Second workshop on defining a multi-dimensional approach to fragility for the OECD States of Fragility Report 2016

Abidjan, 19 October 2015

OUTCOME SUMMARY

The second expert consultation workshop on a multidimensional fragility model for the OECD was hosted by the African Development Bank (AfDB) and took place on 19th October 2015 in Abidjan. 48 participants took part in the workshop, including AfDB staff from various departments, and representatives from national and regional civil society, the Government of Côte d’Ivoire, development agencies and the African Union. Among the participants were also two of the AfDB’s high level advisers on fragility, Gunilla Carlson and Tertius Zongo. The aim of the workshop was to refine and “ground-truth” the results of the Berlin workshop.

The workshop was divided in three sessions. The first session focused on the rationale behind and the expectations towards an OECD fragility model. Generally, participants welcomed the shift towards a multidimensional approach. It was pointed out that the OECD should rather develop a conceptual framework than a model. Participants found that this framework/model should:

1. use acceptable terminology: while the shift from “fragile states” towards “states of fragility” is an improvement, “fragility” itself may be stigmatizing;
2. be a driver of change both within OECD member states and host countries: it should a) lead to smarter aid and better coordination between donors and b) have an incentivizing effect for countries concerned by fragility/risk;
3. be equally useful for both partners (donors and recipients of aid);
4. be universal, while not losing sight of the most vulnerable countries; in particular it needs to be mindful of the work on fragility by the group of g7+ countries;
5. be contextualized; it requires complementary in-depth analysis;
6. be a means for comparison between countries; and
7. be descriptive but have some predictive power.

The second session focused on fragility models and their components. The OECD presented different ways for measuring fragility, including the OECD model used in the States of Fragility Report 2015. Afterwards, the AfDB presented their approach to fragility, including the institution’s internal classification of fragile situations into three categories (high risk, medium risk and low risk). There was consensus that the framework/model should go beyond the state and account for

1. the community level: the human being should be at the centre of a fragility analysis;
2. the regional level and potential spillover effects of conflict;
3. external factors that have the potential to destabilize countries (best captured by the French term “fragiliser”);
(4) societal dynamics, and the importance of demography and education;
(5) the strong link between fragility and conflict/violence;
(6) the strong link between fragility and natural resources, including deforestation; and
(7) political leadership as an important variable influencing fragility.

In terms of presenting the framework, the Venn Diagram was considered useful as it

(1) uses a clustering approach and assigns dimensions to countries, making it an entry point for programming; and
(2) is linked to the SDGs, thereby resonating with the international policy community and beyond.

During the third session, participants worked on refining the fragility model in smaller groups (see Annex 1 for summaries of the group discussions), with the aim to answer some of the questions that had arisen during the Berlin workshop. They focused on: (1) a societal dimension; (2) external factors; (3) areas of limited statehood; (4) acceptable terminology; and (5) the link between analysis and action. The groups concluded that:

(1) A societal dimension, reflecting a country’s history and legacy, should be added to the model. A way should be found to capture social cohesion / the existence of a social contract. The team found the societal dimension hard to separate from institutional aspects relating to the state-society relationship, such as justice, respect for political and economic rights, etc.

(2) External factors should be captured in the model. One could distinguish between human factors (e.g. conflict spillover, migration) and natural factors (e.g. natural resources, climate change).

(3) The concept of areas of limited statehood was found to be closely related to the very definition of fragility; i.e. states with areas of limited statehood may per definition be fragile, as it implied that the state did not have a monopoly on violence, or was not able to effectively provide goods or services. On the other hand, areas of limited statehood are not necessarily conflict-ridden and may exist within states not considered fragile (e.g. mafia-controlled parts of southern Italy).

(4) There is a need to find acceptable terminology. There was no agreement on which terms to use, though. ‘Fragility’ indicates a problem but no solution. ‘Transition’ or ‘risk’ may be avenues to move the discussion ahead. While a ‘risk analysis for sustainable societies’ puts the human being more at the centre of analysis and may be conducted at several levels of society, ‘risk’ also indicates (inherently difficult) forecasting. ‘Risk’ can therefore not stand alone but needs to be qualified.

(5) The link from analysis to action is very important; any future concept requires a clear link to monitoring and evaluation and a clearly specified audience. Country groupings/clusters could be a means to offer entry points for financial and other interventions (e.g. technical assistance). The clusters should be based on the Venn Diagram and a consultative process between donors and partners.
ANNEX 1: GROUP WORK

(1) Do we need to include a societal dimension? What should it look like/which elements should it comprise?

Concept of a social dimension/social cohesion:
- The ability to recognize a common destiny in a social pact/contract seeking to ensure the individual well-being or development, with regard to achieving social equilibrium (social harmony).
Yes, a social dimension should be included.
- A common vision of development that is manifest in a participatory approach.
- The analysis of the social dimension/social cohesion should take into consideration:
  o Judicial and institutional aspects (formal and informal aspects)
  o Public administration (governance)
  o Fundamental rights (freedom of expression, right to education, healthcare, work)
  o Types and causes of conflict, and mechanisms of conflict management

(2) Do we need a dimension looking at external factors?
  a. What are external/transnational/regional factors that could cause fragility?
  b. How could we capture them in the model?

- Human factors
  o Conflict spillovers
  o Foreign interests
    ▪ Political : scale of arms economy
    ▪ Economic
  o Agricultural subsidies by foreign powers – cheap foreign products into local markets
- Natural factors
  o Geophysical
  o Natural resources (linked to economic foreign interests)
  o Deforestation
  o Climate change → food insecurity
  o Diseases

Way of capturing them in the model
- Natural factors
  o How often do catastrophes occur
  o Trend of economic variables
  o Areas of forest left
    ▪ Impact of storm on community
  o Season irregularity
    ▪ Unpredictable crop/harvesting
- Human factors
  o Number of displaced persons
  o Number of people killed/maimed
  o Volume of imports
(3) In areas where statehood is limited (the state doesn’t reach)…
   a. when is it fragile?
   b. is it always fragile?
- Reasons for areas of limited statehood
  o Armed rebellion
  o Non-recognition of state legitimacy
  o Police incapacity to guarantee safety of lives and property
- Scenarios
  o Major breakdown: e.g. Somalia
  o Moderate breakdown: e.g. Mali
  o Minor breakdown: e.g. Nigeria, Kenya
  o Not fragile overall though areas of limited statehood: Italy (mafia), Greece (economy)
- Conclusions
  o Terminology of “fragile situations” applicable when the entire state is concerned
  o Fragile situation depends on/with regard to location, time
  o Applicability of areas of limited statehood to Venn Diagram??

(4) What would be an “acceptable terminology” to replace “fragility”?
   a. No stigmatization but incentivisation
   b. Fusion of donor and partner terminology
- Risk approach (sustainability)
- Direct resource flows to countries and priority sectors & people
- Facilities implementation and coordination
- Resilience, transition
  \(\rightarrow\) Risk analysis for sustainable societies

(5) How could our concept make the link from analysis to action (incentives)?
   a. What does the concept need in order to trigger positive action?
   b. How can it incite coordinated action by donors AND partners?
- Starting point: Venn Diagram
- Consultative process including both donors and partner countries resulting in (regional and multidimensional) groups/clusters of countries
  o A: High level
  o B: intermediate level
  o C: low level
  (Moving between levels is possible)
- Adapted strategies
  o Financing (e.g. AfDB) \(\rightarrow\) also an incentive for private sector engagement
  o Type of intervention (e.g. institutional assistance, budgetary support, operations)
  o Emergency measures (e.g. Ebola)
- Monitoring and Evaluation
  o Expected results
  o Expected impact
    - Monitoring and evaluation strategies
    - Indicators
## ANNEX 2: PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daouda Esse ACHILLE</td>
<td>Convention de la Société Civile Ivoirienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ola ADIGUN</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colette ALLA</td>
<td>Opération des Nations Unies en Côte d’Ivoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yannis ARVANITIS</td>
<td>AfDB, Senegal Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driss BELAMINE</td>
<td>AfDB, Human and Social Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habiba BEN BARKA</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard BIZIMANA</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno BOEDTS</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bosco BUKENYA</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunilla CARLSSON</td>
<td>Special Adviser to the AfDB on the Horn of Africa region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyne CHANGE</td>
<td>AfDB, Governance and Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medjomo COULIBALY</td>
<td>AfDB, Special Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilio DAVA</td>
<td>AfDB, Mozambique Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca DADZIE</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Linda DORMEYAN</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdel ETHMANE</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas GILCHRIST</td>
<td>International Centre for Transitional Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana HOFMANN</td>
<td>OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basil JONES</td>
<td>AfDB, Office of the Special Envoy on Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justus KABYEMERA</td>
<td>AfDB, Agriculture et Agro-Industries Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Pierre Muimana KALALA</td>
<td>AfDB, Transport and ICT Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwila KAMWELA</td>
<td>AfDB, African Legal Support Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emile KEMAYOU</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary KIMANI</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Jerémie KOUADIO N’GUSSAN</td>
<td>Université Félix Houphouet Boigny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Ansah LARTETEY</td>
<td>Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert MAFUSIRE</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlle Eglantine MARCELIN</td>
<td>AfDB, Independent Development Evaluation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapenda Diaw MBAYE</td>
<td>Institut Panafncain de Stratége</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy MKANDAWIRE</td>
<td>AfDB, Transition Support Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice NABALAMBA</td>
<td>AfDB, Statistics Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serge N’GUESSAN  AfDB, Togo Field Office
Philippe NGWALA  AfDB, Transition Support Department
Emmanuel NYIRINKWAYA  AfDB, Transition Support Department
Azedine OUERGHI  World Bank
Tom Mboya OWIYO  AfDB, Special Programs
Robert PEPRAH  AfDB, Financial Control Department
Jolanda PROFOS  OECD
Herimandimby RAZAFINDRANANANA  AfDB, Independent Development Evaluation Department
Ali SANOGO  AfDB, Transition Support Department
Mafe Meite Nogofema SANOGO  Government of Côte d’Ivoire, Ministère d’Etat, Ministère du Plan et du Développement
Baboucarr SARR  AfDB, Transition Support Department
Agnes SURRY  AfDB, Resource Mobilization and External Finance
Bakary SYLLA  Government of Côte d’Ivoire, Ministry of Finance
Hadja TALL  AfDB, Transition Support Department
Sibry TAPSOBA  AfDB, Transition Support Department
Frederik TEUFEL  AfDB, Transition Support Department
Pietro TOIGO  AfDB, African Natural Resources Centre
Alex YEANAY  AfDB, Liberia Field Office
Baldeh YERO  AfDB, Sierra Leone Field Office
Elise YRA OUATTARA  Government of Côte d’Ivoire, Observatoire de la Solidarité et de la Cohésion Sociale
Tertius ZONGO  Special advisor to the AfDB on the Sahel region