

Islamic Ḥiwār Framework (IHF): A KPI-Based Strategic Architecture for Intra-Faith Dialogue, Institutional Governance, and Civilizational Unity

SeyyedAbdolHojjat MoghadasNian

University of Religions and Denominations

S14110213@Gmail.com

SeyedMehdi AlizadehMousavi

University of Religions and Denominations

SMA.Moosavi@urd.ac.ir

SeyedMohammadMahdi HosseinPoor

University of Religions and Denominations

SMM.HosseinPoor@urd.ac.ir

Akbar Bagheri

University of Religions and Denominations

A.Bagheri@urd.ac.ir

Abstract

This study introduces the Islamic Ḥiwār Framework (IHF), a multi-layered, KPI-based architecture developed to operationalize intra-faith dialogue within Islamic contexts by translating theological, ethical, and institutional principles into measurable performance indicators. Drawing from Islamic epistemology, dialogical ethics, and governance structures, the IHF addresses the need for a strategic, accountable, and scalable model for religious rapprochement. A mixed-methods approach was employed, combining expert-based Delphi analysis, AHP-weighted indicator validation, and qualitative document review of intra-Islamic unity initiatives. The research identified 14 strategic domains and 280 KPIs distributed across educational, institutional, digital, jurisprudential, ethical,

and governance axes. Key findings highlight the role of dialogical trust, ethical literacy, governance transparency, and AI-enabled feedback systems in sustaining meaningful rapprochement. The study recommends the adoption of IHF metrics by religious councils, seminaries, and ministries to support transparent, performance-oriented dialogue governance. Theoretically, the model bridges classical *ijtihad* with contemporary strategic frameworks such as Balanced Scorecard and digital maturity indices. Practically, it enables real-time monitoring, stakeholder engagement, and strategic planning aligned with *maqāsid*-based institutional objectives. This research offers an original KPI-based contribution to Islamic studies, religious diplomacy, and civilizational strategy.

Keywords: Intra-Faith Dialogue, KPI-Based Governance, Islamic Unity, Digital Transformation, Religious Diplomacy, Balanced Scorecard, Civilizational Strategy

2

Introduction Background

Intra-Islamic dialogue has historically oscillated between normative aspiration and fragmented execution, often lacking structured methodologies capable of bridging theological, legal, and institutional divides across Islamic traditions. Despite common foundations belief in *tawhīd*, reverence for the Prophetic tradition, and acceptance of Qur'ānic authority Muslim communities remain divided due to epistemological pluralism, historical polemics, and geopolitical sectarianism. Classical calls for *taqrīb* have emphasized the ethical necessity of unity (e.g., Qur'ān 3:103), yet have rarely translated into scalable, measurable models for institutional or grassroots application.

The Islamic *Hīwār* Framework (IHF) emerges within this context as a strategic response to operationalize intra-faith dialogue through a data-driven, multi-layered KPI architecture. It synthesizes Islamic jurisprudence, ethical leadership principles, and digital transformation strategies, notably incorporating AI analytics, Delphi–AHP weighting, and seminary–university integration. Aligning with macro-models such as TQA–4 (*Taqrīb* Quadripartite Architecture), UCTA, and IDDF, the IHF provides a civilizational blueprint capable of institutionalizing dialogue across theological, educational, and policy domains, especially within the evolving religious governance ecosystem of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Statement of the Problem

Despite decades of intra-faith dialogue efforts, Islamic unity initiatives have remained largely rhetorical or episodic, lacking in performance measurement, governance standards, and institutional integration. Existing initiatives are often limited by inadequate evaluation mechanisms, unstructured dialogue formats, and insufficient alignment with contemporary digital tools. This fragmentation is particularly problematic in the context of complex Islamic ecosystems such as Iran, where dialogue among *madhāhib* must interface with evolving technologies, seminary–university systems, and state-level policy instruments.

The absence of a KPI-based operational framework that can measure the effectiveness, sustainability, and ethical fidelity of intra-Islamic dialogue initiatives limits strategic impact and long-term policy

development. Without clearly defined performance indicators and data feedback loops, taqrīb remains idealized but unimplemented.

Research Questions and Objectives

This study investigates the theoretical and practical utility of the Islamic Ḥiwār Framework (IHF) as a scalable, KPI-driven dialogue architecture. Specifically, it addresses the following primary research questions:

- PRQ1: How can intra-Islamic dialogue be transformed from normative aspirations into a measurable, repeatable, and institutionalized process using Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)?
- PRQ2: What is the theoretical and operational efficacy of the IHF in evaluating and enhancing intra-faith dialogue across diverse Islamic traditions?
- PRQ3: To what extent do the 280+ KPIs across the IHF's 14 domains provide a sustainable framework for benchmarking, AI integration, and policy deployment in Islamic dialogue ecosystems?

These questions guide the development and validation of the IHF as an evidence-based model for religious, educational, and digital governance.

Significance of the Study

The study makes both theoretical and applied contributions. Academically, it introduces an original KPI-based framework grounded in Islamic theology, ethics, and strategic management, filling a longstanding gap in the measurement of religious dialogue. Practically, it provides a blueprint for institutional policymakers, seminaries, and digital developers seeking to implement sustainable dialogue systems. By integrating AI analytics, sentiment tracking, Delphi–AHP validation, and performance dashboards, the IHF enables quantifiable governance of religious unity and inter-sect collaboration. Its application is particularly relevant in contexts like Iran, where taqrīb intersects with public policy, Islamic higher education, and strategic digitalization.

Scope of the Study

The Islamic Ḥiwār Framework (IHF) is designed for global intra-Islamic application but is empirically rooted in the Iranian context, where institutional dialogues, seminary curricula, and fatwā authorities interface within a hybrid governance model. The study spans 14 thematic domains including comparative jurisprudence, ethics, environmental fiqh, bioethics, and digital engagement. It draws upon structured KPI inventories, AI-assisted analysis, and institutional benchmarking protocols. Temporal scope extends from 2020–2025, capturing trends in digital Islamic governance and AI policy discourse. Geographically, the framework is adaptable to the broader Islamic world, but the primary validation case is within Iran's religious policy and academic ecosystem.

Outline of the Article Structure

The article proceeds as follows:

- Literature Review: Analyzes prior models of Islamic dialogue and global ecumenical frameworks, identifying gaps in operational measurability.
- Methodology: Details the Delphi–AHP weighting process, KPI development protocol, and the composite scoring mechanism of the Islamic Ḥiwār Index (IHI).
- Findings and Results: Presents the structure and content of the 280+ KPIs across 14 domains, along with sample scoring applications and use-case scenarios.
- Discussion: Compares the IHF to existing dialogue models (e.g., WCC, UNESCO), analyzes policy implications, and assesses scalability and limitations.

- Conclusion: Synthesizes the key findings, identifies risks, and proposes future pathways for research and implementation, especially within digital Islamic governance.

Literature Review

Theoretical Background

Scholarship on intra-Islamic dialogue is anchored in both classical ethics and contemporary organisational thinking. Qur'ānic principles of *ta'aruf* (mutual recognition) and *'adl* (justice) provide the scriptural rationale for engagement, while Prophetic practice offers precedent for dispute resolution grounded in mercy. Afsaruddin (2021) frames these values as the normative core of any authentic Muslim discourse, and Elius (2023) demonstrates how the Sunnah operationalises them in practice. Building on this legacy, Abdoh and Obeid (2022) analyse post-Hijrah conversational ḥadīths to show that rigorous debate and fraternity are not mutually exclusive. Marcinkowski (n.d.) therefore calls intra-Muslim dialogue “the litmus test” of Islam’s credibility in plural societies, insisting that doctrinal integrity and civic cooperation can be harmonised through structured conversation.

A parallel stream of literature applies strategic-management lenses to religious governance. Gilani, Ali and Mohyiddeen (2024) argue that ethical leadership concepts such as *amāna* (trustworthiness) and *ta'awun* (co-operation) can be embedded in performance systems without diluting spiritual ethos. JABBAR et al. (2025) corroborate this claim in the education sector, showing that value-centric management improves institutional competitiveness. Maté, Trujillo and Mylopoulos (2016) add methodological depth by presenting a conceptual-modelling approach for eliciting and selecting KPIs; their framework demonstrates how qualitative aspirations can be translated into measurable indicators a premise central to the Islamic Ḥiwār Framework (IHF) (MoghadasNian, 2025).

Digital transformation studies supply the technological rationale for KPI-driven dialogue. Ishak and Mohamed (2023) highlight the potential of big-data analytics in Islamic governance, while Elmahjub (2023) warns that AI systems require robust ethical safeguards derived from Sharia. Marlina and Ulya (2024) show how natural-language processing extends the reach of religious teaching, and Shalhoob (2025) notes that AI in Islamic finance improves transparency yet demands carefully curated Sharia-compliant datasets. Collectively, these works justify the IHF’s use of dashboards, sentiment analysis and digital monitoring to track progress across its fourteen domains.

Critical Analysis of Existing Literature

Across the corpus a broad consensus emerges: dialogue is a moral imperative, institutional mechanisms are indispensable, and technology can be fruitfully harnessed provided ethical constraints are observed. Afsaruddin (2021), Elius, Khan and Nor (2019) and Majid (2022) emphasise justice, empathy and unity as non-negotiable Qur'ānic and Prophetic ideals. Yet Argon (2009) and Kayaoglu (2011) reveal that such ideals routinely falter in the absence of formally mandated councils, charters and compliance protocols. On the digital side, Maté et al. (2016) and Ishak & Mohamed (2023) insist that data-driven metrics are vital for accountability, while Elmahjub (2023) cautions that algorithmic bias can subvert theological intentions unless controlled by Sharia-based indicators. Ciocan (2024) and McCallum (2022), writing from interfaith perspectives, further underscore the importance of measurable outcomes for public legitimacy.

Convergence among these sources is clear: ethical grounding, institutionalisation and evidence-based evaluation must coexist. The principal divergence lies in measurability. Many authors articulate desired virtues but stop short of prescribing performance metrics. Only the KPI-oriented studies Maté et al. (2016) in modelling, Ishak & Mohamed (2023) in AI governance and Elmahjub (2023) in digital ethics explicitly

call for quantitative benchmarks. The Islamic *Ḥiwār* Framework positions itself at this unresolved junction, proposing a 280-indicator architecture that converts aspirations into auditable results.

Identification of Research Gaps

Notwithstanding valuable insights, the literature leaves four critical voids. First, dialogue studies supply ethical exhortations but rarely delineate KPIs, making success impossible to verify a shortcoming noted by Rahmawati, Yusuf and Mubarak (2024) and by Ciocan (2024). Second, digital scholarship acknowledges AI's promise yet highlights the lack of Sharia-aligned data schemas and indicator dashboards tailored to dialogue ecosystems (Ishak & Mohamed 2023; Marlina & Ulya 2024). Third, little empirical work scrutinises Iran's extensive *taqrīb* institutions; Gilani et al. (2024) observe that policy rhetoric outpaces measurable implementation. Fourth, while Islamic economics research has developed indices for inclusive growth (Ghazal & Zulkhibri 2016) and ethical finance (Zarqa 2019), no comparable index exists for doctrinal rapprochement or theological governance.

The Islamic *Ḥiwār* Framework directly addresses these gaps. By embedding Qur'ānic ethics within a rigorously vetted KPI matrix, integrating AI-enabled monitoring tools, and piloting implementation inside Iran's seminary–university–policy nexus, the IHF transforms intra-faith dialogue from an aspirational ideal into a measurable, repeatable and institutionally anchored practice.

5

Methodology

This study adopts a mixed-methods design, combining qualitative and quantitative approaches to develop, validate, and operationalize the Islamic *Ḥiwār* Framework (IHF). The qualitative dimension supports conceptual model construction grounded in classical Islamic sources and institutional literature, while the quantitative dimension facilitates KPI development, expert validation, and Delphi-based prioritization. This approach was selected to reflect the dual nature of the IHF: a normative-theological construct that must also function as a scalable, auditable performance system applicable across religious and policy institutions. The sampling strategy was purposive, targeting expert scholars, policymakers, and practitioners directly engaged in intra-faith dialogue, religious governance, and digital transformation. Participants included senior figures from Iranian universities, seminary-based *taqrīb* institutions, digital policy units, and interfaith NGOs. Selection criteria were based on domain expertise, institutional affiliation, and prior involvement in religious dialogue initiatives. A total of 30 experts participated in various stages of the study, ensuring both theological and operational diversity.

Data collection proceeded in three phases. First, primary source analysis of Qur'ānic verses, *ḥadīth* collections, and foundational *taqrīb* literature informed the epistemological and ethical components of the IHF. Second, semi-structured interviews with subject matter experts provided insight into practical enablers and challenges of intra-faith dialogue. Third, the KPI inventory was developed and refined using structured Delphi rounds and content analysis of institutional reports, project evaluations, and doctrinal charters. In addition, AI-driven analytics tools and digital text-mining platforms were employed to extract frequency patterns, sentiment vectors, and concept clusters from Islamic theological discourse. For data analysis, qualitative inputs were subjected to thematic analysis, enabling the extraction of dialogical principles and governance models aligned with *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*. Quantitative data from the Delphi rounds were analyzed using weighted scoring models to derive KPI prioritization. Cross-validation was performed using expert triangulation and matrix comparison to ensure consistency across strategic domains. Composite indicators were tested for internal coherence and alignment with institutional mandates.

The research strictly adhered to ethical standards. All interviewees and Delphi participants provided informed consent, and participation was voluntary and anonymized. Sensitive theological positions were handled with scholarly neutrality, and all references were properly attributed to ensure academic integrity. The study was reviewed under institutional ethical guidelines and aligned with norms for responsible research in religious and interfaith contexts. To enhance reliability and validity, multiple validation strategies were employed. Triangulation of qualitative themes with doctrinal texts, member checking of interview data, and pilot testing of the KPI framework ensured conceptual and empirical robustness. The final IHF model underwent expert validation across three independent review cycles to verify accuracy, coherence, and relevance for implementation in intra-faith and policy environments.

Findings and Results

The implementation of the Islamic *Ḥiwār* Framework (IHF) generated a set of measurable, thematically weighted, and expert-validated findings across all fourteen strategic domains. The results demonstrate both the feasibility and necessity of converting intra-faith dialogue aspirations into quantifiable, performance-driven metrics. These findings are directly linked to the research objectives stated earlier namely, to construct a KPI-based model for intra-Islamic dialogue, evaluate its operational validity, and assess its institutional scalability using both qualitative and quantitative techniques.

6

A core result of the Delphi process was the prioritization and consensus around the top KPIs within each domain. Across three iterative rounds, 92% of participants affirmed that the proposed 280 KPIs were not only aligned with core Islamic dialogical ethics but also reflected actionable benchmarks for institutional assessment. The highest weighted indicators emerged in the domains of “Ethical Discourse Integrity,” “Institutional Collaboration Index,” “Jurisprudential Convergence Intensity,” and “Youth Engagement Score.” Each of these KPIs received consensus scores above 0.85 in the AHP-normalized scale, signifying high strategic relevance, clarity, and measurability.

Another significant finding involved the integration of AI-powered tools in the analysis of sentiment data across intra-Islamic communications. Text mining and sentiment analytics applied to public Friday sermons, academic discourse, and social media dialogue across Sunni–Shi‘a communities in Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon revealed a 37% improvement in dialogical positivity and a 28% reduction in sectarian polarity when KPI benchmarks were applied within institutional platforms. These shifts were most visible in institutions piloting the IHF model through its ethical KPIs and dialogue moderation standards. This directly addresses the second research objective concerning the applicability of digital transformation tools especially AI and dashboard visualizations in real-time theological governance.

Additionally, cross-domain analytics showed that the “Dialogical Transparency Index” (measuring openness of institutional responses to critique) was strongly correlated ($r = 0.76$) with improvements in the “Community Trust Metric.” This correlation suggests that institutions which disclosed their doctrinal and operational commitments to *taqrīb* via measurable KPIs witnessed tangible improvements in stakeholder credibility, fulfilling the research goal of institutional validation through strategic communication.

From a governance perspective, the IHF model facilitated role-based accountability tracking. By assigning KPI responsibility matrices (RACI), institutions reported an average 41% improvement in coordination between seminary-based authorities, interfaith councils, and government-linked bodies. These findings directly correspond to the gap previously identified in the literature the absence of integrated, role-specific monitoring tools for intra-faith dialogue and reinforce the strategic imperative of institutional harmonization.

Crucially, the operational deployment of the IHF model confirmed its scalability. Pilot implementations across three provinces in Iran, supported by seminary–university coalitions, revealed that even modest institutional capacity could adopt the model with measurable outcomes within a 6–12 month window. These implementation results validate the model’s practicality in diverse religious, geographical, and administrative contexts, addressing the final research question concerning the institutional feasibility and strategic embedment of KPI-driven dialogue.

In sum, the findings collectively confirm that the IHF model satisfies the threefold strategic aims defined in the introduction: (1) it successfully converts Islamic ethical dialogue principles into a quantifiable framework; (2) it performs as an integrated tool for institutional monitoring and stakeholder engagement; and (3) it aligns with AI-driven governance platforms without compromising Islamic epistemology. The results therefore substantiate the model’s theoretical robustness, operational utility, and transformative capacity within contemporary Islamic intra-faith dialogue systems.

Discussion

The findings of this study affirm the Islamic Ḥiwār Framework (IHF) as a robust, scalable, and operationally validated model for quantifying intra-faith dialogue across theological, ethical, institutional, and digital domains. The successful transformation of Qur’ānic and classical dialogical values into KPI-based metrics addresses a long-standing gap in religious governance namely, the lack of measurable frameworks to track, evaluate, and enhance taqrīb (intra-faith rapprochement) initiatives. The results indicate that not only can religious ethics be operationalized without compromising theological integrity, but that AI-enhanced tools and structured performance indicators can substantively improve dialogue quality, stakeholder trust, and institutional alignment.

1- Interpretation of Results

At the interpretive level, the Delphi validation and KPI prioritization underscore the strong consensus among intra-faith experts regarding the importance of ethical transparency, doctrinal convergence, and youth engagement as foundational elements of sustainable dialogue. The strong correlation between the “Dialogical Transparency Index” and the “Community Trust Metric” highlights the strategic leverage of institutional openness in shaping perceptions of authenticity and legitimacy. Furthermore, the success of AI-driven sentiment analysis in detecting positive shifts in sectarian discourse confirms the model’s suitability for real-time monitoring and continuous improvement. This fulfills the research aim of embedding digital transformation tools such as sentiment analytics, IoT-linked reporting, and real-time dashboards into the strategic infrastructure of Islamic dialogue governance.

2- Comparison with Existing Literature

This study confirms and extends key scholarly contributions. While Gilani et al. (2024) and Maté et al. (2016) discuss general frameworks for interfaith cooperation and stakeholder integration, the IHF advances these by introducing granular KPIs that are both context-specific and ethically grounded. Unlike prior efforts that remain largely qualitative, the IHF quantifies intra-faith dynamics across 14 domains, creating a multidimensional performance grid adaptable to seminary, policy, and NGO environments. Similarly, the operationalization of maqāṣid-based ethical indices aligns with Ciocan’s (2024) call for performance-accountable spirituality but surpasses it by offering a tested, metrics-based architecture deployable within governance dashboards. While Afsaruddin (2021) emphasizes the revival of dialogical ethics in Islamic political thought, the IHF makes this revival auditable, comparable, and institutionally transferable.

Points of divergence with earlier frameworks (e.g., Argon 2009; Maisah et al. 2024) lie in the IHF's integration of AI tools and its Delphi–AHP structured KPI weighting. Whereas prior models emphasize narrative reconciliation or theological inclusivity, the IHF provides a systematic, data-driven framework that preserves theological nuance while enabling cross-domain measurability a balance previously unachieved in the literature.

3- Implications for Theory and Practice

Theoretically, this study introduces a novel fusion of Islamic epistemology, civilizational ethics, and performance science. The IHF expands the scope of digital theology by aligning traditional Islamic values *ḥiwār* (dialogue), *raḥmah* (mercy), *ʿadl* (justice) with contemporary governance frameworks and AI analytics. The architecture functions as a bridge between normativity and strategy, offering a unified KPI model that can be used in religious diplomacy, academic institutions, and transnational dialogue networks. This contributes to the evolution of Islamic dialogue theory by embedding accountability and strategic foresight within the maqāṣidic paradigm.

Practically, the model provides actionable tools for seminary administrators, religious policymakers, and dialogue facilitators. The use of role-based RACI matrices allows institutions to assign ownership to each KPI, enhancing governance and coordination across ministries, NGOs, and inter-sect councils. Furthermore, the successful application of the IHF in real-world provincial contexts suggests it can be deployed within broader regional or international dialogue infrastructures. The model's compatibility with AI-based monitoring platforms makes it adaptable to smart governance systems, ensuring real-time feedback, impact reporting, and adaptive policy adjustments.

In conclusion, the IHF presents a scalable, KPI-anchored framework that not only advances theoretical understanding of Islamic intra-faith dialogue but also equips institutions with operational tools to enact, monitor, and refine this dialogue. It offers a blueprint for transitioning from aspirational rhetoric to measurable progress, integrating theological integrity with digital innovation and strategic governance.

Conclusion

Summary of Key Findings

This study has demonstrated the feasibility and strategic value of the Islamic *Ḥiwār* Framework (IHF) as a performance-based, KPI-driven system for managing intra-faith dialogue and advancing civilizational unity. Through the integration of classical Islamic principles with modern performance analytics, including AI-based sentiment tools and Delphi–AHP validated KPIs, the framework successfully translates qualitative religious ethics into quantifiable institutional benchmarks. The findings revealed that indicators related to dialogical ethics, trust metrics, educational engagement, and governance alignment are central to operationalizing meaningful rapprochement. These results directly fulfill the study's objectives to bridge theological norms with strategic institutionalization, contributing a novel Islamic model within the broader discourse on religious governance and digital transformation.

Recommendations for Practitioners and Policymakers

Based on these insights, it is recommended that religious institutions, policymakers, and interfaith councils adopt the IHF's KPI structure as part of their internal governance and external evaluation frameworks. Seminary boards and religious education institutions should integrate epistemological and ethical KPI dashboards into their curricula and faculty performance reviews to promote dialogical literacy. Ministries of religious affairs and cultural diplomacy bodies are encouraged to deploy AI-enhanced feedback systems such as real-time sentiment monitoring and interactive dashboards to continuously assess the impact of

intra-faith engagement initiatives. Moreover, digital transformation units in state or religious entities should pilot IoT-enabled data collection tools and blockchain-based accountability ledgers to reinforce transparency, stakeholder trust, and equitable representation in dialogue processes.

Limitations of the Study

While the study offers a pioneering KPI-based framework for intra-faith dialogue, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the empirical validation of the IHF was limited to selected Iranian provinces and stakeholder clusters, which may affect the generalizability of the findings across broader Sunni–Shi‘i or transnational contexts. Second, the implementation of digital tools such as AI analytics and IoT integration was constrained by varying levels of technological infrastructure and institutional digital maturity across studied entities. Third, the reliance on expert-based Delphi scoring, while academically rigorous, may reflect certain theological or institutional biases that require triangulation through grassroots-level feedback. These limitations should be addressed in future extensions of the model.

Directions for Future Research

Future studies should aim to expand the geographical and denominational scope of the IHF by piloting it across diverse intra-Islamic contexts including Southeast Asia, the Caucasus, and diaspora communities in Europe and North America. Longitudinal studies can assess the impact of sustained KPI-based dialogue governance over time, particularly in post-conflict or transitional societies. Further research is also needed to enhance the digital infrastructure supporting the IHF, including the integration of blockchain trust ledgers, smart contracts for dialogue agreements, and gamified AI agents for youth theological engagement. Additionally, comparative studies between the IHF and ecumenical Christian KPI models (e.g., ECKF (MoghadasNian, S. 2025b)) would offer valuable insights into cross-religious convergence mechanisms and contribute to the emerging field of digital-theological governance.

References

- Abdoh, M. M., & Obeid, A. H. (2022). الأحاديث العقدية الواردة في الحوار بعد البعثة والهجرة النبوية جمعاً وتخريجاً ودراسة. *Ma`alim Al-Qur`an Wa al-Sunnah*, 18(1), 210–231. <https://doi.org/10.33102/jmq.s.v18i1.358>
- Afsaruddin, A. (2021). **Valorizing Religious Dialogue and Pluralism Within the Islamic Tradition** (pp. 35–45). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66089-5_2
- ALKHUBRA, MOCH. R., Chotimah, C., & Sulistyorini, S. (2025). **Integrasi nilai keislaman dalam manajemen strategik untuk membangun keunggulan kompetitif lembaga pendidikan islam di era globalisasi digital**. *CENDEKIA*, 5(1), 185–192. <https://doi.org/10.51878/cendekia.v5i1.4153>
- Argon, K. (2009). **Strategies for Interreligious and Inter-Muslim Dialogue: A Proposed Methodology**. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 29(3), 355–367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602000903166622>
- Ciocan, T.-C. (2024). **Interfaith Dialogue as a Tool for Combating Discrimination: Theological Insights and Practical Applications**. *Dialogo*, 11(1), 518–548. <https://doi.org/10.51917/dialogo.2024.11.1.34>
- Elius, M. (2023). **Interfaith Dialogue: An Islamic Framework**. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bangladesh. Humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.3329/jasbh.v68i2.70363>
- Elius, M., Khan, I., & Mohd Nor, M. R. (2019). **Interreligious Dialogue: An Islamic Approach**. 15(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.22452/KATHA.VOL15NO1.1>
- Elmahjub, E. (2023). **Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Islamic Ethics: Towards Pluralist Ethical Benchmarking for AI**. *Philosophy & Technology*, 36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-023-00668-x>
- Ghazal, R., & Zulkhibri, M. (2016). **Islamic Inclusive Growth Index for the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) Member Countries**. *Journal of Economic Cooperation and Development*, 37(2), 51.

- Gilani, M. H., Ali, S., & Mohyiddeen, G. (2024). **Reimagining islamic discourse: towards a global ethical framework for contemporary leadership**. Deleted Journal, 103–120. <https://doi.org/10.31436/shajarah.vi.1931>
- Ishak, M. N., & Mohamed, A. (2023). **Harmonization of Islamic Economics with Artificial Intelligence: Towards an Ethical and Innovative Economic Paradigm**. <https://doi.org/10.24256/kharaj.v5i4.4387>
- Kayaoglu, T. (2011). **Constructing the Dialogue of Civilizations: A Case of Islamic Norm-Making in International Society**. Social Science Research Network. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1900309
- Majid, A. Ab. (2022). **Inter-Religious Dialogue: Detrimental to Aqidah or Medium of Da'wah?** International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences, 12(10). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v12-i10/15533>
- Marlina, M., & Ulya, Y. A. (2024). **Communication Strategies in Islamic Da'wah Opportunities and Challenges in the Era of Artificial Intelligence**. Deleted Journal, 1(2), 121–130. <https://doi.org/10.62569/fijc.v1i2.35>
- Maté, A., Trujillo, J., & Mylopoulos, J. (2016). **Key Performance Indicator Elicitation and Selection Through Conceptual Modelling** (pp. 73–80). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46397-1_6
- McCallum, R. (2022). **Evaluating Interreligious Peacebuilding and Dialogue: Methods and Frameworks** ed. by Mohammed Abu-Nimer and Renáta Katalin Nelson (review). CrossCurrents, 72(3), 297–300. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cro.2022.0026>
- MoghadasNian, S. (2025a). **Islamic Hīwār Framework (IHF): A KPI-Based Architecture for Intra-Faith Dialogue and Civilizational Unity**. University of Religions and Denominations. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.34234.30403>
- MoghadasNian, S. (2025b). **Ecumenical Christian KPI Framework (ECKF): A KPI-Based Strategic Architecture for Christian Unity and Institutional Dialogue**. University of Religions and Denominations. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.31969.21609>
- Rahmawati, D., Yusuf, M., & Mubarak, M. (2024). **Kerjasama antar ummat beragama dalam bidang pendidikan untuk mewujudkan generasi rahmatan lil alamin**. <https://doi.org/10.51878/learning.v4i2.2828>
- Shalhoob, H. (2025). **The role of AI in enhancing shariah compliance: Efficiency and transparency in Islamic finance**. Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development, 9(1), 11239. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd11239>
- Zarqa, M. (2019). **Islamic and Conventional Economics – Dialogue and Ethics**. Journal of King Abdulaziz University-Islamic Economics, 32(2), 125–135. <https://doi.org/10.4197/ISLEC.32-2.10>

Appendix

Appendix A: Strategic KPI Architecture for the Islamic Hīwār Framework (IHF)

This appendix presents a comprehensive inventory of 280 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) operationalizing the Islamic Hīwār Framework (IHF), which serves as a multi-dimensional strategy model to foster intra-Islamic rapprochement. Structured under the Universal KPI Development Framework, the KPIs are distributed across 14 strategic domains encompassing theological convergence, institutional governance, jurisprudential harmonization, joint authorship, educational integration, digital media, fatwā standardization, financial sustainability, international collaboration, monitoring and evaluation, sociocultural transformation, technological innovation, healthcare ethics, and environmental responsibility. Each KPI is designed to support the core mission of the IHF: transforming the normative call for Islamic unity into a quantifiable, scalable, and transparent ecosystem of dialogue, cooperation, and civilizational coherence.

This refined set of performance metrics empowers intra-faith leaders, scholars, religious institutions, and strategic policy actors to:

1. Design Dialogue Dashboards: Embed standardized KPI definitions, data sources (e.g., comparative fiqh outputs, shared tafsīr projects, digital learning platforms), and reporting frequencies (monthly, quarterly, annually) to track theological overlap, curriculum integration, and institutional convergence.

2. Assign RACI Roles Across Islamic Bodies: Implement the Responsible–Accountable–Consulted–Informed (RACI) matrix across dialogue institutions, inter-madhhab councils, fatwā boards, youth platforms, and media centers to promote distributed accountability for each strategic dimension.
3. Benchmark Against Historical and Contemporary Unity Models: Calibrate progress using baseline indicators derived from traditional rapprochement efforts (e.g., al-Azhar–Qom declarations, Amman Message, Dar al-Taqrīb) and modern metrics of inter-madhhab cooperation, including scholarly co-authorship, seminarian exchange, and joint religious decrees.
4. Map Interlinked Performance Outcomes: Align multi-domain KPI chains such as Kalāmīc Agreement → Ijtihād Harmonization → Fatwā Coherence → Public Trust in Unity Statements, thereby reinforcing both epistemic validity and social credibility of intra-Islamic dialogue.
5. Incorporate Digital and AI-Driven Enhancements: Utilize tools such as AI-enabled fatwā harmonization, sentiment analysis of sectarian discourse, blockchain-certified funding transparency, and AR/VR-enabled theological training to foster innovation, agility, and ethical governance in the dialogue ecosystem.

The IHF KPI architecture offers a practical mechanism to transition from aspirational unity to executable strategy, providing measurable indicators to guide decision-making, evaluate institutional effectiveness, and scale collaborative success across the global Islamic ummah. It affirms that theological proximity, if systematized through performance logic, can translate into enduring spiritual solidarity and institutional alignment.

Strategic Dimensions & KPI Groups

1. Principles of Dialogue

(Strategic Dimension: Foundational Convergence Criteria, Shared Theological Concepts)

- Shared Creedal Overlap Score (%SCOS)
- Mutual Doctrinal Understanding Index (%MDUI)
- Common Ethical Principle Alignment Rate (%CEPAR)
- Terminology Harmonization Index (THI)
- Qur'ānic Concordance Utilization Rate (%QCUP)
- Hadīth Cross-Sect Acceptance Rate (%HSAR)
- Doctrinal Disagreement Mapping Completion (%DDMC)
- Shared Kalām Principle Adoption (%SKPA)
- Scriptural Dialogue Reference Frequency (#SDRF)
- Level of Doctrinal Misinterpretation Reduction (%LDMR)
- Joint Tefsīr Sessions Conducted (#JTSC)
- Agreement on Uṣūl al-Dīn Score (%AUDS)
- Shī'a–Sunni Creedal Alignment Index (SSCAI)
- Average Time to Resolve Theological Disputes (Days–ATRDT)
- Foundational Dialogue Curriculum Integration (%FDCI)
- Ethical Overlap Metric on Unity Themes (%EOMU)
- Rational Proof Agreement Score (%RPAS)
- Theological Dialogue Vocabulary Standardization Rate (%TDVSR)
- Multi-Madhhab Creedal Survey Consensus (%MMCSC)
- Reduction in Inter-Sectarian Terminological Conflict (%RISTC)

2. Institutional Dialogue Structures

(Strategic Dimension: Institutional Resilience, Formal Dialogue Bodies)

- Number of Formal Dialogue Bodies Established (#FDBE)
- Sustainability Rate of Dialogue Institutions (%SRDI)

- Cross-Sectarian Leadership Representation Index (%CLRI)
- Annual Institutional Dialogue Sessions Held (#AIDSH)
- Institutional Dialogue Charter Adoption Rate (%IDCAR)
- Conflict Resolution Mechanism Effectiveness Score (%CRMES)
- Board of Unity Accreditation Score (%BUAS)
- Diversity of Institutional Membership Index (%DIMI)
- Inter-Madhab Institutional Partnership Rate (%IMIPR)
- Institutional Turnover Stability Index (%ITSI)
- Funding Stability for Dialogue Centers (%FSDC)
- Cross-Madhab Dialogue Board Existence (%CDBE)
- Institutional Dialogue Reporting Compliance (%IDRC)
- Implementation Rate of Institutional MOU Commitments (%IRIMC)
- Staff Training Completion for Dialogue Protocols (%STCDP)
- Transparency Index of Dialogue Bodies (%TIDB)
- Multi-Madhab Decision-Making Inclusivity Score (%MDMIS)
- Average Resolution Time of Internal Disputes (ARTID-Days)
- Crisis Preparedness and Institutional Resilience Score (%CPIRS)
- Digital Infrastructure Adequacy for Dialogue (%DIAD)

12

3. Jurisprudential Dialogue Processes

(Strategic Dimension: Comparative Ijtihād Mechanisms, Mutual Ijtihād Workshops)

- Number of Joint Ijtihād Workshops Conducted (#JIWC)
- Cross-Sect Juridical Convergence Score (%CSJCS)
- Mutual Recognition of Legal Schools Index (%MRLSI)
- Fatwā Harmonization Success Rate (%FHSR)
- Comparative Fiqh Publication Output (#CFPO)
- Rate of Collaborative Jurisprudential Text Reviews (%CJTUR)
- Disputed Masā'il Resolution Rate (%DMRR)
- Mutual Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah Index (%MMSI)
- Ratio of Shared Ijtihād Outcomes (%RSIO)
- Number of Juridical Consensus Statements (#JCS)
- Comparative Uṣūl al-Fiqh Engagement Rate (%CUFER)
- Adoption Rate of Dialogue-Based Iftā Frameworks (%ADBIF)
- Cross-Madhab Legal Opinion Dissemination Index (%CMLODI)
- Number of Shared Fatwā Banks (#SFB)
- Public Trust in Joint Legal Opinions (%PTJLO)
- Fiqh al-Raḥmah Training Completion Rate (%FR-TCR)
- Average Legal Dispute Resolution Time (Days-ALDRT)
- Digital Comparative Ijtihād Platforms Developed (#DCIP)
- Consensus Rate on Ethical Legal Matters (%CRELM)
- Cross-Madhab Legal Review Panels (#CMLRP)

4. Joint Authorship & Publication

(Strategic Dimension: Co-Authored Scholarship, Joint Publications)

- Number of Co-Authored Unity Publications (#CAUP)
- Cross-Sect Citation Index (%CSCI)

- Digital Repository Access Rate for Joint Works (%DRARJW)
- Multilingual Unity Publication Ratio (%MUPR)
- Cross-Madhab Peer Review Committee Frequency (#CPRCF)
- Joint Commentary Publications on Shared Texts (#JCST)
- Number of Published Cross-Sect Fatwā Compendiums (#PCFC)
- Annual Conference Proceedings Co-Publication Rate (%ACPCPR)
- Joint Religious Studies Journal Launches (#JRSJL)
- Open-Access Unity Scholarship Availability (%OAUSA)
- Scholarly Impact Factor of Dialogue Publications (%SIFDP)
- Ratio of Shī'a–Sunni Co-Editors in Journals (%SSCEJ)
- Shared Doctrine Encyclopedia Compilation Progress (%SDECP)
- Policy Paper Citations from Joint Publications (#PPCJP)
- Ratio of Inter-Madhab Publishing Agreements (%RIMPA)
- Number of Joint Academic Books (#JAB)
- Joint Tafsīr Annotation Projects (#JTAP)
- Digital Citation Index Across Madhāhib (%DCIAM)
- Youth Participation in Joint Authorship Projects (%YPJAP)
- Inclusion of Dialogue KPIs in Academic Curricula (%IDKAC)

13

5. Education & Training

(Strategic Dimension: Curriculum Integration, Seminarian Exchange)

- Number of Integrated Dialogue Curricula Developed (#IDCD)
- Shī'a–Sunni Seminarian Exchange Rate (%SSSER)
- Joint Theological Training Completion Rate (%JTTC)
- Ratio of Dialogue-Focused Courses in Seminaries (%RDFCS)
- Instructor Certification in Dialogue Ethics (%ICDE)
- Inclusion Rate of Shared Doctrinal Units (%IRSDU)
- Unity Pedagogy Integration Index (%UPII)
- Student Perception Score on Unity Education (%SPSUE)
- Training Program Completion Rate for Youth (%TPCRY)
- Ratio of Joint Religious Academic Seminars Held (#JAS)
- Digital Dialogue Education Platforms Usage (%DDEP)
- Curriculum Review Cycle Completion Rate (%CRCCR)
- Ratio of Female Participation in Dialogue Education (%RFPDE)
- Average Cost per Inter-Sectarian Training Session (\$ACISTS)
- Joint Certificate Program Enrollment Growth (%JCP-EG)
- Instructor Dialogue Capacity Building Index (%IDCBI)
- Number of Theological Unity MOOCs (#TUM)
- Student Dialogue Competency Score (SDCS)
- Multifaith & Intra-faith Comparative Theology Course Offering Rate (%MFCTCOR)
- Post-Training Application of Dialogue Tools Rate (%PTADTR)

6. Dialogue Media & Tools

(Strategic Dimension: Digital Engagement, Multimedia Content Reach)

- Number of Dialogue-Centered Media Campaigns (#DCMC)
- Average Multimedia Engagement Rate (%AMER)

- Dialogue Podcast Subscription Growth (%DPSG)
- Cross-Sectarian Video Content Production Volume (#CSVCP)
- Social Media Dialogue Index (%SMDI)
- Mobile Application Downloads for Dialogue Tools (#MADD)
- Average Daily Active Dialogue Platform Users (DAU-DP)
- Digital Hate Speech Countering Rate (%DHSCR)
- Content Diversity Index for Dialogue Channels (%CDIDC)
- Content Translation Completion Rate (%CTCR)
- Youth Interaction Index via Digital Dialogue Tools (%YIIDT)
- Digital Campaign Conversion Score (%DCCS)
- Inter-Madhab Media Collaboration Frequency (#IMMCF)
- Sentiment Analysis Positivity Score (%SAPS)
- Number of Dialogue Gamification Pilots (#DGP)
- Dialogue App Retention Rate (30-day %DARR)
- Dialogue-Focused AI Chatbot Usage Rate (%DFACUR)
- Number of Dialogue-Focused YouTube Playlists (#DFYP)
- Podcast Listener Retention Rate (%PLRR)
- Digital Misinformation Response Speed (Hours-DMRS)

14

7. Harmonization Mechanisms

(Strategic Dimension: Unified Fatwā Protocols, Standardization of Legal Maxims)

- Number of Standardized Legal Maxims Compiled (#SLMC)
- Unified Fatwā Protocol Adoption Rate (%UFPAR)
- Cross-Madhab Fatwā Database Usage Rate (%CMFDUR)
- Standard Fatwā Formatting Compliance (%SFFC)
- Juristic Synonym Harmonization Index (%JSHI)
- Consensus on Urgent Religious Issues (%CURI)
- Average Time to Resolve Conflicting Fatāwā (Days-ATRFC)
- Adoption Rate of Fatwā Harmonization Manuals (%AFHM)
- Ratio of Inter-Madhab Fatwā Panels (#IMFP)
- Legal Terminology Convergence Score (%LTCS)
- Fatwā Harmonization Training Completion (%FHTC)
- Youth Participation in Fatwā Consultative Sessions (%YPFCS)
- Inter-Sectarian Emergency Ruling Agreements (#ISERA)
- Annual Harmonized Fatwā Releases (#AHFR)
- Use of Digital Fatwā Toolkits in Conflict Cases (%DFTCC)
- Consensus-Based Fatwā Approval Score (%CBFAS)
- Cross-Juristic Risk Assessment Index (%CJRAI)
- Fatwā Harmonization Feedback Satisfaction Score (%FHFSS)
- Gender Inclusivity in Fatwā Councils (%GIFC)
- Integration of ESG in Joint Fatwās (%IESJF)

8. Organizational & Financial Support

(Strategic Dimension: Resource Mobilization Efficiency, Cross-Financing Agreements)

- Total Cross-Funded Dialogue Projects (#TCFDP)
- Ratio of Budget Allocated to Dialogue (%RBAD)

- Average Grant Approval Time for Unity Projects (Days–AGATUP)
- Donor Retention Rate for Dialogue Institutions (%DRRDI)
- Ratio of In-Kind Support in Dialogue Events (%RIKSDE)
- Annual Financial Audits for Unity Programs (#AFAUP)
- Joint Fundraising Campaign Participation Rate (%JFCPR)
- Diversity Index of Dialogue Funders (%DIDF)
- Efficiency of Budget Utilization Score (%EBUS)
- Proportion of Dialogue Budget from Government Grants (%PDBG)
- Ratio of Financially Self-Sustaining Dialogue Centers (%RFSSDC)
- Use of Zakat/Waqf for Dialogue (%ZWD)
- Average Sponsorship Amount per Dialogue Event (\$ASAPDE)
- Return on Investment for Unity Projects (%ROIUP)
- Multi-Sector Financial Collaboration Rate (%MSFCR)
- Crowdfunding Engagement Success Rate (%CESR)
- Number of Dialogue-Focused Financial MOUs (#DFFMOUs)
- Blockchain-Verified Funding Transparency Index (%BVFTI)
- Youth-Led Dialogue Funding Initiatives (#YDFI)
- Ratio of Dialogue Financial Reports Published Annually (%RDFRPA)

15

9. International Collaboration

(Strategic Dimension: Global Forum Participation, Frequency of Joint Conferences)

- Number of Joint International Conferences (#JIC)
- Global Religious Dialogue Forum Participation Rate (%GRDFPR)
- Cross-National Dialogue MOUs Signed (#CNDMS)
- Average Annual Participation in OIC Dialogue Events (#AAPOICDE)
- International Religious Institutions Represented (#IRIR)
- Rate of Multilingual Dialogue Sessions (%RMDS)
- Intra-Islamic Representation in Global Events (%IIRGE)
- Number of Countries with Active Dialogue Hubs (#CAHD)
- Foreign Ministry Engagement Score (%FMES)
- Global Unity Advocacy Delegations Sent (#GUADS)
- Digital Broadcast Reach of International Dialogue Events (%DBRIDE)
- Cross-Border Fatwā Alignment Index (%CBFAI)
- Number of Academic Partnerships for Dialogue (#NAPD)
- Youth Representation in Global Dialogue Missions (%YRGDM)
- Funding from International Bodies (%FIB)
- Rate of International Legal Recognition of Dialogue Institutions (%ILRDI)
- Joint Intergovernmental Unity Resolutions Passed (#JIURP)
- Average Joint Project Duration (Months–AJPD)
- Consensus Rate in Global Dialogue Summits (%CRGDS)
- Recognition of Islamic Hiwār Charter by Global Entities (#RICGE)

10. Monitoring & Evaluation

(Strategic Dimension: Convergence Metrics Tracking, Feedback Loop Implementation)

- KPI Dashboard Completion Rate (%KDCR)
- Quarterly Convergence Score Index (%QCSI)

- Number of Annual Evaluation Reports (#AER)
- M&E Cycle Completion Adherence (%MECCA)
- Stakeholder Feedback Integration Rate (%SFIR)
- M&E Officer Training Completion Rate (%MEOTCR)
- Corrective Action Implementation Rate (%CAIR)
- Use of AI in Performance Analytics (%UAIPA)
- Variance from Dialogue KPIs (%VDK)
- Public Accessibility to Evaluation Reports (%PAER)
- Multi-Stakeholder Review Sessions Conducted (#MSRSC)
- Number of Dialogue Impact Audits (#DIA)
- Consistency Rate Across Dialogue Metrics (%CRADM)
- Qualitative–Quantitative Data Balance Index (%QQDBI)
- Integration of SMARTER Review Cycles (%ISRC)
- Compliance Score with Dialogue Benchmarks (%CSDB)
- Inclusion of M&E in Dialogue Curriculum (%IMEDC)
- Ratio of KPIs Achieved per Quarter (%RKAPQ)
- Sentiment Analysis Evaluation Index (%SAEI)
- Time to Detect KPI Deviations (Hours–TDKPID)

16

11. Social & Cultural Impact

(Strategic Dimension: Societal Outreach Impact, Public Perception Levels)

- Unity Awareness Campaign Reach (#UACR)
- Rate of Public Approval for Intra-Faith Dialogue (%RPAIFD)
- Community-Level Dialogue Events (#CLDE)
- Reduction in Sectarian Incidents (%RSI)
- Social Media Perception Index (%SMPI)
- Media Sentiment Positivity Score (%MSPS)
- Level of Interfaith Acceptance (%LIA)
- Cultural Unity Event Attendance (#CUEA)
- Surveyed Increase in Religious Tolerance (%SIRT)
- Rate of Dialogue Exposure in Rural Areas (%DERA)
- Community-led Dialogue Project Initiatives (#CDPI)
- Ratio of Dialogue Outreach in Schools (%RDIS)
- Cultural Production on Unity Themes (#CPUT)
- Artistic Collaboration Projects Promoting Unity (#ACP-PU)
- Broadcast Viewership of Dialogue Programs (#BVDP)
- Community Support Funding for Dialogue (%CSFD)
- Cross-Madhab Cultural Exchange Events (#CMCEE)
- Dialogue Messaging in Friday Sermons (%DMFS)
- Surveyed Increase in Trust Across Madhāhib (%SITCM)
- Ratio of Dialogue-Focused Social Campaigns (%RDFSC)

12. Sustainability & Innovation

(Strategic Dimension: Innovation Adoption Rate, Pilot Project Successes)

- Number of Dialogue Innovation Pilots (#DIP)
- Rate of AI Integration in Dialogue Tools (%RAIIDT)

- Environmental Sustainability Index for Dialogue Centers (%ESIDC)
- Success Rate of Unity Innovation Projects (%SRUIP)
- Blockchain Use in Fatwā Authentication (%BUF-A)
- Digital Twin Scenario Testing Completion (%DTTSC)
- Ratio of Dialogue Centers Powered by Renewable Energy (%DCPRE)
- Smart Dialogue Tool Adoption Rate (%SDTAR)
- Paperless Dialogue Program Ratio (%PDPR)
- Green Certification of Dialogue Institutions (%GCDI)
- Staff Innovation Training Completion (%SITC)
- Startup Partnerships in Dialogue Ecosystem (#SPDE)
- Dialogue Innovation Grant Disbursement Efficiency (%DIGDE)
- Rate of Open-Source Tool Contributions (%ROSTC)
- Digital Knowledge Repository Growth Rate (%DKRGR)
- Innovation Idea Submission Rate by Staff (%IISRS)
- Dialogue Innovation Index (%DII)
- Inclusion of Youth-Led Tech Innovations (#YLTi)
- Use of AR/VR in Dialogue Simulations (%UVRDS)
- Sustainability Strategy Integration Score (%SSIS)

17

13. Health & Bioethics

(Strategic Dimension: Healthcare Ethics Framework, Bioethical Guideline Development)

- Number of Joint Bioethical Guidelines Issued (#JBGI)
- Fatwā Convergence on End-of-Life Ethics (%FCELE)
- Dialogue Participation by Islamic Medical Councils (%DPIMC)
- Shared Position Papers on Genetic Engineering (#SPPGE)
- Ethical Organ Donation Consensus Rate (%EODCR)
- Ratio of Dialogue Involvement in Public Health Crises (%DIPHCR)
- Mental Health Discourse Inclusion Index (%MHDII)
- Islamic Bioethics Integration in Medical Curricula (%IBIMC)
- Cross-Sect Endorsement of Pandemic Fatāwā (%CSEPF)
- Healthcare Ethics Training Completion Rate (%HETCR)
- Joint Ethical Review Committees Established (#JERCE)
- Public Education Campaigns on Islamic Bioethics (#PECIB)
- Islamic Hospital Dialogue Partnership Score (%IHDPS)
- Ethical Stance Alignment on Genetic Therapy (%ESAGT)
- Dialogue Forums on Artificial Reproduction Ethics (#DFARE)
- Cross-Madhab Collaboration on Medical Consent (%CMCMC)
- Inclusion of Disability Ethics in Dialogue (%IDED)
- Unified View on Brain Death Rulings (%UVBDR)
- AI-Bioethics Dialogue Platform Launch (#AIBDPL)
- Bioethical Decision-Making Satisfaction Score (%BDMSS)

14. Environmental & Disaster Jurisprudence

(Strategic Dimension: Environmental & Crisis Ethics, Disaster Response Jurisprudence)

- Fatwā Convergence on Environmental Ethics (%FCEE)
- Dialogue Engagement in Climate Risk Fatāwā (#DCRF)

21th International Conference on Management & Humanistic Science Research in Iran

AUGUST 22, 2025 | TEHRAN



ISC_{CM}

International Science Citation Center



بیست و یکمین کنفرانس بین‌المللی پژوهش‌های مدیریت و علوم انسانی در ایران
۳۱ مرداد ۱۴۰۴ | تهران

۲۱

- Islamic Green Economy Dialogue Sessions Held (#IGEDSH)
- Rate of Adoption of Eco-Fiqh Curricula (%RAEFC)
- Participation in Inter-Sect Environmental Summits (#PISES)
- Joint Disaster Relief Fatwā Committees Formed (#JDRFC)
- Crisis Jurisprudence Decision Speed (Hours-CJDS)
- ESG Framework Integration in Religious Decrees (%EFIRD)
- Inclusion of Environmental Risks in Dialogue Protocols (%IERDP)
- Awareness Campaigns on Water Ethics (#ACWE)
- Rate of Sustainable Practice Compliance at Dialogue Centers (%RSPCDC)
- Dialogue-Supported Waqf for Disaster Relief (#DSWDR)
- Ratio of Fatwā Response Time to Environmental Crises (%FRT-EC)
- Youth Involvement in Eco-Jurisprudence Initiatives (%YIEJI)
- Biodiversity and Shariah Position Paper Publications (#BSPPP)
- Cross-Sect Convergence on Animal Welfare Ethics (%CSCAWE)
- Inter-Madhab Position Alignment on Disaster Insurance (%IM-PADI)
- Renewable Energy Advocacy in Religious Dialogue (%REARD)
- GIS-Based Environmental Risk Dialogue Applications (#GBERDA)
- Crisis Fatwā Compliance Monitoring (%CFCM)