



Results-Based Framework for PCRDR Activities

Peace and Security Department





Results-Based Framework for PCRDR Activities

Peace and Security Department





FOREWORD

The Results-Based Framework (RBF) is a tool for the planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development (PCRD) activities of the African Union (AU).

Developed by the AU PCRD Inter-departmental Task Force in collaboration with the representatives of the Regional Economic Communities and Regional Mechanisms (RECs/RMs) to the AU Commission, the RBF is a Commission-wide effort that sets out the AU's strategic objectives for PCRD, identifies

relevant interventions and links them to outcomes and results that support the realisation of the identified objectives. All the interventions outlined in the document have been developed against a backdrop of cause and effect interlinkages and, as such, provide for activities and programs at various levels, within the AUC as well as with the RECs/RMs, Member States, African Civil Society and Partners. The RBF is anchored on the African Peace and Security Architecture Roadmap 2016-2020 and other related policy instruments.

Indeed, Silencing the Guns in Africa by 2020 and Creating the Africa We Want requires a multiplicity of actors and interventions. Yet, attaining results does not lie merely in the number of activities conducted but rather, in the extent to which efforts are harmonised to attain our strategic objectives.

The collaborative and participatory approach utilised in development of the RBF has further enhanced cooperation between the various Divisions and Departments of the AUC, and has engendered consensus as well as ownership of this document. It is expected that this document will contribute to enhancing coordination and collaboration between the Divisions and Departments of the AU Commission and the RECs/RMs. It is my hope that the RBF will ultimately lead to better communication and also strengthen the principle of complementarity in practice and provide a clear road map for our Partners.

This document is now an additional tool for the monitoring and evaluation of our PCRD efforts, and its implementation will be assessed in relationship to the set outputs, outcomes and the overall impact.

I encourage all AUC Departments and RECs/RMs to use the RBF as a primary reference document as they plan and implement PCRD-related activities. Doing so would ensure that the Commission and RECs/RMs leverage their political capital, and more critically, optimise the use of their financial and human resources in order to support Member States and Communities emerging from conflict and/or difficult transitions.

Ambassador Smail Chergui
Commissioner for Peace and Security
African Union Commission
13 February 2018

THE CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND POST-CONFLICT RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

The Crisis Management and Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development (CMPCRD) is one of the Divisions in the Peace and Security Department that supports the efforts of the African Union Commission to prevent, manage and resolve conflicts as well as, support the reconstruction and development endeavours of countries emerging from conflicts and/or difficult transitions.

The CMPCRD comprises two Units, namely; Crisis Management and Post Conflict Reconstruction and Development (PCRD). Under the Crisis Management Unit, the Division manages conflicts through monitoring of political, security and humanitarian situations across the continent, and implements decisions adopted by the Peace and Security Council (PSC). The Division oversees all AU-led and/or supported mediation efforts including providing backstopping support to the High Level Representatives and Special Envoys of the Chairperson of the Commission. In order to enhance the effectiveness of African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA), CMPCRD is also in charge of the activities of the Mediation Support Unit (MSU).

The PCRD Unit, which is responsible for the implementation of the AU's PCRD policy, develops frameworks for the implementation of the policy, leads Post-Conflict Needs Assessments and implements Quick Impact Projects (QIPs) and Peace Strengthening Projects (PSPs). Through the African Solidarity Initiative (ASI), the Division also supports efforts of the Commission to mobilize in-kind and financial contributions, in collaboration with concerned countries and other Member States, Regional Economic Communities, as well as the relevant African institutions, to support post-conflict reconstruction activities and efforts in the African countries concerned. CMPCRD liaises with the RECs/RMs, multilateral institutions including the United Nations system, the African Development Bank, bi-lateral development agencies and African and non-African Civil Society Organizations on the implementation of the AU's mandate for crisis management and reconstruction efforts.

The Division also coordinates the activities of the AU Liaison Offices in Member States emerging from Conflict or those undergoing difficult transitions thereby contributing towards effective stabilization that lays the foundation for social justice and sustainable peace, in line with Africa's vision of renewal and growth. Through the implementation of its mandate, the CMPCRD supports the overall vision of the Commission to Silence the Guns by 2020 and assist in the effective implementation of Agenda 2063.

Peace and Security Department Results-based Framework for PCRD Activities

Impact: Member States and communities emerging from conflict are supported in taking effective, coordinated and timely action for their post-conflict reconstruction and development

Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities	Theory of Change/Assumptions
PCRD Policy Framework (2006), Lusaka Roadmap (2016), APSA Roadmap (2016-2020) & related policies provide normative foundation for AU/RECs/RMs' leading role. Not all mechanisms yet fully in place or operationalised. Ad hoc PCRD interventions being undertaken.	Evidence of clear, joint PCRD strategies & policies being delivered through timely & coordinated PCRD interventions where AU/RECs/RMs are taking a leading role in line with their mandates and capacities.	By 2020 - 1) Timely PCRD interventions based on systematic needs assessments and reflecting AU niche role; 2) Joint PCRD programming within AUC & between AUC, RECs/RMs and other agencies; 3) PCRD initiatives based on continental & regional policies & strategies; 4) capacity of AU/RECs to provide & coordinate support; 5) financial & in-kind support mobilised by AU/RECs, incl. via AU Peace Fund; 6) relevant expertise deployed within PSOs; 7) capacities of AULOs enhanced in line with their mandates so effective PCRD is enabled.	See entries under each PCRD pillar.	If AU/RECs/RMs, in conjunction with national and international partners, effectively support countries to emerge from conflict/complex emergencies, then these countries will be more able to address the root causes of conflict and establish a more secure, just & inclusive environment in which the population will benefit from peace, security and socio-economic development. This assumes that AU has the political will and appropriate resources to pursue the changes sought.

Pillar 1: Security - Stable and realistic security arrangements in countries emerging from conflict are promoted

See separate tab

Pillar 2: Humanitarian - Integrated and coordinated humanitarian/emergency assistance in countries in conflict and emerging from conflict is enabled

See separate tab

Pillar 3: Socio-economic - Sustainable socio-economic development that improves living conditions in countries emerging from conflict is promoted

See separate tab

Pillar 4: Political governance - Stable, inclusive, participatory and transparent political governance and transition arrangements in countries emerging from conflict are enabled

See separate tab

Pillar 5: Human Rights - Enhanced respect, protection and promotion of human rights, justice and reconciliation in countries emerging from conflict

See separate tab

Pillar 6: Women, Youth and Gender - Increased inclusion and participation of women and youth in countries emerging from conflict

See separate tab

Pillar 7: Partnerships - Strong partnerships involving national, regional and international actors for effective management of PCRD inputs

See separate tab

Pillar 1: Security

Outcome 1: Stable and realistic security arrangements in countries emerging from conflict are promoted

Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities	Theory of Change / Assumptions
<p>Outcome 1: AU and RECs contribute SSR/SSG support to post-conflict countries requesting it as defined in the SSR Policy Framework</p> <p>1) AU SSR policy framework exists; 2) One REC (ECOWAS) has an SSR Policy framework; 3) ECCAS and IGAD are in the process of developing PCRD policies.</p>	<p>1) Operationalisation of AU SSR policy framework reflecting AU comparative advantages; 2) Responsiveness of the AU to SSR assistance requests; 3) Partnership arrangements with technical SSR/SSG actors; 4) RECs develop and regional SSR policies that are in sync with the AU SSR policies.</p>	<p>By 2020: 1) AU SSR policy framework is operationalised and roles clarified, including AULOs at field level; 2) Roster of qualified SSR experts ready for consistent utilization; 3) At least 2 other RECs supported to develop regional SSR policies; 4) SSR assistance requests addressed by AU, RECs & other actors (SSR experts deployed); 5) Partnership arrangements with technical SSR/SSG actors, including UN & WB established with clearly identified roles, responsibilities and structures for coordination.</p>	<p>Activities are included under outputs.</p>	<p>If AU/RECs/RMs, in conjunction with national and international partners, effectively support security sector reform processes within countries to emerge from conflict/complex emergencies, then these countries will be more able to structure, recruit, train and deploy military, police, prisons and other national security actors in a manner that is linked to national needs and priorities and in line with AU and international standards relating to the security sector under democratic controls. This assumes that AU and its partners have relevant policies & strategies, access to appropriate technical and financial resources, that inputs are harmonised, prioritised and relevant, and that SSR/SSG actors' activities reflect their comparative advantages, and that there is political will amongst the parties involved to pursue the changes sought.</p>
<p>Output 1.1: Regional SSR policies are developed and serve as instruments for standardization and harmonization of national SSR policies</p> <p>Only 1 REC/RM has SSR policy framework. MS alignment with AU and RECs SSR frameworks not available.</p>	<p>1) Regional SSR policies are in place and based on continental policy; 2) # MS that align their policies to AU/RECs SSR policies; 3) # civilian SSR experts provided in support of AU PSOs.</p>	<p>1) 2 RECs/RMs develop and align SSR policies based on continental policy; 2) 20% of MS develop national SSR plans; 3) 3 AU PSOs have required civilian SSR experts; 4) AU-brokered peace agreements include provisions for SSR with clear obligations and mechanisms for monitoring in relevant cases; 5) PCRD reports to the PSC include implementation of SSR policy and frameworks in relevant states.</p>	<p>1) Sensitise MS, esp. post-conflict states on importance of effective SSR; 2) Support RECs/RMs in the development/alignment of regional SSR frameworks; 3) Policy & technical partnerships developed with specialist agencies & funding sources to support RECs/RMs and MS in the development and implementation of SSR policies; 4) AU in collaboration with RECs, MS facilitate and support MS to align national policies with AU and regional policy framework on SSR; 6) RECs, in collaboration with MS, develop mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on the implementation of AU SSR guidelines and guidance notes; 6) Design, develop, validate and adopt a continental SSR code of conduct; 7) Monitor and evaluate the implementation of the SSR policy, Code of Conduct, etc.</p>	<p>RECs/RMs are willing & able to develop regional policies; MS are willing to engage on SSR/SSG & align their SSR plans with continental and regional policies; Resources are available for development and implementation of SSR policies and plans at regional and national levels respectively; AU is able to enter into strategic partnerships based on comparative advantage.</p>

Output 1.2: Capacities of AU and RECs to assist MS to develop and implement national SSR Policies, Strategies and Programmes are enhanced			
1) AU SSR policy framework exists; 2) No SoPs for the implementation of AU SSR Policy; 3) No standardized SSR training curricula; 4) Limited efforts where these exist; limited capacity for monitoring and evaluating SSR at the AUC and the RECs/RMs.	1) Level of operationalisation of AU SSR policy; 2) Existence of SSR capacity building resources; 3) Best practice dissemination; 4) Evidence of transfer of relevant skills during the SSR training, workshops and other capacity.	By 2020, 1) AU develops SOP on implementation of SSR Policy; 2) Standardized AU SSR training curricula developed; 3) The above are adopted by all RECs/RMs; 4) SSR workshops and training conducted in 6 post-conflict countries.	AU has the resources to provide required support to RECs/RMs and MS; technical partners are available to support policy delivery/training; MS are willing to accept and support AU/RECs/RM SSR initiatives.
Limited awareness, buy-in and involvement of stakeholders at all levels.	Level of support from stakeholders for SSR initiatives; # SSR awareness raising and sensitization events; # RECs/RMs & MSs; # Agreements and involvement with UN and other international actors on common engagement in SSR processes.	By 2020, 1) Sufficient stakeholders to support the execution of SSR activities in at least 5 post-conflict countries; 2) Sustained processes of awareness raising and sensitization on SSR developed by stakeholders at all levels.	Political will and buy-in exist at all levels; Relevant interventions at all levels; Technical & financial resources are available for highest priority countries.
SSR experts included in the AU Standby Capacity (ASC) which is the roster for peace and security experts. Number of experts on ASC is low.	SSR experts are available and ready for deployment to Member States or African-led PSOs.	By 2020, 1) The ASC is populated with SSR experts for timely deployment; 2) SSR experts included in the generation of personnel for AU PSOs.	Sufficient African SSR experts exist on the roster; SSR included in PSO mandates; RECs/RMs and MS understand the need and when to request SSR assistance.
Outcome 2: Enhanced capacities of AUC, RECs/RMs and MS to meet the DDDR challenges in post-conflict countries			
1) DDDR policy framework in place (2012); 2) AU/RECs/RMs and MS have limited DDDR capacities; 3) DDDR processes are not sufficiently promoted at national and local levels; 4) Civilian DDDR expertise is not fully institutionalized in AU PSOs; 5) No REC has DDDR policy.	Availability of technical and financial DDDR resources; Responsiveness of the AU to DDDR assistance requests; Availability of qualified DDDR experts as required.	By 2020, 1) AU DDDR policy is operationalised; 2) Partnership arrangements exist with major international partners; 3) Pool of technical & financial capacities exists, enabling AU/RECs/RMs to contribute to DDDR initiatives with partners.	If AU/RECs/RMs, in conjunction with national and international partners, effectively support DDDR processes within countries to emerge from conflict/complex emergencies, then these countries will be more able to manage their post-conflict transition by right sizing their security services (via SSR) and reintegrating former combatants in a manner that is linked to national needs and priorities and in line with AU and international standards relating to the DDDR within democratic systems. This assumes that AU and its partners have relevant policies & strategies, access to appropriate technical and financial resources, that inputs are harmonised, prioritised and relevant, and that DDDR and SSR/SSG actors' activities reflect their comparative advantages, and that there is political will amongst the parties involved to pursue the changes sought.

Low levels of technical understanding and political support for the promotion and implementation of DDDR processes at national and local levels. Low awareness of AU DDDR policy guidelines and frameworks.	Level of awareness of AU DDDR policy, guidelines and frameworks; Number of countries promoting and implementing DDDR strategies	By 2020, at least 6 MS emerging from conflict are supported in undertaking DDDR and benefiting from AU/RECs, and international support.	National, local and other stakeholders demonstrate political will by taking a consensus-based approach to DDDR in line with AU policies and international best practice and engaging with these actors in the implementation of DDDR processes and activities; at least minimum funds and technical expertise available.
Limited qualified personnel/staff and lack of other resources to implement DDDR programmes and activities.	Technical & financial resources allocated to DDDR.	By 2020, 1) AU/REC/RMs capacities relating to DDDR processes are clarified and enhanced; 2) Sensitization & training programmes for REC and MS are increased; 3) AU DDDR guidelines utilised in AU PSOs and PCRD efforts.	National, local and other stakeholders demonstrate political will by taking a consensus-based approach to DDDR in line with AU policies and international best practice and engaging with these actors in the implementation of DDDR processes and activities; at least minimum funds and technical expertise available.
ASC roster makes provision for DDDR experts; number of DDDR experts on ASC roster is low.	DDRR experts are available and ready for deployment to Member States or African-led PSOs.	By 2020, the ASC populated with adequate number of DDDR experts for timely deployment.	DDRR experts exist on the roster; DDDR included in PSO mandates; RECs/RMs and MS understand the need and when to request DDDR assistance.
CP and protection of CAAC not integrated into decision-making processes and policies of the AUC and relevant organs.	Guidelines for mainstreaming CP and protection of CAAC developed and implemented in accordance with the AU POC standards.	By 2020, CP and protection of CAAC mainstreamed into PCRD in accordance with the AU POC standards.	Political will and buy-in to develop, adopt and implement policy on CP and protection of CAAC; Capacity exists for mainstreaming of CP and protection of CAAC into relevant policy and strategic decision-making processes.
Limited capacity exists	# Trained personnel with the required knowledge and skills; # Institutional frameworks for effective inter-departmental collaboration for CP and CAAC; Reporting from entities responsible for CP and CAAC.	By 2020, 1) CP and CAAC work plan exists; 2) Capacity of relevant personnel enhanced on CP and the protection of CAAC.	Political will and buy in exists; Resources are available to capacitate relevant actors.

Output 6: Enhanced and integrated Child Protection (CP) and protection of Children Affected by Armed Conflict (CAAC) within AU PSOs		
Limited provisions for CP and protection of CAAC within AU policies and responses.	# Qualified CP experts deployed to AU PSOs; CP and CAAS integrated into PDT and in-mission trainings; AU PSO personnel aware and sensitized on CP and CAAC issues.	By 2020, 1) Clear mandated roles and responsibilities for CP and protection of CAAC in ongoing AU PSOs and SOs; 2) CP and protection of CAAC fully integrated into PDT and in-mission trainings.
		1) Recruit qualified CP experts to AU PSOs; 2) Establish/operationalize CP units within PSOs; 3) Awareness raising and sensitization events on CP and protection of CAAC for all personnel in AU PSOs; 4) Develop a training module on CP and the protection of CAAC for integration into all PDT and in-mission training; 5) Monitoring arrangement established & feeds into reporting.
		Child protection personnel are deployed in AU peace support operations.

Pillar 2: Humanitarian/Emergency Assistance			
Outcome 2: Integrated and coordinated humanitarian/emergency assistance (HUM) in countries in conflict and emerging from conflict is enabled			
Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities
<p>Outcome 1: AU takes a leading role in facilitating the enabling environment for effective humanitarian action in concert with other humanitarian actors</p> <p>1) Humanitarian action and disaster risk management policy guideline exists. Guidelines on QIP, PSP, and alignment of national policies with the Africa Programme of Action (PoA) for Disaster Risk Reduction exist; 2) Absence of a standing AU fund for humanitarian emergency response; 3) Absence of standing humanitarian and emergency response capacity.</p>	<p>1) Increase capacity for risk assessment, mitigation and preparedness; 2) Mechanisms for facilitating coordinated Humanitarian (HUM) assistance exist.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) AU humanitarian policy, guidelines and SOPs are fully developed, disseminated and actively used in humanitarian emergencies; 2) Mechanisms established for monitoring, assessment and response; 3) Linkage to international HUM agencies established, esp. UN and specialist NGOs; 4) Liaison Offices capacitated to facilitate conducive environments for humanitarian support; 5) Africa Programme of Action for Disaster Risk Reduction is fully integrated into National and Regional Policies by 2020.</p>	<p>Theory of Change/Assumptions</p> <p>If AU PCRD efforts provide appropriate measures to facilitate and coordinate humanitarian/emergency assistance, then there will be a significant improvement in the overall humanitarian situation because comprehensive and interlinked platforms for emergency/recovery processes will exist.</p> <p>Resources for the implementation are available; Willingness to contribute to, and support the coordinated collaboration of humanitarian/emergency assistance to vulnerable populations. Liaison offices are capacitated to facilitate the establishment of conducive environments for humanitarian action.</p>
<p>Output 1.1: PCRD Humanitarian SOP includes the mechanisms for the relevant elements of the humanitarian policy and guidelines</p> <p>Interdepartmental PCRD Taskforce exists; No PCRD SOP yet in place for HUM.</p>	<p>Extent of PCRD programming for humanitarian action in accordance with the SOP.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) SOP for HUM/emergency assistance developed; 2) SOP is disseminated and practitioners are sensitised and trained; 3) Effective implementation of the SOP.</p>	<p>Resources for timely and effective response to humanitarian and emergency situations exist. SOP is consistent with international HUM standards.</p>
<p>Output 1.2: Critical humanitarian and emergency interventions facilitated by AU</p> <p>Emergency assistance is not always provided in a timely and coordinated manner; Joint AU/RECs/UN OCHA mechanism for coordination of critical emergencies is not available.</p>	<p>1) Extent of AU contribution to HUM response to particular emergencies; 2) Degree to which affected individuals/groups receive timely critical emergency support.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) Decision-making system within AU for the determination of critical emergency needs & the AU response exists; 2) SOP for the effective deployment of resources is utilised in critical interventions.</p>	<p>Delimitation of AU's roles and mandates in relation to the provision of humanitarian support; Resources are available; AU PCRD and UN OCHA established mechanisms for critical emergency support exists.</p>
<p>Output 1.3: Strengthen capacity and coordination of African humanitarian NGOs</p> <p>African humanitarian NGOs, efforts in PCRD are not well coordinated. Limited role for African humanitarian NGOs in HUM assistance and natural disaster situations.</p>	<p>1) Extent of network of humanitarian actors; 2) # of African NGOs engaged in PCRD humanitarian activities; 3) # of training opportunities identified and utilised; 4) # of critical emergency interventions provided.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) SOP for the effective deployment of African HUM resources is in place and implemented; 2) Framework for the coordination of African NGOs for HUM established.</p>	<p>There is buy-in to establish and join the network.</p>

Output 1.4: Strengthen preparedness capacity of RECs and MS to prevent, respond to and recover from disasters	Number of RECs and MS which aligned their DRR Policies with PoA.	By 2020, all RECs and 50% MS have their DRR Policies aligned with PoA.	1) Support the alignment of the policies and strategies of DRR in RECs and MS with the PoA for the implementation of Sendai Framework 2015-2030.	There is political will and resources to support alignment of regional and national policies with the Programme of Action for Disaster Risk Reduction.
Output 1.5: Develop lessons-learned frameworks for HUM	Existence of standardized methodology, guidelines and tools based on scientific evidence and local and indigenous knowledge for risk assessment and analysis.	By 2020, 1) RECs and MS have the standardized methodology and guidelines based on scientific and indigenous knowledge for risk assessment.	Develop risk surveillance capacity; inventory and mapping of different approaches and methods used for risk assessment & analysis; Establish an interactive knowledge sharing platform with a library of existing methodologies for risk assessments and analysis for different risk contexts.	Risk assessment and data management systems exist and operational.
Output 1.6: Enhance knowledge and awareness on Disaster Risk Reduction	Lack of awareness of disaster risk at all levels.	Number of sensitization activities undertaken.	RECs and MS are sensitized on DRR.	There is reliable risk detection, anticipation and communication mechanism.
Output 1.7: Support resilience building	Vulnerability to hazards due to lack of preparedness mechanisms.	1) Existing contingency plans, stimulation exercises on response, evacuation, trainings undertaken; 2) Existing early warning systems.	Development of contingency policies, plans; information dissemination; development and provision of trainings; provision of equipment; regular simulation exercises.	Significant political will and resources are available.

Pillar 3: Socio-economic Reconstruction and Development

Outcome 3: Sustainable socio-economic development that improves living conditions in countries emerging from conflict is promoted

Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities	Theory of Change/Assumptions
Outcome 1: Effective facilitation of PCRD support improving living conditions in countries emerging from conflicts/in transition and post-conflict countries, continue to fall at the bottom of any list measuring social development and economic activity. AU and RECs have limited capacities to respond to post-conflict MS needs, AULOs and RECs LOs in MS have limited capacities and unclear mandates to closely interact with MS on their needs and with other international actors. AU and RECs have limited capacities to assist MS in developing and monitoring tailor-made interventions according to needs.	Identified improvement in living conditions and comprehensive support for socio-economic development.	By 2020, 1) AU & RECs, roles in socio-economic aspects of PCRD have been clarified and policy basis exists; 2) Partnership modalities have been established with specialist agencies and tested in at least 5 countries; 3) At least 5 post-conflict countries that have received assistance have demonstrated increase in living conditions of at least 20% amongst selected populations. The framework for social development as a means of creating the conditions for sustainable and inclusive growth is in place.	Activities are included under outputs.	If the AU plays a coordinating and facilitating role involving countries and communities recovering from conflict and national, regional and international assistance agencies, then there will be stronger local ownership and linkages between African capacities and local needs, enabling a more robust, relevant, and sustainable PCRD response in the socio-economic sphere. Key assumptions include: availability of funding; political stability and will; partnerships.
Output 1.1: Enhance capacities of AU and RECs/RMs to effectively respond to socio-economic needs of post-conflict countries Some experience with capacity development support (e.g. African Solidarity Initiative). AU and RECs have limited capacities to respond to post-conflict MS needs. AULOs and RECs LOs in MS have limited capacities and unclear mandates to closely interact with MS on their needs. AU and RECs have limited capacities to assist MS in developing and monitoring tailor-made interventions according to needs. Limited partnerships developed.	1) Mandates for socio-economic support; 2) AU and RECs/RMs capacity to provide appropriate technical assistance; 3) # of experts with experience in all PCRD fields.	By 2020, 1) AU & RECs have a clear policy basis and strategy in place reflecting their comparative advantages; 2) Capacities of AU/RECs/RMs to support socio-economic needs in line with agreed policies are developed and functional; 3) Roster of experts developed and in place; 4) Agreed policy and resource envelope for QIPs.	1) Implementation of Social Protection Policy and Social Protection Plan for Informal Economy and Rural Workers Framework completed by 2018; 2) Implement frameworks on Labour Migration Governance for Development and Integration and Public-Private Partnership for Jobs Creation and Inclusive Development; 3) Ensure AU/RECs, capacities are developed to effectively interact with critical stakeholders; 4) QIPs based on clear needs assessments.	The need is identified and resources for the development of expertise exist; Realistic assessment of AU/RECs, role and capacities that matches resources and comparative advantages; Policy basis in place; External agencies willing to partner; Interaction with MS possible.
Output 1.2: Partnership arrangements in place with specialist PCRD actors Limited expertise at AU and RECs/RMs level. MS have limited expertise for the implementation of PCRD processes. Limited experience with operational partnerships and absence of a model for cooperation (except for ASI).	Extent & character of partnership modalities relating to PCRD socio-economic support.	By 2020, AU/RECs have developed and introduced a partnering modality reflecting their mandates and capacities, enabling them to interact with specialist agencies.	1) Analysis of AU/RECs, comparative advantages and mandates relating to socio-economic aspects of PCRD support to MS; 2) Consultation with key specialist agencies (incl. UN, AfDB, WB, etc); 3) Development of model partnership arrangements; 4) Trial engagement with selected post-conflict countries.	The need is identified and resources for the development of expertise exist; Realistic assessment of AU/RECs, role and capacities that matches resources and comparative advantages; Policy basis in place; External agencies willing to partner; Interaction with MS possible.

Outcome 4: Political governance – Stable, inclusive, participatory and transparent political governance and transition arrangements in countries emerging from conflict are enabled

Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities	Theory of Change/Assumptions
<p>Most AU key legal instruments of the African Charter on the African Charter on Popular Participation in Development, the Cairo Agenda for Action and ACDEG) have legalised the principle of popular participation and rule of law.</p>	<p>1) Citizens are informed on processes of governance, decision making and the rule of law; 2) There is freedom of association; 3) Participation by all eligible persons in decision-making processes at all levels; 4) There is equality before the law; 5) Citizens have access to redress in the event of violations.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) 100% of requests for enhancing governance processes and institutions; 2) 100% of requests for assistance include the core components of governance system; 3) 100% of requests for assistance include the core components of the justice system.</p>	<p>1) Needs analysis for the re-establishment of governance processes and the rule of law; 2) 100% of the National Development Plans of post-conflict countries include measures for enhancing governance and the rule of law; 3) Capacity development for the (re-) establishment of governance and rule of law processes; 3) Support national consultative processes for transitional justice, the re-establishment/strengthening of governance processes and the rule of law.</p>	<p>1) PCRD interventions contribute to building, developing and strengthening institutions, then conflict-affected countries and countries working to prevent conflicts will become more resilient because state-building and consolidation will reflect inclusive, participatory, accountable and transparent political governance arrangements that are just and reflect the rule of law and international human rights standards. It is assumed that there is political will at all levels of the state in question; institutional and organizational capacity to implement these frameworks of the AUC, RECs, RM, and MS level.</p>
<p>30 member states have ratified and domesticated the AU Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance</p>	<p>1) Inclusion of AU political governance norms in peace negotiations and agreements; 2) Nature & extent of PCRD interventions relating to political governance and transition; 3) Devolution of authority from national to local levels in post-conflict countries; 4) Increased government transparency and accountability, and public confidence in governance structures; 5) Existence of an enabling environment for meaningful popular participation in all forms and levels of governance; 6) Existence of institutions that promote democracy such as electoral commission, office of the ombudsman, public protector's office, etc.; Increased number of women in decision-making in the public institutions as well as the private sector.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) Significant number of peace agreements reflect AU governance norms; 2) 50% increased utilization of AU frameworks on political governance and transition by AUC, REC/RM and post-conflict countries; 3) At least 70% of the people perceive that the press is free and freedom of expression pertains; 4) At least 70% of the public perceive elections to be free, fair and transparent by 2020; 5) At least 5 post-conflict countries submit state reports to the ACDEG; 6) At least 3 post-conflict countries accede to the APRM.</p>	<p>Activities are included under outputs.</p>	<p>If PCRD interventions contribute to building, developing and strengthening institutions, then conflict-affected countries and countries working to prevent conflicts will become more resilient because state-building and consolidation will reflect inclusive, participatory, accountable and transparent political governance arrangements that are just and reflect the rule of law and international human rights standards. It is assumed that there is political will at all levels of the state in question; institutional and organizational capacity to implement these frameworks of the AUC, RECs, RM, and MS level.</p>
<p>AU has existing instruments and policies on political governance and transitions (ACDEG, AGA, APSA, roadmaps, Human Rights). Application of governance frameworks is patchy in post-conflict countries. Uneven compliance with AU instruments on peace, security, democracy, elections and governance.</p>	<p>1) Post-conflict MS requests for assistance for institutional capacity building; 2) AU and RECs are able to respond in a timely and effective manner to support requests.</p>	<p>By 2020, 100% of requests for assistance are supported by AU directly or indirectly (via other agencies) through partnership arrangements.</p>	<p>1) Joint needs assessments with RECs and MS to identify capacity development needs for enhancing political governance; 2) Technical assistance/support plans developed in partnership with specialist agencies, incl. NGOs, think tanks; 3) AU/RECs contributions defined and provided; 4) Monitoring and reporting to PSC.</p>	<p>Capacity and resources to harmonize continental and regional political governance instruments and national frameworks; Political will of MS; Availability of specialist support at AU/RECs; Partnership arrangements with specialist agencies, CSOs etc; MS willing to accept the role of CSOs in supporting political governance.</p>
<p>AU has existing instruments and policies on political governance and transitions (Charter, AGA, APSA, roadmaps, Human Rights). Application in post-conflict countries is uneven due to lack of political will and capacity shortcomings.</p>	<p>1) Extent of ratification and domestication of the policies and mechanisms on political governance and transitions (e.g. ACDEG); 2) Post-conflict MS requests for assistance for institutional capacity building.</p>	<p>By 2020, at least 50% of post-conflict MS ratify and implement AU/RECs policies and mechanisms on political governance (esp. ACDEG).</p>	<p>1) Peace negotiations specifically include AU political governance norms; 2) Advocacy and sensitisation missions undertaken; 3) Engagement by AU/LOs & technical missions from AUC; 4) Technical assistance/support plans developed in partnership with specialist agencies, incl. NGOs, think tanks; 5) AU/RECs contributions defined and provided; 5) Monitoring and reporting in the area of state and institutions are anchored and predicated on the ACDEG Member Develop programmes of action to promote and popularize African Shared Values among citizens, including mainstreaming them in schools, curricula by 2018; 7) AU Shared Values instruments harmonized at national level by 2020. Continental/Regional 1) AU citizens engagement strategy adopted and implemented 2) An Implementation and Follow up Framework on Member States Commitment on Shared Values adopted and</p>	<p>Capacity and resources to harmonize continental and regional political governance instruments and national frameworks; Political will of MS; Availability of specialist support at AU/RECs; Partnership arrangements with specialist agencies, CSOs etc; MS willing to accept the role of CSOs in supporting political governance.</p>

Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities	Theory of Change/Assumptions
<p>AU Member States have ratified the Charter on the Values and Principles of Public Service and Member States have signed the Charter on the Values and Principles on Decentralisation.</p>	<p>Extent of ratification and Domestication/implementation of instruments in the governance processes of AU Member States advanced. Increased government transparency and accountability, and public confidence in governance structures.</p>	<p>By 2020, at least 50% of post-conflict Member States ratify and show evidence of the implementation of the two instruments in their governance processes.</p>	<p>1) Sensitization and advocacy for the ratification and implementation of the two instruments; 2) Capacity building for CSOs to partner governments in the implementation of the instruments as well as monitor the progress of implementation; 3) Establish a framework for innovations for the collection and sharing of good practices.</p>	<p>AU member states ratify and effectively implement the Charter on the Values and Principles of Public Service and Decentralisation. Citizens' participation in governance processes are encouraged.</p>
<p>Africa has a huge youth population. However, the potential of youth is under-exploited. The AU Youth Charter is in force.</p>	<p>Extent of ratification and domestication/implementation of the AU Youth Charter; Participatory, representative and inclusive political processes as well as responsive state institutions to the needs of all youth (including both young men and women).</p>	<p>By 2020, at least 50% of post-conflict countries ratify and show evidence of the implementation of the AU Youth Charter. Political processes in at least 50% of post-conflict countries are participatory and include considerations of youth.</p>	<p>1) Sensitization and advocacy for the ratification and implementation of the African Youth Charter; 2) Support the development of a plan of action for the integration of youth considerations in governance, transitional justice and development programs; 3) Support capacity development for relevant national institutions and civil society organisations for the promotion of the active participation of youth in governance, transitional justice and development processes at all levels.</p>	<p>Youth are effectively sensitised, and plans of action are developed and implemented.</p>

Pillar 5: Human Rights, Justice and Reconciliation
Outcome 5: Enhanced respect, protection and promotion of human rights, justice and reconciliation in countries emerging from conflict

Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities	Theory of Change/Assumptions
Existing AU instruments on human rights are not ratified and domesticated by all MS. The AU does not have an instrument on mass atrocity crimes.	1) % increase in signature, ratification and domestication of the instruments; 2) Evidence that AU instruments on human rights are effectively implemented; 3) % increase in awareness amongst stakeholders on human rights and justice.	By 2020, 1) 60% of MS become parties to and domesticate existing AU instruments on human rights; 2) AU instruments on human rights are effectively implemented; 3) % increase in awareness amongst stakeholders on human rights and justice.	Activities are included under outputs. Reconciliation in member states	If the AU supports Member States to establish mechanisms where necessary, for the promotion and protection of human rights, then justice will be accessible to all and reconciliation and healing will be enhanced because institution building of human rights national structures will be promoted.
Output 1.1: Capacity of AU and RECs to support the respect for, protection and promotion of human rights, justice and reconciliation in countries emerging from conflict	1) Capacity development for relevant AU and REC staff on addressing mass atrocity crimes in particular included in PSO mandates and ceasefire agreements; 3) Increased resource allocation for the AU's promotion and protection of human rights efforts in post-conflict countries.	1) Agreement reached on the drafting of an Africa-focused mass atrocity crime instrument; 2) Human Rights Officers embedded in all AULOs.	1) Work with relevant international partners to develop capacity of AU and REC staff on human rights promotion, protection and monitoring in post-conflict countries; 2) Sensitization and advocacy for the development of an Africa-focused instrument on mass atrocity crimes; 3) Develop guidelines on the integration of accountability for mass atrocity crimes into transitional justice mechanisms of relevant states; 4) Mobilize resources for the development of an Africa-focused instrument on mass atrocity crimes.	AU and RECs/RMs capacity is enhanced to address mass atrocity crimes; Willingness of AU and RECs/RMs to include human rights promotion, protection and monitoring in post-conflict countries within their strategies.
Output 1.2: Resources have been mobilized to support states in the implementation monitoring and reporting of human rights obligations	Extent to which AU is able to effectively support states in the implementation, monitoring and reporting on their human rights obligations.	By 2020, 1) Robust human rights institutions and report on their human rights obligations to relevant AU bodies.	1) Develop human rights indicators for different scenarios to be integrated into the PCRD needs assessment framework; 2) Develop a framework for the analysis of MS' needs for the (re)establishment/strengthening of human rights institutions in post conflict countries; 3) Develop and implement a resource mobilization plan for the (re)establishment/strengthening of human rights institutions in post conflict countries; 4) Undertake monitoring & reporting, including feedback to MS; 5) Establish linkages with UN agencies and civil society.	Political will and commitment to promote human rights, justice and accountability from member states. Willingness of key actors to support AU efforts at the promotion and protection of human rights.

Output 1.2: Established/strengthened human rights protection structures	Weak HR protection structures, esp. in MS recovering from conflict.	% of (re)established institutions with human rights mandates; % change in access to justice.	By 2020, 1) Robust human rights protection structures developed in at least 50% of PCMS; % change in access to justice institutions since 2017.	1) Support a capacity needs assessment and development to promote institution-building of national structures mandated to promote and protect human rights, such as national commissions for the protection of human rights in accordance with the Paris Principles; 2) Support capacity development on the promotion and protection of human rights for legislative institutions.	Member States receive technical support from AU to reinforce national human rights mechanisms.
Output 1.3: Capacity of national human rights institutions and civil society strengthened	Africa has varied experiences with reconciliation and transitional justice, including TRCs. Some African CSOs have significant experience on Tracks II and III human rights institutions in most African countries do not meet the Paris Principles.	1) # NHRIs & CSOs that have received capacity development on AU HR norms; 2) # partnership arrangements developed between AUC and actors at national level in MS; 3) Improvement in human rights situation from the state of affairs in 2017.	By 2020, 1) CSOs advocacy capacity on human rights protection and NHRIs in all AU Member States operationalised; 3) Member States' reports on human rights promotion and protection include implementation of AU's instruments on human rights.	By 2020, 1) Train human rights oriented CSOs on the PCRD-CSO platform on the AU Ten Year Human Rights Action Plan; 2) Training for NHRIs on international human rights instruments and implementation of the Ten Years Human Rights Action Plan.	NHRIs willing to receive support from AU. PCRD-CSO platform is effectively implemented and regularly consulted.
Output 1.4: Reconciliation and transitional justice supported	Africa has varied experiences with reconciliation and transitional justice, including TRCs. African CSOs have significant experience on Tracks II and III experience from CSOs.	1) AU Transitional Justice Policy (TJP) adopted by AU policy organs; 2) # of AU Member States implementing the AU TJP; 3) SOP on TJP developed.	By 2020, 1) AU has an agreed policy on transition justice and accompanying action plan; 2) 100% peace negotiations involving AU are in accordance with the policy and practical aspects reflected in peace agreements and implementation arrangements.	1) Develop guidelines for the collection and compilation of best practices on African T.J.; 2) Lobby relevant policy organs to adopt the AU Transitional Justice Policy; 3) Undertake consultations with national & international experts to provide clarity on the AU's role in the promotion of reconciliation and transitional justice in affected countries; 4) Develop SOP for the AU TJP; 5) Support the development of context-specific mechanisms that are compatible with international law and the ACHPR to facilitate peacebuilding and reconciliation activities from the national to the community levels.	Political will and commitment to implement and promote human rights, justice and accountability from member state, including role of CSOs.

Pillar 6: Women, Youth and Gender

Outcome 6: Increased inclusion and participation of women and youth in countries emerging from conflict

Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities	Theory of Change/Assumptions
<p>Outcome 1: Effective mainstreaming of GWY</p> <p>Conflicts disproportionately affect women and youth and exacerbate vulnerabilities; conflicts alter traditional gender roles; the agency of women and youth in conflict situations is not always acknowledged and harnessed; there is a lack of consistency in mainstreaming GWY into the implementation of PCRD at all levels; GWY inequalities continue to exist.</p> <p>A number of instruments on the promotion and protection of the rights of women and youth exist.</p>	<p>1) Reduction in GWY inequalities; 2) Integration of GWY considerations in PCRD plans, programs and reports; 3) GWY considerations included as specific indicators for monitoring and reporting in all mission reports; 4) GWY considerations included in the Guidelines for the implementation of the PCRD policy; 5) Full participation of women and youth (including those living in disabilities) in the socio-political and economic life of the state; 6) Ratification of, accession to, domestication and implementation of, the relevant AU instruments protecting the rights of women, girls and youth, including the Solemn Declaration on Gender Equality in Africa, the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa, the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, and the African Youth Charter and other relevant international instruments.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) 50% of post-conflict countries ratify AU instruments on women and youth and/or effectively implement their international commitments on gender and youth; 2) Reduce GWY inequalities in PCRD implementation; 3) AU and RECs/RMs consider GWY mainstreaming in all their work and are able to provide related support to MS; 4) 50% of post-conflict MS adopt and use the indicators of the gender scorecard to monitor the progress of efforts to increase inclusion and participation of women and youth.</p>	<p>Activities are included under outputs. If the AU supports the development of gender, women and youth sensitive PCRD policies, programs and activities, then conflict transformation efforts will be accelerated and durable, because underlying causes of inequalities will be better addressed.</p>	
<p>Output 1.1: Overarching mechanism to facilitate the full mainstreaming of GWY</p> <p>The current arrangement for mainstreaming GWY into peace and security efforts is dysfunctional. The different components responsible to mainstream GWY are not well integrated in achieving a common objective.</p>	<p>1) GWY Mechanism is established; 2) GWY is dove-tailed in all AU peace and security efforts; 3) reporting is GWY sensitive.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) Reduce GWY inequalities in PCRD implementation; 2) AU and RECs/RMs consider GWY mainstreaming in all their work and are able to provide related support to MS; 3) MS adopt the CRF for measuring progress in the WPS agenda.</p>	<p>1) Include guidelines for the integration of GWY considerations in the guidelines for implementing the PCRD policy; 2) Re-establish the Gender Peace and Security programme that includes a Youth aspect in it; 3) Establish a coordination process to facilitate the coordination and collaboration of the various gender programmes and gender focal points; 4) Provide training for relevant actors in the AUC on how to include and mainstream GWY into post-conflict processes; 5) Elaborate the PCRD components of the AU-Youth in Peacebuilding Initiative with clear indicative activities for youth-sensitive PCRD interventions.</p>	<p>Political will and buy-in (including donors); GWY mainstreaming mechanism and components are provided with sufficient resources so that they have capacity to operate.</p>

Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities	Theory of Change/Assumptions
<p>Outcome 2: Effective mainstreaming of GWY</p> <p>Inclusion of GWY considerations at RECs/RMs and MS levels is limited and inconsistent; inequalities in PCRD processes and activities prevent the full participation of women and youth; The victimisation of women and youth limit the recognition and utilisation of their agency in PCRD efforts.</p>	<p>1) Capacity of RECs/RMs to design, implement and monitor GWY mainstreaming in the implementation of the PCRD policy; 2) Capacity of MS to design, implement and monitor GWY mainstreaming in PCRD.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) RECs/RMs and MS are capacitated to effectively mainstream GWY into the implementation of the PCRD policy and plans; 2) Legal provisions provided to address the non-participation of women and youth and gender-blind initiatives.</p>	<p>Activities are included under outputs.</p>	<p>Buy-in from all actors and stakeholders at all the intervention levels; Capacity and resources exist at the AUC; Resources exist for the implementation.</p>
<p>Output 2.1: AU PCRD Guidelines provide guidance on ways to mainstream GWY/PCRD efforts</p> <p>No guidelines and standards for mainstreaming GWY in PCRD exist.</p>	<p>1) PCRD guidelines and standards include the GWY mainstreaming requirements; 2) Extent to which GWY guidelines and standards are reflected in all PCRD plans, programs and activities.</p>	<p>By 2020, PCRD guidelines and standards include GWY mainstreaming requirements.</p>	<p>1) Develop a concept note for the development of the guidelines and standards; 2) Conduct a technical experts workshop to consider the content of the guidelines and standards; 3) Establish a working group for the development thereof; 4) Develop the guidelines and standards for inclusion in the overarching PCRD SOP; 5) Raise awareness, obtain buy-in and roll out to RECs/RMs and MS; 6) Develop a coaching and mentoring plan; 7) Actively monitor and evaluate the utilization thereof.</p>	<p>Technical expertise to develop the guidelines and standards is available within PCRD; PCRD is capacitated to develop the guidelines and standards.</p>
<p>Output 2.2: RECs/RMs and MS institutions are capacitated to develop capacities for the implementation of the PCRD</p> <p>RECs/RMs and MS institutions are not capacitated to undertake capacity development for the implementation of the GWY PCRD policy.</p>	<p>1) Existence of training curricula on the various aspects of the PCRD policy; 2) Capacity of institutions as implementers of the PCRD policy; 3) # capacity development workshops conducted.</p>	<p>By 2020, enhanced capacity at all levels to better implement the GWY consideration in the implementation of the full spectrum of the PCRD policy.</p>	<p>1) Design and develop the curricula to mainstream GWY into PCRD; 2) Resource mobilization for capacity development by institutions; 3) Conduct capacity development workshops for relevant divisions in the AUC, RECs/RMs/Member States on inclusive programming to mainstream GWY considerations in PCRD plans, programs and activities; 4) Develop M&E tools.</p>	<p>Buy-in from all actors and stakeholders at all the intervention levels; Capacity and resources exist at the AUC; Resources exist for the implementation of activities.</p>

Pillar 7: Partnerships

Outcome 7: Strong partnerships involving national, regional and international actors for effective management of PCRD inputs

Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities	Theory of Change/Assumptions
<p>Output 1: Shared strategic vision and objectives of partners and stakeholders to facilitate timely and effective support to Member States emerging from conflict.</p> <p>Limited common understanding of the concept of partnership; Varied capacities; international support Group concept exists; Consultative processes on PCRD are ad hoc; No partnership frameworks for joint programming on PCRD exist; Some experience of hybrid PSO and cooperation relating to PSO support. AULOs available at field level but lack capacity and resources to fully engage.</p>	<p>1) Evidence of joint PCRD programming, including formulation of common objectives; 2) Key stakeholders are included (AU, RECs, MS, IFIs, UN, Bi-lateral Partners, etc.) and AULOs are engaged.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) Consultative mechanism for effective partnerships for PCRD established at field level and in Addis involving UN, AFDB, WB, AU, RECs, EU, and AULOs etc; 2) consultative mechanisms established for civil society.</p>	<p>Activities are included under outputs</p>	<p>If the AU takes the lead in establishing partnerships based upon organisations' legitimacy and mandate and taking account of their comparative advantages, including resources, convening power and technical capacity, then a more effective utilisation of African and international resources and capacities will be possible, enabling greater impact for PCRD initiatives ultimately contributing to more sustainable and appropriate post-conflict transitions. This assumes that there is willingness of partners to collaborate and coordinate; that there is buy-in from RECs and Member States on increased partnerships; and that donors and partners will provide predictable and sustainable resources.</p>
<p>Output 1.1: Consultative mechanisms for joint actions – including the mobilization of resources and expertise established</p>				
<p>International Support Group concept exists; Consultative processes on PCRD are ad hoc; No general mechanism or partnership forum on PCRD. AU & RECs have liaison officers in respective HQs. Periodic meetings between AU and RECs are held. UN Office to the AU operational.</p>	<p>1) TORs for the consultative mechanisms in place; 2) Country level mechanisms; 3) International mechanisms.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) Partnership forum that meets on a regular basis including key international actors; 2) Key working principles agreed at field level and include AULOs; 3) Mechanisms for resource mobilization and availability of expertise on PCRD.</p>	<p>1) AUC develops a partnership plan for engagement; 2) Enhance relationship between relevant divisions for PCRD within the United Nations Office to the African Union; 3) Raise awareness and obtain buy-in of potential partners; 4) Convene consultative meetings.</p>	<p>All stakeholders agree that their objectives will be realized better through partnership and that the appropriate capacities are in place at continental, regional and national levels. Cooperation is seen as a value over and above competition for resources. The AU has the lead role in coordination and oversight.</p>
<p>Output 1.2: Policies, approaches and priorities of AU PCRD, key partners and stakeholders are synergized</p> <p>Strategic Partnership Agreement on Peace and Security exists between the AUC and the UN; Lack of decisive strategic dialogue between Africa and the international community, including the UN system, on global policies and practices negatively impacting on Africa and its people. No agreed upon framework for joint approaches for PCRD implementation; No strategic dialogue forum for discussions on the implementation of PCRD; AULOs not fully engaged.</p>	<p>1) Common framework on joint approaches signed and used as reference; 2) Evidence of strategic PCRD policy dialogue with partners and stakeholders.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) Operationalisation of the joint AU-UN Framework on peace and security; 2) Regular briefings of the UN PBC to the PSC; 3) MoUs on PCRD implementation with relevant partners and stakeholders; 4) Joint PCRD assessments and implementation.</p>	<p>1) Develop joint operational guidelines out of the AU-UN Framework on peace and security for the planning, design and implementation of PCRD activities; 2) Annual joint briefings of the UN PBC (Peacebuilding Commission) to the PSC; 3) Establish MoU on PCRD implementation with relevant partners and stakeholders (this should include the RECs/RMs); 4) Joint PCRD assessments and implementation of recommendations; 5) Establish desk-to-desk engagements on PCRD between AU, RECs, UN, CSOs and other international partners for experience sharing and the collection and sharing of lessons learned; 6) Enhance and capacitate AULOs to effectively support the full gamut of PCRD interventions.</p>	<p>Political-buy in; Institutional adaptability that enables and facilitates collaboration among the various stakeholders; AULOs have capacity.</p>

Outcome 2: AU PCRD policy and implementation operates holistically and is fully inter-departmental within AUC

Baseline	Indicators	Target	Activities	Theory of Change/Assumptions
<p>Limited interaction and collaboration between AU departments on PCRD (although this is improving) and between AU and RECs/RMs.</p>	<p>1) # and scope of joint task groups/working groups; 2) Frequency of desk-to-desk cooperation; 3) # of joint approaches implemented for crisis & post-conflict countries.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) periodic desk-to-desk cooperation in the context of the inter-departmental taskforce.</p>	<p>Activities are included under outputs.</p>	<p>If the AUC takes a truly inter-departmental approach to PCRD that draws on the capacities and experience of all its departments under effective leadership, then PCRD policy implementation will be more efficient and effective and lead to stronger and more sustainable results, both internally and externally.</p>
<p>Output 2.1: inter-departmental SOP agreed and operational enabling coherent AUC responses to crises</p>				
<p>Limited interaction and collaboration between AU departments on PCRD (although this is improving) and between AU and RECs/RMs.</p>	<p>1) SOP in place & operational.</p>	<p>By 2020, 1) SOP has been drafted and agreed; 2) SOP is in place and operational involving all PCRS involved departments, AULOs & linking to AU decision-makers.</p>	<p>1) Est. inter-departmental WG and draft SOP; 2) SOP endorsement and introduction; 3) Sensitisation of staff; 4) Capacity development and resources to AULOs; 5) Monitoring & reporting including in annual work plans & practices.</p>	<p>AUC senior management endorsement. Agreement on anchoring within CMPCRD.</p>

Peace and Security Department
African Union Commission

P. O. Box: 3243, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Tel.: (251-11)55193 21

Fax: (251-11)551 93 21

Email: situationroom@africa-union.org

Website: www.peaceau.org

Twitter: @AU_PSD



AFRICAN UNION UNION AFRICAINE

African Union Common Repository

<http://archives.au.int>

African Union Commission

Peace and Security Department

2018-02-13

Results-Based Framework for PCRDR Activities

Peace and Security Department

Crisis Management and Post Conflict Reconstruction Division (CMPCRDR), Peace and Security Department

<http://archives.au.int/handle/123456789/4979>

Downloaded from African Union Common Repository