

Civil Society Dialogue Network Policy Meeting at Expert Level

EEAS Early Warning tools

Questions for participants on Early Warning Risk Matrix (Working Group A)

1. The matrix requires the review of conflict risks at different time periods. **To what extent do the choice of conflict risks align with the time intervals they have been allocated?** *E.g. Should unemployment be monitored annually / bi-annually / quarterly to be of most value?*
2. The external indices are intended to map onto the root causes of conflict framework that has been utilised in the development of the EU's Country Conflict Assessment. **Are there alternative reliable, regularly updated and openly accessible data sources for these root causes that should be considered for the matrix?**
3. The matrix has aimed to balance external quantitative data with more qualitative data from internal EU sources to triangulate and contextualise the indices. **How have you, in your own methodologies, sought to overcome the limitations of quantitative indicators?**
4. The matrix includes qualitative data from the EU delegations (EUDs) annual Country Conflict Assessment, input from civil society dialogues, as well as the EUDs' quarterly review. **How have you incorporated and given weight to qualitative data in your own data-gathering processes?**
5. The output of the matrix is a two page country report, which is designed to be accessible for analysts, but also to act as part of the supporting evidence if/when presented to decision-makers. **Given this rationale, can you see opportunities to further synthesise or abbreviate the presentation of information?**
6. **How do you (would you) account for classified inputs / data within your own early warning systems?**
7. Given the proliferation of early warning tools and systems, **in what ways could this information matrix be modified to support greater cohesion with other information and conflict risk systems?**

Questions for participants on Country Conflict Assessment (Working Group B)

1. The CCA is subdivided into eight problem areas, thought to represent broadly the main categories of causes of violent conflict. **Would you agree with this, or is there another important problem area that needs to be included?**
2. **Do you have specific feedback on the questions for each problem area?** (problematic wording, key issue missing etc.)

3. The questionnaire aims at tapping existing knowledge of key delegation staff, and inquires into subjective assessments, for which there may or not be well documented sources of information. **Do you have / know of experience with tapping tacit knowledge of field level staff, as a complement to research data / indices / statistics? What is your view on this approach (pros and cons)?**

4. For each problem area, the respondent is asked for a concluding assessment on a scale of 5 (with 'undecided' as middle option). **From a methodology point of view, would you favour inclusion of the 'undecided' option, or is it in your experience better to force the respondent to either agree (somewhat) or disagree (somewhat) with the statement?**

5. In the existing methodology, the answers to the CCA are summarised in a numerical score, giving equal weight to each category. The trend is then included in the Early Warning Risk Matrix. **How would you summarise the CCA in an overall assessment of conflict risk?**