based.

3.1 Key achievements

Use this sub-section to present the top three **key achievements** from the **reporting period**. Focus on **major milestones or breakthroughs** that led to clear results for the project. For each achievement, explain **why it was significant, how it contributed to the project's objectives, and what changed as a result**. Emphasise results and decisions enabled, not activities alone. Keep descriptions concise, factual, and evidence-based. The achievements reported in this section will be highlighted on your project page in the upcoming [CRAF'd Annual Report](#).

#V	Key achievement	Significance	Links / materials
	Briefly describe a major result or milestone achieved while implementing the project. For example: The project developed a cloud system that now delivers up-to-date weather and impact feeds.	Explain why this achievement matters, how it contributed to project objectives, and what changed as a result. For example: The cloud system enables drought outlooks from 2 to 4 months in advance and flood alerts up to 16 days ahead. Using this data, local NGOs started targeted seasonal funding allocations ahead of the hazard impact.	Provide direct links to reports, tools, dashboards, articles, or other materials that demonstrate or document the achievement.
a.	Crisis Group officially launched a fully operational interface for policymakers and other stakeholders responding to climate-related violence in the Horn of Africa.	<p>The finalised eEARTH dashboard combines sector-specific data from climate analytics with our own observations of conflict dynamics through a risk rating system, filling key analytical gaps and increasing policymakers' access to vital information including which locations face the greatest multi-hazard risks, and whether conditions are improving or deteriorating.</p> <p>In a launch webinar attended by 361 participants, our experts explored the ways struggles for access to natural resources and climate hazards shape modern conflicts, highlighting examples from Somalia and Yemen. They demonstrated how eEARTH's integrated approach, fusing</p>	<p>Interface: https://earth.io/</p> <p>eEARTH launch webinar: https://www.crisisgroup.org/evt/global/tracking-resources-and-conflict-fracturing-world</p>


		<p>data science with Crisis Group’s analysis, offers a powerful framework for monitoring risks.</p> <p>After the event, a number of decision makers who have engaged with our work since the start of eEARTH’s development remarked on their satisfaction with the fully iterated program. For instance, a Programme Manager for Climate Change, Environment and Security at the EU’s Foreign Policy Instrument (FPI) described the event as a “really successful launch” which FPI was “delighted” to support. A Deputy Unit Head at the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) also described the progress made towards the current eEARTH platform as “impressive”. Other attendees praised eEARTH as “unique”, in terms of how it can connect previously separate data systems across climate, economics and security, generating singular risk analysis in a field where policymakers normally struggle for decisive recommendations</p>	
b.	<p>High-Level Briefings to UN Missions, EU leaders and humanitarian officials contributed to enhanced stakeholder knowledge of complex climate security risks.</p>	<p>As part of the <i>Climate Talks</i> – a series of policy events initiated by the Permanent Mission of Germany to the UN to address the climate crisis – we co-hosted a high-level panel on early warning in February 2025. The event introduced eEARTH to high-level stakeholders, illustrating how early warning systems can help better anticipate climate-driven instability to strengthen populations’ resilience in vulnerable regions.</p> <p>In the same month, we connected with three of the UN Security Council’s Informal Expert Group on Climate, Peace and Security for an introductory briefing. The group members, from Slovenia, Panama and the Republic of Korea’s mission, requested frequent updates about the system, and welcomed follow-up conversations on how eEARTH could support their work.</p> <p>At the EU’s request, Crisis Group also joined the Brussels and Nairobi Climate Security Dialogues in February and</p>	<p>Livestreamed <u>panel</u> on AI hosted by the Complex Risk Analytics Fund (CRAF’d)</p>

		<p>March 2025, gathering some 80 experts and practitioners from the EU to deepen and localise conversations on the nexus of climate, peace and security. At the Nairobi Climate Security Dialogues, Crisis Group’s Senior Analyst spoke during the opening panel on policy and programme responses to Climate, Peace and Security Risks in the East and Horn of Africa. She also presented eEARTH during a workshop session focused on integrating Early Warning Systems into preventative programming. Subsequently, she accepted an invite from the European Commission to present our work on climate and conflict in Somalia at the May meeting of the EU Fragility and Transformation Hub.</p> <p>Finally, we showcased eEARTH at a UNGA High-Level Week panel hosted by CRAF’d, underscoring that resources increasingly sit at the heart of modern conflicts, making tools like eEARTH essential for smarter aid delivery and preventing conflict.</p> <p>These briefings validated the platform’s utility to detect and address risks before they escalate, and positioned its early warning analysis as a credible input for diplomatic and strategic decision-making.</p>	
c.	<p>Since eEARTH’s launch in September 2025, the interface has attracted 7,070 users and generated 41,186 views.</p>	<p>Users spend an average of five minutes on country pages – significantly above standard web engagement benchmarks. This indicates in-depth interaction with the dashboard’s analytical features rather than casual browsing.</p>	<p>In 2026, we will deepen our impact assessment by circulating user surveys to capture qualitative feedback, use cases, and evidence of how eEARTH informs policy, research, and programming decisions.</p>

3.2. Ecosystem partnership and outcomes

Use this sub-section to describe partnerships that **contributed to the implementation of the project** and/or **to strengthening the data and reporting ecosystem during the reporting period**. Partnerships may include organizations that **acted as implementing or counterpart partners**, contributing directly to data collection, coordination, validation, or analysis of project outputs, **as well as organizations that contributed to system-level outcomes**, such as improved data sharing, interoperability, standardization, or reuse of data by multiple stakeholders.

For each partnership, describe the **concrete results achieved through collaboration** and **what changed as a result**. Focus on outcomes and added value generated by the partnership rather than coordination activities or processes.

#VI	Partner organization	Result of the partnership	Links / materials
	List the organization that contributed as an implementing, counterpart, or ecosystem partner to the project.	Briefly describe what improved or changed because of the partnership, including concrete outputs or outcomes (e.g. better data, wider access, shared standards). For example: The organization collaborated with two additional data partners to deliver multi-sectoral needs assessments; during the 2026 humanitarian planning cycle, the partners aligned their data collection approaches and developed a standardized implementation package that will be integrated into their API in future iterations, improving consistency and reuse of data	Provide direct links to reports, datasets, dashboards, tools, or publications that demonstrate the results of the partnership.
a.	The Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)'s Climate Prediction & Applications Centre (ICPAC)	In 2024, Crisis Group signed a memorandum of understanding with IGAD/ICPAC, which fostered regular technical exchanges on climate security risk forecasting and provided a regional platform for eEARTH's insights. Meetings with staff members from ICPAC allowed us to outline early warning modalities specific to South Sudan and the Horn region. Remarking on our unique experience in regional conflict hotspots compared to other organisations, the ICPAC Thematic Lead invited us to join the Eastern Africa Regional Technical Working Group on Anticipatory Action (RTWGAA), providing strategic direction for member states, developing flood and drought trigger thresholds, and capacity building initiatives.	Integration of ICPAC's seasonal forecasting data on eEARTH's dashboard: https://earth.io/map/south-sudan?plugin_id=temperature_forecast_above&date=2025-11
b.	Armed Conflict Location & Event Data (ACLED)	We consulted with the respective country analysts and data leads at ACLED to ensure a thorough understanding of the data's limitations and support accurate interpretation of results. These limitations are also clearly highlighted on the eEARTH dashboard to inform users	Important considerations displayed on the eEARTH interface regarding conflict data:

		and encourage responsible data use.	https://earth.io/map/somalia?plugin_id=conflict_resource_acled
c.	International Organization for Migration (IOM)	We engaged with analysts from IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) teams for Somalia and Ethiopia, as well as staff from the Global Data Institute, to exchange insights on climate-related displacement risks and early warning approaches. These discussions explored opportunities to integrate displacement dynamics into climate–conflict risk analysis, and informed exchanges on drought indices and flood data relevant to displacement monitoring.	
d	Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC)	We consulted IDMC experts working on information management and regional coordination to better understand the landscape of displacement data, methodological differences, and their biases. These insights informed how displacement data are contextualized on the eEARTH dashboard, including clearer explanations of data limitations to support responsible use and interpretation. Discussions also identified potential areas for collaboration with IDMC's Global Analysis team on displacement-related risk analysis.	Important considerations displayed on the eEARTH interface regarding displacement data: https://earth.io/map/somalia?plugin_id=displacement_idmc
e	Climate Hazards Center (CHC)	We engaged with CHC experts to better understand expected climate conditions in the Horn of Africa, including the links between La Nina patterns, rainfall variability, and flooding, and incorporated these insights into our analysis. Following the detection of inconsistencies in flood data, consultations with CHC data specialists helped identify their causes and informed adjustments to our data processing workflow, reducing the risk of inaccurate results displayed on the eEARTH interface.	Flood Map, South Sudan: https://earth.io/map/south-sudan?date=2025-09
f	Columbia University Climate School	We held regular consultations with a climate expert from the Columbia Climate School to review the quality of selected data products, validate analytical insights derived from them, understand data biases, and improve the accessibility of eEARTH's climate visualizations. These discussions led to several improvements, including revisions to flood maps and improved approaches for presenting climate forecasting maps, strengthening the clarity and reliability of the eEARTH dashboard.	Flood Map, South Sudan, distinguishing between inundation in- and outside of wetlands: https://earth.io/map/south-sudan?date=2025-09

		Rainfall Forecast Map, Somalia, highlighting regions that experienced unusually low rainfall in recent months and are projected to receive below-average precipitation in the coming months: https://earth.io/map/somalia?plugin_id=rainfall_forecast_below&date=2025-09
g	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	We held productive meetings with leading conflict, environment and food security experts at the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) in Nairobi, reviewing synergies in early warning and anticipatory action decision making. A Food Security and Early Warning Economist from the FAO team expressed interest in how eEARTH's analytics could strengthen the conflict and displacement sections of the Food Security and Nutrition Working Group (FSNWG) report, co-ordinated by over eighty international and civil society organisations in the Horn of Africa to respond to regional emergencies.
h	German Permanent Mission to the UN	The German Mission and Crisis Group co-hosted a <i>Climate Talks</i> event in New York, where we worked closely with the UN in South Sudan and Mozambique to present a high-level overview of our system's real-time, localised insights designed to inform diplomatic and humanitarian interventions. The session brought together over twenty permanent missions to the UN, representatives of the EU delegation, and senior officials from the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR). Partnering with a leading voice on climate policy like Germany helped attract more than 100 participants, with attendees expressing appreciation for our work in bringing climate change and resource dynamics into discussions on regional peace and security.


3.3. Results from data uptake and use

Use this sub-section to **provide at least three examples** showing how the project’s **data or insights were taken up and used by partners** to inform **concrete decisions or actions**, leading to **measurable outcomes**. Selected examples will be featured as “Impact Stories” on the [CRAF’d website](#).

For each example, **describe the context, how the data or insights were used to inform a decision or action, and what changed as a result**. Keep descriptions **concise, factual, and evidence-based**.

Examples should demonstrate **one or more** of the following:

- Improved anticipation, prevention, or response in fragile and crisis-affected settings
- Changes in funding, prioritization, or resource allocation decisions
- Earlier, faster, more targeted, or more dignified assistance to affected populations


#VII	Context	Data-driven decision	Resulting impact	Links / materials
	Briefly describe the problem, risk, or decision gap in a fragile or crisis-affected setting. For example: Repeated intercommunal tensions in Akobo County, South Sudan, were causing cyclical displacement, with limited early warning to prevent escalation before violence occurred.	Explain and, where possible, quantify how the project’s data or insights informed concrete decisions and actions, including their relevance for resource allocation and programming. For example: Project’s data was integrated into the displacement prediction model to forecast population movements up to 3 months ahead. In May 2024, elevated risk forecasts triggered a targeted programmatic response, including inter-community dialogues engaging over 200 local leaders, youth, and officials.	Describe the difference this made in practice, including quantitative results where available. For example: Preventive action contributed to 2,800 fewer displaced people than neighboring areas, achieved a ROI of over 6.6× emergency funding, and informed early-action models now used in 6 countries.	Provide full links to relevant reports, articles, and other materials that demonstrate the use case and impact.
a.	Policymakers working on climate security in the Horn of Africa lacked integrated analysis linking environmental stress, armed group dynamics, and local conflict risks. This limited the ability of international partners to incorporate climate-security risks into	Using eEARTH’s analytics, Crisis Group integrated precipitation, vegetation, and conflict datasets with geospatial mapping of water reservoirs in its December 2024 report <i>“Fighting Climate Change in Somalia’s Conflict Zones”</i> . The analysis demonstrated how Al-Shabaab exploits drought cycles and water access to strengthen social control and influence local conflict dynamics.	The findings informed diplomatic and development discussions among international partners. Somalia’s ambassador to Kenya cited the report as identifying lines for national policy advocacy, while the UK ambassador to Somalia noted that its recommendations were explored as an entry point for engagement with armed groups. The EU’s DG INTPA Horn of Africa team also highlighted	Report link: https://www.crisisgroup.org/rpt/africa/horn-africa/somalia/316-fighting-climate-change-somalias-conflict-zones

	policy engagement and programming.		the analysis as a useful input for future EU programming decisions.	
b.	During negotiations on the renewal of the UN peacekeeping mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) in 2025, draft resolutions proposed removing climate-security language from the mandate, despite growing evidence linking extreme flooding, displacement, and local conflict dynamics.	Drawing on eEARTH-supported climate and conflict analysis, Crisis Group published the commentary " <u><i>The Stakes of Stripping Climate from UN Peacekeeping in South Sudan</i></u> " (April 2025), explaining how flooding and environmental pressures contribute to displacement and intensify ethnic and political tensions. The analysis was also shared with UN Security Council experts during a closed-door briefing by Crisis Group's UN Director and Senior UN Analyst.	<p>The analysis provided evidence for diplomats seeking to maintain climate-security provisions in the UNMISS mandate and supported discussions on the role of environmental stress in conflict dynamics in South Sudan.</p> <p>The timely evidence provided by Crisis Group supported arguments for the language to remain the same – which it did as the resolution passed in May.</p>	<p>Commentary link: https://www.crisisgroup.org/gna/africa/south-sudan/stakes-stripping-climate-un-peacekeeping-south-sudan</p> <p>UNSC Resolution on UNMISS Mandate Renewal: https://press.un.org/en/2025/sc16059.doc.htm</p>
c.	Since adopting the <u>2023 Joint Communication on the climate-security nexus</u> , EU institutions have placed increasing emphasis on integrating climate and environmental risks into external action, crisis management and security-sector engagement. Delivering on this agenda requires more systematic use of evidence-based analysis and foresight to inform programming and policy decisions. However, policymakers often operate	Through the eEARTH platform and related analysis, Crisis Group provided EU counterparts with real-time monitoring and integrated datasets on climate, environmental pressures, and conflict risks. The EU Delegation and EUCAP Mission in Somalia indicated they intend to use eEARTH to complement open-source data when engaging national ministries and supporting the training of security forces on how environmental pressures interact with other drivers of conflict. Building on this engagement, Crisis Group also advised the European Commission's Joint Research Centre on the implementation of the EU's Joint Communication to the European Parliament and Council on the	<p>Now that the platform has been publicly released, EU policymakers are expected to begin incorporating eEARTH insights into both operational and strategic processes.</p> <p>The Secretary-General of the EU referenced our early warning system in the progress report on the implementation of the Joint Communication on the climate-security nexus, citing eEARTH as a resource that can inform the EU's ongoing climate security trend analysis. This analysis aims to ensure that granular, verified climate and conflict data informs political and strategic decision-making across the</p>	EU Progress Report

	<p>in institutional silos and lack granular, verified analysis linking environmental stressors to conflict dynamics in fragile contexts, limiting their ability to anticipate and respond to emerging climate-security risks.</p>	<p>impact of climate change and environmental degradation on peace, security and defence.</p>	<p>EEAS, the European Commission and the Council of the EU.</p> <p>The Commission’s Joint Research Centre and the EU Satellite Centre also invited Crisis Group to contribute to discussions on the future EU Climate, Environment and Security Data and Analysis Hub planned for 2027.</p> <p>Finally, the European Commission’s Foreign Policy Instrument (FPI) has expressed interest in supporting the expansion of eEARTH to cover risks related to water systems, attacks on civilian infrastructure and armed-group presence.</p>	
d	<p>Tana River County, Kenya, is a hotspot where climate variability (erratic rainfall, water scarcity, shifting grazing routes) intersects with localized intercommunal tensions over natural resources. Local peacebuilding actors reported that early warning signals often fail to translate into preventative action at the community level due to a “last-mile” gap between global risk analysis and local response mechanisms.</p>	<p>Amani Center CBO, a community-based peacebuilding and development organization in Tana River County, reported using insights and lessons from Crisis Group’s eEarth platform as a benchmark for understanding climate–conflict risks and strengthening their early warning and prevention work. The organization is exploring collaboration to feed real-time local insights into the platform and to translate risk data into community-level mitigation actions through its local initiatives and media platforms (including Vox Radio).</p>	<p>The platform’s data and analysis have helped inform local actors’ understanding of emerging climate–conflict risks and strengthened their capacity to anticipate and respond to resource-based tensions. By linking global early warning analysis with grassroots peacebuilding networks, the approach supports earlier, more locally informed conflict prevention efforts in a high-risk climate–conflict hotspot.</p>	<p>Amani Center CBO website: https://www.amanicentercbo.org/</p>

4. LESSONS LEARNED

Use this section to **provide up to five lessons** from the reporting period that are relevant to the **design, implementation, use, or sustainability** of the project. For each lesson, **clearly state the insight gained** and **describe how it informed an adjustment, improvement, or future approach**. Focus on learning that led to action or change, rather than general observations. Keep responses **concise, practical, and evidence-based**.

#VIII	Category	Lesson learned	Adjustment informed
	Select the category of the lessons learned..	Briefly describe what your organization learned while implementing the project. For example: The project learned that data downloads alone did not provide insight into who was using the platform or how the data informed decision-making.	Explain what you changed (or will change) in project implementation or reporting as a result of this lesson. For example: An API user registration mechanism was introduced to capture user profiles and usage patterns, enabling better analysis of data uptake and use.)
a.	Others ▾	Over the past year, the climate security agenda has lost traction due to weakening multilateral cooperation and funding cuts, reducing opportunities for coordinated advocacy with climate and humanitarian actors at COPs and strategic policy fora. At the same time, geopolitical competition over natural resources—including critical minerals and transboundary water systems—has increased demand for analysis linking environmental pressures to conflict dynamics.	While climate security will remain an integral part of our workflow, we have repositioned eEARTH within a broader framework of resource-driven conflict dynamics to maintain policy relevance in a more turbulent geopolitical environment. Building on its initial focus on climate hazards such as droughts and floods, the platform increasingly examines how resource pressures—including water disputes, food insecurity, land competition and other strategic assets—interact with political and security dynamics. This approach reflects a wider shift in conflict patterns, where resources are becoming central to geopolitical competition and local instability alike, and broadens engagement with diplomatic, security and development actors beyond traditional climate-policy forums.


b.	Organizational ▾	eEARTH's scalable data methodology has strengthened Crisis Group's capacity for integrated analysis across climate, resource, and conflict dynamics, demonstrating the value of combining geospatial data with field-based research.	We are exploring ways to scale the methodology across additional thematic areas and regional programmes, integrating data-driven analysis more systematically into Crisis Group's research outputs.
c.	Communications ▾	Combining data analytics with policy-facing analysis significantly increased the uptake of eEARTH insights by diplomatic and institutional partners. Integrating platform outputs into Crisis Group's reports and briefings helped translate technical findings into actionable policy recommendations.	We will continue integrating eEARTH analytics into public analysis, diplomatic briefings, and targeted engagement with institutional partners (e.g., EU institutions, UN actors and regional policymakers) to strengthen the policy relevance and practical use of the platform's insights.
d.	Methodology ▾	When we presented the eEARTH prototype for South Sudan to Crisis Group staff and external stakeholders in fall 2024, feedback highlighted the need for more advanced analytical functionality within the dashboard. In particular, users expressed strong interest in overlaying multiple datasets to identify areas affected by multiple hazards and in accessing clearer information on how risk levels are calculated.	Following the eEARTH soft launches, the interface was refined to incorporate these insights. New features were introduced, including the ability to overlay multiple data layers and access more detailed information on risk assessments, improving transparency, interpretability, and analytical usability.

5. VISIBILITY AND EXTERNAL ENGAGEMENT

Use this section to **document how the project and its results were communicated, referenced, or recognised externally** during the project reporting period. Focus on **visibility that demonstrates reach, uptake, or influence**, rather than promotional activity alone.

5.1 External coverage and engagement

Use this sub-section to **provide at least three examples** of where the project’s work was **featured, discussed, or referenced externally** during the project reporting period, such as events, blogs, reports, peer-reviewed articles, or other platforms. For each example, **briefly describe the coverage or engagement** and include a **quantitative indicator of reach or engagement** where available.

#IX	Type	Description	Reach / indicator	Links / materials
	Select the type of coverage and engagement.	Provide the title and a short description of the engagement or coverage, explaining what was shared or referenced and in what context. For example: Presented at an international data forum to share the project’s data collection methodology and gather feedback.	Provide a quantitative indication of reach or uptake, such as number of participants, downloads, views, citations, or mentions, where available. For example: Received feedback from over 50 workshop participants.	Include direct links to publications, recordings, dashboards, or other materials documenting the engagement or coverage.
a.	Events & presentations ▾	We hosted our eEARTH public launch event in September 2025, which we held virtually to amplify our reach. During this live webinar, our experts explored the ways struggles for access to natural resources and climate hazards shape modern conflicts, highlighting examples from Somalia and Yemen. They also demonstrated how eEARTH’s integrated approach, fusing data science with Crisis Group’s analysis, offers a powerful framework for monitoring risks.	Event attended by 361 online participants. After the event, a number of decision makers who have engaged with our work since the start of eEARTH’s development remarked on their satisfaction with the fully iterated program: a Programme Manager for Climate Change, Environment and Security at the EU’s Foreign Policy Instrument (FPI), for instance, described the event as a “really successful launch” which FPI was “delighted” to support. A Deputy Unit Head at the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) also described the progress made towards the current eEARTH platform as	Recording: https://www.crisisgroup.org/evt/global/tracking-resources-and-conflict-fracturing-world Online interface: https://live-earth.patheonsite.io/

	<p>We marked eEARTH's full launch and virtual introductory event by promoting the platform on Crisis Group's social media accounts. These accounts included our X profile with 233,000+ followers and LinkedIn profile with 233,000+ followers.</p> <p>Across all social media posts, we directed our audiences to eEARTH's online interface, where they can learn more about the system, and sign up for updates on climate security and resource dynamics in the Horn.</p>	<p>"impressive". Other attendees praised eEARTH as "unique", in terms of how it can connect previously separate data systems across climate, economics and security, generating singular risk analysis in a field where policymakers normally struggle for decisive recommendations.</p> <p>On eEARTH's official launch date, September 15th, we coordinated posts on X and LinkedIn with our livestreamed virtual event. Our X post proved particularly successful, accruing 12,400 views to date. Our LinkedIn post garnered positive reactions from a Head of Regional Office at ECHO and the European Commission, a Programme Officer at NATO and the Deputy Director General of Paris Peace Forum. The livestreamed event was also posted on YouTube for our 21,700 subscribers.</p> <p>A subsequent LinkedIn post by Crisis Group's Climate, Environment and Conflict Project Director, was similarly well received by international decision makers. An FAO Portfolio Coordinator shared the project outline with the WFP's Head of Research Assessment and Monitoring (RAM), while another WFP Advisor described the launch as a "timely" intervention in early warning climate monitoring. The post also attracted the attention of the Special Envoy at the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a Policy Officer for Land and Environment at the European</p>	
--	--	--	--

			Commission, and the UNDP Portfolio Lead for Climate, Nature and Energy.	
b.	Events & presentations ▾	In February 2025, the UN Mission of Germany invited the eEARTH team to co-host a high-level <i>Climate Talk</i> on early warning, with 20+ permanent missions to the UN, climate security advisors, and senior officials from the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction.	<p>The event attracted more than 100 participants, with attendees expressing appreciation for our work in bringing climate change and resource dynamics, including eEARTH, into discussions on regional peace and security.</p> <p>Our collaborators from the German Mission to the UN shared videos of Crisis Group staff speaking at their <i>Climate Talks</i> event. They circulated a short video to their 91,000+ followers on X of Richard Gowan, Crisis Group’s Program Director for Global Issues and Institutions, discussing how to help communities prepare for extreme climate risks after moderating the event.</p>	
c.	Events & presentations ▾	In September 2025, our President & CEO Dr. Comfort Ero promoted eEARTH at a UNGA High-Level Week panel on AI hosted by the UN’s Complex Risk Analytics Fund (CRAF’d), where she underscored that resources increasingly sit at the heart of modern conflicts, making tools like eEARTH essential to detect and address risks before they escalate.	Our collaborators from CRAF’d – in addition to broadcasting the full event – also shared a highlight video of Crisis Group’s President and CEO, Dr. Comfort Ero, discussing eEARTH to LinkedIn, which received positive feedback from two members of the UN Secretary-General’s Office, among others.	<p>Recording: https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:7379873647387381760/?actorCompanyId=80322147</p> <p>Video: https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:7379873647387381760/?actorCompanyId=80322147</p>

d	Publications & reports ▾	<p>In 2024, Crisis Group published the the video <i>"Mapping Conflict: Somalia's Climate Crisis and the Fight Against Al-Shabaab"</i> (May) and the report <i>"Fighting Climate Change in Somalia's Conflict Zones"</i> (December), highlighting how al-Shabaab insurgents maintain control over parts of Somalia by monopolising water resources during prolonged drought. The publication and video drew on eEARTH-derived drought and conflict data, combined with satellite imagery from Planet Labs PBC, to analyse how environmental pressures interact with local and regional conflict dynamics.</p>	<p>The video performed strongly, receiving 14,400 views in its first month. The report, offering in-depth analysis and recommendations to policy-makers, recorded 2,902 views over the same period and was cited by several prominent outlets, including AP News, FAZ, AFP, The Independent, The East African (2x), The New Humanitarian.</p>	<p>Report:https://www.crisisgroup.org/africa/horn-africa/somalia/316-fighting-climate-change-somalias-conflict-zones</p> <p>Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bn6sf7703As&list=TLGGMu9jllgVnFwwNDA2MjAyNA</p>
	Publications & reports ▾	<p>In April 2025, Crisis Group published the Q&A <i>"The Stakes of Stripping Climate from UN Peacekeeping in South Sudan"</i>, examining the implications of proposals to remove climate-security provisions from the mandate of the UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS). Drawing on eEARTH's climate and conflict research, the publication highlighted how extreme flooding, displacement and food insecurity exacerbate political tensions and local conflict dynamics, and outlined why maintaining climate analysis within peacekeeping</p>	<p>The Q&A reached 4,367 views in its first month, reflecting strong engagement with this timely policy issue.</p>	<p>Q&A: https://www.crisisgroup.org/africa/horn-africa/south-sudan/stakes-stripping-climate-un-peacekeeping-south-sudan</p>

		mandates remains important for effective conflict prevention.	
--	--	---	--

5.2 Leadership testimonial

Use this sub-section to **provide one quote** from your organization's leadership reflecting on the **project's results** and the **contribution of CRAF'd support**. Limit the quote to a **maximum of 25 words**. Also, submit a high-quality photo of the person quoted and label them accordingly.

#XI	Quote	Full name of person quoted	Title of person quoted
a.	CRAF'd support enabled Crisis Group to build the flagship eEARTH platform, combining data analysis with on-the-ground political expertise to track how climate and resource pressures drive conflict and instability. As many governments pull back from funding innovative research and analysis even as conflicts proliferate, CRAF'd fills a critical gap, ensuring that cutting-edge approaches tackle the problems that matter most.	Dr Comfort Ero	President and CEO, International Crisis Group