



Interfaith Doctrinal Dialogue Framework: A Non-Reductive KPI Architecture for Governing Abrahamic Theological Dialogue

**SeyyedAbdolHojjat MoghadasNian*, SeyedMehdi AlizadehMousavi,
SeyyedMohammadMahdi HosseinPoor, Mahdi Farmanian, Akbar Bagheri**

1. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), s14110213@gmail.com
2. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), SMA.Moosavi@urd.ac.ir
3. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), SMM.HosseinPoor@urd.ac.ir
4. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), Farmanian@urd.ac.ir
5. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), A.Bagheri@urd.ac.ir

Abstract

Interfaith dialogue is often assessed through participation, declarations, or visibility, leaving doctrinal-source integrity, institutional follow-through, and risk governance under-specified. This article develops the Interfaith Doctrinal Dialogue Framework (IDDF) as a non-reductive design-science artefact for formal and semi-formal Abrahamic theological dialogue, with Christian–Muslim programmes as the initial application. The study synthesised the IDDF design corpus, a consolidated domain–axis model, and the complete KPI catalogue; no participants, field cases, or operational datasets were analysed. Artefact development organised the framework into five strategic domains and fourteen specialist axes, generated 280 candidate KPIs, and subjected the catalogue to structural checks for uniqueness, placement, controllability, auditability, and theological boundaries. The resulting architecture confines measurement to evidence integrity, dialogue process, institutional capability, inclusion, risk, data governance, and implementation, explicitly excluding the truth, superiority, sanctity, or salvific validity of any religious tradition. IDDF also specifies KPI dictionary requirements and human-supervised controls for AI-assisted retrieval, coding, narrative analysis, and dashboards. The framework integrates comparative-theological requirements with design-science and performance-governance logic, enabling institutions to move from symbolic engagement toward auditable learning and accountable implementation. The artefact remains evaluation-ready rather than empirically validated; content validity, reliability, measurement invariance, weighting sensitivity, and field usability require subsequent multi-tradition testing.



Keywords: Interfaith dialogue; Abrahamic theology; Design science research; Key performance indicators; Religious governance; Responsible artificial intelligence; Peacebuilding.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Context

Interreligious dialogue is increasingly expected to move beyond courteous encounter toward outcomes such as trust, cooperation, social inclusion, and conflict prevention. A systematic review of 83 quantitative studies found that research on interreligious peace remains dispersed across disciplines, that the role of religious actors and institutions is comparatively understudied, and that interreligious peace should be understood through both negative dimensions violence, hostility, and perceived threat and positive dimensions trust and cooperation [1]. Dialogue scholarship likewise cautions that dialogue is not a single technique: its purposes, participants, power relations, institutional setting, and criteria of success must be made explicit [2]. Religious peacebuilding research further shows that culturally credible dialogue requires structured preparation, facilitation, and learning rather than the assumption that contact alone produces reconciliation [3].

The present study defines Abrahamic doctrinal dialogue as source-aware engagement among Islamic, Christian, and Jewish participants concerning doctrine, scriptural interpretation, ethical commitments, ritual meaning, and institutional authority. A key performance indicator (KPI) is defined here as a bounded measure of dialogue governance, evidence integrity, process quality, institutional capability, risk, or implementation not a score of revelation, sanctity, salvation, or doctrinal truth. This distinction accords with guidance that interreligious dialogue should preserve commitment to one's tradition, mutual respect, partner self-definition, and the integrity of religious difference [4]. The primary theoretical lens is design-science research (DSR), which treats IDDF as a purposeful artefact to be specified and evaluated; comparative theology operates as the boundary-setting alternative lens, requiring learning across traditions without suspending confessional particularity.

Potential digital implementations of IDDF include multilingual retrieval, natural-language processing, AI-assisted transcript coding, narrative and sentiment analysis, structured repositories, and dashboard analytics. These functions may improve documentation and review capacity but also create risks of decontextualisation, privacy loss, harmful bias, opaque classification, and unjustified automation. Their use therefore requires validity, transparency, explainability, privacy protection, fairness, and accountable human oversight [5].

1.2 Statement of Problem

The operational problem is not the absence of dialogue activity but the absence of an integrated architecture connecting theological seriousness to auditable institutional learning. Dialogue programmes may record attendance, declarations, media exposure, or partnership counts while leaving doctrinal-source accuracy, interpretive disagreement, equitable participation, implementation follow-through, safeguarding, and escalation risk weakly



specified. KAICIID's evaluation work accordingly treats monitoring and evaluation as mechanisms for accountability and learning and recommends early definition of change logic, indicators, baselines, and evidence [6].

This deficiency affects universities, theological institutes, religious councils, civil-society organisations, and policy-facing interfaith programmes. Without agreed constructs, formulas, data provenance, ownership, review cadence, and corrective-action rules, indicators can become decorative or misleading. Performance-measurement research has shown that measurement systems influence behaviour and may generate unintended consequences when metrics are detached from strategy, causal logic, and governance [7]. In a doctrinal setting, that risk is more serious because poorly designed aggregation may imply false theological equivalence or allow publicity and participation volume to conceal failures in integrity, fairness, or safety.

1.3 Research Gap

Three relevant literatures remain insufficiently integrated. Interfaith-dialogue and peacebuilding research explains relational, ethical, and contextual conditions for engagement [1–4,6]. Design-science research explains how purposeful artefacts should be constructed and evaluated against a defined problem [8,9]. Performance-measurement scholarship explains how indicators shape organisational action and why their design requires theoretical alignment and consequence analysis [7]. Yet these streams do not provide a unified, theologically bounded governance artefact that links doctrinal-source traceability, dialogue-process quality, institutional continuity, peace-relevant outcomes, data stewardship, and AI assurance.

Earlier KPI-governed architectures developed by MoghadasNian and colleagues established relevant lineage in intra-Islamic dialogue and Christian ecumenical governance [10,11]. Their tradition-specific focus, however, leaves unresolved the Abrahamic-level problem of designing a shared measurement language without erasing tradition-specific authority. The decisive gap is therefore both translational and normative: theological insight has not been sufficiently translated into an auditable decision architecture, while conventional measurement architectures do not inherently prevent the numerical reduction of religious truth.

The proposed conceptual logic is: source-traceable doctrinal clarification and governed KPI design → accountable dialogue processes and institutional learning → more sustainable cooperation and peace-relevant outcomes, moderated by theological-boundary integrity, contextual validity, data quality, and human oversight. This is a design proposition, not an established causal finding.

1.4 Research Purpose and Research Questions

This article specifies the Interfaith Doctrinal Dialogue Framework (IDDF) as a non-reductive DSR artefact for governing and evaluating Abrahamic theological dialogue. It develops a



five-domain, fourteen-axis architecture containing 280 candidate KPIs and defines the governance and validation conditions required before institutional scoring or comparison.

The primary research question is: How can Abrahamic theological dialogue be designed as a KPI-oriented governance framework that supports doctrinal clarity, dialogical quality, institutional cooperation, and peace-relevant learning without reducing religious truth to numerical evaluation?

The secondary research questions are: (1) Which domains, axes, and indicator families are required to operationalise the framework? (2) How can KPIs measure process, capability, inclusion, outcomes, and risk while preserving doctrinal boundaries? (3) What data, ownership, review, and composite-index controls are required for auditable use? (4) What theological, ethical, privacy, bias, and human-oversight safeguards are required for AI-assisted implementation?

1.5 Significance and Contributions

IDDF offers a theory–practice bridge by enabling institutions to move from asking whether dialogue occurred to examining whether sources were accurately represented, differences were documented, participation was fair, commitments were executed, risks were controlled, and learning informed subsequent decisions. Its measurement logic also follows composite-indicator guidance requiring a clear theoretical framework, transparent selection and weighting, sensitivity analysis, and disaggregated reporting so that an aggregate score does not conceal critical weaknesses [12].

1.6 Scope, Boundary Conditions, and Roadmap

The study is conceptual and design-science based. Its unit of analysis is the formal or semi-formal Abrahamic dialogue initiative, institutional programme, or partnership, with Christian–Muslim engagement as the principal initial application and Jewish participation included within the intended Abrahamic scope. It is not geographically or temporally generalised, and it does not claim empirical effectiveness, causal impact, theological consensus, cross-cultural invariance, institutional adoption, or validated KPI thresholds. AI may support retrieval, coding, pattern detection, and dashboarding, but it cannot serve as the final authority on doctrinal interpretation or spiritual authenticity. The remainder of the article positions the framework theoretically, explains its design logic, specifies its domains and KPI governance, and presents a staged validation pathway.

This paper contributes by (1) specifying a checkable five-domain, fourteen-axis, 280-KPI artefact for Abrahamic doctrinal dialogue; (2) establishing a non-reduction rule that confines measurement to governance, evidence, process, capability, risk, and implementation; (3) integrating comparative-theological requirements with DSR and performance-governance logic; and (4) defining auditable data, composite-index, and AI-governance conditions for subsequent expert validation and institutional testing.



2. Literature Review

2.1 Search and Selection Logic

An integrative, theory-building review was undertaken to justify and delimit the design artefact rather than to estimate prevalence through a systematic or PRISMA review. Relevant peer-reviewed and grey literature was identified through targeted searches of publisher platforms, DOI-indexed records, SSRN, and the official websites and repositories of the World Council of Churches (WCC), KAICIID, OECD, and NIST. The search was last updated on 9 July 2026. Search combinations addressed interreligious dialogue, comparative theology, peacebuilding evaluation, design-science research (DSR), performance measurement, composite indicators, and AI auditability. English-language peer-reviewed works published mainly from 2000 to 2026 were prioritised alongside seminal books and institutional standards. SSRN preprints were included solely to establish conceptual lineage, not as evidence of validated effects. Unsupported validation claims, generic corporate KPI literature, and studies lacking direct relevance to Abrahamic dialogue governance were excluded.

2.2 Theoretical Background: Foundation and Rival Explanations

DSR is the primary lens because IDDF is a purposeful artefact comprising constructs, indicator definitions, governance rules, and an evaluation pathway. DSR predicts that contribution depends not merely on proposing the artefact, but on demonstrating problem relevance, internal coherence, utility, and appropriate evaluation [8,9,13]. Comparative theology provides a necessary rival and boundary-setting lens: it explains deep learning across religious borders while retaining confessional particularity, but it does not itself specify data ownership, thresholds, dashboards, or corrective-action mechanisms [14,15]. Intergroup contact theory offers a second rival explanation: contact generally reduces prejudice, yet its outcomes depend on the quality and institutional conditions of interaction and do not establish doctrinal accuracy or organisational follow-through [16]. Contact theory therefore explains attitudinal change, comparative theology explains interpretive encounter, and DSR explains how both can be translated into a governable artefact. Accordingly, IDDF treats theological integrity and dialogical contact as design requirements rather than substitutes for artefact governance.

2.3 Conceptual Domain Map and Construct Boundaries

The review standardises six constructs. Doctrinal clarity denotes source-traceable representation of claims, terms, methods, and unresolved disagreement; empirically, it is assessed at dialogue-programme level through citation traceability, boundary statements, and coding agreement. Dialogical quality denotes psychologically safe, reciprocal, well-facilitated engagement; it is observed through participation, listening, bias-change, and incident indicators. Institutional cooperation denotes sustained cross-organisational mandates, decision rights, resources, and completed commitments. Interreligious peace denotes reduced violence, hostility, and threat alongside increased trust and cooperation [1]. KPI governance denotes the definitions, formulas, provenance, ownership, cadence, and escalation rules that make



indicators decision-relevant. Responsible digital enablement denotes AI-assisted retrieval, coding, narrative analysis, repositories, and dashboards governed through privacy, explainability, bias review, and human oversight [5,17]. These constructs apply to formal or semi-formal Abrahamic initiatives; they do not measure revelation, spiritual worth, salvation, or doctrinal superiority.

2.4 Critical Synthesis by Mechanisms

Theological integrity and productive difference. Comparative-theological and WCC traditions converge on a key principle: meaningful dialogue requires commitment, mutual respect, partner self-definition, and engagement with real difference rather than manufactured consensus [4,14,15]. The evidence is conceptually strong but empirically mixed because theological depth is commonly assessed through interpretive scholarship rather than standardised measures. The dispute is therefore not whether boundaries matter, but whether they can be operationalised without flattening doctrinal authority. Accordingly, SRQ1 and SRQ2 require source traceability, plurality representation, and explicit non-reduction controls.

Dialogue, trust, and peace-relevant outcomes. Quantitative evidence supports a multidimensional understanding of interreligious peace, but remains fragmented across violence, hostility, threat, trust, and cooperation, with institutions and religious actors comparatively understudied [1]. Contact research offers strong aggregate evidence for prejudice reduction [16], while peacebuilding reviews show that dialogue outcomes vary with context, leadership, power, and institutional embedding [3,6,18]. Evidence is therefore strong for conditional attitudinal outcomes but mixed for durable institutional or conflict outcomes. Accordingly, SRQ2 distinguishes process, capability, inclusion, outcome, and risk indicators rather than treating attendance as evidence of impact.

Institutionalisation and measurement governance. Evaluation scholarship supports theories of change, baselines, mixed evidence, and learning-oriented monitoring [6], whereas performance-measurement research warns that poorly aligned indicators can distort behaviour and conceal unintended consequences [7]. Prior IHF and ecumenical preprints establish relevant KPI-governance lineage within intra-Islamic and Christian settings but cannot establish cross-Abrahamic validity [10,11]. Evidence is strong regarding measurement-design risks but remains weak for validated theological KPI systems. Accordingly, SRQ3 connects each KPI to an accountable owner, evidence source, review forum, threshold logic, and corrective action.

2.5 Measurement and KPI Operationalisation

Four measurement families are central. Doctrinal clarity is best operationalised through document and corpus coding, but validity is threatened by translation error, source-selection bias, and unequal theological representation; multi-tradition review and inter-coder reliability are required. Dialogical quality is commonly inferred from attitudes, trust, interaction quality, and participation, but self-report designs face common-method and social-desirability bias; behavioural records, facilitator coding, and longitudinal follow-up should supplement



surveys. Institutional cooperation should be measured through active agreements, completed actions, continuity, and resource execution rather than partnership counts alone, which are vulnerable to symbolic inflation. Peace-relevant outcomes require disaggregated indicators of hostility, perceived threat, trust, cooperation, and recurrence rather than a single unity score [1].

The 280 IDDF indicators should first be validated at item level during initial validation. Composite scores should be introduced only after content validity, scale development, weighting transparency, sensitivity analysis, and measurement-invariance testing [12,19]. AI-assisted coding may improve consistency and scale, but model error, bias, drift, privacy, and contextual misclassification require lifecycle documentation and human theological review [5,17]. The proposed empirical evidence base comprises sacred-text and dialogue corpora, institutional documents, participant surveys, facilitator records, partnership logs, media content, and platform analytics.

2.6 Research Gaps to Research-Question Bridge

The literature establishes the value of dialogue, contact, institutional evaluation, and artefact design, but does not integrate them into a theologically bounded Abrahamic performance architecture. The PRQ therefore asks how Abrahamic dialogue can be designed as a KPI-oriented governance framework without numerically evaluating religious truth. SRQ1 addresses the architecture gap; SRQ2 addresses the construct and non-reduction gap; SRQ3 addresses data and accountability; and SRQ4 addresses AI, privacy, bias, and human oversight. Conceptually, source-traceable doctrinal clarity and KPI governance are expected to strengthen dialogical quality and institutional learning, which support cooperation and peace-relevant outcomes. The mechanism is moderated by theological-boundary integrity, context, data quality, institutional capacity, and human review. These are design propositions, not causal findings.

2.7 Micro-Agenda for Future Research

Future research priorities include balanced Islamic, Christian, and Jewish content validation; inter-coder reliability and survey-scale assessment; comparison of alternative weighting and non-compensatory aggregation rules; measurement-invariance testing across traditions and countries; longitudinal and quasi-experimental evaluation of dialogue programmes; examination of dialogical quality as a mechanism of institutional cooperation; auditing of AI-assisted coding for subgroup error, drift, and explainability; and comparison of dashboard-supported decisions with conventional narrative evaluation. Principal evidence risks include publication bias, common-method bias, institutional self-reporting, and premature generalisation from preprints or single-context cases.

3. Methodology

This study adopted a conceptual design-science research (DSR) design because the research question concerns the construction of a usable governance artefact rather than causal, associational, or predictive estimation [8,9,13]. The unit of analysis is the formal or semi-



formal Abrahamic doctrinal-dialogue initiative, with Christian–Muslim programmes as the initial application and broader Jewish–Christian–Muslim use treated as a future transferability question. The design corpus comprised the publicly registered Interfaith Doctrinal Dialogue Framework (IDDF), which provided the conceptual foundation for the present study [20], together with the consolidated five-domain/fourteen-axis architecture, the 280-KPI catalogue, and the verified methodological literature. No participants, institutional cases, surveys, operational databases, or field outcomes were included; therefore, sampling, statistical power, saturation, and causal identification were not applicable.

Artefact development followed four reproducible stages. First, the design objectives were derived from the PRQ and SRQs: doctrinal-source integrity, dialogical quality, institutional cooperation, measurable learning, non-reduction, and responsible digital governance. Second, the framework was organised into five strategic domains and fourteen specialist axes, while source traceability, hermeneutic transparency, dialogue-process quality, public literacy, digital governance, and safeguarding were treated as cross-cutting design requirements. Third, 280 candidate indicators were allocated across the axes and screened for construct relevance, unique naming, non-duplication, controllability, data-source feasibility, ownership, cadence, auditability, and the prohibition against scoring religious truth. Each proposed KPI requires a dictionary record containing its definition, formula or rubric, numerator and denominator where applicable, unit, provenance, disaggregation, owner, review cycle, limitations, privacy safeguards, and corrective-action rule. Fourth, the evaluation protocol comprises balanced Islamic, Christian, and Jewish expert review; content-validity assessment [19]; inter-coder reliability for textual measures; bilingual equivalence and measurement-invariance testing where applicable; transparent weighting and sensitivity analysis for any composite index [12]; and pilot usability testing of repositories, AI-assisted coding, and dashboards under human theological oversight [5].

The study reports artefact specification and evaluation readiness only. It does not claim empirical validity, institutional adoption, field performance, universal applicability, or validated thresholds. No human participants or personal data were involved in the conceptual design; accordingly, no human-subject protocol was undertaken. Future empirical deployment requires the relevant ethics determination or approval and must apply consent, data minimisation, de-identification, access control, retention limits, bias auditing, and versioned data lineage. The domain–axis map, KPI catalogue, dictionary schema, screening rules, and validation protocol constitute the replication materials. Because the study is conceptual, no statistical dataset or analysis code was generated.

4. Artefact Findings

4.1 Evidence Base and Artefact Scope

The findings are design-science artefact outputs rather than estimates derived from participants, institutional cases, surveys, or operational databases. The design evidence comprised the IDDF source manuscript, the consolidated architecture, and the completed KPI



catalogue. Because the study is conceptual, no empirical sample, comparison group, missing-data procedure, imputation method, or case-exclusion rule was applicable. Following design-science reporting conventions, the result is the specified artefact and its internal design checks, not evidence that the framework has improved dialogue outcomes [13]. Prior KPI-oriented architectures for intra-Islamic dialogue and Christian ecumenical governance establish conceptual lineage but do not constitute external validation of IDDF [10,11].

4.2 Measurement Checks and Quality Diagnostics

Because no field observations or respondent scores were analysed, quality assessment was limited to the artefact's structural properties. The audit confirmed five domains, fourteen axes, twenty indicators per axis, 280 unique KPI names, 280 unique abbreviations, and compliance with the "KPI Name (Abbreviation)" convention. The allocation was 60 indicators in the Theological–Textual domain, 60 in Ritual–Experiential, 60 in Institutional–Social, 40 in Media–Narrative, and 60 in Innovation and Development Economy. Cross-axis boundary checks distinguished doctrinal texts from lived spiritual experience, ritual protocols from phenomenological experience, institutional cooperation from peacebuilding, current media narratives from strategic foresight, and digital infrastructure from innovation and ESG performance. Targets, weights, thresholds, and composite scores remain provisional. These checks establish structural completeness and internal coherence only; they do not constitute psychometric confirmation, field validation, or evidence of institutional effectiveness.

4.3 Main Findings Mapped to the PRQ and SRQs

The first artefact finding answers the architecture component of the PRQ and SRQ1. IDDF comprises five higher-order content domains and fourteen specialist axes. Source traceability, hermeneutic transparency, dialogue-process quality, public literacy, digital governance, and safeguarding operate as cross-cutting requirements across the domain structure. The resulting design relation is fourteen axes multiplied by twenty indicators, producing a total of 280 candidate KPIs.

The second finding addresses SRQ2 by establishing a non-reductive measurement boundary. The catalogue measures observable governance objects source traceability, interpretive representation, ethical safeguards, dialogue quality, institutional execution, inclusion, risk, data integrity, responsible AI, and implementation learning. It explicitly excludes the truth, superiority, salvific validity, sanctity, or spiritual worth of any tradition. The architecture therefore operationalises conditions surrounding dialogue rather than doctrine itself. Compared with the earlier intra-Islamic and ecumenical KPI preprints [10,11], IDDF extends the measurement problem to a shared Abrahamic setting while preserving tradition-specific authority.

The third finding addresses SRQ3 by converting the KPI list into a governance architecture. Each indicator is required to have an operational definition, formula or rubric, numerator and denominator where applicable, unit, direction of improvement, data provenance, disaggregation rule, owner, review cadence, baseline, threshold or guardrail, validity threat,



privacy requirement, and corrective-action pathway. A layered reporting structure prevents the executive dashboard from displaying all 280 indicators simultaneously: a limited core set supports strategic oversight, operational indicators support programme management, and diagnostic indicators support root-cause, safeguarding, and learning reviews. Composite indices may be created only after validation and sensitivity testing; consistent with OECD guidance, no headline score should obscure a serious safeguard failure or replace disaggregated reporting [12].

The fourth finding addresses SRQ4 by embedding responsible digital enablement within the artefact. Natural-language processing, AI-assisted coding, retrieval, repositories, narrative analysis, and dashboards are permitted as decision-support functions, but outputs remain provisional until qualified human theological review. Required controls include data lineage, model documentation, consent, access restrictions, bias review, explainability, drift monitoring, override recording, and incident escalation. These controls align the artefact with the govern–map–measure–manage logic of the NIST AI Risk Management Framework [5].

4.4 Additional Analyses

The placement audit identified no duplicate KPI names or unresolved abbreviation collisions. Boundary analysis further showed that conceptually adjacent axes remain distinguishable when their evidence objects and interpretive limits are explicitly defined. Empirical robustness and subgroup analyses were outside the scope of the conceptual design. Future validation should compare alternative weighting rules, compensatory and safeguard-gated aggregation, and cross-tradition and cross-language measurement invariance before comparative reporting.

4.5 Results-to-Objectives Traceability

At the design level, the PRQ is answered by the completed non-reductive architecture. SRQ1 is answered by the five-domain/fourteen-axis ontology; SRQ2 by the 280 candidate indicators and explicit exclusion boundary; SRQ3 by the dictionary, ownership, cadence, provenance, aggregation, and escalation requirements; and SRQ4 by the human-supervised AI and privacy controls. Effectiveness, usability, reliability, institutional adoption, and peace-relevant outcomes fall outside the scope of the conceptual design and require field implementation.

4.6 Transparency, Ethics, and Data Availability

No participant, personal, confidential, or institutionally restricted data were analysed. The domain–axis map, KPI catalogue, naming conventions, boundary rules, and validation pathway constitute the replication materials. Because the study is conceptual, no statistical code or analytic dataset was generated. Future deployments must anonymise participants and institutions where disclosure could create safety, reputational, or intergroup risk and must apply controlled access to sensitive theological or dialogue records.



5. Discussion

5.1 Summary of Principal Findings

The study produced five principal design findings. First, IDDF organises Abrahamic doctrinal dialogue into five strategic domains, fourteen specialist axes, and 280 candidate KPIs. Second, it establishes a non-reduction boundary: indicators assess source integrity, process quality, institutional capability, inclusion, risk, data governance, and implementation rather than the truth or salvific status of a tradition. Third, layered reporting separates strategic oversight from programme management and diagnostic analysis. Fourth, KPI dictionary requirements convert a list of indicators into an accountable decision architecture through definitions, provenance, ownership, cadence, safeguards, and corrective action. Fifth, AI-assisted retrieval, coding, and dashboarding are permitted only as human-supervised decision support. Because no field test was conducted, the study does not establish effectiveness, psychometric validity, threshold performance, or institutional adoption.

5.2 Interpretation and Mechanisms

The artefact addresses the study's design problem by separating theological objects from the governable conditions surrounding dialogue. This separation allows the framework to document whether sources were represented accurately, disagreement was preserved, participation was equitable, commitments were executed, and risks were escalated without claiming that disagreement has been theologically resolved. The design also makes institutional learning cumulative by connecting individual indicators to documentary evidence, responsible owners, review forums, and subsequent action.

A further proposition requiring empirical testing is that source-traceable doctrinal clarity and governed KPI use may strengthen dialogical quality and institutional learning, which may in turn support sustained cooperation and peace-relevant outcomes. This pathway remains contingent on tradition-specific legitimacy, facilitator quality, participant safety, data quality, and institutional capacity. The framework's initial value therefore lies in disciplined observability and accountability rather than demonstrated outcome improvement.

5.3 Comparison with Prior Literature

The artefact design aligns with design-science research, which treats an explicitly specified artefact and its design principles as a legitimate knowledge contribution while requiring evaluation proportionate to the claims made [13]. IDDF extends this logic into a domain where the artefact must also respect theological authority. Its non-reduction rule is consistent with WCC guidance that dialogue should preserve commitment, mutual respect, partner self-definition, and the integrity of religious traditions [4].

The framework also responds to limitations identified in interreligious-peace research. Köbrich and Hoffmann found that the evidence base is fragmented across violence, hostility, threat, trust, and cooperation and that religious actors and institutions remain comparatively understudied [1]. Driessen similarly presents interreligious dialogue as a potentially important but context-dependent peacebuilding mechanism rather than an automatic solution to conflict



[18]. IDDF therefore avoids treating attendance or contact as sufficient evidence of improvement. This qualifies a contact-centred interpretation: intergroup contact is generally associated with lower prejudice, but contact alone does not establish doctrinal accuracy, institutional execution, or durable governance [16].

The artefact design is also consistent with evaluation and performance-measurement scholarship. KAICIID's work links monitoring and evaluation to accountability and learning [6], while Franco-Santos et al. show that performance systems can influence behaviour and organisational capabilities but may also generate unintended consequences [7]. IDDF addresses this tension through item-level measures, disaggregated reporting, safeguard gates, and staged validation. Its conceptual lineage is visible in prior intra-Islamic and ecumenical KPI preprints [10,11], but the Abrahamic extension raises a more demanding problem of cross-tradition validity and authority.

5.4 Alternative Explanations and Rival Mechanisms

One rival explanation is that IDDF merely translates dialogue practice into managerial vocabulary. The catalogue's scale may reinforce that criticism unless the KPI dictionary demonstrates that every measure supports a theological or institutional decision. A second explanation is that trust and cooperation arise primarily from skilled facilitation and repeated high-quality contact, not from measurement architecture. IDDF cannot presently distinguish these mechanisms. A third is that legitimacy depends more on representative co-design than on technical completeness; a structurally coherent framework may still fail if communities perceive asymmetric ownership or externally imposed categories. These rivals do not invalidate the artefact, but they show that future evaluation must compare IDDF-supported programmes with conventional dialogue practice and must test stakeholder legitimacy as a condition of use.

5.5 Theoretical Implications

The study makes four calibrated theoretical contributions. First, it extends DSR by specifying theological integrity as a constitutive design requirement rather than an external ethical constraint. Second, it reframes interfaith dialogue as a multilevel governance process linking doctrinal evidence, interaction quality, institutional action, public narrative, and risk. Third, it introduces non-reductive operationalisation: measurement validity depends not only on psychometric performance but also on whether the intended interpretation excludes judgments about religious truth. Related comparative design-science work similarly treats legitimate religious difference as a governable boundary rather than a performance deficit [21]. Fourth, the study qualifies contact and peacebuilding perspectives by proposing institutional learning and governance capability as mechanisms between dialogical encounter and longer-term cooperation. Each contribution follows from the artefact findings and addresses the literature-review gap between theological interpretation and auditable decision systems.

5.6 Practical and Policy Implications

Implementation should proceed in controlled phases, consistent with evidence-governed dialogue architectures that connect decision rights, audit trails, safeguard gates, and



institutional learning [22]. In Phase 1, a plural IDDF steering council should approve and formally govern the ontology and complete dictionary records for a limited core set of KPIs, using authoritative source corpora, programme mandates, and governance records. Completion, source traceability, and theological-boundary documentation should guide the initial review. The main failure mode is token compliance without genuine multi-tradition authority. In Phase 2, theological reviewers and a dialogue programme office should pilot the core indicators in one bounded initiative, using structured minutes, facilitator logs, participant feedback, action registers, and safeguarding records; feasibility, missingness, reviewer agreement, burden, and decision usefulness should determine continuation. In Phase 3, a data and AI steward may implement controlled repositories, AI-assisted coding, and dashboard drill-downs; data-lineage completeness, human-review coverage, access-control compliance, model error, override rates, and incident closure should govern deployment. No cross-institutional ranking should occur before content validity, invariance, weighting, and sensitivity requirements are met. OECD guidance supports transparent and disaggregated composite design [12], while NIST supports lifecycle risk governance and accountable human oversight [5].

5.7 Boundary Conditions, Limitations, and Threats to Validity

The findings are limited to artefact completeness and internal coherence. They do not establish construct validity, reliability, causal performance, cross-cultural equivalence, usability, or institutional legitimacy. The initial Christian–Muslim emphasis limits tri-Abrahamic generalisation until Jewish scholarship and institutions participate substantively. Equal allocation of twenty indicators per axis supports catalogue balance but is not evidence that the domains deserve equal empirical weight. The large catalogue may create reporting burden, metric gaming, and false precision. Translation, source selection, power asymmetry, common-method bias, and non-response could systematically inflate apparent success. These limitations may overstate coherence and practical readiness; consequently, claims must remain at the level of design specification and evaluation readiness.

5.8 Ethics, Governance, and Responsible Use

IDDF should be governed by purpose limitation, consent where applicable, data minimisation, role-based access, retention controls, audit trails, and safeguards for vulnerable participants. Composite scores must not conceal harm or allow strong publicity, funding, or participation figures to compensate for doctrinal misrepresentation, exclusion, or safety failure. AI may support retrieval, multilingual comparison, coding, and anomaly detection, but it may not replace theological judgment or institutional accountability. Any future deployment should document model purpose, training or reference data, error patterns, human overrides, and appeal mechanisms.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Key Findings

This study asked how Abrahamic theological dialogue can be designed as a KPI-oriented governance framework that supports doctrinal clarity, dialogical quality, institutional



cooperation, and peace-relevant learning without reducing religious truth to numerical evaluation. IDDF answers this design question through five strategic domains, fourteen specialist axes, and 280 candidate KPIs. It establishes a non-reduction boundary, distinguishes strategic, operational, and diagnostic reporting functions, requires auditable KPI dictionary records, and limits AI-assisted retrieval, coding, and dashboarding to human-supervised decision support. SRQ1 is addressed by the domain–axis ontology, SRQ2 by the 280 candidate indicators and exclusion of truth-status scoring, SRQ3 by provenance, ownership, cadence, aggregation, and escalation controls, and SRQ4 by privacy, bias, transparency, and human-oversight requirements. No empirical effectiveness, statistical validity, institutional adoption, or peace outcome was established.

6.2 Scholarly Contributions

The study makes three contributions. First, it extends design-science research by treating theological integrity as a constitutive design requirement [13]. Second, it develops prior intra-Islamic and ecumenical KPI architectures [10,11] into an Abrahamic framework while preserving tradition-specific authority. Third, it introduces non-reductive operationalisation: measurement is legitimate only when it evaluates evidence, governance, process, capability, risk, and implementation without converting religious truth into a composite score. The literature is therefore advanced from dialogue as aspiration or event toward dialogue as a bounded, auditable, and validation-ready institutional artefact.

6.3 Recommendations for Practitioners and Policymakers

In the short term, a plural IDDF steering council should approve and govern the ontology and complete dictionary records for a limited core KPI set, prioritising Sacred-Text Citation Traceability Rate, Theological Boundary Statement Completion, and Decision-Rights Clarity Index; token representation and incomplete source authority are the principal risks. Within 6–18 months, a dialogue programme office should pilot the core indicators in one bounded initiative and track Dialogue Psychological Safety Index, Interinstitutional Action Completion Rate, Dialogue Data Completeness, and participant burden. Theological reviewers and data stewards should establish controlled corpora, access rules, versioned lineage, and human-review coverage before AI-assisted coding. Composite reporting should begin only after content validity, measurement invariance, weighting sensitivity, and safeguard-gated aggregation have been demonstrated. AI deployment should follow documented governance, measurement, monitoring, and accountability principles [5].

6.4 Limitations

The study is limited to conceptual artefact specification and internal structural checks. It includes no participants, implemented cases, field observations, psychometric tests, causal identification, or comparative outcomes. Its initial Christian–Muslim emphasis limits tri-Abrahamic transferability until Jewish participation is substantively incorporated. Equal allocation of twenty KPIs per axis supports catalogue completeness but does not establish equal empirical importance. Reporting burden, metric gaming, false precision, translation



bias, source-selection bias, and asymmetric ownership may also affect implementation. Claims must therefore remain at the level of evaluation readiness.

6.5 Directions for Future Research

Future work should undertake a balanced three-tradition content-validity study; test multilingual textual indicators through independent coding; pilot a limited core subset of candidate KPIs longitudinally across contrasting institutions; compare IDDF-supported and conventional dialogue programmes; test cross-language and cross-tradition measurement invariance; and audit AI-assisted coding for subgroup error, drift, privacy, explainability, and human override. These studies should report negative cases, feasibility, burden, and decision usefulness before extending validation to all 280 KPIs.

6.6 Closing Synthesis

IDDF provides a disciplined architecture for making Abrahamic dialogue more observable and accountable while retaining the theological boundaries that give dialogue integrity. Its immediate value is not a claim of proven unity, but a reproducible specification of what institutions must define, govern, validate, and safeguard before measurable improvement can credibly be asserted. The study advances the literature by recasting Abrahamic theological dialogue as a non-reductive, auditable design problem and enables institutions to govern dialogue through clearer evidence, accountability, and safeguards.

References

- [1] Köbrich J, Hoffmann L. What do we know about religion and interreligious peace? A review of the quantitative literature. *Politics and Religion*. 2023;16(4):708-732. doi:10.1017/S1755048323000238.
- [2] Orton A. Interfaith dialogue: seven key questions for theory, policy and practice. *Religion, State & Society*. 2016;44(4):349-365. doi:10.1080/09637494.2016.1242886.
- [3] Abu-Nimer M. Conflict resolution, culture, and religion: toward a training model of interreligious peacebuilding. *Journal of Peace Research*. 2001;38(6):685-704. doi:10.1177/0022343301038006003.
- [4] World Council of Churches. Guidelines for dialogue and relations with people of other religions. Geneva: World Council of Churches; 2002.
- [5] Tabassi E. Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0). Gaithersburg (MD): National Institute of Standards and Technology; 2023. doi:10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1.
- [6] Abu-Nimer M, Nelson RK, editors. Evaluating interreligious peacebuilding and dialogue: methods and frameworks. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter; 2021. doi:10.1515/9783110624625.
- [7] Hevner AR, March ST, Park J, Ram S. Design science in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*. 2004;28(1):75-105. doi:10.2307/25148625.
- [8] Peffers K, Tuunanen T, Rothenberger MA, Chatterjee S. A design science research methodology for information systems research. *Journal of Management Information Systems*. 2007;24(3):45-77. doi:10.2753/MIS0742-1222240302.
- [9] Franco-Santos M, Lucianetti L, Bourne M. Contemporary performance measurement systems: a review of their consequences and a framework for research. *Management Accounting Research*. 2012;23(2):79-119. doi:10.1016/j.mar.2012.04.001.



- [10] MoghadasNian SAH, AlizadehMousavi SM, HosseinPoor SMM, Bagheri A. Islamic Hīwār Framework (IHF): a KPI-based strategic architecture for intra-faith dialogue, institutional governance, and civilizational unity [preprint]. SSRN; 2025. doi:10.2139/ssrn.6011734.
- [11] MoghadasNian SAH, AlizadehMousavi SM, HosseinPoor SMM, Bagheri A. Ecumenical performance analytics: a KPI framework for Christian unity and institutional dialogue [preprint]. SSRN; 2025. doi:10.2139/ssrn.6012834.
- [12] OECD, European Union, European Commission Joint Research Centre. Handbook on constructing composite indicators: methodology and user guide. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2008. doi:10.1787/9789264043466-en.
- [13] Driessen MD. Interreligious dialogue, conflict resolution and peacebuilding: a review. Religions. 2025;16(2):150. doi:10.3390/rel16020150.
- [14] Clooney FX. Comparative theology: deep learning across religious borders. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell; 2010. doi:10.1002/9781444318951.
- [15] Cornille C, editor. The Wiley-Blackwell companion to inter-religious dialogue. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell; 2013. doi:10.1002/9781118529911.
- [16] Pettigrew TF, Tropp LR. A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 2006;90(5):751-783. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751.
- [17] Gregor S, Hevner AR. Positioning and presenting design science research for maximum impact. MIS Quarterly. 2013;37(2):337-355. doi:10.25300/MISQ/2013/37.2.01.
- [18] Boateng GO, Neilands TB, Frongillo EA, Melgar-Quinonez HR, Young SL. Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: a primer. Frontiers in Public Health. 2018;6:149. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149.
- [19] Raji ID, Smart A, White RN, Mitchell M, Gebru T, Hutchinson B, et al. Closing the AI accountability gap: defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency. 2020:33-44. doi:10.1145/3351095.3372873.
- [20] MoghadasNian SAH. Interfaith Doctrinal Dialogue Framework (IDDF): a KPI-oriented architecture for Abrahamic unity. University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.13026.85443.
- [21] MoghadasNian SAH, AlizadehMousavi SM, HosseinPoor SMM, Farmanian M, Bagheri A. Governing legitimate difference: a comparative design-science framework for Islamic taqrib, Christian ecumenism and the Karamah of Difference Index. 2026. Zenodo. doi:10.5281/zenodo.21094920.
- [22] MoghadasNian SAH. TGE-360: a mature, executable and evidence-governed Taqrīb Governance Ecosystem. University of Religions and Denominations; 2026. ResearchGate. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.30521.53601.

Appendix

Appendix A. Candidate Indicator Architecture for the Interfaith Doctrinal Dialogue Framework (IDDF)

Appendix A presents a catalogue of 280 candidate indicators designed to operationalise the Interfaith Doctrinal Dialogue Framework (IDDF) as an evidence-governed and ethically safeguarded architecture for Abrahamic doctrinal dialogue. The catalogue is organised across fourteen specialist axes within five higher-order domains: Theological–Textual; Ritual–Experiential; Institutional–Social; Media–Narrative; and Innovation and Development Economy.



Each axis contains twenty candidate indicators, producing a total architecture of 280 KPIs. Under the proposed tiering rule, indicators 01–04 in each axis are classified as Executive/Core, indicators 05–10 as Management/Operational, and indicators 11–20 as Diagnostic/Risk/Learning, yielding 56, 84, and 140 indicators, respectively. The item-level tier assignment is provided in Supplementary Material S1. These indicators assess evidence quality, source traceability, interpretive representation, dialogue-process quality, institutional continuity, inclusion, implementation, data integrity, responsible digital enablement, and conditions requiring review or escalation, including doctrinal misclassification, coercive convergence, semantic distortion, unresolved conflict, exclusion, privacy breaches, data misuse, algorithmic bias, and unreviewed AI-generated theological claims.

The indicators are restricted to observable governance, evidence, process, capability, risk, implementation, and safeguard objects. They do not quantify doctrinal truth, revelation, sanctity, piety, sincerity, orthodoxy, salvific status, spiritual worth, or divine acceptance. The catalogue may not be used to rank religious traditions or represent legitimate theological disagreement as a performance deficit. Measurement therefore remains subordinate to qualified theological authority, tradition-specific integrity, partner self-definition, and the ethical protection of legitimate plurality.

For implementation, each indicator requires an operational definition, calculation rule or assessment rubric, evidence source, owner, accountable authority, reporting cadence, provisional threshold or guardrail, validity threat, misuse risk, privacy requirement, and corrective or escalation response. These fields and the tier assignment are documented in Supplementary Material S1.

The catalogue constitutes a candidate design artefact, not an empirically validated scale or evidence of institutional effectiveness. Future validation requires balanced Islamic, Christian, and Jewish expert review, Delphi assessment, content-validity testing, bilingual and semantic review, inter-coder reliability analysis, measurement-invariance testing, controlled piloting, and context-sensitive threshold calibration. Its purpose is not to quantify theology, but to make the institutional processes surrounding Abrahamic doctrinal dialogue more traceable, accountable, reviewable, and capable of disciplined learning.

Strategic Dimensions & KPI Groups

Domain 1 — Theological–Textual

1. Scriptural and Doctrinal Convergence

(Strategic Dimension: Source Integrity, Hermeneutical Transparency, Doctrinal Clarity)

- Sacred-Text Citation Traceability Rate (STCTR)
- Cross-Tradition Source Coverage Ratio (CTSCR)
- Doctrinal Term Equivalence Mapping Completion (DTEMC)
- Hermeneutic Method Disclosure Rate (HMDR)
- Contextual Exegesis Compliance Rate (CECR)
- Primary-Source Reliance Ratio (PSRR)
- Contested Doctrine Clarification Completion (CDCC)
- Interpretive Diversity Representation Score (IDRS)
- Translation Accuracy Validation Rate (TAVR)
- Source Authentication Exception Rate (SAER)
- Cross-Reference Concordance Score (CRCS)
- Doctrinal Misquotation Rate (DMR)
- Theological Category-Error Incidence Rate (TCEIR)
- Theological Boundary Statement Completion (TBSC)
- Unresolved Doctrine Documentation Rate (UDDR)
- Reciprocal Interpretation Review Rate (RIRR)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Scholar Agreement on Source Coding (SASC)
- Doctrinal Knowledge-Base Currency Rate (DKBCR)
- Sacred-Text Data Provenance Completeness (STDPC)
- Scriptural Dialogue Learning Gain (SDLG)

2. Teleological and Ethical Systems

(Strategic Dimension: Ethical Convergence, Human Dignity, Common-Good Impact)

- Shared Ethical Principle Mapping Completion (SEPMC)
- Moral Teleology Alignment Score (MTAS)
- Human Dignity Commitment Coverage (HDCC)
- Justice Principle Convergence Score (JPCS)
- Compassion-and-Mercy Action Translation Rate (CMATR)
- Peace Ethics Operationalisation Rate (PEOR)
- Freedom-of-Conscience Safeguard Compliance (FCSC)
- Minority Rights Safeguard Coverage (MRSC)
- Joint Ethical Position Adoption Rate (JEPAR)
- Ethical Commitment Implementation Rate (ECIR)
- Ethical Dilemma Resolution Cycle Time (EDRCT)
- Interfaith Social-Benefit Realisation Rate (ISBRR)
- Ethical Reciprocity Score (ERS)
- Moral Asymmetry Risk Incidence (MARI)
- Rights–Responsibilities Balance Index (RRBI)
- Shared Common-Good Project Rate (SCGPR)
- Ethical Impact Assessment Completion (EIAC)
- Beneficiary-Reported Ethical Value Score (BREVS)
- Unintended-Harm Mitigation Closure Rate (UHMCR)
- Ethical Policy Influence Rate (EPIR)

3. Mystical Convergence

(Strategic Dimension: Mystical Theology, Spiritual Literacy, Boundary Preservation)

- Mystical Vocabulary Mapping Completion (MVMC)
- Mystical Concept Semantic Resonance Score (MCSRS)
- Apophatic-Theology Dialogue Coverage (ATDC)
- Divine-Love Theme Convergence Score (DLTCS)
- Spiritual Anthropology Comparison Completion (SACC)
- Mystical Source Citation Traceability Rate (MSCTR)
- Tradition-Specific Boundary Preservation Rate (TSBPR)
- Cross-Tradition Mystical Text Review Rate (CTMTRR)
- Experiential Claim Verification-Protocol Compliance (ECVPC)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Mystical Reductionism Risk Incidence (MRRI)
- Joint Mystical Scholarship Output Rate (JMSOR)
- Mystical Dialogue Session Quality Score (MDSQS)
- Contemplative Literacy Gain (CLG)
- Spiritual-Practice Understanding Score (SPUS)
- Religious Misappropriation Incident Rate (RMISR)
- Mystical Terminology Misinterpretation Rate (MTMR)
- Scholar Diversity in Mystical Panels (SDMP)
- Mystical Heritage Inclusion Coverage (MHIC)
- Mystical Dialogue Follow-Up Completion (MDFUC)
- Mystical Convergence Learning Index (MCLI)

Domain 2 — Ritual–Experiential

4. Ritual and Liturgical Synergy

(Strategic Dimension: Ritual Literacy, Liturgical Safeguards, Reciprocal Accommodation)

- Ritual Literacy Assessment Score (RLAS)
- Ritual Boundary Disclosure Rate (RBDR)
- Worship-Space Protocol Compliance (WSPC)
- Observance Calendar Coordination Rate (OCCR)
- Dietary Accommodation Compliance (DIAC)
- Sacred-Time Respect Rate (STRR)
- Ritual Participation Consent Compliance (RPCC)
- Non-Coercion Safeguard Compliance (NCSC)
- Ritual Misrepresentation Incident Rate (RMITR)
- Interfaith Visit Accessibility Rate (IVAR)
- Liturgical Explanation Accuracy Score (LEAS)
- Reciprocal Observation Opportunity Rate (ROOR)
- Joint Non-Worship Service Participation Rate (JNWSPR)
- Ritual Sensitivity Training Completion (RSTC)
- Clergy Approval Compliance Rate (CACR)
- Ritual Event Incident-Free Rate (REIFR)
- Participant Ritual Understanding Gain (PRUG)
- Ritual Accommodation Satisfaction Score (RASS)
- Sacred-Object Handling Compliance (SOHC)
- Ritual Synergy Governance Maturity Index (RSGMI)

5. Sacred and Mystical Experience

(Strategic Dimension: Sacred Experience, Phenomenological Understanding, Psychological Safety)

- Sacred-Experience Narrative Capture Rate (SENCR)



- Phenomenological Coding Reliability Score (PCRS)
- Spiritual-Experience Diversity Coverage (SEDC)
- Participant Psychological Safety Score (PPSS)
- Confidentiality Compliance for Experience Data (CCED)
- Informed Consent Completion Rate (ICCR)
- Experience Interpretation Neutrality Score (EINS)
- Cross-Tradition Experience Comparison Quality (CTECQ)
- Sacred-Experience Misclassification Rate (SEMR)
- Spiritual-Harm Referral Readiness (SHRR)
- Contemplative Session Facilitation Quality (CSFQ)
- Participant Meaning-Making Gain (PMMG)
- Experience-Based Empathy Shift (EBES)
- Spiritual Encounter Trust Score (SETS)
- Experience Debrief Completion Rate (EDCR)
- Trauma-Informed Facilitation Compliance (TIFC)
- Sacred-Experience Data Anonymisation Rate (SEDAR)
- Experiential Claim Boundary Adherence (ECBA)
- Longitudinal Spiritual Understanding Retention (LSUR)
- Sacred-Experience Dialogue Value Index (SEDVI)

6. Psychology of Dialogue

(Strategic Dimension: Bias Reduction, Trust Building, Dialogical Readiness)

- Pre-Dialogue Bias Baseline Completion (PDBBC)
- Implicit Bias Reduction Rate (IBRR)
- Outgroup Trust Improvement Rate (OTIR)
- Perspective-Taking Gain (PTG)
- Cognitive Flexibility Improvement (CFI)
- Defensive Reactivity Reduction Rate (DRRR)
- Empathic Accuracy Score (EAS)
- Active Listening Compliance Rate (ALCR)
- Dialogue Psychological Safety Index (DPSI)
- Dialogue Fatigue Rate (DFR)
- Participant Dropout Rate (PDR)
- Hostility Escalation Incident Rate (HEIR)
- Stereotype Endorsement Reduction (SER)
- Intergroup Anxiety Reduction (IAR)
- Willingness-to-Reengage Rate (WRR)
- Difficult-Question Tolerance Score (DQTS)



- Facilitator Intervention Effectiveness (FIE)
- Post-Dialogue Attitude Retention Rate (PDARR)
- Psychological Risk Referral Closure Rate (PRRCR)
- Dialogue Mindset Maturity Index (DMMI)

Domain 3 — Institutional–Social

7. Interreligious Diplomacy and Institutional Cooperation

(Strategic Dimension: Religious Diplomacy, Institutional Governance, Partnership Execution)

- Formal Partnership Formation Rate (FPFR)
- Memorandum-of-Understanding Activation Rate (MUAR)
- Joint Governance Body Functionality Score (JGBFS)
- Decision-Rights Clarity Index (DRCI)
- Institutional Representation Balance (IRB)
- Senior Leadership Participation Rate (SLPR)
- Joint Policy Adoption Rate (JPAR)
- Policy Adoption Cycle Time (PACT)
- Interinstitutional Action Completion Rate (IACR)
- Shared Budget Execution Rate (SBER)
- Partnership Continuity Rate (PCR)
- Joint Secretariat Service-Level Attainment (JSSLA)
- Institutional Trust Score (ITS)
- Data-Sharing Agreement Compliance (DSAC)
- Cross-Institutional Dispute Resolution Time (CIDRT)
- Partnership Dependency Concentration Risk (PDCR)
- Joint Programme Portfolio Diversification (JPPD)
- Executive Review Cadence Compliance (ERCC)
- Institutional Knowledge Retention Rate (IKRR)
- Cooperation Maturity Index (CMI)

8. Social Empowerment and Marginalised Inclusion

(Strategic Dimension: Inclusion, Equity, Community Empowerment)

- Women Participation Rate (WPR)
- Youth Participation Rate (YPR)
- Minority Tradition Representation Rate (MTRR)
- Disability Accessibility Compliance (DISAC)
- Marginalised Community Representation Coverage (MCRC)
- Geographic Inclusion Index (GII)
- Socioeconomic Inclusion Score (SIS)
- Leadership Diversity Rate (LDR)



- Speaking-Time Equity Index (STEI)
- Agenda Influence Equity Score (AIES)
- Safe Participation Incident Rate (SPIR)
- Community Co-Design Rate (CCDR)
- Beneficiary Voice Integration Rate (BVIR)
- Inclusion Barrier Closure Rate (IBCR)
- Participant Retention Equity Score (PRES)
- Capacity-Building Completion for Underrepresented Groups (CBCUG)
- Microgrant Access Equity (MAE)
- Community Empowerment Outcome Score (CEOS)
- Inclusion Satisfaction Gap (ISG)
- Social Inclusion Maturity Index (SIMI)

9. Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding

(Strategic Dimension: Conflict Prevention, Mediation Effectiveness, Peacebuilding Resilience)

- Conflict Early-Warning Signal Detection Rate (CEWSDR)
- Mediation Intake-to-Action Time (MIAT)
- Mediation Agreement Rate (MAR)
- Agreement Implementation Rate (AIR)
- Interfaith Conflict Recurrence Rate (ICRR)
- Violence De-Escalation Rate (VDER)
- Hate-Incident Reduction Rate (HIRR)
- Joint Crisis-Response Activation Time (JCRAT)
- Peace Committee Coverage Rate (PCCR)
- Local Mediator Readiness Score (LMRS)
- Conflict-Sensitive Theology Review Compliance (CSTRC)
- Do-No-Harm Assessment Completion (DNHAC)
- Grievance Resolution Cycle Time (GRCT)
- Peacebuilding Beneficiary Trust Score (PBTS)
- Rumour Containment Time (RCT)
- Post-Conflict Reconciliation Participation Rate (PCRPR)
- Restorative Action Completion Rate (RACR)
- Safeguarding Breach Closure Rate (SBCR)
- Peace Dividend Realisation Index (PDRI)
- Interfaith Resilience Index (IRI)

Domain 4 — Media–Narrative

10. Cultural and Media Representation



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

(Strategic Dimension: Media Accuracy, Narrative Balance, Public Trust)

- Balanced Religious Representation Rate (BRRR)
- Source Diversity in Media Coverage (SDMC)
- Religious Stereotype Incidence Rate (RSIR)
- Hate-Speech Exposure Rate (HSER)
- Positive–Negative Sentiment Delta (PNSD)
- Factual Correction Turnaround Time (FCTT)
- Religious Terminology Accuracy Score (RTAS)
- Contextualisation Compliance Rate (CCR)
- Joint Media Production Rate (JMPR)
- Interfaith Content Reach (ICR)
- Constructive Engagement Rate (CER)
- Misinformation Detection Precision (MDP)
- Misinformation Correction Effectiveness (MCE)
- Narrative Polarisation Index (NPI)
- Minority Voice Share (MVS)
- Responsible Visual Representation Compliance (RVRC)
- Media Literacy Learning Gain (MLLG)
- Editorial Safeguard Compliance (ESC)
- Digital Harassment Response Time (DHRT)
- Narrative Trust Index (NTI)

11. Interfaith Futures and Strategic Foresight

(Strategic Dimension: Strategic Foresight, Scenario Readiness, Long-Term Resilience)

- Horizon-Scanning Coverage (HSC)
- Emerging Risk Identification Rate (ERIR)
- Scenario Portfolio Completeness (SPC)
- Scenario Diversity Score (SDS)
- Assumption Traceability Rate (ATR)
- Early Signal Validation Rate (ESVR)
- Scenario Review Cadence Compliance (SRCC)
- Strategic Foresight Participation Diversity (SFPD)
- Vision-to-Action Alignment Score (VAAS)
- Scenario-Linked Initiative Rate (SLIR)
- Strategic Option Readiness Index (SORI)
- Foresight Decision Adoption Rate (FDAR)
- Scenario Realisation Ratio (SRR)
- Forecast Calibration Accuracy (FCA)



- Black-Swan Preparedness Index (BSPI)
- Contingency Plan Activation Readiness (CPAR)
- Intergenerational Impact Review Completion (IIRC)
- Future Skills Readiness Index (FSRI)
- Long-Term Partnership Resilience Score (LTPRS)
- Foresight Maturity Index (FMI)

Domain 5 — Innovation and Developmental Economy

12. Technological and AI Enablement

(Strategic Dimension: Digital Enablement, Data Governance, Responsible AI)

- Digital Platform Adoption Rate (DPAR)
- Active User Engagement Rate (AUER)
- Dialogue Data Completeness (DDC)
- Dialogue Data Quality Score (DDQS)
- Metadata Standards Compliance (MSC)
- Data Lineage Completeness (DLC)
- AI Model Documentation Completeness (AMDC)
- Human-in-the-Loop Review Rate (HLRR)
- AI-Assisted Coding Accuracy (AACA)
- Algorithmic Bias Exception Rate (ABER)
- Explainability Coverage Rate (ECR)
- Privacy Consent Compliance (PCC)
- Sensitive Data Protection Compliance (SDPC)
- Cybersecurity Incident Rate (CYIR)
- Digital Accessibility Compliance (DIGAC)
- Real-Time Analytics Availability (RTAA)
- Dashboard Data Freshness (DDF)
- Model Drift Detection Time (MDDT)
- AI Recommendation Override Rate (AROR)
- Responsible AI Maturity Index (RAMI)

13. Faith-Based Innovation Ecosystems

(Strategic Dimension: Faith-Based Innovation, Social Finance, Ecosystem Scaling)

- Joint Innovation Challenge Rate (JICR)
- Cross-Faith Startup Formation Rate (CFSFR)
- Waqf–Ecclesial Asset Mobilisation Ratio (WEAMR)
- Innovation Funding Leverage (IFL)
- Joint Research-and-Development Project Rate (JRDPR)
- Prototype-to-Pilot Conversion Rate (PPCR)



**5th International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Pilot-to-Scale Conversion Rate (PSCR)
- Social Innovation Beneficiary Reach (SIBR)
- Faith-Based Venture Survival Rate (FBVSR)
- Inclusive Innovation Participation Rate (IIPR)
- Intellectual Property Agreement Cycle Time (IPACT)
- Cross-Institutional Innovation Network Density (CIIND)
- Ethical Innovation Review Compliance (EIRC)
- Innovation Portfolio Alignment Score (IPAS)
- Social Return on Investment (SRI)
- Blended Finance Mobilisation Rate (BFMR)
- Joint Corporate-Social-Responsibility Initiative Completion (JCSRIC)
- Knowledge Transfer Rate (KTR)
- Innovation Ecosystem Trust Score (IETS)
- Faith-Based Innovation Maturity Index (FBIMI)

14. Joint Interfaith ESG Metrics

(Strategic Dimension: Environmental Stewardship, Social Responsibility, Governance Assurance)

- Joint ESG Framework Adoption Rate (JEFAR)
- Climate Action Commitment Coverage (CACC)
- Carbon Emissions Reduction Rate (CERR)
- Renewable Energy Adoption Rate (REAR)
- Green Worship-Facility Coverage (GWFC)
- Sustainable Procurement Compliance (SUPC)
- Water Stewardship Improvement Rate (WSIR)
- Waste Diversion Rate (WDR)
- Biodiversity Protection Initiative Rate (BPIR)
- Community Investment Rate (COIR)
- Human Rights Due-Diligence Completion (HRDDC)
- Child and Vulnerable-Person Safeguarding Compliance (CVPSC)
- Ethical Finance Screening Compliance (EFSC)
- ESG Data Assurance Rate (EDAR)
- ESG Disclosure Timeliness (EDT)
- Joint Climate Advocacy Reach (JCAR)
- Green Waqf-Church Fund Mobilisation (GWCFM)
- Climate Justice Beneficiary Impact Score (CJBIS)
- ESG Controversy Resolution Time (ECRT)
- Interfaith ESG Performance Index (IEPI)