

EC Checklist for Root Causes of Conflict

European Commission, based on the contribution of the Conflict Prevention Network (CPN)

Primary purpose

Awareness raising / early warning and pro-active agenda setting

Intended users

Decision makers and desk officers in bilateral and multilateral donor organisations. It is most relevant to diplomatic and development actors

Levels of application

Country and regional levels.

Conceptual assumptions

N / A

Main steps and suggested process

The checklist is filled in by European Commission desk officers and delegation staff, on the basis of their general knowledge of the country and other open sources of information. Subsequent statistical analysis allows the addition of other quantitative data (e.g. UNDP Human Development Index) and the clustering of results according to category.

Guiding questions / indicators

The checklist uses the following root causes of conflict / early warning indicators:

1. legitimacy of the state: are there proper checks and balances in the political system? How inclusive is the political/administrative power? What is the overall level of respect for national authorities? Is corruption widespread?
2. rule of law: how strong is the judicial system? Does unlawful state violence exist? Does civilian power control security forces? Does organised crime undermine the country's stability?
3. respect for fundamental rights: are civil and political freedoms respected? Are religious and cultural rights respected? Are other basic human rights respected?
4. civil society and media: can civil society operate freely and efficiently? How independent and professional are the media?

5. relations between communities and dispute-solving mechanisms: how good are relations between identity groups? Does the state arbitrate over tensions and disputes between communities? Are there uncontrolled flows of migrants/refugees?
6. sound economic management: how robust is the economy? Is the policy framework conducive to macro-economic stability? How sustainable is the state's environmental policy?
7. social and regional inequalities: how are social welfare policies addressed? How are social inequalities tackled? How are regional disparities tackled?
8. geopolitical situation: how stable is the region's geopolitical situation? Is the state affected by external threats? Is the state affecting regional stability?

In the original tool, each question is further specified by two to four sub-questions.

Required resources

Mainly desk-based tool, limited resources required.

Current applications

- In preparation for the January 2002 debate on potential conflict issues, conflict assessments were carried out by Commission desk officers and EC delegations for more than 120 countries, on the basis of the indicators. The objectives were:

---to increase awareness, within the EU decision-making forums, of the problems of those countries/regions with the highest assessed risk of an outbreak, continuation or re-emergence of conflict

---to heighten efforts to ensure that EU policies (and in particular EC ones) contribute to conflict prevention/resolution.

Countries receiving highest scores were drawn to the attention of the General Affairs Council through a confidential "watch list". The watch list is subject to constant revision, on the basis of the above indicators.

- When drafting the political analysis section of the Commission's country and regional strategy papers, risk factors contained in the checklist are systematically reviewed by the Commission's geographical services and, on the basis of the conflict analysis, attention is drawn to conflict prevention focused activities that external aid should target.

Lessons learnt

- Although the checklist is relatively new, generally EC desk officers and delegations are positive about the usefulness of the tool. It is regarded as an important step forward for mainstreaming conflict prevention and addressing structural causes of conflict through EU policies and programmes. In order to streamline the procedure further, a web-based platform is under development.

- In order to further improve the efficiency of the checklist, the following actions are being considered:

---a review of the appropriateness of the indicators and the clusters, with a view to identifying whether more indicators should be added or whether indicators should be further adapted to specific geographical regions.

---more specialised training for desk officers and delegations on the root causes checklist - using the checklist requires allocating a rating to each indicator (from 0-4) and thus involves a certain measure of personal perception. The training would help ensure that the results of the analysis can be assessed consistently and comparatively.

---another possible use for the checklist would be to apply it, in the Commission's interactions with partners (e.g. EU member states, international organisations, NGOs, etc.).

Commentary on the tool

- The checklist exercise needs to be placed in the context of the Communication from the Commission on conflict prevention and the EU programme for the prevention of violent conflicts, which highlighted the need to move the timescale for EU action forward, becoming progressively more pro-active and less reactive. It also promotes the notion that an early identification of risk factors increases the chances of timely and effective action to address the underlying causes of conflict.

- The checklist is only one of the tools that the Commission has at its disposal for monitoring and early warning. Others include regular reporting from Delegations and desk officers on issues related to the economic and political developments in concerned countries, open source information via the Commission's crisis room, and ECHO's disaster monitoring system, known as ICONS (Impeding Crisis Online New System).

Available reports

The checklist for root causes of conflict is available on the EC website (http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/cpcm/cp/list.htm).

Contact details

Conflict Prevention Unit

European Commission

External Relations Directorate General

Javier Niño Pérez

Tel: +32 2 2964852

E-mail: javiernino-perez@cec.eu.int

Guy Banim

Tel: +32 2 2996049

E-mail: guy.banim@cec.eu.int

<http://www.conflictsensitivity.org/node/67> (18.07.2011)

<http://www.conflictsensitivity.org/content/key-readings-0> (18.07.2011)

Founded in 2003, INCAS Consulting Ltd. works at the intersection of security, development and corporate investment.

We provide services in climate risk management, armed violence reduction, forecasting and prevention, corporate security and training in war-torn and fragile countries.

Here you will find in-depth information about these services, the regions we work in, the people who make up INCAS, our track-record and clients. The website is designed to enable quick access and does not contain heavy graphics.

For enquiries related to our work, please use the form provided in the contact page.

Based in Moscow, INCAS Eurasia currently focuses on Russia, the Caucasus and Central Asia. INCAS Eurasia provides a range of services, including forecasting and prevention, application of IFC guidelines, stakeholder engagement, strategic communications for risk prevention and management, training and capacity building, and due diligence work. Our regional capabilities include a network of leading conflict and security experts, local early warning monitors in different parts of the region, partnership arrangements with major non-governmental organisations, and high-level government, business sector and media relationships.

Specific areas of work:

- The application of IFC guidelines on indigenous people, Equator Principles, stakeholder consultations on projects with social/environmental impact for the oil industry
- Stabilisation of the North Caucasus and efforts to address youth unemployment, the proliferation of Islamic extremism, and protests against Russian government measures to quell armed resistance
- Support to de-escalation of tensions between Armenia and Azerbaijan and risks of re-militarisation in Nagorno-Karabakh
- Political risk management following the 2008 Russia-Georgia war and its implications for investment in both Georgia and Russia
- Risk assessment of hydrocarbon resources and the construction of export pipelines in Central Asia

Case study 1: Stakeholder Engagement – Energy Company in Russia

In 2006-2007, INCAS Consulting was commissioned by one of the world's leading energy companies to review engagement processes with external stakeholders regarding new projects in East Siberia. The range of measures we implemented to complete the brief involved:

- We conducted an internal review of the stakeholder engagement process, including taking stock of corporate instruments and capacities with recommendations to the top management
- We engaged with key stakeholders including key e-NGOs to suggest that an imminent media campaign is suspended until a comprehensive independent study is conducted
- We invited the leading scientists and independent research institutions to design and carry out a study following jointly-owned ToR, elaborated by our team and e-NGOs together
- We convened a series of roundtable meetings to seek third party verification and endorsement for the jointly-owned approach to the study, taking all key aspects into account
- The study was managed by our team and delivered results that were recognised and respected by all key stakeholders. A key result was acceptance of the pipeline route that suited the interests of the company and was socially and environmentally the safest
- In the course of the engagement, the company significantly reduced social risks associated with an \$18 billion project as well as strengthened its reputation vis-à-vis an environmental NGO community and indigenous peoples' organisations

As a result of this exercise, the company adopted a reputation management strategy INCAS proposed. Implementation of this strategy helped prevent a potentially damaging campaign by an alliance of environmental and social NGOs. This was achieved by constructive dialogue, which the NGOs later referred to as "exemplary". These results were achieved in less than 18 months and were successfully replicated for two other major projects in West and East Siberia.

<http://www.incasconsulting.com/#/assignment-log/4540757515> (18.07.2011)

<http://www.incasconsulting.com/#/articles-and-interviews/4540757489>

EU Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management - Roles, Institutions, and Policies

GROSS Eva, JUNCOS Ana

Catégories: #07. Sélection Janvier 2011, Sécurité et Défense

Prix Unitaire: 110,00 € (TVA 6 % incluse)

ISBN: 9780415572354

Editeur: ROUTLEDGE

Collection: Routledge/UACES Contemporary European Studies

Date de publication: 17-12-2010

Reliure: hard

Nombre de pages: 192

Langue(s): English/Anglais

Résumé:

Conflict prevention and crisis management has become a key activity for the EU since the creation of the European Security and Defence Policy in 1999. The rapid growth of this policy area, as well as the number of missions deployed beyond the EU's border raise important questions about the nature of the EU's international role and its contribution to international security.

The Contributions to EU Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management analyze European conflict prevention and crisis management in terms of the EU's evolving global role, its institutions and its policies. The volume analyzes the EU's position in relation to the US, the UN and other regional security organizations, and applies three different institutional perspectives – historical, rational choice and sociological institutionalism – to explain the increasing institutionalization of EU crisis management policy. It also critically analyzes the application of EU

policies in West Africa, Afghanistan and the Caucasus. Providing a comprehensive analysis of EU crisis management policy, the volume explores what role EU conflict prevention and crisis management policy plays in a European and a global context.

Offering a comprehensive and original contribution to the literature on EU foreign and security policy, this volume will be of interest to students and scholars of European politics, international relations and security studies.

Table des matières:

1.	Introduction	Eva	Gross	and	Ana	E.	Juncos
Part							
2.	The EU's Role in International Crisis Management: Innovative Model or Emulated Script? Xymena Kurowska and Thomas Seitz						
3.	European Union Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management						
Part							
4.	Introducing Governance Arrangement for EU Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management Operations: A Historical Institutional Perspective						
5.	Conceptualising the EU as a Civil-Military Crisis Manager: Institutional Actors and their Principals						
6.	The Other Side of EU Crisis Management: A Sociological Institutional Analysis						
Part							
7.	The EU in West Africa: From Developmental to a Diplomatic Transatlantic Policy? Marie Gibert						
8.	The EU in Afghanistan: Crisis Management in a Coherent Crisis						
9.	The EU in Georgia: Towards a Coherent Crisis Management Strategy? Giselle Bosse						
10.	Conclusion and Outlook	Eva Gross and Ana E. Juncos					

JUNCOS Ana

Ana E. Juncos is a Post-doctoral Fellow in the Department of European Studies and Modern Languages at the University of Bath, working on a two-year project on the 'EU's Global Role', in cooperation with the Federal Trust and funded by the James Madison Trust. She holds a PhD in Politics, International Relations and European Studies from Loughborough University, where she is currently a Teaching Fellow. Her doctoral research, partly funded by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond through the 'European Foreign and Security Policy Studies Programme', focused on the coherence and effectiveness of the EU's Foreign and Security Policy in Bosnia (1991-2006). Previously, she won a scholarship at the Spanish National Council for Scientific Research and worked as a research assistant at the University of Ottawa (Canada). She holds a degree in Political Science and Public Management (University Complutense of Madrid) and a European Humanities Diploma (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris).

GROSS Eva

Eva Gross is Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for European Studies, Vrije Universiteit Brussel and a visiting lecturer at the University of Kent: Brussels School of International Studies. Research interests include the role of the EU as a global actor, the Europeanization of national foreign and security policy, transatlantic relations and EU conflict prevention and crisis management policies. She holds a PhD from the London School of Economics and has been a visiting fellow at the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) in Brussels and the EU Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) and CERi Science Po, both in Paris.

Avis des clients:

Il n'y a pas encore de commentaire sur ce produit.
Veuillez vous identifier pour poster un commentaire.

Analysis II

Last Updated: 03/10/2008

Can the European Union be a peace-maker in the world? In Kosovo?

Jan Oberg, PhD

Jan Oberg discusses the legality of Kosovo's declaration of independence, the dangers of an increasingly militant and tactless EU foreign policy, and the continued need for creative thinking and enlightened policy reform.

1. New EU mission in Kosovo is a violation of the UN and international law

EU Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso recently said that the new EU mission in Kosovo mission, dubbed EULEX, is not illegal, “because UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has not opposed it” - and continued “The EU mission is not contrary to UN Security Council Resolution 1244 and the international law.”

Strangely, EU's President has to defend his Union against critics who maintain that its mission called LEX - meaning law! - is not established according to international law. Unfortunately for Barosso, they are right and have read and understood Resolution 1244 of 1999 (after NATO's bombing) in which the members were:

- "Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the other States of the region, as set out in the Helsinki Final Act and annex 2," and

- "Reaffirming the call in previous resolutions for substantial autonomy and meaningful self-administration for Kosovo."

Indeed, what is there to discuss? If 1244 were respected by Western law-breaking governments, EULEX could only have been established in agreement with Serbia/Belgrade as were all other international missions in Kosovo since 1999 - and by the local authorities and not exclusively with the latter and against the explicit will of Belgrade.

Oddly, the EU President introduces a new rule: What is not explicitly opposed by the UN Secretary-General is legal! So, say, the bombing of Yugoslavia and the US occupation of Iraq are perfectly legal acts?

The UN as such has been a victim of the West's conflict-mismanagement of former Yugoslavia since 1991 – as has been pointed out in numerous TFF-produced analyses and debate articles. Kosovo's declaration of secession on February 17 had no UN endorsement. It ought to have had, by the Security Council or General Assembly. But the independence advocates knew that the majority of members would not support their policy or independent Kosovo as a unique case outside international law.

With leading Western governments having humiliated the UN, how convenient for Mr. Barroso to now evoke the authority of the world organization and Ban Ki-Moon who, regrettably, already performs as the most feeble Secretary-General in decades.

2. The EU should not be stronger militarily as long as it has virtually no civilian competence in dealing with conflicts and has neither agreed on a single big foreign policy issue nor had a peace-building success.

Swedish foreign minister Carl Bildt, who was one of most knowledgeable diplomats in former Yugoslavia, recently argued that the EU needs a stronger military dimension. Last autumn, he wrote a non-paper about how to best make Kosovo independent outside international law and with only a "semblance" of it. His proposal to give the EU more of a military profile to make peace is a non-starter and a non-solution.

In 2006, TFF published the only systematic analysis of the peace potentials of the EU so far and, to put it

diplomatically, the Union leaves a lot to be desired. (See Jan Oberg, [Does the UN Promote Peace? Analysis, Critique and Alternatives](#), 2006).

In the report I gave ample evidence of the fact that there is a gross imbalance between the Union's extremely weak and outdated civilian dimension and its military tools – in words, in institutions, in policy-making, and in budgets. It does not even have a peace academy. If you are of the opinion that the EU is too weak militarily given its economic importance, you'll understand when you read the report how bad it is on the civilian side. This is particularly true since the Treaty tells us Europeans and the world that its primary *raison d'être* is to work for peace inside Europe and to be a peacemaker worldwide.

The UN Charter of 1945 is light years ahead intellectually and ethically. Both the earlier EU Treaty and the Lisbon Treaty of last year is intellectually devoid of innovations and knowledge about conflict analysis, reconciliation, mediation, non-violence, peace concepts, and what have you. Not even these very words are there.

In addition, the current EU "foreign minister" Javier Solana has written a European Security Strategy which, if it had been written by a political science student at any European university, would have failed as an exam paper.

In addition, he is a non-convicted war criminal; it is conveniently forgotten by everyone in the media and politics that Javier Solana was the highest civilian responsible for the destruction of Yugoslavia in his capacity of Secretary-General of NATO when it bombed the place for 78 days, killed proportionately many more civilians than were killed in the September 11 attacks, used depleted uranium, and created a larger refugee stream out of Kosovo than even Milosevic had managed to.

In substantial political terms, the Union's goals of "common" foreign policy – speaking with one voice – has failed repeatedly. It even begs the question whether in that policy domain there will ever be a unified voice worthy of something called a union.

EU members have disagreed on every major foreign policy issue facing them: Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Iraq and now Kosovo. Mr. Solana who does an impressive amount of airport hopping and peacebuilding press conferences and other high-level people constantly tell the world that the EU has contributed to peace everywhere. How many journalists have ever asked him: Where and in what sense, Mr. Solana? Its perhaps largest single foreign policy blunder was to make the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina unavoidable by prematurely and against the criteria for recognition of new states to recognize Croatia and Slovenia as independent states without the faintest idea of the consequences or a plan for the rest of ex-Yugoslavia.

Now some of them have done it again with a Kosovo that a) does not control its own territory, 2) has 10% of its people – ethically cleansed in 1999 - living in Serbia without having been given a chance to return over 9 long years, and 3) a Kosovo that is so independent that it needs one NATO, one OSCE, one UN and 2-3 EU missions plus an interesting [new creature, the International Steering Group on Kosovo \(ISG\)](#).

The ISG was established in Vienna on February 28, 2008 with representatives from Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Sweden, Turkey, Belgium, Denmark, Hungary, Slovenia, Switzerland and Kosovo Contact Group members Britain, France, Germany, Italy and the United States. They said – surprise, surprise! – that they are there to promote Kosovo's development into a "stable, multiethnic and

democratic state."

They are whistling in the dark. Is this a tragedy or a farce, or both? Well, let's call it EU common foreign policy in a nutshell. It is all make-believe. It's only a matter of time before the sand castle called EU conflict-management and peace-building come tumbling down.

New instability in the Balkans is in the cards – and secessionists and separatist worldwide are inspired by the "unique" – "no-precedent here" – illegal process of recognizing Kosovo outside a negotiated, law-based framework. The whole thing promises to be a boomerang in-the-making, a millstone around the EU neck.

3. Alternatives: What about an EU peace policy with just a little creativity?

Of course, there is much more creative thinking around. TFF is proud to direct your attention to a larger analysis by Francesco Marelli, a young European who has written a ["Proposal for an EU Commissariat for Peace and Conflict Transformation"](#) as his MA thesis in peace studies at the European Peace University – just posted on TFF's homepage.

While he was at it, he also wrote [a criticism of Solana's European Security Strategy](#) – but more than that, Marelli has done what the excellent scholar does: study the facts, criticize the world when it is not what it could be, and propose a strategy for building a better world. In short: Diagnosis, Prognosis-Criticism-Warning and Treatment.

My report mentioned above contains 24 steps and reforms that could be taken if those who say that they want the EU to be a peace-maker in the world mean business.

So, with just a little knowledge about peace and a dose of creativity the EU, indeed the world, could be a better place.

One never stops wondering why so many citizens, experts and media routinely accept what is presented to them as relevant, realistic, and optimal when in fact it is merely continuations of policies that have created the problems and caused so much suffering – policies that are clearly dysfunctional given the huge majority's longing for a more peaceful and humane world community with democratic governance.

A chef behaving the way EU foreign ministers do would eat and serve porridge three times a day 7 days a week and routinely defend it as haute cuisine. And that's what you believe, of course, if you have never opened a cookery book or dared be inspired by someone else's creations.

There are few areas of human life so devoid of creativity, a will to do good, and to make innovations as that of foreign policy. The EU and its peace-preventive policies in the Balkans ever since 1991 makes a shining example – no matter what its representatives try to make us believe.

They have some kinds of power but are certainly not burdened by intellectual, moral or artistic powers.

Jan Oberg is the co-founder and director of The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research (TFF). Dr Oberg is a former director of the Lund University Peace Research Institute (LUPRI); former secretary-general of the Danish Peace Foundation; and a former member of the Danish government's Committee on security and disarmament. Many more of his articles, including further analysis of Kosovo, are available at www.transnational.org.

http://www.monitor.upeace.org/archive.cfm?id_article=493 (18.07.2011)

Conflict analysis of Georgia

- [[Diese Seite übersetzen](#)]

www.ucm.sk/revue/2010/1/mihalikova.pdf

Dateiformat: PDF/Adobe Acrobat - [Schnellansicht](#)

von E Miháliková - [Ähnliche Artikel](#)

The need to conduct a **conflict analysis** of Georgia and conflict zones within the countries of the **EU** recognized it. The impact of Kosovo played quite ...

Conflict analysis of Georgia

Translated Title: Conflict analysis of Georgia

Publication: Slovak Journal of Political Sciences (1/2010)

Author Name: Mihaliková, Eva;

Language: English

Subject: Politics / Policy Studies

Issue: 1/2010

Page Range: 59-83

No. of Pages: 25

File size: 180 KB

Download Fee: 3.2 Euro (€)
(only non-subscribers)

Summary: The escalation of the conflict between Georgia and South Ossetia in August 2008 that led to a war between Georgia and Russia attracted the attention of the world. Caucasian republic has been struggling with unresolved conflicts since the dissolution of Soviet Union. Separatist regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia have been trying to achieve independence from Georgia. Unresolved conflicts in the region are destabilizing the region. The region is of a strategic importance for the global players as well mainly due to its endowment with natural resources. Therefore, it is inevitable to identify the source of potential conflicts, its main parties and possible solutions to avoid future escalation.

Keywords: Conflict analysis; Georgia; Abkhazia; South Ossetia; conflict parties; conflict dynamics; conflict resolution