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Is Early Warning Difficult/Necessary?

1. Cost Effectiveness Argument

2. Targeted Policy Options

3. Mainstreaming

4. Inverse U Curve - signals/noise ratio

5. Type I and Type II Errors
Current Issues
Timely and Relevant Analysis
Policy Impact
Methodologically Sound and Sustainable Approach
Applications for Risk Assessments

- early warning capabilities require a systematic, multi factor, and integrated approach

- the necessary framework would incorporate both the historical context and specific local interactions associated with failure

- CIFP risk assessments focus on structural transformation, and are complementary to early warning methodologies, which focus on anticipating violent escalations and providing strategic responses
Analytical Needs

a) an understanding of three elements: (i) conflict generating factors as specified above; (ii) stakeholder agendas and grievances; and (iii) peace generating factors (structural and dynamic peace developments, effectiveness of peace-making/building activities, etc.) and;

b) a range of data sources and analytical methods, such as (i) micro-level assessments (e.g. events and perceptions not covered by the media); (ii) intermediate and micro-level events (such as those covered by newswire reports e.g. Reuters, ITAR-TASS, BBC and expert analysts); and (iii) macro-level trends using structural data and leading indicators
Early Warning/Risk Assessment Typology

**Macro or long-term processes** associated with system-structure transformations and the associated problems of the emergence of weak states;

**Intermediate mechanisms** associated with institutional viability and state weakness; and

**Micro or short term selection processes** and mechanisms that account for preferences of violence over pacific forms of strategic interactions and the subsequent escalation and/or duration of ethnic hatreds, violence, repression, and war at specific points in time.
Early Warning/Risk Assessment Typology
Early Warning/Risk Assessment Typology

1a) · **Macro Level evaluation** of structural indicators (econometrically or through pattern recognition techniques) (e.g. parts of the State Failure Project; PIOOM; CIFP; HEWS; ICB; FIRST, Rummel's Democide data-base, Uppsala's Conflict database);

1b) · **Macro Level time** series of leading indicators (e.g. IOM; Refworld; FAO's GIEWS; Reliefweb; the UN system-wide Earthwatch; HazardNet for disasters; the global early warning system for displaced persons -GEWS);
Early Warning/Risk Assessment

Typology

2a) **Intermediate Level** conjunctural models that track changes in pre-specified events and interactions between groups (e.g., conflict/cooperation, genocide, non-violent protest) using machine-coded data, pattern recognition and neural networks (e.g., PANDA; KEDS);

2b) **Intermediate Level** structured (Delphi) and subjective models, which utilize a team of experts who identify key actors and estimate their future position on a given issue (regime stability, turmoil likelihood, investment restrictions and trade restrictions) with regards to their power to influence the outcome, the importance (salience) they attach to the issue, and the certainty or firmness of the actor's orientation (e.g., Decision Insights; Political Risk Services)
Early Warning/Risk Assessment

**Typology**

3a) · **Micro Level** sequential models which develop risk assessments based on tracking of specific behaviours - using accelerators (e.g. parts of State Failure; CEWS);

3b) · **Micro Level** response models which evaluate outside response to conflict and develop feasibility assessments based therein (e.g. Helen Fein's Life Integrity Violations Approach; IDRC's PCIA);

3c) · **Micro Level** field reporting by NGO networks (e.g. FEWER; FAST; ICG, CIPDD) using structured and/or unstructured reporting techniques
2 FAST’s Analytical Model to Understand Armed Conflict

**ROOT CAUSES**
Background factors that enhance the likelihood of armed conflict
- necessary but not sufficient causes of armed conflict
- mostly static – change only slowly over time
- mostly embedded in historical context

Examples are:
Ethnic diversity; Colonial history; Economic situation

**PROXIMATE CAUSES**
Factors that can lead (together with the root causes) to armed conflict
- are time-wise closer to the outbreak of armed conflict
- can change quickly over time

Examples are:
Government type; Increase in poverty level

**ARMED CONFLICT**

**POSITIVE INTERVENING FACTORS**
Decreasing the likelihood of armed conflict
Example: Civil Society Initiatives

**NEGATIVE INTERVENING FACTORS**
Increasing the likelihood of armed conflict
Example: Arms-trade
Integration and Collaboration

- **Allows areas of high risk** to be identified in advance of a serious conflict outbreak

- **Enables local analysts** and events-monitoring systems to focus on where to expect triggering or catalyzing events to come from

- **Helps policy makers** and other stakeholders in potentially volatile environments to identify conflict-generating factors, and to rapidly assess possible responses to the situation
FEWER/CIFP Example

Illustration. Early warning systems: Emerging good practice.

- **News-wire monitoring/analysis** (e.g., Reuters, BBC) (FASR/SPF)
  - Product: Monthly news summaries/ graphic analyses

- **Dynamic exchange:** (FAST/Local analysts/CIFP)

- **Structural data surveying/analysis** (CIFP/NPSIA)
  - Product: Biannual data surveys/graphic analyses

- **Regional and international expert group**
  - Role: Feed-back on early warning reports

- **Local analysts engaged in country-monitoring** (EAWARN/CIPDD)
  - Using early warning methodology and range of information and data sources
  - Product: Final early warning reports (e.g., early warning on Javakheti)

- **FEWER network research activities**
  - Products: who’s doing what and preventive surveys (Russian, US government, EU, local NGOs)

- **Strategic roundtables** (e.g., May 2000 meeting of local NGOs, Georgian and Armenian governments, OSCE, UN agencies, bilateral and multilateral donors to develop a peace consolidation plan for Javakheti)
Risk Assessment Methodology

- Indicators are selected according to key literature and experts in the field of conflict prevention and state failure.
- The raw data is indexed in order to provide a relative risk comparison, using a 1-9 scale of indices.
- A variety of open sources provide the data, including the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme, and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.
Online Data Query

Select Indicators
For multiple selections, hold down ctrl (Windows) or command key (Mac)
- None
- Demographic Stress
- Total Population
- Total Population Index
- Population Growth Rate (Annual %)
- Population Growth Rate Index
- Population Density Index

Or Select all Indicators within a Category
- None

Choose Years
For multiple selections, hold down ctrl (Windows) or command key (Mac)
- 2000
- 1999
- 1998

Choose Output Format:
- Single Country Table
- Single Indicator Table

Save the results in CSV
- No
- Yes
CIFP Map Viewer: GDP/Capita 1996
## Calculation of Risk Scores for Leading Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Rank Score [1] (Base Scale)</th>
<th>Trend Score (Modifier)</th>
<th>Volatility Score (Modifier)</th>
<th>Indicator Risk Score (Sum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Concern</td>
<td>Worsening +1</td>
<td>High +2</td>
<td>Very High Risk 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change 0</td>
<td>Moderate +1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving -1</td>
<td>Stable 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Risk 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Risk 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- High Risk: 9, Very High Risk: 12
- Medium Risk: 6, High Risk: 9
- Low Risk: 3, Medium Risk: 6
- Low Concern: 3, No Change: 0
- Moderate Concern: 6, No Change: 0
- High Concern: 9, No Change: 0

**Notes:**
- The Risk Score is calculated by summing the Global Rank Score, Trend Score, and Volatility Score.
- Scores range from Low Risk (0) to Very High Risk (12).
- Scores can change based on trends and volatility.
Linkages Between Issue Areas
Resulting Weights

(5) Internat. Links

(5) Environmental

(3) Human. Dev.

(8) Economic

Armed Conflict
Political Instab.
Militarization
Pop. Heterog.
Environmental
Economic
Human. Dev.
Demographic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>High Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>High Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>Medium Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>High Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>Medium Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>High Risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Burundi
- History of Armed Conflict: 9.27 - High Risk
- Governance and Political Instability: 8.25 - High Risk
- Economic Performance: 8.20 - High Risk
- Human Development: 9.71 - Very High Risk
- Environmental Stress: 9.00 - High Risk
- International Linkages: 6.80 - High Risk

### Democratic Republic of Congo
- History of Armed Conflict: 8.93 - High Risk
- Governance and Political Instability: 10.50 - Very High Risk
- Population Heterogeneity: 8.67 - High Risk
- Demographic Stress: 6.67 - High Risk
- Economic Performance: 7.29 - High Risk
- Human Development: 8.63 - High Risk
- International Linkages: 6.6 - High Risk

### Kenya
- Governance and Political Instability: 8.36 - High Risk
- Population Heterogeneity: 8.33 - High Risk
- Economic Performance: 7.04 - High Risk
- Human Development: 8.14 - High Risk
- Environmental Stress: 7.67 - High Risk

### Rwanda
- History of Armed Conflict: 6.77 - High Risk
- Governance and Political Instability: 8.85 - High Risk
- Militarization: 6.68 - High Risk
- Demographic Stress: 7.17 - High Risk
- Human Development: 8.78 - High Risk
- Environmental Stress: 9.67 - Very High Risk
- International Linkages: 7.10 - High Risk

### Tanzania
- Governance and Political Instability: 9.00 - High Risk
- Population Heterogeneity: 6.93 - High Risk
- Economic Performance: 7.35 - High Risk
- Human Development: 6.67 - High Risk
- Environmental Stress: 7.56 - High Risk
- International Linkages: 7.00 - High Risk

### Uganda
- History of Armed Conflict: 7.63 - High Risk
- Governance and Political Instability: 6.80 - High Risk
- Population Heterogeneity: 7.37 - High Risk
- Economic Performance: 7.56 - High Risk
- Human Development: 7.00 - High Risk
- Environmental Stress: 7.56 - High Risk
Sample Table:
Human Development in West Africa
Early Warning Brief: Contents

- Local Monitoring Information Analysis
- Most Salient and Weighted Structural Risk Factors (absolute and relative changes)
- Negative/Positive Contributing Factors
- Stakeholders (agendas and positions)
- Scenarios (best, worst, most likely)
- Policy Options
- Narrative
III. DEMOGRAPHIC RISK

1. Population Growth and Density Pressures

The size, density, distribution and composition of a country’s population can serve as structural preconditions for conflict. Changes in these factors, such as rapid rates of growth and urbanization, can also accelerate the conflict development process through heightening competition for access to physical and social resources, and thereby increasing scarcity, growing inequality, and environmental degradation.

Figure IIIA: Population Projections to 2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2000 Population toMillions (%)</th>
<th>2025 Population toMillions (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>221.4 (45.5%)</td>
<td>281.4 (40.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>90.9 (18.7%)</td>
<td>126.7 (18.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>22.2 (4.5%)</td>
<td>26.6 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Asia Region</td>
<td>338.2 (6.6% of World Total)</td>
<td>461.1 (5.7% of World Total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Indonesia is the fourth most populous country in the world. While the population growth rate is relatively moderate, and has been declining steadily over the past decade, the immense size of the population has meant that even such moderate levels of growth pose significant risks, especially when combined with recent poor economic performance (see Section II) and declining environmental indicators (see Section VII).

While population growth rates have begun to decline in both the Philippines and Cambodia as well, these two countries are not as far along the “demographic transition” from high to low birth and death rates as is Indonesia. In Cambodia and the Philippines, while both fertility and mortality rates have fallen, the rate of the former has outpaced the latter, resulting in growth rates that remain among the highest in the region.

Figure IIIB: Continued Declines in Population Growth Rates Expected

While the long-term trend across the region is towards continued decreases in population growth rates (see Figure IIIB), population pressures nonetheless remain a significant concern in many respects. Population densities will continue to increase to levels that pose ever more serious environmental and social risks, particularly in the cases of Indonesia and the Philippines, which both have a highly uneven population distribution.

Figure IIIC: Regional Population Densities
OUTPUTS: Background and Methodological Reports

- Early Warning Methodology Report (01/07/2000)
- Early Warning Methods: Background Report and Methodological Notes (Summer 2000)
- Early Warning Methodology Report (01/07/2000)
- Preliminary Selection of Indicators: Discussion Paper (10/12/2002)
- Assessing Country Risk: Creating an Index of Severity (01/05/2001)
- Risk Assessment Template (01/08/2001)
- Conflict Prevention, Gender and Early Warning: A Work in Progress (11/02/2002)
- CIFP Methodology, Data Descriptions, Data Sources
- CIFP Risk Assessment Indicator Definitions
Some Recent Regional Conflict Risk Assessment Reports

- [Conflict Risk Assessment Report: Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines](#) (01/01/2002)
- [Conflict Risk Assessment Report: West Africa: Mano River Union and Senegambia](#) (01/04/2002)
IMPACT

Timely Release of Reports

Standardized Methodology

Operationally Relevant

Strategic Response