



HIGH REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE UNION FOR
FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND
SECURITY POLICY

Brussels, 27.7.2017
SWD(2017) 282 final

JOINT STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

**EU conflict Early Warning System: Objectives, Process and Guidance for
Implementation - 2017**

EU conflict Early Warning System: Objectives, Process and Guidance for Implementation - 2017

Contents

<u>Context</u>	3
<u>Objectives and Scope of the EU conflict Early Warning System (EWS)</u>	4
<u>Components of the EWS</u>	4
<u>1. Prioritisation</u>	5
<u>2. Shared assessment and follow-up</u>	5
<u>3. Monitoring</u>	7
<u>Impact/Added Value</u>	7
<u>Annex I Indicators for the Global Conflict Risk Index (2017)</u>	8
<u>Annex II: Who does what?</u>	9

This document reflects lessons learned and modifications made to the EU conflict Early Warning System and it replaces the Joint Staff Working Document (SWD (2016) 3).

Context

Article 21(2)(c) of the Treaty on European Union explicitly names conflict prevention as one of the EU's foreign policy goals. The 2011 Council conclusions on Conflict Prevention have elaborated this point and provide a strong mandate for the EU to engage in conflict prevention.¹ In order to identify structural risks of conflict and prevent the emergence, re-emergence or escalation of violent conflict, early warning capabilities are indispensable.

In its conclusions, the Council considers that conflict early warning needs to be further strengthened within the EU and that output from all sources, including from Member States, should be better integrated; conflict early warning should draw more extensively upon field-based information, including from EU Delegations and civil society actors, in order to provide a more solid foundation for conflict risk analysis. Enhancing conflict early warning will also enable the EU to work more effectively with partners on issues regarding the responsibility to protect and the protection of human rights. Finally, Council conclusions stress that more emphasis needs to be put on early action to mitigate the risks of outbreak and recurrence of conflicts.

In follow-up to these conclusions, the European External Action Service (EEAS) and Commission services have put in place the EU conflict Early Warning System (EWS) as part of their broader activities in the field of security policy. The procedures and methodology of the system were tested in two regional pilot studies in 2012 and 2013, before the system was rolled out in September 2014 for all non-EU countries.

The EWS is a key component of the EU's Comprehensive Approach to External Conflict and Crises (2013)² and applies to the complex context of EU external action implemented by the EU and Member States. The Joint Staff Working Document (SWD (2016) 3) was a deliverable of the 2015 Action Plan for the Comprehensive Approach.³

The purpose of this Joint Staff Working Document is to serve as basis for the collaboration on the EWS. To this end, this document describes EWS objectives and scope, components and stakeholders.

The changes introduced in this document are in line with the Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy for the European Union⁴ calling for more investment in early warning and conflict prevention and linking early warning to early action, as well as the new European Consensus on Development⁵ and the Joint Communication on "A Strategic Approach to Resilience in the EU's External Action"⁶. The EWS will be implemented fully applying an integrated approach.

¹ Doc 11820/11.

² Doc 9644/14, JOIN (2013) 30, 11.12.2013.

³ SWD (2015) 85, 10.4.2015.

⁴ <http://europa.eu/globalstrategy/en/global-strategy-foreign-and-security-policy-european-union>.

⁵ Doc 9459/17.

⁶ SWD(2017) 226, 227 final.

Objectives and Scope of the EU conflict Early Warning System (EWS)

The EWS is a robust, evidence-based risk management tool that identifies, assesses and helps prioritise situations at risk of violent conflict⁷ for non-EU countries, focusing on structural factors and with a time horizon of four years. It also identifies conflict prevention and peace building opportunities.

The EWS promotes a shared assessment of conflict risks and stimulates timely, relevant and coherent responses to prevent the emergence, re-emergence or escalation of violence by developing options for new responses or fine-tuning those that already exist.

The goal is not 'prediction'. It will always be difficult to pinpoint the exact trigger for the eruption of violence. There are, however, certain structural factors and indicators that frequently correlate with conflict risk that the EWS can help to mitigate.

Components of the EWS

The EWS process is conducted once per year, which ensures a regular update of priorities and allows time for analysis and follow-up. The process must be able to evolve and respond to the requirements of different EU actors. However, the following components constitute essential elements.

Preparatory component: risk scanning

Main stakeholders: European Commission Services ♦ EEAS: EU Intelligence and Situation Centre, EU Military Staff Intelligence Directorate (Single Intelligence Analysis Capacity - SIAC) and Prevention of conflicts, Rule of Law/Security Sector Reform, Integrated Approach, Stabilisation and Mediation division (PRISM).

The preparatory component compiles available risk information, as the basis for subsequent prioritisation and conflict risk assessment by EU services. The main resource is a quantitative index of conflict risk⁸. The indicators that form the basis of the index (see Annex I) have been selected according to their strong correlation with highly violent conflict. They do not focus on risk for the EU but for the third country itself, with specific attention to human security.⁹

⁷ Violent conflict refers to those conflicts resulting in violence occurring within, between and across state boundaries and including violence targeting particular groups, such as mass atrocities. Situations 'at risk of conflict' are understood as situations where the actions of any of the conflict parties threaten or hold out the prospect of threatening: the security of a population or particular groups, and/or the fulfilment of core state functions, and/or the international order.

⁸ The Global Conflict Risk Index: <http://conflictrisk.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>. Developed by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre for the EWS, this is also used for the EU's Index for Risk Management (INFORM) as part of efforts to improve the evidence base for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection financial decisions and policy making, measuring the risk of humanitarian crises and disasters, including human-induced hazard. The Global Conflict Risk Index is currently funded by the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP).

⁹ Different mechanisms with a conflict early warning or risk management component also exist within other services, such as tools related to crisis management (e.g. situation room) or EU threat assessment (intelligence based). The EWS integrates findings from these sources where possible. The Risk Management Framework for Budget Support also assesses conflict risk for the purpose of decision making on EU financial assistance.

The findings of the index are complemented with intelligence-based analysis from the SIAC, which focuses on risks to the EU and its Member States. SIAC has adapted its methodology to include the structural conflict risk factors that are central to the EWS. The results are then brought together with the latest qualitative situation analysis available from open sources and internal assessments. Taken together, these different sources provide a first global overview of conflict risk. This overview is presented to EEAS and Commission services as the starting point for component 1. (Prioritisation)

1. Prioritisation

Main stakeholders: Management and staff of EEAS and Commission Services, including in Delegations ♦ Political and Security Committee (PSC).

The preparatory risk scanning is reviewed by relevant services, including input from EU Delegations, in order to identify early warning priorities. This takes into account specific EU interests and leverage as well as where there is value in reviewing, enhancing or expanding EU engagement to increase prevention / peacebuilding impact.

The result of the review process is shared with Member States for discussion and input in PSC, which concludes the prioritisation phase.

Following PSC discussions and, where appropriate, relevant guidance, senior management requests their staff to launch coordination work on further analysis and/or preventive action involving EU Delegations, field missions and EU staff in headquarters. This takes place through informal country team inter-service consultations, including EEAS and Commission services as described below in component 2. (Shared assessment and follow-up)

2. Shared assessment and follow-up

Main stakeholders: EU Delegations ♦ ECHO field offices ♦ EU Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) Missions in-country ♦ EU Special Representatives (EUSR) ♦ Member States' Embassies in third countries ♦ EEAS and Commission services' headquarters geographic and thematic staff ♦ Council Working Groups ♦ PSC.

Following prioritisation and PSC discussion, EEAS geographical Managing Directors together with the Heads of Delegation and other relevant players in the EEAS and Commission services agree on a tailor-made timeline for follow-up activities serving as a roadmap for a timely, relevant and coherent response. A mapping exercise involving EEAS and Commission Services can contribute to ensure that proposed actions build on existing engagements/activities and analyses. This timeline and possibly the mapping exercise will be presented to the relevant Council Working Group or to the PSC.

Preventive action is based on expertise from the field and a thorough analysis of the specific conflict risks in the EWS priority countries. EEAS and relevant Commission Services can deploy a targeted in-country mission to support EU Delegations with the Assessment of Structural Risks of Conflict. All EU actors in-country are consulted, including field staff of ECHO, EUSR teams, CSDP missions and representatives of Member States as well as EU Delegations. This represents the collective assessment of EU actors at country level. Following inter-service consultations, Member States are consulted and informed through the relevant Council structures.

In-country, the consultation is based on a structured discussion among EU actors, around a series of factors linked to human security. The factors cover 10 risk areas: Legitimacy, Rule of Law, Security,

Inter-Group Relations, Human Rights, Civil Society & Media, Society, Climate Change & Disasters, Economic Performance and Regional Stability.

During this process, EU actors take stock of existing interventions and their impact on conflict/risks. Such interventions include preventive / peacebuilding actions as well as actions with other goals (e.g. developmental, security, political) that affect the identified risk factors or causes of conflict and fragility. Where there is a need to complement ongoing activities, e.g. to address a rising risk level, EU actors develop proposals for additional action. Proposals are linked to the analysis of conflict and target those structural factors that have been identified as specific risks. These can consider the full range of the EU's engagement on external action as well as measures proposed by the Member States through their mission staff.

The results of the in-country consultation process are documented in the Assessment for Structural Risks of Conflict. They represent the collective assessment of EU actors at country level.

On the basis of these collective assessments, the EEAS geographic services prepare a Conflict Prevention Report for each priority that identifies key risks as well as options and recommendations for political and programmatic preventive action, in consultation with the Delegation(s) concerned and Commission services. The purpose of the Conflict Prevention Report is to explicitly link the analysis undertaken and the development of options for responses, with timelines for action. The assessment and proposals contained in these reports are subsequently discussed and agreed during country team / region / theme-specific inter-service meetings in Headquarters as joint EEAS and Commission services' output. Staff from thematic and specialised departments are invited to contribute to the analysis.

Where necessary, more detailed information on individual priorities can be gathered by commissioning conflict analyses from the EU institutions or from external organisations. Guidance for using the conflict analysis tool can be found in the joint EEAS – Commission guidance note on conflict analysis¹⁰ or the EU Staff Handbook: Operating in situations of conflict and fragility.¹¹ A conflict analysis can also serve as an opportunity to reflect on the conflict sensitivity of previous EU policies.

Conflict Prevention Reports are shared and discussed with the relevant geographic Council Working Groups and are the basis for follow-up work by the various services, EU Delegations and Member States.

3. Monitoring

Main stakeholders: Management and staff of EEAS and Commission services ♦ EU Delegations ♦ Member States' representatives.

At the end of each EWS iteration (twelve months) the Heads of Delegations will be asked to prepare, together with Member States present in the country, a substantive report. This Head of Missions report will feed into the monitoring report which will be prepared with the support of the concerned services in EEAS (geographical Managing Directorates, EUSRs, PRISM) and Commission for the Inter-Service Senior Management and subsequent report to PSC. The Head of Mission report sets out the proposals for (early) actions that have been undertaken in line with the Conflict Prevention Report,

¹⁰ <http://intragate.ec.europa.eu/eeas/eeaszone/?q=node/52532#Guidancereferences> (intranet)

¹¹ <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-fragility/document/guidance-note-conflict-analysis-support-eu-external-action>

and the results obtained. Where proposals have not been followed up, reasoning is provided. The identified options for action may be updated / revised. This monitoring phase triggers new guidance on forward action and a reflection on impact as well as lessons learned during the process and potential improvements.

Impact/Added Value

The EWS facilitates EU-wide discussion on where risks for violent conflict exist, and on what integrated action can be identified to mitigate those risks. The focus is on multiplying the preventive and peacebuilding impact of EU engagement.

Each component is designed to add value for EU actors working in and on countries affected by, or at risk of violent conflict.

Information gathering and risk scanning provides a valuable additional resource for EU staff and management by integrating in a single product a wide variety of different conflict risk assessments: quantitative and qualitative, external and internal, open source and intelligence-based.

Prioritisation allows the EU and Member States to focus resources where there is most leverage, capacity and interest to have a real impact on the prevention of violence, on enhancing peacebuilding and/or strengthening resilience.

Bringing together the wider country teams, in-country and at headquarters, for shared assessment and analysis promotes increased impact by stimulating greater coherence in developing options for preventive action based on a 'joined-up' assessment of risks and dynamics.

The monitoring phase fosters the translation of options into action, feeding into diplomatic activity and the identification of conflict prevention / peacebuilding responses to be developed through the relevant instruments. It also allows for a comprehensive overview of EU contribution to reducing conflict risks and preventing violent conflict.

Annex I Indicators for the Global Conflict Risk Index (2017)¹²

Risk area	Concept	Indicator
Political	Regime type	Regime Type
		Lack of democracy
	Regime performance	Government Effectiveness
		Level of Repression
		Empowerment Rights
Security	Current conflict situation	Recent internal conflict
		Neighbours with HVC
	History of conflict	Years since HVC
Social	Social cohesion and diversity	Corruption
		Ethnic Power Change
		Ethnic compilation
		Transnational Ethnic Bonds
	Public security and health	Homicide Rate
		Infant Mortality
Economy	Development and distribution	GDP per capita
		Income inequality
		Openness
	Provisions and employment	Food security
		Unemployment
Geography - Environment	Geographic challenge	Water Stress
		Oil Production
		Structural constraints
	Demographics	Population size
		Youth bulge

Source: <http://conflictrisk.jrc.ec.europa.eu/Methodology>

¹² The choice of indicators reflects academic research on their correlation with conflict risk and the availability of datasets that cover all non-EU countries, are updated at least annually and include historical data to allow for testing for relevance. The choice may be updated.

Annex II: Who does what?

The preparatory risk-scanning step of the EWS compiles risk information from open sources and intelligence as a basis for subsequent prioritisation, shared assessment & follow-up and monitoring components.

	Prioritisation	Shared Assessment & Follow up	Monitoring
EU Delegations; other field presence	Provide input to geographic desks' review of risk information in preparation for the inter-service meeting at senior-management level	Complete the Assessment of Structural Risks of Conflict based on structured discussions with EU actors in the field Comment on and discuss the Conflict Prevention Report	Prepare substantive report together with Member States present in the country Contribute to reporting on progress and measures taken to increase prevention / peacebuilding impact
Geographic Desks; EEAS and Commission Services	Review risk information in preparation for the inter-service meeting at senior-management level	Agree on a tailor-made timeline for follow-up activities serving as a road map for timely, relevant and coherent responses Draft and discuss the Conflict Prevention Report based on the Assessment of Structural Risks of Conflict Present and discuss the Conflict Prevention Report in the relevant Council Working Group (WG) or Council Body	Report on progress and propose possible adjustments to increase prevention / peacebuilding impact
Management: EEAS and Commission Services	Inter-service meeting at senior-management level to identify early warning priorities for conflict prevention / peacebuilding/strengthening resilience	Provide input and guidance for preventive action	Review progress, reporting and guidance on action
Council / Member States	PSC discussion provides input and guidance to risk identification	Each priority is presented to the relevant Council Working Group or the PSC Member States' Embassies in-country contribute to structured discussions around conflict risks as input to Assessments of Structural Risks of Conflict Council WG discussions Member States identify bilateral preventive action	Council WG discussions on progress and action
PRISM/EEAS	Compile and present preparatory risk information Coordinate the overall EWS process	Facilitate in-country structured discussions on conflict risks Support development of Conflict Prevention Reports and facilitate discussion and agreement thereon	Support discussion of progress reporting and the identification of adjustments to preventive action