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• **General objective:** Develop an indicators framework to monitor SOCIAL COHESION and CONFLICT.
• Started as a pilot in Northern Ninewa:
• Provide **QUANTIFIABLE** measure of a **BASELINE** and **CHANGE** for specific **DRIVERS** of conflict...

• ...that we can **MONITOR** over time.
The design of the monitoring framework:

- **CONFLICT**
- **GOALS**
- **INDICATORS**

Appears when:
- Conflict **DRIVERS** are high
- Institutional **PERFORMANCE** is low

Goals that need to be achieved to reduce intensity or likelihood of conflict. This means:
- Conflict drivers are **REDUCED**
- Institutional performance is **INCREASED**

Measures to see how close or far we are from achieving the goals. There can be many indicators for each goal.
USIP's Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments (MPICE)

- This framework includes:
  - 149 goals (drivers and institutional responses)
  - +800 indicators

- Our framework, based on MPICE contains **48** indicators across **23** goals over **4** vectors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe and Secure Environment</th>
<th>Political Moderation and Stable Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
<td>Social Wellbeing and Livelihoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey constructed around indicators + context → to explore *intra-* and *inter-group* dynamics of **MAIN** communities residing in target locations.
• Focusing on general community perceptions but also group-to-group dynamics in each district.
• Focusing on general community perceptions but also group-to-group dynamics in each district.
• Focusing on general community perceptions but also group-to-group dynamics in each district.
• Focusing on general community perceptions but also group-to-group dynamics in each district.
• Focusing on general community perceptions but also group-to-group dynamics in each district.
TECHNICAL CHARACTERISTICS

How the data is and what it can be used for:

1. Total sample size of 1,100 household interviews across north Ninewa, covering several towns and villages across subdistricts.

2. For each population group in each region, we gathered a random sample of ~ 90 interviews → 10%-12% margin of error.

3. Teams of enumerators in each region matching the ethno-religious grouping for interviewees.

4. Data cannot (and must not) be merged to show a district average because of the research design → the aim was to gather data for each population group separately to allow for cross-group and cross-temporal comparison as opposed to providing a representative picture of the district.

5. Largest limitation: limited number of female respondents in some subdistricts that does not allow for weighting answers and eliminate potential gender biases. Average male / female respondents ratio is 71% / 29%.

6. Other limitation linked to field restrictions: enumerators could not (or were not willing to) access some locations that were selected for fieldwork. In some cases, they also faced hostile reception from local communities.