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Previous Research Using CIFP Conflict indicators:

1. SIDS have very specific and individual vulnerabilities related to their economic conditions, governance, and international linkages. Few have all of the problems in extreme in comparison to larger countries. This suggests that SIDS could benefit from very specific and targeted policies where the problems are very specific and not compounded by other risk factors.

2. The evidence suggests that there are significant differences in the ways the methodologies evaluate both the risks faced by SIDS and the political and economic structures designed to mitigate those risks. For instance, scores for the 10 SIDS states included in both Briguglio and Galea’s economic vulnerability index and the CIFP risk index correlate at -0.54.

3. Using a modified version of the CIFP risk index that includes only issue indicators related to ‘inherent’ structural vulnerability – demographic stress, environmental stress, population heterogeneity, and human development – that correlation score rises to -0.77.
Previous research on SIDS

1. Attempted to determine the causes of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) vulnerability and resilience (Briguglio et al 2006);

2. Used contrasting cases to explore these linkages (e.g. Solomon Islands versus Mauritius) along with some basic preliminary statistical testing;

3. Research resulted in a number of interesting findings and has subsequently stimulated related research on Jamaica and Haiti (Prest et al 2006).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Island Developing States</th>
<th>Risk Index (weighted average)</th>
<th>Small Island Developing States</th>
<th>Risk Index (weighted average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia (Federated States of)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparative Results of SIDS in Briguglio et al. Economic Vulnerability Risk Index and CIFP Conflict Risk Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of this current research:

1. To evaluate the governance index against SIDS and Small State performance along several dimensions including rule of law, human rights and economic efficiency factors not specified in our conflict/instability index.

2. Specifying the characteristics of governance along six dimensions of state performance. We then evaluate the rank performance of SIDS and Small States in comparison to all of the countries in our dataset (with an approximate sample size of 190).

3. This initial testing will allow us to specify the correlates of governance of SIDS. We will also evaluate the performance of the CIFP index against measures of resilience developed by Briguglio in order to fine tune our own index.

4. We anticipate a strong correlation between the resilience index and our governance index because both give greater attention to market performance, the capacity of the state and the ability of the state to enforce contracts.
CIFP Structural Data Methodology

Indicator Clusters

For Governance CIFP creates an annual relative ranking of all countries based upon performance in six key indicator clusters; scores are calculated on the basis of over 100 indicators.
Methodology
Project Inputs

Structural data
- Baseline assessment
- Relative ranking

Event-based data
- Field officer and expert surveys
- Allied, IO, NGO, private sector, and media reports

Evaluative Framework

Qualitative Assessment
- Survey data
- Expert opinion
- Structured analogy
- Iterative Delphi technique
Methodology Analysis and Output

Data analysis
- Structural governance score
- Event trend-lines
- Survey data
- Event trend-lines

Policy Evaluation
- Identify available options
- Demand-driven impact assessment

CIFP Net Assessment
- Quantitative and qualitative trend analysis
- Drivers of change
- Scenarios
- Systemic and sectoral analysis
- Stakeholders
- Implications for policy
Initial Findings

• Importance of multi-source data collection
• Need for demand-driven analysis
• Need to distinguish ‘democratic process’ from elections
• ‘Boom-and-echo’ effect of significant events
• Curvilinear nature of democratic development
Initial Findings

Relation of Democracy to Fragility

![Graph showing the relation of Polity IV score to Average CIFP fragility score with a polynomial trendline.](image)
Initial Findings

Relation of Human Rights to Fragility -- CIRI Empowerment Index

![Graph showing the relation between CIRI empowerment index and average CIFP fragility index. The graph displays a polynomial trendline.](image)
In addition to a structural assessment for all countries, CIFP performs an event-based trend analysis for potentially fragile states. Data sources are varied, including both qualitative input from officers in the field and quantitative event monitoring.

- **Event Monitoring**
  - Intensity
  - Centrality
  - Causal Relevance

- **Field Survey**
  - Quantitative questionnaire
  - Qualitative feedback
  - Structured analogy and Delphi-based iterative forecasting

- **Trend Analysis**
  - Recent Trend
  - Future Projections

- **Event-based Trend Report**
  - Trend summary and contextualization
  - Trend interpretation
  - Generation of potential scenarios
1. Executive Summary

One of Haiti's key challenges is its police force's inability to establish security throughout the nation. Should the United Nations (UN) withdraw at any point in the near future, the current incapacity of the Haitian National Police (PNH) to assume its role as a security provider will generate even greater instability. Haiti receives a great deal of international aid, but inefficiencies and corruption in the government impede its development progress.

**UNDERLYING CONDITIONS**

An assessment of Haiti's structural baseline performance using the CFP governance and democracy indexing methodology reveals that Haiti is still a high-risk nation that faces a number of key governance and democratization challenges (see Table 2). Poor performance in the Rule of Law, Human Rights, and Accountability and Transparency clusters remain the greatest concern.

**EVENTS ANALYSIS**

Daily monitoring of key events began with the inception of the governance project. 168 key events covering the range of political, economic and social interactions have been collected, weighted and assessed. The average event score is slightly positive at 1.63 indicating a slight but not significant improvement in Haiti’s overall situation (see Table 3).

A large number of stabilizing events in the Government and Market Efficiency cluster, and destabilizing events in the Rule of Law and Political Stability and Violence clusters explain why the overall trend is only slightly positive. (See Table 4).
Haiti

4. Underlying Conditions

4.1 Political Stability and Violence

- Governance and Political Violence
  - Political Stability
  - Government Effectiveness
  - Rule of Law

4.2 Human Rights

4.3 Government Transparency and Accountability

Cluster Score: 6.00

Relevant good governance and democratic processes indicators were divided into 6 clusters: Political Stability and Violence, Rule of Law, Human Rights, Government Transparency and Accountability, and Government Effectiveness. The data collected confirms that Haiti is still a country of concern, with much progress to make in terms of good governance and democratic processes. Three of the clusters demonstrated a high risk for destabilization: the Rule of Law, Human Rights, and Government Accountability and Transparency clusters were the lowest performers, but performance in Government and Market Efficiency and Democratic Participation is also cause for concern.

Political Stability and Violence

As the only cluster at medium risk, its score of 6.20 can partly be explained by the absence of large-scale armed conflict and refugees produced; however, other indicators in this category score high, which accurately portrays the situation on the ground. The score for permanence of regime type shows the fragility of the democratic system currently in place and takes into consideration the long tradition of authorization rule and military intervention in the political system. The score for politically motivated violence against civilians is also high, reflecting the political violence in the period prior to and following Aristide's departure. The score should decrease now as political stability is higher in the wake of Préval's election.
Haiti

### 5.2 Political Stability & Violence

The slightly negative average score (-0.15) and continuation of the antipolitical mood (0.016) can in part be explained by the fading hopes that followed the first and second rounds of elections. As urban street gang activity became more confrontational and government resources became less available to address the lack of rule of law in the short-term, the number of violent incidents between gangs, UI personnel, and police forces increased. This followed an initial period of calm immediately after the Presidential and legislative elections.

#### Summary of key stabilizing events:
- Unveiling of Préval's cabinet (7 June 2006)
- Launch of the DDR program (5 September 2006)
- Improvement in the Haitian-Dominican relationship (12 June 2006)
- Ratification of Haiti into the OAS and CARICOM (5 July 2006)
- Uplift of the US arms embargo against Haiti (6 October 2006)

#### Summary of key destabilizing events:
- Clashes between gangs and UI personnel (7 and 13 June, 11 November 2006)
- Clashes between gangs and the Haitian police (20 July and 7 December 2006)
- Protests (both peaceful and violent) for the withdrawal of the UN (19 and 24 October, 18 November)
- Arrest of Lavalas party organizers (18 August 2006)
- Protest for the return of Aristide and threat to use violence by Lavalas members (15 July 2006)

### Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>All Events</th>
<th>Stable Events</th>
<th>Destabilizing Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>All Events</th>
<th>Stable Events</th>
<th>Destabilizing Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13

A series of kidnappings targeting foreigners—and more recently school children—has contributed to this downward trend. On the positive side, a slight improvement in the treatment of political prisoners, plans to reform the national police force, and the dismantlement of gangs by the MINUSTAH and the Haitian police have helped to somewhat mitigate the otherwise negative outcome of the cluster.

#### Summary of key stabilizing events:
- Political prisoners freed (14 June, 28 June, and 14 August 2006)
- Dismantlement of urban gang and crackdown on crime (18 August and 6 September 2006)
- Plans for judicial and police reforms (21 August 2006)

#### Summary of key destabilizing events:
- Series of kidnappings targeting foreigners (20 June, 20 July, 21 July, 7 August, 17 October, and 29 November 2006)
- Gang members target police officers (11 June and 15 June 2006)
- Gang violence causes the death of many innocent, civilians (7 July, 21 August, and 6 December 2006)
- Violence breaks out during municipal elections (3 December 2006)
- The kidnapping of school children forces the government to end the school year prematurely (13 and 16 December 2006)
Table 17
5.4 Government and Market Efficiency
The average event score in the government and market efficiency cluster is moderately positive (3.59), resulting in a stabilizing trend overall (0.31).

The majority of events recorded in this cluster have been announcements of international aid grants by industrialized countries following the Donors’ Conferences in August and November, and the granting of debt relief by key international organizations such as the World Bank and the IMF. Only a few destabilizing events were recorded and are concentrated around the lack of government response to floods during the hurricane season and government employee protests over non-payment of wages.

Summary of key stabilizing events:
- Announcement of international aid grants by Canada, the United States, the European Union, Venezuela and the World Bank (throughout the period)
- Debt relief granted to Haiti by the World Bank, the IDB and the IMF (20 September, 20 November, and 5 December, 2006)
- The Haitian government initiates a back-to-school campaign in the worst stram of Port-au-Prince and builds centers for street kids (19 September 2006)

Summary of key destabilizing events:
- The government fails to respond to damage caused by floods and bad weather during hurricane season, leading to deaths and the destruction of important infrastructure (1 August, 22 November, and 5 December 2006)
- Government employees protest over back wages (14 December 2006)
- US$50 million dollars are blocked in State visits because of the inability of the government to propose viable projects on which to spend the money (24 November 2006)

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Events</th>
<th>Stabilizing Events</th>
<th>Destabilizing Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average score</td>
<td>Average score as % of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-events</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilizing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destabilizing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

5.5 Secondary Drivers

Human Rights
Very few human rights-related events were recorded in the period monitored. One was Senator Joseph Lambert’s request to reinstate the death penalty to address the lawlessness in the country (18 December 2006). Another is the activities organized and declarations pronounced on 10 December, the tenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

Government Transparency and Accountability
Government transparency and accountability continue to be significant challenges for Haiti. During the period monitored, Haiti was ranked 134th in the 2006 Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index. There were also irregularities reported during the municipal elections on 3 December 2006 and an issue involving government money being allocated for the purchase of vehicles for elected deputies (6 October 2006). On the positive side, the government attempted to address corruption problems by initiating an inquiry to investigate problems of corruption and misappropriation of funds under the interim government (23 August 2006).

Democratic Participation
Events recorded within the democratic participation cluster have largely been stabilizing. These events came in the form of peaceful protests, the launching of the Haiti’s Peace Club (21 September 2006) and the holding of the first country’s first municipal elections (3 December 2006). This cluster could have a strong influence on the overall improvement of the country if it were to become a primary driver. If properly nurtured, the increasing strength of civil society and the non-intervention of the police during peaceful protests could reinforce democracy and act as a check on government.
CIFP Goals

• To provide decision-support tools for desk officers;

• To provide strategic and operational guidance for policy makers;

• To integrate problem-centred analysis into whole-of-government policy-making; and

• To develop a network of research and policy capabilities across Canada.
Democratic Processes and Governance

**Project Goals**

- Evidence-based analysis of governance and democratic processes in 5 countries using CIFP methodology

- Contribute to a better understanding of governance and democratic processes in selected countries

- Provide decision-support to policymakers in area of democratic processes and governance
Effective policy in developing states requires a solid analytic base that:

- Identifies the relative risks that each state faces internally and poses externally;

- Combines real time dynamic analysis with structural information;

- Provides policy relevant diagnosis;

- Matches the analysis to the operational capacity of the end user; and

- Provides an evaluative framework for assessing policy impact.
Value Added

- Multi-source data
  - Expert surveys
  - Event monitoring
  - Structural assessment

- Intensive research focus

- Comparative case-study structure

- Tailored to the policy needs of CIDA and the Canadian government
Project Beneficiaries and Outputs

**Beneficiaries**
- CIDA officers
- Members of the broader community of practice
  - Inter- and intradepartmental partners
  - Democracy Council
  - Other governance-focused NGOs
  - Academic community

**Output and Sustainability**
- Country Reports
- Production of a manual based on project experiences
### Expert Opinion

### Key Survey Topics

- Distribution of power
- Effectiveness of Institutions
- Effectiveness/professionalism of police, armed forces, judicial system, and prison system
- Presence of elected opposition
- Treatment/participation of potentially marginalized groups (e.g. urban and rural poor; ethnic, religious, cultural minorities; women)
- Government capacity
- Perceptions of government legitimacy
- Level of democratic participation
- Effectiveness/legitimacy of political parties (e.g. inclusiveness/polarization of major parties)
- Level and effects of corruption
- Effective regulation/management of the economy
- International development (level of international engagement, absorptive capacity, etc)
- Extent and effectiveness of pro-poor policies
- Respect for human rights
- Security from internal/external conflict
- Regional stability
- Key sources of instability in government and society
- Identification and assessment of recent trends
- Future forecasts
- Survey comments/feedback
Tired of playing second fiddle, Canada raises the bar with this site, which easily outshines the CIA's State Failure project (see separate entry). The base aim is similar: discover what factors correlate with violent political conflict, with a view to early warning and prevention.

The CIFP, a joint academic-government project, tells us we should be looking out for. Factors include a history of conflict, environmental stresses, ethnic divisions, and militarization, among others. A well-done interface spits out the base statistics, and irregular risk reports provide country risk ratings as well as dry, detailed country risk assessments. Reports on hot topics such as corporate social responsibility also appear on the site.
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david_carment@carleton.ca

Stewart Prest, Senior Research Analyst
cifp@carleton.ca
stewartprest@gmail.com

Teddy Samy
ysamy@ccs.carleton.ca

www.carleton.ca/cifp