

HDR-Net Consolidated Reply

DISCUSSION: Putting the Human Security approach into practice

Cross-posted on UNDP's HDR-Net and CPRP-Net

Prepared by Richard Jolly, Deepayan Basu Ray, Hanna Schmitt, Misaki Watanabe and Sharmila Kurukulasuriya

December 2006

Table of Contents:

- [Introduction and Launch Message](#)
 - [Summary of Responses](#)
 - [Related Resources](#)
 - [Responses in Full](#)
-

Introduction & Launch Message:

Sarah Burd-Sharps, HDRO/UNDP and Gita Swamy, BCPR/UNDP

Dear Colleagues,

It is with great pleasure that we present the fifth in our series of Occasional Papers, this one on human security as an operational approach, written by Sir Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu Ray. As you are no doubt aware, this concept was first introduced by the [Global Human Development Report 1994](#). While several governments, some organisations and researchers have pursued this concept further, there is still need to continue to define and refine the concept, and to look at what it means to use a human security approach “on the ground”. With over a dozen NHDRs already published on the topic, we believed it was time to explore the applications and policy experiences these HDRs have to offer using the human security framework, and to look at how these reports, taken as a body of work, can inform current debates on human security.

Previous Occasional Papers, which are intended to provide theoretical and practical guidance for NHDR teams around the world, were produced in collaboration with UNDP’s Bureau for Development Policy, addressed the topics of environment, gender, HIV/AIDS and conflict prevention. Producing these papers has presented an opportunity to exchange experiences and good practices in producing NHDRs and other UNDP programs and projects.

We would therefore once again like to tap into the broad experiences and knowledge that human development professionals and CPR practitioners on these networks possess so as to begin an e-discussion on NHDRs, the human security frameworks and its applications on the ground. We would like to discuss the main findings of the paper as well as the broader practical implications for UNDP and its partners in this area. The outcomes of this discussion will be shared in a consolidated form on both networks and also feed in the production of additional tools to support country offices in applying a human security framework to their work.

We are very pleased that the authors of the paper [National Human Development Reports and the Human](#)

[Security Framework: A Review of Analysis and Experience](#) agreed to act as Guest Moderators for this discussion. Richard Jolly is currently Honorary Professor at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) at the University of Sussex, UK, is a Co-director of the UN Intellectual History Project and was principal coordinator of the Human Development Report in the late 90's. Before this, he served for 14 years in UNICEF and co-authored the path breaking book "Adjustment with a Human Face". Deepayan Basu Ray is also at IDS and is currently an Editor with the id21 project. His research interests are in the areas of human security, conflict/crisis and state capacity, and the rights based approach to development.

We hope you will contribute to this discussion and that you will find the attached paper useful in your work. We hope to receive your comments by 09 June 2006.

Looking forward to a lively debate!

Sincerely

Sarah Burd-Sharps
Chief, NHDR Unit and Deputy Director, HDRO
Human Development Report Office
UNDP

Gita Swamy Meier-Ewert
Knowledge Management Coordinator
Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery
UNDP

Sir Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu Ray, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK

Dear colleagues,

We are pleased to invite you to take part in a discussion on the attached [Occasional Paper on NHDRs and the Human Security Framework](#) and the practical implication of the concept for the work of UNDP. Human security has recently gained increasing attention, notably in initiatives by the governments of Norway, Canada and Japan and in the international commission report [Human Security Now](#), co-chaired by Amartya Sen and Sadako Ogata. (2003). The recent major UN report [A More Secure World: Our shared responsibility \(2004\)](#) used human security as the frame within which to outline their proposals aimed at the revitalisation of the organisation – though it mostly refers to human security as comprehensive collective security.

Human Security in its broadest sense embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. The Commission of Human Security describes Human Security as the protection of the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment. It means protecting fundamental freedoms that are the essence of life and protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations. It means using processes that build on people's strengths and aspirations. It means creating political, social, environmental, economic, military and cultural systems that together give people the building blocks of survival, livelihood and dignity.

In spite of this surge of interest by civil society and international organizations, some still express reservations about the usefulness and the coherence of the concept. For this reason, our paper begins with a review of the basic concept of human security, the doubts and criticisms it has evoked and our replies to these criticisms. The paper then summarizes the main elements of the 13 country reports, original features of the methodology they use and lessons from them for policy and for responding to their criticisms of the concept. Finally, our paper makes proposals for future use of the concept by UNDP, especially in relation to NHDRs and for preparing situation analyses for countries where the new Peacebuilding Commission may be operative.

We and others in the HDRO and BCPR would be glad to receive comments and contributions on any of these points. Especially interesting however, would be comments on three areas of questions:

1. Has the concept of human security been used in your own country – and how useful has it proved to be? What were your experiences?
2. Are there other frameworks or approaches for the analysis of human security which could improve our ability to ‘operationalise’ the concept?
3. Do the [recommendations](#) in this paper seem useful for analysis and policy of human security – and how might they be improved?

We look forward to an engaging discussion on these critical issues as well as your feedback on the study and ways to make it more useful to UNDP and the whole UN system.

Best wishes,

Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu Ray
Institute of Development Studies (IDS)
University of Sussex, UK

[\[back to top\]](#)

Responses were received, with many thanks, from:

1. [Pippa Norris](#), BDP/UNDP
2. [Hans Risser](#), UNDP **Serbia and Montenegro**
3. [Richard Ponzio](#), University of Oxford
4. [Cleophas Torori](#), UNDP **Liberia**
5. [Noriharu Masuji](#), BRSP/UNDP
6. [Erica Marat](#), Uppsala University
7. [Sascha Graumann](#), UNDP **Ukraine**
8. [Tetsuo Kondo](#), UNDP **Timor Leste**
9. [Shahin Yagub](#), HDRO/UNDP
10. [Eno Ngjela](#), UNDP **Albania**
11. [Basant Kumar Subba](#), UNDP **Ukraine**
12. [Archie Law](#), UNDP/RSC Johannesburg
13. [Chikako Kodama](#), UNDP PAPP
14. [Olaf Juergensen](#), UNDP **Jordan**
15. **Mehrnaz Mostafavi**, OCHA ([message 1](#), [message 2](#))
16. [Ivan Lupis](#), UN OCHA
17. [Fakhruddin Azizi](#), UNDP **Afghanistan**
18. [Rose Ssebatindira](#), UNDP **Uganda**

[\[back to top\]](#)

Summary of Responses:

[Concept of human security](#) | [Added value of human security practical application](#) | [Challenges and limitations of human security framework](#) | [Measuring human security](#) | [Suggestions to improve the recommendations of the occasional paper](#)

Dear colleagues,

In the course of this lively discussion we have received many valuable and insightful responses from colleagues in UNDP country office, other UN agencies and academia. We would like to thank all who took the time to review the thematic paper and provided feedback on it and shared their experiences on this topic. Your suggestions have proved to be very useful and will feed into the production of additional tools to support UNDP practitioners in applying a human security framework to their work. Whilst pursuing this, we will also give due consideration to the number of challenges and criticisms raised by colleagues on the usefulness and applicability of the human security framework.

Generally, network members welcomed the thematic paper as a timely and important initiative and shared their experiences and ideas with regards to

- (1) The concept of human security
- (2) The added value of the human security framework and its application in practice
- (3) Challenges and limitations of the human security framework
- (4) Suggestions to improve the operationalization of the human security concept
- (5) Suggestions on how to improve the recommendations of the occasional paper.

(1) Concept of human security

The concepts put forward by members from UNDP, OCHA, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), the UN Trust Fund for Human Security and academia of what we mean by human security largely validated to the definition of human security put forward by the Occasional Paper. There was general consensus among members that human security is:

- **People-centered:** Human security focuses on the most vulnerable individuals and communities and advocates for policies and programs that are based on the notions of protection and empowerment.
- **Multi-dimensional:** Human security is an integrated approach that brings together the multiplicity of challenges faced by individuals and communities and recognizes the inter-linkages between security, development and human rights. It is an approach that highlights the gaps in military, social, political, economic and environmental systems;
- **Universal:** Human security is universal in the sense that it gives equal importance to all rights on freedom from basic insecurities (civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights).
- Other important points raised by members on what we mean by human security include:
 - Human security is not only about securing human necessities but also **ensuring that such necessities will not be lost in the future**. Human security calls for minimizing “**downdside risk**” by understanding the ramifications of poverty and focusing on **social protection and disaster prevention**. Thus, it is intricately linked with the objectives of conflict prevention and disaster risk reduction and emphasizes the importance of **protecting and empowering people** in time of crisis.
 - Human security comprehensively addresses the objectives of “freedom from fear,” “freedom from want,” and “freedom to live in dignity” and thus goes beyond socio-economic outcomes. It is **closely linked with the objectives of the Millennium Declaration and the MDGs** as human security provides an integrative approach that embraces the three dimensions of the Declaration: peace and security, development and the MDGs and human rights, democracy and good governance.

(2) Added value of the human security framework practical applications

The concept of human security is fundamental to UNDP's mandate of human-centered development, and thus adds value to the area of our work in the following ways:

Focuses on individuals / communities:

Contributors emphasized that Human Security has helped considerably in understanding the shift in the political landscape and discourse around the link between the humanitarian/developmental consequences of good governance, peace and security. As a tool for practitioners, the real strength of the human security framework remains its ability to analyze and explain how moving towards a broader conceptual understanding of 'Freedom' has benefited those people most marginalized in so many of the societies in which UNDP is at work. Human security thus brings the missing ethnical dimension in the study of international relations. The human security framework works to improve "protection and empowerment" of individuals by comprehensively including both top-down protection and bottom-up empowerment measures.

Provides a model for analysis and prioritization in crisis situations:

The experience in developing a National Human Development Report (NHDR) focusing on human security in **Afghanistan** and **Liberia** demonstrates how the concept of human security can provide a useful model for analyzing human development in post-conflict contexts. By analyzing human security and human capacities, NHDRs in post-conflict situations can provide the way forward for capacity development and people-centered post-conflict recovery. The concept of human security has also been useful for developing the Country Office's CPAP and related CPR programmes as in **Uganda**. Adopting human security as a framework for analysis also helps the prioritization of post-conflict recovery work. For example in **Afghanistan**, after the launch of its NHDR on human security, considerable improvements in the human security conditions have been made throughout the country. Over the past years, there has been considerable progress in improving the education and health care conditions, return of refugees, reintegration of women into society and implementing the Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) process of ex-combatants. Human security remains central to initiating and planning projects and programs in **Afghanistan**.

Provides a framework for monitoring and early warning in crisis / post-crisis situations:

Human security has also been used for monitoring and early warning purposes in **Albania** and **Ukraine**. The human security framework adds an additional dimension to traditional socio-economic indicators in early warning by identifying and monitoring the main threats to people's lives. It also provides a framework to analyze the impact different government / international agencies' programme has in meeting the people's human security needs. Adopting a "human security" label has also been particularly useful when adapting an Early Warning tools for crisis prevention to a post-crisis country that is no longer under emergency conditions.

Provides an integrative model for planning:

Network members pointed out that the human security framework has proven to be very useful in conceptualizing and then planning for programming interventions in post-conflict countries where the **understanding of the connections between conflict, security and development is necessary for tackling deep-rooted problems**. Human Security is an integrative approach, which brings together the multiplicity of challenges faced by individuals and communities by recognizing the inter-linkages between security, development and human rights. The concept offers a framework under which people are both **protected and empowered** and consequently are better able to actively prevent and mitigate the impact of insecurities they are facing. Although this has not taken place systematically, using the human security framework in the start-up of the programmes from the earliest assessments and project design can increase the impact of programmes by strengthening the links between different interventions – for

example between mine action, small arms, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) and security sector reform.

Identifies multiple entry points for interventions:

Essential steps to elaborate and NHDR or other national analyses on Human Security:

- Reflect national priorities and ownership
- Define human security
- Describe most relevant human insecurities in the national context and link it to human development
- Collect and provide data on human security
- Consider undertaking a public opinion survey opinion to clarify the attitudes of people to different types of threat and their impact
- Analyze and assess comparatively the costs and benefits of current and past policy initiatives to deal with the various types of threats to human security
- Provide policy recommendations for the future (set and affirm goals, utilize partnerships, create comprehensive strategies) and ways to measure their impact

For example in the **Great Lakes Region in Northwestern Tanzania**, UN OCHA is addressing human security challenges in a post-conflict situation faced by refugees, internally displaced persons, and the host community. In this regard, the project tackles **human security through focusing on multiple entry points** that seek to break the cycle between conflict, poverty, loss of education, infectious diseases and environmental degradation. Among the interventions included are capacity building of local government; reduction of small arms and light weapons; enhancement of education and enrollment of out of school youth; strengthening of agricultural production; and advancement of life-saving skills and knowledge on HIV/AIDS and malaria.

Encourages broad partnerships:

Taking a human security approach encourages building partnerships at the international, national and local levels. This aims to not only strengthen local capacities but also promote collaboration among the many actors involved in the management of security issues and the achievement of human security. For example, OCHA **Peru** is finalizing a multi-agency project in Southern Andes region prone to natural disasters. Under the framework of protection and empowerment, several UN agencies - in collaboration with community networks, non-governmental organizations, as well as regional, local and national authorities - will work together to implement early warning and monitoring systems, improve environmental management and local agricultural and livestock practices, and strengthen community awareness and knowledge of practical preventive measures in response to natural disasters.

Provides a model for evaluating CPR programmes:

In the case of the **mine action programmes in Jordan**, applying a human security framework could help evaluate whether individual freedoms and security have been enhanced for the border population once the program is completed. At present, there is a strong indication that the mines will be replaced by electronic sensor devices and that the fertile border will probably remain a no-go-zone. The human security approach would be helpful in pinpointing these types of incongruities.

Tool for Advocacy:

Adopting the human security framework is also a strong advocacy tool as it provides a platform for pursuing programmes that addresses both security and development imperatives. Thus, human security framework can elevate the status and consequently funding for core development challenges vis-à-vis “traditional” security concerns that normally pre-occupy the media and donors during and after violent conflict. Further, labeling an intervention “human security” may also be more appealing for host countries no longer wishing to be classified as a country in “crisis.”

Complements the MDGs:

A point was raised on the relationship between human security and achievements of the MDGs, and whether one should promote one over the other. A member questioned that the achievement of the MDGs may not necessarily guarantee achievement of human security. However, pursuing the objective of human security complements our work to achieve the MDGs as human security embraces the three dimensions of the Millennium Declaration: peace and security, development and the MDGs and human rights, democracy and good governance.

Some practical examples of how UNDP and partners are practically applying the human security framework include:

- UNDP **Serbia-Montenegro** recently closed its conflict prevention and recovery (CPR) program and transferred ongoing projects to a newly established human security cluster. The HS cluster is focusing on challenges caused by regional and global processes affecting the country and its most vulnerable population. In 2005 the cluster had a budget of US\$ 3.5 million and focused on the following areas of intervention: (1) environmental concerns, global impact. (2) pandemics, global concerns, (3) control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, (4) forced Population Displacements, and (5) disaster Management.
- Since 2001, UNDP **Albania** has developed a new early warning reporting **methodology based on human security monitoring that focuses on qualitative research in order to capture the human security situation**. Albania's 2004 Early Warning/Human Security Monitoring Report identified the main threats to people's lives through a nationally representative survey: (1) Not enough money to feed the family; (2) Illness; (3) Housing; (4) Pollution; (5) Loss of job; (6) Property issues, (7) Extortion, (8) Legal disputes, (9) Neighborhood violence. The final Report grouped these threats around four main HS patterns: (1) poverty and inequality, (2) rule of law and corruption, (3) personal and community security, and (4) natural disasters and pollution.
- UNDP Ukraine's Crimea Integration and Development Programme (CIDP)'s main component was to set up a **Human Security Monitoring System with combined early warning monitoring with institutionalized dialogue-like processes, in the form of the Human Security and Development Council (HSDC)**. The HSDC was established in 2002 and formalized in 2003 as a Consultative and Advisory Body at the Council of Ministers of the ARC. Its main functions are two-fold: (1) to monitor and detect early signs of possible tension, instability or social conflict, and (2) to develop policy recommendations for addressing areas of special concern. To assist the HSDC, a research body has been formed with CIDP to monitor trends and conduct regular research on the different aspects of human security, using a variety of research methodologies, such as: periodic public opinion polls, collection of official statistics and event monitoring based on information disseminated through mass media, expert interviews, field research case studies, etc. The information is analyzed and used for the preparation of Human Security and Development Reports. The main significance of the Human Security and Development Monitoring System is that it enables key policy- and decision-makers in Crimea to measure and analyzes the effect of Government policies. Moreover, the system allows for measuring systematically the impact of support provided by UNDP and others in terms of supporting stability, integration and development.

Other agencies have integrated the human security framework in their areas of work:

- **Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA)** has developed seven principles of Human Security, which they utilize when formulating or screening development programs and projects: (1) reaching those in need through a people-centered approach; (2) empowering people as well as protecting them; (3) focusing on the most vulnerable people, whose survival, livelihood and dignity are at risk; (4) comprehensively addressing both "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear"; (5) responding to people's needs by assessing and addressing threats through flexible and inter-sectoral approaches; (6) working with both government and local communities to realize sustainable development; and (7) strengthening partnership with various actors to achieve a higher impact from assistance.

- **UNOCHA** developed a human security-based methodology for humanitarian early warning analysis and risk assessment. The methodology is divided into three main parts: (1) a "snapshot assessment" step (2) a more thorough analytical approach using four broad Human Security Sectors to assess a particular country/region at risk of a crisis; and (3) a scenario-building exercise which maps out potential humanitarian-related consequences and aids in the formulation of recommendations targeting those potential consequences. In step two, four broad Human Security Sectors are to be used for conducting a thorough early warning/risk assessment analysis: (1) social sector, (2) economic sector, (3) political sector, (4) environmental sector.
- **UN Trust Fund for Human Security**, which was launched in 1999 by the Government of Japan and the UN Secretariat. The United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS) finances projects carried out by organizations in the UN system, and when appropriate, in partnership with non-UN entities, to advance the operational impact of the human security concept. Two examples of the types of projects funded by UNOCHA under the UNTFHS.

(3) Challenges & limitations of the human security framework

Although members agreed that human security brings forward a critical element for UNDP's area of work, a number of challenges and limitations of the concept were raised. The main criticism is that there is still limited practical advice on how to turn the human security concept into action.

One contributing factor to this shortcoming is that there is still a **lack of clarity of what we mean when we use the human security concept**. It is a very broad concept and it remains very difficult to consent to a universal definition. It is also unclear if we use it as an approach, a framework or an object to achieve, or all three? Human security can be used in all three purposes but differentiation needs to be made between them in order to identify the components for each and provide guidance to turn human security into action. Further, a lot of thought has been put into using human security for upstream analysis, but there is still a gap that needs to be bridged on how to actually do human-centered development in the context of human security in the field.

Another challenge is **linking analysis with action**. The concept for human security is often used for analyzing and monitoring situations, but effective and systematic linkages between analysis and appropriate action remains are often missing. Contributors pointed out that human security has not always been intentionally applied as a discrete planning and operational tool within UNDP. Therefore it was felt that in order to tackle human security within UNDP's programs and to operationalize the concept, it should be more systematically incorporated into UNDP's core activities, for example through integration into the MYFF as one of the cross-cutting issues.

On the other hand, some feel that the concept is too all encompassing that it is difficult to define what is "not" human security. In Country Offices, "human security" cluster can be a catch-all name for all projects that do not fit into the work of other clusters. **Lack of useful measures to monitor the impact** of the work under human security concept also raises questions about the usefulness of the concept.

Considering that the main threats to people's lives differ by context, there is a need for qualitative analysis to reveal the pattern of human security concerns. Others argued that human security is **largely a western-driven concept imported by international organizations** which does not resonate with some populations in developing countries. Focusing too much on human security issues may also create tension with legitimate sources of societal and state security and concerns.

(4) Measuring human security

Since human security is a very broad concept, it is difficult to map and measure it and data has to come from different sources. The Global Human Development Report 1994 divides human security into seven main categories: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, and political security.

The Human Security Report 2005 'War and Peace in the 21st century' divided data into the following categories:

- Armed Conflict: number of conflicts, countries in conflict, and warring parties; number of deaths from armed conflict; beyond deaths (Countries are assigned a score on a ten-point scale based on casualty numbers, size of affected areas, dislocated populations, extent of infrastructure damage and other factors.)
- Deadly assault on civilians: one-sided violence; genocide and politicide; democide
- Terrorism
- Human Rights
- Political stability
- Refugees and IDPs
- Small Arms, landmines and UXO

Another way to measure human security conditions might be through longitudinal household dataset on poverty dynamics and vulnerability. Poverty is a temporal phenomenon and people know that in order to survive in the future, they have to count in certain risks in their survival strategy. Longitudinal datasets allow the quantification of chronic poverty and the estimation of vulnerability to future poverty based on current household characteristics. This method also gives greater definition to the types of risks faced by individual households and the safety-nets required to address them. Most of the literature on longitudinal household datasets is written in terms of income poverty; however, concepts and frameworks could apply to any welfare metric that has temporal variability and therefore is a source of household insecurity.

(5) Suggestions how to improve the recommendations of the occasional paper

Generally, contributors found the suggestions of the paper to be very useful and timely. In particular the suggestion to make the human security analyses available in all countries that are under consideration for action in the Peacebuilding Commission, as well as the recommended methodology for measuring the perception of insecurity in the country were received with much interest.

Some contributors felt, however, that the paper focused too much on an upstream analysis and monitoring of human security, rather than on providing a bottom-up approach and an on-the-ground how-to handbook. Moreover, contributors emphasized that one of the most salient challenges to operationalizing human security was the continued compartmentalization of mandates and disciplines within UN agencies, government ministries and academic and policy institutions. Therefore it would be important to give more attention to the kind of interdisciplinary approaches, methodological know-how and policy coordination mechanisms that are required in order to promote human security on the ground. In this context it was also felt that while human security conditions differ from one country to another and therefore a standard approach would not be appropriate, it would be important to consider a common analytical platform to assess human security conditions in a particular country in order to establish a more systematic understanding of the human security gaps in a particular country. This can also address the need to approach human security that gives due consideration to individual traits of any given country within the context of the country's regional location.

Once again, we would like to thank you for your valuable inputs to this discussion, which will be essential to the further incorporation of the concept into the work of UNDP on the ground.

[\[back to top\]](#)

Related Resources

[General](#) | [UNDP Publications](#) | [Human Development Reports](#) | [Websites](#) | [Resource Institutions](#) | [Country Offices working on Human Security issues](#) | [From the Network Archives](#)

I. General

- Richard Jolly and Deepayan Basu Ray. [National Human Development Reports and the Human Security Framework: A review of Analysis and Experience](#), NHDR Occasional Paper, April 2006
- Commission on Human Security. [Human Security Now](#), New York 2003
- Human Security Centre. [The Human Security Report 2005: War and Peace in the 21st Century, New York 2005](#)
- Report of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. [A more secure world: our shared responsibility](#), New York
- Center for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity, University of Oxford, [Social Exclusion and Conflict: Analysis and Policy Implications](#)
- R. Ponzio, 'Why Human Security is a New Concept with Global Origins', stair 1, No 2 (2005): 66-71.
- S Neil MacFarlane and Yuen Foong Khong. ["Human Security and the UN: A Critical History."](#) (2006)
- Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart, [Sacred and Secular](#) (Cambridge University Press 2005)
- Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs: **Early Warning Unit**. ["human security-based methodology for humanitarian early warning analysis and risk assessment"](#)
- Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA): [Human Security and JICA](#)
- JICA Poverty Reduction and Human Security: [Incorporating the Concept of Human Security in Poverty Reduction](#), 2006
- Center for Humanitarian Dialogue: [The Role of Non-State Actors in building Security – The case of Armed Groups in Intra-State Wars](#) (2000)
- OECD DAC: ["Security and Human Security: An Overview of Concepts and Initiatives– What Implications for West Africa?"](#) (2004)
- Government of Canada: ["Human Security and Conflict Prevention"](#) (2006)
- OCHA [Digital Library](#) on Human Security

II. UNDP Publications

- HDRO/BCPR, [NHDR Thematic Guidance Note on Conflict Prevention](#)
- UNDP Bangladesh [Human Security Report](#) (2002)
- UNDP Mongolia: [Economic and Ecological Vulnerabilities and Human Security in Mongolia](#) (2005)
- UNDP [Securing Development - UNDP's Support for Addressing Small Arms Issues](#) (2005)
- UNDP BCPR / BRSP: [Experiences from the Field - UNDP CSO Partnerships for Conflict Prevention](#) (2005)
- UNDP BDP, ["Environment Conflict and Human Security: Analytical Linkages, Evidence and Policy Options"](#)

III. Human Development Reports

- [Human Development Report 1994](#): - **New Dimensions of Human Security** - The report introduces a new concept of human security which equates security with people rather than territories, with development rather than arms. It examines both the national and the global concerns of human security.
- [Central Asia Human Development Report 2005](#) - **Bringing down barriers** - Regional cooperation for human development and human security. Chapter 4 of the Report looks at the question of regional cooperation on water, energy and environment. Water, energy and environmental resources are critical for human development and human security. In Central Asia, they are closely linked, through both geography and the vast infrastructure systems put in place during Soviet days. The republics are

tightly interconnected with each other in managing these resources, even as each country had different endowments and priorities.

- [Afghanistan Human Development Report 2004](#) – **Security with a Human Face** - The first-ever Afghanistan Human Development Report shows economy, education improving, but poverty, inequality and instability threaten progress. It draws a portrait of a nation still at odds - if no longer at war - with itself. And in a novel approach to peacemaking, the unblinking, unvarnished Report concludes that "human security" and "human development," rather than military force and diplomacy alone, are key to resolving Afghanistan's complex problems.
- [Bulgaria Human Development Report 1998](#) – **The State of Transition and the Transition of the State** - The Report focuses attention on the issue of the country in transition. Which are the government's priorities? What traps there may be on the road to good governance? Which are the spheres the state cannot and should not give up? The fundamental problem set out in the Report is how short-term change can contribute to the attainment of sustainable long-term development.
- [East Timor Human development Report 2002](#) – **The Way Ahead** - The Report gathers all-important qualitative and statistical data on the population's standard of living. It contributes to the understanding of these challenges and helps map a route out of the cycle of poverty. Finally, this first NHDR assesses some of the most pressing difficulties in East Timor but also demonstrates how a commitment to human development can set the country on a peaceful and productive new course.
- [Estonia Human Development Report 1997](#) – **Social Cohesion and Social Exclusion/ Deprivation**
- [Kyrgyzstan Human Development Report 2000](#) – **Democratic Governance for Human Development** - The Report offers a discussion of several new areas of human development in the republic that will require close attention by state and society over at least the next five to ten years. These major themes involve issues of globalization, security, and development.
- [Latvia Human Development Report 2003](#) – **Human Security and Human Development** - The Report focuses on defining Human Security in Latvia. As a result of Latvia's transition from the Soviet occupation to a market economy after its independence, the people of Latvia has experienced substantive changes in their lives in the past ten years. The goal of this Report is to reduce this "insecurity effect" felt at the individual level. It offers practical tools and mechanisms to help people identify risks in their lives, and develop individual and collective risk management strategies as well as security-enhancing / problem-solving skills. The Report also aims at priorities and measuring the effect of their policies.
- [Liberia Human Development Report 2006](#) - **Building and Mobilising Capacities for Reconstruction and Development** - The report offers fresh insights into the complex arena of human development, from the perspective of a post-conflict context, making a strong case for breaking the cycle of violent conflict, creating and sustaining peace as the basis for capacity building for reconstruction and development.
- [Lesotho Human Development Report 1998](#) – **General Human Development Report** - The first Human Development Report for Lesotho focuses on human security. Since Lesotho's commitment to human development is only recent, the main findings of the report conclude that many areas of human security remain problematic.
- [Macedonia Human Development Report 2001](#) – **Social Exclusion and Human Insecurity in the FYR Macedonia** - The Report explores the dimensions of the often traumatic personal, family, community and collective feelings of insecurity and social exclusion that exist in Macedonia. The analysis in the Report focuses on the problem of insecurity related to unemployment, employment and the work place; social exclusion of the rural population and economic insecurity in the work force originating in the transition process, insecurity deriving from environmental threats, inter-ethnic relations, lack of personal security associated with petty crime, lack of judicial protection, insecurity in dealing with state administrative organs and legal insecurity, as well as the exclusion that accompanies these circumstances.
- [Moldova Human Development Report 1999](#) – **Transition and Human Security** - The Report argues that human beings are the first priority in the development process - economic growth and economy itself being no more than a means towards achieving human development.
- [Mozambique Human Development Report 1998](#) – **Peace and Economic Growth** - The challenges facing Mozambique in terms of sustainable human development are enormous, but the opportunities, chances and the need for rapid human development are still greater. The Report concludes that the

improvement of the human condition and of the capacities of Mozambicans go well beyond the absence of war and positive and speedy economic growth.

- [Philippines Human Development Report 2005](#) – **Peace and Conflict Prevention: Human Security** - Based on the concept of human security, the report assesses the state of human security, using human development indicators additional indicators of human security. It identifies the structural causes of the conflict in Southern Philippines and the areas of particular vulnerability to violent conflicts. The report also provides an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of key Philippine institutions in terms of their roles and capacities in terms of rights protection, peace building, and conflict prevention. The report is intended to draw attention to the human development and economic costs of the unending armed conflict in Southern Philippines the urgency of taking serious measures to put an end to it. The report calls for political reforms to increase stability in governance and open discussions on the role of the military in the recent political transition and its implications for political stability.
- [Sierra Leone Human Development Report 1998](#) – **From Civil Conflict to Human Security**
- [Solomon Islands Human Development Report 2002](#) – **Building a Nation** - The purpose of the Report is to contribute to discussion on the efforts of individuals, households, the private sector, government, civil society as well as development partners in providing opportunities for people in Solomon Islands to achieve satisfying lives. The report gives an overall view of the human development status of the country. In doing so it points out a lot of issues as well as potential development paths and options. Finally, its Report provides information, ideas, guidance and possible solutions that can be used in Solomon Islands to further improve people's livelihood.

IV. Websites

- **SURF Arab States:** [On-Line Resources on Human Security](#)

V. Resource Institutions

- OCHA [Human Security Unit](#)
- United Nations [Trust Fund for Human Security](#)
- Government of Canada – [Human Security Programme](#)
- [Canadian Consortium on Human Security](#)
- [Human Security Network](#)
- [Human Security Center](#)
- [Commission on Human Security](#)
- United Nations [Intellectual History Project](#)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan. [Official Development Assistance Charter](#)
- Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) [Projects on Human Security](#)

VI. Country Offices working on Human Security issues

ALBANIA

In practical terms, the Human Security concept was made part of the second UNDP Common Country Framework for UNDP, and the structure of UNDP country programme was organized in (a) Democratic Governance, and (b) Human Security. A Human Security Framework for Albania that was locally formulated laid the ground for the new Human Security Programme that included several sub-programmes such as the Enabling Environment for Human Security, Personal and Community Security, Socio-economic Security and Environmental Security. Human Security was also incorporated in UNDP Albania's work in early warning, which was published in the 2004 [Early Warning: Human Security Monitoring Report](#), which tried to identify through a nationally representative survey what were the main threats to the people's lives.

- UNDP Albania Early Warning – [Human Security Monitoring projects](#)

BOSNIA – HERZEGOVINA

UNDP Bosnia-Herzegovina's Human Security Portfolio relates to two projects: Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) Demilitarization; and Mine Action: Strengthening mine action structures and reducing mine threat through mine clearance activities in the field.

- UNDP Bosnia – [Herzegovina: Human Security Portfolio](#)
- [Small Arms and Light Weapons Control Project](#)
- [Mine Action Project](#)

BRAZIL

UNDP Brazil has a project on “Human Security Partnerships with the Third Sector in Brazil,” which aims to integrate public security and development policies through partnership with civil society. Together with Viva Rio – a CSO with a track record on working on human security issues and public security – the project aims to develop municipal public security plans and contribute to control of small arms and light weapons at the national and state levels.

- UNDP Brazil: [Human Security Partnerships with the Third Sector in Brazil Project](#)

CROATIA

UNDP Croatia's [Transitional Justice and Human Security Cluster](#) works on projects related to control of small arms and light weapons, transitional justice and anti-corruption initiatives.

EL SALVADOR

UNDP El Salvador's Programme “Towards a Society without Violence,” executed the project (funded by BCPR) which aims to contribute to human development in the two municipalities of Ilopango and San Martin, through a reduction of armed violence. As such, the project is developing a pilot experience of the prohibition of weapons carrying, allowing the evaluation of its impact on human development and poverty and raising awareness in support of strengthening present national firearms legislation.

- [Towards a Society without Violence Programme](#)

SERBIA & MONTENEGRO

UNDP Serbia and Montenegro established a Human Security Cluster a few years ago reflecting the increasing level of the country's stability and the desire to concentrate on UNDP's development work and phase out of Crisis Prevention and Recovery. The Cluster focuses on some of the following issues: developing the national strategy for sustainable development, environmental issues, HIV prevention in vulnerable people, control of small arms and light weapons, supporting forced population displacements and disaster management.

- UNDP Serbia and Montenegro ([SCG](#)) [Human Security Cluster Framework](#).
- UNDP Serbia: [Human Security Projects](#)

SIERRA LEONE

UNDP Sierra Leone approaches human security through its project on Armed Violence Prevention, which aims to reduce armed violence and demand for small arms.

- UNDP Sierra Leone Project [Brief Armed Violence Prevention Programme](#)
- UNDP Sierra Leone: Community Arms Collection and Development Programme, [Final Report](#)

UKRAINE

UNDP Ukraine's Crimea Integration and Development Programme has a Human Security Component. The Human Security and Development Monitoring System provides analysis on the extent in which policies are effective in improving the living conditions in Crimea and to what extent are these

improvements are matched by people's perceptions about their quality of life. The UNDP/CIDP Analytical Group monitors trends and conducts regular research on the different aspects of human security, which are compiled into a Human Security and Development Reports, which are extensively discussed the Human Security and Development Council (HSDC), comprised of high-level stakeholders of the Autonomic Republic of Crimea.

- UNDP Ukraine [Crimea Integration and Development Programme](#)

VI. From the Network Archives

CPRP-Net:

- E-discussion:
[Crisis in Development? MDGs in Conflict and Disaster Settings](#)
- Query:
[Monitoring & Early Warning on Conflict / Comparative Experiences /Palestinian Territories](#)
- Query:
[Guatemala/ Comparative Experiences / Security Sector Reform - Community Based Citizen/Human Security Projects](#)
- Query:
[Small Arms Control & Community Policing/comparative experiences/Belize](#)

HDR-Net:

- For Comments: [NHDR Thematic Guidance Note on Conflict and Conflict Prevention](#), 23 August 2004
- Query:
[Liberia HDR 2006: Searching for Volunteer Reviewers for Liberia's HDR 2006 on Capacity Building for Reconstruction and Development.](#)

[\[back to top\]](#)

Responses in Full

Pippa Norris, BDP/UNDP, wrote:

Dear Richard and Deepayan

I am pleased to learn about the growing focus on human security as a core concept in development. You may be interested in the book I recently published with Ronald Inglehart, [Sacred and Secular](#) (Cambridge University Press 2005) which used the concept of human security and applied this as the core explanation for patterns of secularization and religiosity worldwide.

Chapters are also available on [my website](#), including how the concept was operationalized and the survey evidence used for the analysis.

With warm regards

Pippa Norris
Director, Democratic Governance Group
Bureau for Development Policy
United Nations Development Programme

Richard Ponzio, University of Oxford, wrote:

Dear Colleagues,

With the encouragement of Sarah and Gita, I am attaching a short [journal piece](#) on why human security is a new, innovative concept with global origins, in response to an essay in the same volume by Professor

Neil MacFarlane (a "bullets and bombs" IR scholar, who co-wrote, as part of Sir Richard Jolly's UN Intellectual History Project Series, a recent book on Human Security and the UN: A Critical History. Visit: www.UNhistory.org).

In response to Richard and Deepayan's second question below, Professor MacFarlane and many in the fields of international relations and political science (especially Canadians it seems!) would contend that to "operationalise" the concept, it is necessary to restrict the definition - and, at a minimum, this normally implies around "freedom from fear" issues. But one of the concept's breakthroughs, beginning with the HDR 1994, is its holistic embrace of the inter-linkages and need to simultaneously address "freedom from fear" and "freedom from want" issues. In response to the first question below, human security thus proved useful in conceptualizing and then planning for a number of concrete programming interventions in post-conflict Afghanistan, Kosovo, and the Solomon Islands, where an understanding of the connections between conflict, security, and development is necessary for tackling deep-rooted problems. From DDR, weapons for development projects, and looking at security sector reform through the lens of development to tailoring our governance interventions in a manner that would respond both to security and development imperatives, human security helped significantly to elevate the status of (and \$\$ for) core development challenges vis-à-vis security concerns that normally pre-occupy the media and donors during and after violent conflict.

In response to the third question, I found Richard and Deepayan's key conclusions and recommendations to be useful, particularly the suggestion to "make available human security analyses in all countries being considered for action in the Peacebuilding Commission." To maintain the concept's relevance and central role in advancing the broader human development agenda, NHDRs and human security practitioners must continue to reach out and learn from the "traditional" security community. By positing that human beings count, human security helps scholars and practitioners balance the traditional preoccupation with the state as the main "unit of analysis" with the urgent needs of people. In doing so, the concept introduces a missing ethical dimension in the study of international relations and related subjects. Moreover, setting legitimate concerns about the parameters of human security aside, a growing number of International Relations scholars recognize its importance in bridging the development and humanitarian analytical fields with the IR sub-field of security studies.

Richard
Richard Ponzio
University of Oxford

[Noriharu Masuji](#), BRSP/UNDP, wrote:

Dear Mr. Richard Jolly and Mr. Deepayan Basu Ray (and colleagues in HDRO and BCPR),
(I am sorry for my lengthy note.)

In response to your launch message, I would like to share with you my comments and introduce you some references that may be useful to our pursuance of operationalising the concept of human security.

First of all, I wish to congratulate you and those who actively participated in compiling this excellent Paper. I find it very interesting and am pleased to see that we as UNDP had kept the concept of human security to date.

UNDP and UN Trust Fund for Human Security

I am saying this because ever since the 1994 HDR, I don't think we have notably operationalised or integrated the word "human security" into our programmes and projects. But UNDP is the largest recipient of [UN Trust Fund for Human Security](#) (funded solely by the Japanese government and managed by UNOCHA; from 1999 to date, UNDP received approximately US\$73.7 million for 36 projects, which consisted of more than 37% of the approved UNTFHS total expenditure US\$196 million) and enjoys benefits of carrying out programmes and projects based on people-centered approaches that are consistent with UNDP thematic areas, aiming to help efforts to achieve MDGs. I am sure that by having

access to this trust fund, we have been strengthening our coordination and partnerships with other UN agencies, and civil society and other partners, as it promotes multi-sector collaboration among development partners.

Human Security as UNDP core activity

However, the trust fund is just one outer resource. In order for us, as UNDP, to tackle human security within our programmes and operationalise the concept, we should discuss more and seek to incorporate it into our core activities e.g. documentation in MYFF, and integrate it as one of the cross-cutting issues. Internalizing the concept and methodology would surely push us forward in pursuance of human security both in name and substance, together with the member states that support the concept.

Government of Japan and Human Security

For example, as described in the report, the Japanese government is one of the prominent supporter of human security, with its [ODA Charter](#) (2003) as well as the [ODA Medium-term Policy](#) (2005) focusing on its promotion. We share a similar vision of human security with Japan and this is one of the significant partnership areas. For example, as a follow-up to the UNDP-Japan Annual Consultation held in July 2005, UNDP and the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) agreed to explore further collaboration in human security. One such collaboration was the launch of the Central Asia Human Development Report titled [Regional Cooperation for Human Development and Human Security in Central Asia](#) in December 2005 in Tokyo at a symposium co-organized with MoFA.

JICA and Human Security

Now, speaking of Japanese related activities, we are also collaborating with [Japan International Cooperation Agency](#) (JICA) at HQ level as well as on the ground. JICA, with its fiscal 2004 expenditures at roughly US\$1.5 billion, and having 56 country offices, is an implementation agency for the Japanese bilateral grants, and in particular, technical cooperation, focusing on institution building and human resources development. You may know that since 2003, JICA is led by Madame Sadako Ogata, the champion of human security. Being the focal point for all Japanese related issues in BRSP, and through the annual consultation and various exchanges of information, I understand that JICA has been making efforts to operationalise human security based on field-oriented approach. I would therefore like to introduce you some of their works that may provide you with relevant answers to the three areas of questions, respectively.

1. Has the concept of human security been used in your own country – and how useful has it proved to be? What were your experiences?
2. JICA recently published a [brochure](#) explaining how they address human security. In the last section “Case studies” (p.5), you could find their experiences in Zambia, Myanmar, Afghanistan, Bolivia and Bangladesh in the areas of primary health care, poverty reduction, women empowerment and water. More cases could be found [here](#).
3. Are there other frameworks or approaches for the analysis of human security which could improve our ability to ‘operationalise’ the concept?

Through accumulated experiences and research studies, JICA has come up with seven principles of human security. JICA utilizes these items when formulating or screening programmes and projects.

Please refer to page 4 of the same [brochure](#):

- (1) Reaching those in need through a people-centered approach
 - (2) Empowering people as well as protecting them
 - (3) Focusing on the most vulnerable people, whose survival, livelihood and dignity are at risk
 - (4) Comprehensively addressing both “freedom from want” and “freedom from fear”
 - (5) Responding to people’s needs by assessing and addressing threats through flexible and inter-sectoral approaches
 - (6) Working with both government and local communities to realize sustainable development
 - (7) Strengthening partnership with various actors to achieve a higher impact from assistance
4. Do the recommendations in this paper seem useful for analysis and policy of human security – and how might they be improved?

I understand that this Paper basically focuses on upstream analysis and monitoring of human security oriented NHDRs rather than provide on-the-ground how-to handbook. I presume there is more to discuss and define in order to fill in the gap between the two and to pursue human-centered development in the context of human security at the field level.

JICA's rationale for human security is to focus on downside risks of downturns, as described in page 2 of the [brochure](#): "The idea is that people in developing countries are prone to the constant risk of sudden downturns (downside risks). Human security stresses not only securing human necessities, but also ensuring that such necessities will not be lost in the future." And through recent talks I had with JICA, they said they still need to pursue the concept further, by accurately and dynamically understanding the ramifications of poverty and mounting an effort to deepen ex-ante approach e.g. social protection and disaster prevention, so as to minimize the downside risk in the very beginning.

Having said this, JICA has been taking the actions below so as to operationalise the concept of human security:

1. Incorporate the concept in its country and regional programmes
2. Reflect and practice the concept at the field level
3. Improve development tools and project cycle procedures
4. Mainstream the concept with other development partners

Furthermore, they acknowledge that they need to build up more experiences through implementation of concrete projects by maximizing and monitoring/evaluating tangible impacts on needy people.

Here is another reference that you may be interested.
[Poverty Reduction and Human Security](#) (March 2006) / JICA

I hope these would be of your help.

Best regards,

Nori Masugi
Programme Advisor, Japan Affairs
Bureau for Resources and Strategic Partnerships
United Nations Development Programme

[Mehrnaz Mostafavi](#), UNOCHA, wrote:

Dear Colleagues:

Further to [Noriharu's message](#), allow me to respond to the following questions - answers to which are based on our experience at the Human Security Unit, OCHA.

1. Has the concept of human security been used in your own country – and how useful has it proved to be? What were your experiences?

As outlined by [Noriharu](#), the UN Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS) that was established in 1999 has to date funded projects in over 90 countries.

Based on our activities in the field as well as the conclusions of the [Commission on Human Security](#), we see the added value of human security for several reasons:

- i. It is an integrative approach that brings together the multiplicity of challenges faced by individuals and communities and as such recognizes the inter-linkages between security, development, and human rights. Today, we are living in an age where the lethal interaction between lack of development, security and human rights pose grave threats not only to the immediate victims but also to the

collective security of the international community. In this regard, human security highlights the need to deal with today's challenges in an integrative manner.

- ii. By providing a framework to address interconnected issues and multi-sectoral demands, human security highlights the gaps in military, social, political, economic, and environmental systems within and between countries and as such strives to promote a comprehensive framework that addresses the broad spectrum of challenges faced at national, regional and international levels.
- iii. By identifying the importance of freedoms from basic insecurities and by making no distinction between civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights, human security gives equal importance to all these rights and seeks to establish a threshold below which no one's survival, livelihood and dignity should be threatened. As such, human security offers a practical framework for identifying the specific gaps that are at stake in a particular situation and forces us to address the broader context of vulnerability.
- iv. Finally, by making the individual the center of analysis, human security focuses on the most vulnerable individuals and communities and advocates for policies and programmes that are based on notions of "protection" and "empowerment." From the human security perspective what this means is that to find solutions to specific threats, there are roles and responsibilities that different parties can take thereby building on each other's initiatives and capabilities. In this sense, human security not only promotes a framework under which people are both protected and empowered and are therefore in a far better position to actively prevent and mitigate the impact of insecurities, but it also helps in establishing a social contract among the various sectors of a given society and in this way it cultivates public discourse, improves/cements relations between citizens and the state, promotes local ownership, and strengthens social capital.

2. Are there other frameworks or approaches for the analysis of human security which could improve our ability to 'operationalise' the concept?

At the Human Security Unit, we have operationalised the concept based on the following parameters:

- Implementing the "protection and empowerment" framework by comprehensively including both top-down protection and bottom-up empowerment measures;
- Promoting partnerships with civil society groups, NGOs, and other local entities and encouraging implementation by these entities. In this regard, we seek not only to strengthen local capacities but also to Promote collaboration among the many actors involved in the management of security issues and the achievement of human security;
- Addressing the broad range of interconnected issues that take into account the multi-sectoral demands of human security; and
- Advancing integrated approaches.

To give you a better understanding of the application of the human security approach as applied by our Unit, allow me to share with you two examples of the types of projects we are currently funding under the UNTFHS:

- In the Great Lakes Region in Northwestern Tanzania, for example, we are addressing human security challenges in a post-conflict situation as faced by refugees, internally displaced persons, and the host community. In this regard, the project focuses on multiple entry points that seek to break the cycle between conflict, poverty, loss of education, infectious diseases, and environmental degradation. Among the interventions included are capacity building of local government; reduction of small arms and light weapons; enhancement of education and enrollment of out of school youth; strengthening of agricultural production; and advancement of life-saving skills and knowledge on HIV/AIDS and malaria.
- Meanwhile in Peru, we are in the process of finalizing a project located in the Southern Andes region where natural disasters including landslides, earthquakes and forest fires have generated an unstable situation in terms of food, income and health security. A multi-agency intervention, the project is based on the protection and empowerment framework. Several UN agencies in collaboration with community networks, non-governmental organizations, as well as regional, local and national authorities will be working together, to among others, implement low-cost early warning and

monitoring systems; improve environmental management and local agricultural and livestock practices; and strengthen community awareness and knowledge of practical preventive measures in response to natural disasters.

3. Do the recommendations in this paper seem useful for analysis and policy of human security – and how might they be improved?

While I very much appreciate the thorough review and the pertinent recommendations of the paper, I would however like to ask the authors to consider the following suggestions/requests:

- a) I would like to request that more analysis and attention be given to the sort of interdisciplinary approaches, methodological know-how and policy coordination mechanisms that will be required if human security is to be achieved. In our work, we find the most salient challenge to operationalising human security is the continued compartmentalization of mandates and disciplines within UN agencies, government ministries (in both recipient and donor countries), and academic and policy institutions.
- b) Furthermore, while I agree that human security conditions will certainly differ from one country to another and therefore a standard approach would not be appropriate, however, I would like to urge the authors to consider a common analytical platform in assessing human security conditions in a particular country. In this way a more systematic understanding of the human security gaps in a particular country can be established. Ivan Lupis (lupis@un.org) who is the focal point on early warning methodology in OCHA, recently developed a guide based on the human security framework which may be of interest to you.

I hope this helps and thank you again for your invaluable contribution and commitment to further strengthening our work in human security.

With kind regards,

Mehrnaz Mostafavi (Ms.)
Programme Officer
Human Security Unit
Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs United Nations
<http://ochaonline.un.org/humansecurity>

[Sascha Graumann](#), UNDP Ukraine, wrote:

Dear colleagues,

Please find below a short write up on our Human Security Monitoring System which should answer some of your questions. In a couple of days, we will undertake a review of the system to design our future strategy for this work. I will be glad to share the outcome of this review with you as soon as it becomes available.

Best regards,

Sascha Graumann
UNDP Crimea Integration and Development Programme (CIDP), Ukraine
Crimea Integration and Development Programme
Human Security and Development Component

Background

The [UNDP Crimea Integration and Development Programme](#) (CIDP) was established in response to the complex challenges faced by Ukraine after independence in relation to Crimea. On top of the widespread negative effects of the social and economic collapse following the break-up of the Soviet Union that

affected the entire country, and the subsequent challenges of transition towards a democratic society and a market economy, there were a number of specific issues and events in Crimea that made the situation there potentially more volatile than elsewhere in Ukraine.

Questions concerning the status of Crimea (until 1954 part of Russia and the RSFSR) within newly independent Ukraine, and the mass return after 1989 of more than 260,000 Crimean Tatars, who were forcibly deported from Crimea in 1944, created tensions that quickly escalated to a point where widespread violent conflict seemed likely, with potentially destabilizing effects for the young Ukrainian state.

Timely and concerted efforts by the Government of Ukraine and the International Community have contributed to stabilizing the situation in Crimea during the nineties. However, the vast majority of Crimean Tatars continued to find themselves in a marginalized and excluded position vis-à-vis mainstream society, while many other Crimeans, in particular in the rural areas, were equally struggling to make ends meet.

Most Crimean Tatars settled in the rural steppe areas of the northern two-thirds of the peninsula, mostly in so-called "compact settlements", three hundred of which have been constructed more or less spontaneously since their return. They often lack basic services such as water, gas and electricity supply, as well as schools and health facilities. For many Crimean Tatar households, the only source of income is what they can produce and sell as surplus from their kitchen gardens. Unemployment is over 40%, according to the most conservative estimates. Besides, they have only belatedly been recognized as eligible recipients of land titles under the ongoing land reform programme when most of the land was already distributed.

On the other hand, having been severely threatened in their survival as a nation in a premeditated way during the years of deportation, the majority of Crimean Tatars is acutely aware of its identity and keenly determined to recover what was lost of its culture and to pass it on to future generations. This aspect is frequently misinterpreted by other ethnic groups in Crimea as "radicalism" or "fanaticism" and sets the Crimean Tatars further apart from the rest of society, thereby adding cultural and political exclusion to the social and economic marginalization. In such a situation, it is easy to identify scenarios that may trigger renewed conflict. However, such conflicts would probably be deeper-rooted and more structural than the ones prevalent during the 90s.

Against this background, CIDP's main goal is to foster sustainable human development in a manner that contributes to the maintenance of peace and stability in Crimea through initiatives aimed at preventing interethnic violence and enhancing peaceful coexistence among different ethnic groups. For this purpose, CIDP concentrates its efforts on five closely interrelated strategic areas: the promotion of good governance, the reduction of marked economic disparities, tolerance education, the improvement of quality and accessibility of basic social services and the setting up of a Human Security Monitoring System.

The CIDP Human Security Monitoring System

Operating at the highest level of policy-making in Crimea, CIDP's Human Security Component complements the community-based work of the other programme components. It combines an early warning type system with dialogue-like processes institutionalized in the form of the Crimea Human Security and Development Council.

The ARC Human Security and Development Council

The Human Security and Development Council (HSDC) was established in September 2002 with support from UNDP/CIDP. In May 2003, it was formalized as a Consultative and Advisory Body at the Council of Ministers of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (ARC). The council comprises key policy and decision makers from the Crimean Government, Parliament, academia and civil society and is chaired by the ARC Prime Minister. Its main functions are two-fold:

- i. to monitor and detect early signs of possible tension, instability or social conflict, using a Human Security Management Information System; and
- ii. to develop policy recommendations for addressing areas of special concern and advocating for their implementation at different levels of government.

The council also determines priority areas of research of human security and development. Research methods and principles were endorsed during the sessions of the Council which also considers the Human Security Reports.

The UNDP/CIDP Analytical Group

To assist the HSDC, an analytical group, a research body, has been formed within CIDP. The analytical group monitors trends and conducts regular research on the different aspects of human security. Independent reports are being produced which are intensively discussed by the HSDC prior to their publication and dissemination. As recommended by the HSDC, the monitoring is focused on the socio-economic, political and interethnic situation. Since the Human Security and Development Reports are the basis for decision-making on key issues of relevance for the ARC, council members often request additional researched on issues of particular concern.

A variety of research methodologies are being used: periodic public opinion polls to obtain the views of citizens on the situation in Crimea and the work of the Government, collection of official statistics and event monitoring based on information disseminated through mass media (newspapers and electronic media). This is complemented by expert interviews and field research case studies. The information is then analyzed and used for the preparation of the Human Security and Development Report.

CIDP's analytical group also oversees the further development of the monitoring system and the indicator framework.

Part of the research is sub-contracted to local experts and think tanks. They perform research in the framework of the programme approved at the sessions of the Council. Expert institutions do not interact with the Human Security and Development Council in order to ensure maximum research neutrality. The independence of the report prepared by the UNDP programme has proved to be a crucial pre-condition for making it the basis for discussion and consensus-building at council meetings.

Achievements

During the first quarter of 2004, the first Crimea Human Security and Development Report was issued on the basis of a series of public opinion polls and surveys as well as official statistical data and event reports carried out and collected in 2003. Based on the work of a team of researchers, the report presents revealing and partially disquieting information on a broad range of topics such as the social and economic situation in Crimea, the socio-demographic situation, the political situation, ethnic aspects of human security, health, housing education, environment as well as crime and terrorism. The Report was followed by interim surveys and analysis in September 2004 and the preparation of a 2005 Human Security and Development Report. In total 10 surveys and 11 public opinion polls were conducted and the results were used in report preparation.

The reports generated a high interest among key ARC decision-makers. They were studied by the Prime Minister, the Speaker of the ARC Parliament and the Representative of the President of Ukraine in the ARC, who used the report materials at the working sessions in their departments. Members of the Human Security Council expressed their willingness to be involved in the process of further materials preparation.

Research data of the reports were used in the Council of Ministers when discussing the situation resulting from tariff increases on housing and communal services, thus justifying the necessity for decentralization in making these decisions. Deputies of the Parliament of Crimea discussed report materials at the sessions of standing committees and at the Commission on Interethnic Relations.

On 25 February 2004, the Crimean Parliament approved a resolution on improving inter-ethnic relations in Crimea, calling on the Human Security and Development Council to continue monitoring trends and making recommendations in this regard.

The main significance of the Human Security and Development Monitoring System lies in the fact that it provides key policy- and decision-makers in Crimea with a tool to accurately measure and analyze in a holistic manner to what extent policies are effective in improving living conditions in Crimea and to what extent these improvements are matched by people's perceptions about their quality of life.

Moreover, apart from measuring and analyzing the effect of Government policies, the system also allows for measuring systematically the impact of technical assistance and other forms of support provided by UNDP and others at the level of Crimea, districts and individual settlements in terms of supporting stability, integration and development, and to bring the findings to the attention of key policy- and decision-makers in the Human Security and Development Council. In this way, the system and the Council provide excellent opportunities for analyzing the impact of UNDP's grass-roots area-based approaches in support of community-development, decentralized governance, income & employment generation.

As such, the CIDP Human Security Monitoring System addresses five distinct needs:

- a. the need for timely policy analysis in potentially critical situations in order to recommend timely sensible policies for the use of the ARC Government and the international community;
- b. the need to address potential risks created by policy failures in a timely manner;
- c. the need to establish a database of indicators to allow monitoring of trends for regional as well as national use;
- d. the need to institutionalize a regular exchange of knowledge between civil society and the Government, thus contributing not only to a better foundation of Government policies, but also to their broader acceptance in Crimean society;
- e. the need to strengthen capacity of the ARC Government for evidence-based policy-making.

Difficulties

During the second half of 2004 and the first half of 2005, the work of the Human Security and Development Council was seriously hampered by the absorption of key Crimean policy-makers in the events surrounding the presidential elections and the orange revolution. While this was a one-time event, which is not expected to again present a problem for the project, it is important that the council remains functional and a platform for discussion particularly during difficult periods. Therefore, we agreed with the Government to convene the Council quarterly and on a more regular basis.

Personnel shifts after the elections, led to substantial changes in the composition of the council. CIDP's analytical group is currently working with new council members individually to increase their awareness and understanding of the human security concept.

Next Steps

Over the next years, CIDP will support the expansion and improvement of the Human Security and Development Monitoring System. The system will be enhanced, particular in terms of its forecasting and scenario-building capacity. The collection of data on statistics and events will continue and will be included in a Management Information System that will be gradually transferred to the Government.

Regular, systematic monitoring of main indicators of human security, conflict potential and development opportunities (including the impact of CIDP activities, implementation of the Millennium Development Goals and the Government's Social and Economic Development Strategy until 2015), the preparation, publication and discussion of analytical reports, and the translation of findings into policy recommendations and actions, will greatly enhance the Government's capacity to respond effectively to

the many complex challenges of transition, including high-profile issues related to land distribution, minority rights, cultural liberty, gender mainstreaming and other.

In the future, the Human Security Council will meet on a quarterly basis, consider the presented reports and work out recommendations. A more regular work of the council will allow its transformation into a regular platform for dialogue among key representatives of the Crimean society. This is of particular importance given the recent unstable Governments and the upcoming elections. Moreover, the last report shows a fairly dramatic deterioration in the attitudes of some ethnic groups towards each other and every effort needs to be made to pick up and monitor subtle indications of impending violence before it actually erupts. The fact that the authorities have so far been able to react fast and effectively does not mean that this will always be the case. In particular the appearance of armed militias such as the self-styled Cossacks gives reason for concern.

The cooperation with independent local research institutions will be intensified to provide additional research and analyses of key issues in Crimea and to build their capacity in order to take over functions of the CIDP analytical group at the end of the project.

The effectiveness of CIDP's work in this area is due to the combination of a traditional early warning system with an institutionalized arrangement for consensus-building among high-level policy-makers on key recommendations resulting from the early warning. In the future, this will be further strengthened through interventions aimed at improving strategic planning capacity of the Government which will be implemented under CIDP's good governance component. Moreover, the system benefits from CIDP's long-term presence on the community-level.

[Shahin Yaqub](#), HDRO/UNDP, wrote:

Dear Colleagues,

I read this paper with a lot of interest. I would like to direct my comment to question 2 (about other relevant frameworks).

My comment draws on the literature on poverty dynamics and vulnerability based on longitudinal household datasets (these datasets re-survey the same people over time). The poverty dynamics literature highlights that poverty is a temporal phenomenon. This was already known to some extent through participatory research, since poor people themselves automatically incorporate a temporal dimension in their welfare valuations – people know they have to survive tomorrow as well as today, and they also know life is fraught with predictable and unpredictable risks which need to be accounted for in their survival strategies.

The increasing availability of longitudinal datasets allowed quantification of chronic poverty versus transitory poverty, and also estimated vulnerability to future poverty conditional on current household characteristics. This showed that insecurity is not simply the result of random events but is distributed unequally according to social and economic structures within society. Hence, a role for public policy. It also gave greater definition to the types of risks faced by households and the safety-nets required to address them.

Most of this literature is written in terms of income poverty but its concepts and framework would apply to any welfare metric that has temporal variability (and therefore is a source of household insecurity). For example, a common response to income insecurity is to pool risks (this is the essence of insurance). One might say safety-in-numbers is a form of risk pooling against physical insecurity. One of the lessons of the poverty dynamics literature is that there are limits to the extent that poor households can reduce insecurities by 'risk pooling'. For example, poor households cannot easily pool risks that they all share (covariate risks), and therefore the safety-net to address the risk has to be externally provided. Other insecurities are reduced at the cost of landing households into long-run poverty traps (for example some farming options give greater yield and higher risk).

Best regards,

Shahin Yaqub
Human Development Report Office
New York

Basant Kumar Subba, UNDP Ukraine, wrote:

Dear Colleagues,

Please find attached file where includes an article (page-27) on experience of Crimea on conflict prevention approach within the frame work of Human Security.

[Find document: [Experiences from the Field: UNDP-CSO Partnership for Conflict Prevention.](#)]

--

Basant Kumar Subba
UNDP/Crimea Integration and Development Programme

Chikako Kodama, UNDP PAPP, wrote:

Dear colleagues,

Thank you very much for sharing interesting recourses and experiences, and Richard and Deepayanpaper's, thank you for giving us an opportunity to discuss on the interesting topic.

I would like to direct my comments (actually questions) at question 1. Since the paper's approach is more upstream oriented, my questions may be off the point for the paper. However, as Noriharu pointed out, I also think that we need to fill the gap between the upstream analysis and practices on the ground. Thus, I would appreciate your sharing experiences and comments.

1. Has the concept of human security been used in your own country – and how useful has it proved to be? What were your experiences?

In the occupied Palestinian territories, the UN agencies recently received fund from the Human Security Trust Fund (HSTF). Along implementing projects, I got confused about the usage of the human security concept, which is whether the human security is an approach, a framework/critique, an object to achieve or all three. If I understand correctly, the human security in the paper is used for all three depending on the context although it is used as framework upon the review of the NHDRs. I think, therefore, the human security can be used for those three purposes. With the understanding of the human security as approach, framework and objective, the differentiation would contribute to issues needed to be clarified in order to make human security concept into action.

(1) Human security as approach

If the human security is an approach, what is the role of UNDP? As Mehrnaz shared with us, there are parameters for the HSTF for project selection. In case of the HSTF, the UN agencies are expected to jointly address such issues. Therefore, UNDP alone does not need to meet all parameters as long as the UN agencies together in a project approach the issues according to such parameters (at least so I understood). However, there was a comment from the people from the programme on Humanitarian Policy and Conflict Research, Harvard University, that if UNDP wants to say that it is taking the human security approach, UNDP has to do not only the capacity building of the government/ counterparts to support the top-down protection, which normally what UNDP does, but also we have to work on downstream projects too. However if UNDP is heading for a more upstream organization, can the UNDP be up to the human security requirement?

(2) Human security as a framework/critique

If the human security is used as a framework like many NHDRs did, how was the result of the analysis linked with the country programme and projects? The recommendations and future direction for the NHDRs on human security presented in the paper are useful. However, the guidance on the application of the study into practical action would be needed, too.

(3) Human security as objective

If the human security is the objectives of development or the things to be achieved, is there experience of COs to have clear goals, i.e. if the goals are met, we can say that the human security achieved, with which the progress of the human security programme can be measured? In particular, because UNDP applies the result-based approach to the projects and programme and the human security is the thing that UNDP aims and promotes, we need to have goals to be measured.

In addition, what is the relationship of MDGs and which should we promote more? My understanding is that the achievements of MDGs not necessary guarantee the achievement of human security although many countries targeted MDGs and focusing the development efforts to achieve them.

I hope my questions are not far away from the focus of the discussion and I am looking forward to hearing your thoughts.

Best regards,

Chikako KODAMA
Programme Management Officer
Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People

[Hans Risser](#), UNDP Serbia and Montenegro, wrote:

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you for initiating this interesting discussion and for providing an excellent report. Below are specific and short comments to the questions posed in the discussion. Attached to this email is a copy of the [Serbia-Montenegro \(SCG\) Human Security Cluster Framework](#).

1. Has the concept of human security been used in your own country – and how useful has it proved to be? What were your experiences?

The SCG Country Office (CO) currently has a Human Security Cluster of related projects (Please see the attached note on HS Cluster Framework). This cluster was created a few years ago, when the CO initiated a reorganization of projects and programmes. At this time, the decision was made to close the Crisis, Prevention and Recovery programme and transfer ongoing projects from this programme to the new Human Security Cluster. One of the reasons for doing so was that the country was in a period of increasing stability, so the decision was taken to concentrate the work of the UNDP on development work and phase out CPR. Whether it was too earlier for such a move remains a debate in our CO. The government was also supportive of this initiative since it objected to its classification as a country in 'crisis'. The focus on 'human security' was less objectionable to the government than 'Crisis Prevention and Recovery'. One critique of the existing human security cluster is that, in practice, it has become a 'catch-all' cluster for all projects that do not fit into the work of the other CO clusters. This critique may have been a reflection of the cluster's formation, but with some refinement, the cluster has focused its work a bit more although we still suffer from a useful measure of the impact of our work.

3. Do the [recommendations](#) in this paper seem useful for analysis and policy of human security – and how might they be improved?

The Recommendations of this paper are useful, in particular the methodology recommended for measuring the perception of insecurity in the country. Such surveying could easily be included in Early Warning Reports or occasional omnibus surveys. The results of these surveys could provide the measure needed to focus the work of the HS cluster.

Hans Risser
Project Manager - SACISCG
UNDP Serbia and Montenegro

[Cleophas Torori](#), UNDP Liberia, wrote:

A General Contribution from Liberia

An analysis of the meaning and implications of the concept of human development in a post conflict context compelled us to adopt a human security analytical framework to demonstrate, in a compelling manner, how 14 years of conflict have undermined basic human survival, livelihood and dignity, thus touching on the very core of human security. Undertaken in the context of a forthcoming [National Human Development Report for Liberia](#), this analysis further reveals that cost of the Liberian civil conflict was high, and negatively affected human development in two critical aspects.

First, nearly every family in Liberia incurred some kind of loss as a result of the conflict. Some family members suffered from psychological stress and the trauma of not knowing whether there would be food or death the very next day. Furthermore, nearly all families incurred the loss of assets either from looting, physical destruction or the collapse of the financial sector. Loss of homes and other physical assets leave people with no means of sustainable livelihoods thus subjecting the Liberian people to higher risk of malnutrition, shorter lives, illness and illiteracy. The Liberian conflict destroyed the socio-economic fabric of the society, breaking down family values and community coping mechanisms. While it is true that entire communities suffered from being denied these necessities, women were worst off. Many suffered the brutality of rape, sexual exploitation and abuse, both during and after the conflict had subsided.

Throughout the report, the concept of human security and the issue of human capacities are analysed in order to give an analytical framework for the report an analytical foundation. In particular, the report explores the impact knowledge production and management, health care delivery system, the environment and food security; and, the impact on all aspects of governance – political, economic. By so doing, it also helps to situate capacity development for Liberia as a post-conflict priority concern to improve human development and build a sustainable peace.

In this respect, the concept of human security is very useful model for analysis in post-conflict discourse on human development and it is time analysts, practitioners and politicians understand its distinction from the traditional view of security.

Cleophas Torori
Policy & Governance Adviser
& HDR Task Manager
UNDP Liberia

[Erica Marat](#), Uppsala University, wrote:

1. Has the concept of human security been used in your own country – and how useful has it proved to be? What were your experiences?

The concept of human security has not been commonly used in the Central Asian countries (although this may be changing with the recent publication of the [Central Asia Regional Human Development Report](#)). It

remains still largely associated with a concept imported by international organizations, but not necessarily used by government institutions. There are reasons why the concept of human security is not perhaps as popular among some national stakeholders in Central Asia. First, the rise of insurgent groups threatens the functioning of state structures. Second, the shadow economy (drug trafficking, money laundering, etc.) is hardly controllable by domestic or international actors and benefits only a small number of people, while impoverishing the masses. Third, corruption in public structures considerably hinders the efforts of the international community. All these security issues require a regional approach, as opposed to only an approach tailored to individual countries. Common problems of most developing states such as environmental problems, unequal and unjust distribution of economic resources, and overpopulation can create tension between human security policies and societal security / state security.

2. Are there other frameworks or approaches for the analysis of human security which could improve our ability to 'operationalise' the concept?

All states today are linked between each other by economic, cultural or political ties. States are also linked by illegal economic ties through regional/international organized crime groups. Therefore, the concept of human security should be looked through an approach that considers individual traits of any given country in addition to the context of that state's regional location. Also, the concept of human security should be differentiated in developed and developing states. Human security in weak states should be regarded as a part of a complementary national economic development and strengthening of non/state political institutes.

3. Do the [recommendations](#) in this paper seem useful for analysis and policy of human security – and how might they be improved?

As a military analyst (with a civilian background) I want to emphasize that military institutions should not be undermined in analyzing the security of weak states, such as Afghanistan or Mozambique. Although the state can use the military to increase its own security, as opposed to the security of its people, it could be argued that any weak state needs a cohesive army in order to prevent armament of non-state actors. Most weak states today are multiethnic and multi-religious. This sometimes influences the rise of religious or ethnic minority groups against the government and in case the state is militarily weaker, there is leeway for the opposition to become a stronger military force. The case of Tajikistan in the early 1990s illustrates how the opposition became a strong military force in a short period of time in the presence of a militarily weak state.

The first recommendation of the NHDR paper suggests conducting public opinion surveys on what constitutes human insecurity among the local population. Since the concept of human security is a western-driven one, the population in developing countries might have difficulties understanding it. The results of some surveys might prove to be of little use for the construction of a country-based approach, unless they are carefully designed and adapted to local contexts and are used together with a broader range of data and research. For instance, I can assume that the understanding of personal security for a Kyrgyz villager might be centered around his/her fear of state officials (border guards, taxation, militia) as opposed to environmental degradation, health problems or other issues more relevant in other countries.

Erica Marat, PhD
Research Fellow,
Central Asia-Caucasus Institute/Silk Road Studies Program,
Uppsala University

[Mehrnaz Mostafavi](#), UNOCHA, wrote:

Dear colleagues:

In responding to [Chikako's inquiry](#) on the relationship between Human Security and the MDGs, there are two points that I would like to make:

Human Security is a concept that comprehensively addresses the objectives of "freedom from fear," "freedom from want," and "freedom to live in dignity." As such human security goes beyond socioeconomic outcomes and provides an integrative approach that includes the three dimensions of the Millennium Declaration (i.e., peace and security; development and the MDGs; and human rights, democracy and good governance).

In addition to proposing an integrative approach, human security also recognizes chronic poverty, economic crises (including financial, debt and terms of trade crises), natural disasters and conflicts as posing the greatest threats to human security. In this regard, by deliberately addressing these "downside risks", human security gives serious attention to the importance of protecting and empowering people in times of crises and highlights the added value of "downturn with security" to the MDGs and their emphasis on a more inclusive and equitable globalization.

For UNDP, human security is probably most important in its work on conflict prevention and reconciliation as well as its focus, although I believe it is not that strong, on social protection instruments that could complement its overall development work.

I hope this helps.

Best regards.

Mehrnaz Mostafavi (Ms.)
Programme Officer
Human Security Unit
Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs United Nations

[Tetsu Kondo](#), UNDP Timor Leste, wrote:

Dear colleagues,

I started working in Timor Leste as the Aid Coordination Advisor to Timorese Government, as part of the support team of UN Humanitarian Coordinator. As you are aware, the Timor Leste Government is facing the politico-military crisis to maintain its integrity, and now the effective national police force is absent. Australian-led multi-national force is in place to ensure the security of the city of Dili and the UN has just issued Humanitarian Flash Appeal.

In the middle of this humanitarian process, we are now going through a major lesson, namely, the balance between the government responsibility/ownership and UN's humanitarian responsibilities. Timor-Leste Government is very much committed to supporting the IDPs in the emerging camps (now we count 56 camps with 65,000 IDP, 110,000 across the nation) by its own policy and resource. UNCT is closely supporting the government and there is no divergence with the government in implementing humanitarian assistance projects as proposed in the Flash Appeal.

However, I must say that this was made possible largely by UNDP's recent track record in nurturing the good partnership with the government. If the government does not exist, as was in the case of 1999 before the independence, it would have been simpler to address humanitarian needs of the people. Now, the full-fledged government exists, though its policing capacity is lost. In such situations, how can the UN's responsibility be effectively discharged in consistency with the government ownership? Without UNDP's governance capacity building activities, the government leaders would be very much confused. I do not think it appropriate to go to political discussion, but the events in the past few weeks here were the typical case in considering how to apply Human Security into UNDP practice. My message here is that our good partnership building efforts with Government in peacetime can make UN to address human security most effectively in the crisis time.

In terms of MDG, we have to come back in a little while, if the timeframe is still applicable even in this situation.

Best regards,

Tetsuo Kondo
Resource Mobilization and Aid Coordination Advisor
UNDP Timor Leste

[Eno Ngjela](#), UNDP Albania, wrote:

Dear colleagues,

I would like to share with you the following information about UNDP's work in Albania in the terms of putting the human security concept in practice.

Thank you and best regards,

Eno Ngjela
Team Leader / Policy
UNDP Albania

The concept of human security has been widely used in Albania. Following the crisis of 1997 that was shortly accompanied by another state of emergency during the Kosovo war, a certain prominence was given to the considerations of human security at large in the country since the problems seemed to capture a vast array of insecurities. The first attempt of addressing human security trends in the country was done by the publication of the first [Early Warning Report in 1999](#) just after the Kosovo crisis. The report analysed through qualitative and quantitative research the main challenges that Albania had to face at that time: maintaining the internal and regional stability, improving the public order by combating crime and fighting corruption, pursuing in the path of institutional reforms, improving and separating the judicial system from the other powers, maintaining and improving the macroeconomics indicators through national and international support, and establishing better and more fruitful collaboration with the neighboring countries. A year later, the [National Human Development Report 2000](#) continued to focus on the economic and social security in the country with a particular attention being paid to the issue of emigration and internal migration.

These two main publications that helped raise the awareness about human security were later accompanied by the [UN Agencies Common Country Assessment for Albania 2002](#) that endorsed human security by trying to address the questions of Albania's challenges in pursuit of security and development by identifying the root causes and reducing systematic inequalities.

On practical UNDP terms, the Human Security concept was made part of the second UNDP Common Country Framework for Albania. The structure of the UNDP country programme was organized in two narrowly and more strategically focused programme areas: (a) Democratic Governance, and (b) Human Security. A Human Security Framework for Albania that was locally formulated laid the ground for the new Human Security Programme that included several sub-programmes such as the Enabling Environment for Human Security, Personal and Community Security, Socio-economic Security and Environmental Security.

Following a second [Early Warning Report in 2001](#) that mainly focused on political security due to the upcoming elections at the time, UNDP in Albania tried to capture the analysis and the monitoring of trends of human security through a totally different approach. We went ahead with the preparation of the new project document on Human Security Monitoring after having lengthy debates about the Early

Warning signature name that following the experience in Bulgaria and Romania was being advocated in the SEE region at that time.

The new Early Warning reporting in Albania aimed to provide the decision-makers with a qualitative analysis of the development trends, warning of any possible crisis based upon a scientific assessment of events and a continuous monitoring of the appropriate political, economic and social indicators. The next and the most important step was the use of the reports as policy-generating tools that would enable the government to take stock of the recommendations offered and act upon them in a timely manner. This would have ensured the application of the EW principles and would have introduced a proactive way of thinking improving the capacity building process of the decision-making structures.

While the intention was to focus more on the monitoring of human security while keeping the catchy Early Warning title, the challenge was to define and agree on what are the indicators that fully capture the human security in Albania. Despite the existence of some international publications with various lists of indicators, the issue was how to come up with a relevant list of human security indicators for a country that is not focusing on structural threats due to ethnic conflict but on really people centred security concerns. The challenge was to adapt an Early Warning tool for crisis prevention in a post-crisis country that was no longer under emergency conditions. The answer to that came through the qualitative research that I think it is the best way to capture the human security situation in a country. Macro-economic figures are absolutely necessary but in a country like Albania where the GDP has noted a steady 6 percent growth for most of the past decade these figures can be misleading.

Therefore, the [2004 Early Warning: Human Security Monitoring Report](#) tried to identify through a nationally representative survey what were the main threats to the people's lives. And the picture became much clearer. Not surprisingly, the hierarchy of concerns consisted in this ranking order: not enough money to feed the family, illness, housing, pollution, loss of job, property issues, extortion, legal disputes and neighbourhood violence. This as a clear indication for the team that decided to write the report based on these hierarchy of threats grouped in four main human security patterns: poverty and inequality, rule of law and corruption, personal and community security and natural disasters and pollution.

The report attracted much public attention but it did not go very well with the government. While, the media and the academia were eager and loved this kind of reporting – especially in a country with scarce and not reliable data, we failed in our goal to convince the government in embracing this initiative and establishing a human security policy unit somewhere in the central level that would take this data and analysis and recommendations and prepare policy papers, documents and appropriate action. The main issue that I would like to reiterate from the recommendations is that if we want to promote the human security concept and be able to provide good analysis and policy ideas, we have to extensively use qualitative research. In another attempt in an unpublished paper we tried to even come up with a Personal human Security Index and a Community Human Security Index. However, this work requires periodic qualitative surveying and extensive funds in order to be able to construct and analyse nationally representative trends.

[Archie Law](#), UNDP/RSC Johannesburg, wrote:

All,

The Mine Action work of UNDP supports the governments of mine affected countries to respond to the humanitarian and social and economic problems caused by landmines and other Explosive Remnants of War and many of these governments are States Parties to the Anti Personnel Mine Ban Treaty (APMBT). Our work is greatly facilitated by the existence of the treaty as it provides a framework for mine action at the international and national level and contains a number of obligations for States Parties to the Treaty to meet. These include obligations on mine affected countries to clear mined areas in areas under their control or jurisdiction and obligations on States Parties in a position to do so, primarily the international donor community, to assist their work.

In this context UNDP has assisted governments in Burundi, Mauritania, Senegal and Uganda to start up mine action programmes in the last 18 months. People's personal and collective security has been at the forefront of each programme's development although we can't really claim to have fully utilized a human security approach in the start up of these four programmes. Whilst mine action and a number of other CPR activities have responded to basic human insecurity caused by landmines and other issues such as armed violence we haven't fully utilized a human security framework to guide our interventions and enhance our response to human insecurities. The use of a human security framework in the start up of the programmes from the earliest assessments and project design may have further increased the impact of these programmes by strengthening links to other areas of work, for example small arms, DDR, and security sector reform.

The use of a human security framework could certainly lead to more homogeneous CPR programmes that have greater impact on UNDP's government partners and their efforts to help their people. The recent CPR experience in Burundi has in many ways followed a human security approach to post crisis recovery. Initially BCPR deployed a mission to Burundi at the invitation of the DSRSG to conduct needs assessments in five areas of work and has since assisted the Country Office to develop programmes in these areas. This has positioned UNDP to be a valuable partner to the Government of Burundi as the UN Mission transitions into an integrated mission and UNDP is expected to ramp up the support it provides to the government. This integrated approach led to the mobilisation of a CPR Advisor in the Country Office, Denise Holland, although this role could have been titled Human Security Advisor as this colleague is the custodian for the framework that all CPR programming is being conducted within.

I think we need to do some more thinking about how human security meshes with crisis prevention and recovery itself as the use of a human security framework could be a useful method of ensuring that all CPR programming is designed to meet human insecurities in an integrated manner. In particular it would be very useful to analyse how we might link the use of a human security approach to CPR with conflict sensitive development. If a conflict development analysis could be utilized as a cross cutting issue in an overall human security framework we may be able to better link conflict prevention with other CPR activities and thus substantially increase the overall impact of CPR work.

Thanks,

Archie Law
Regional Mine Action Advisor (Africa)
RSC Johannesburg

[Rose Ssebatindira](#), UNDP Uganda, wrote:

Dear All,

This is specific to the third question: "Do the [recommendations](#) in this paper seem useful for analysis and policy of human security – and how might they be improved?"

The recommendations given this far are specific to the preparation of future NHDRs and other national level studies on human security. I suggest this debate/study and follow up recommendations also address the desired applied side of the findings of such NHDRs and other studies, for example their effectiveness as advocacy tools. I'll give an example that also relates to question one "Has the concept of human security been used in your own country – and how useful has it proved to be? What were your experiences?"

A short answer to question one is yes and NO. Yes specific to the CO CPAP and related ongoing CPR programmes - Mine Action and one Human Security Project - as [Archie Law](#) indicated but NO from the higher level national development planning point of view - a critical entry point in this regard (HS framework as a policy tool).

Uganda recently (2004) completed revision of the PEAP 2004/05-07/08 to a more policy action oriented national development framework that should lead to specific outcomes. Two such outcomes (also referred to as development pillars) include PEAP Pillar 3 -Security, Conflict Resolution and Disaster Management and Pillar 5 - Human Development. While inclusion of these two pillars is a much appreciated development - provides a more focused development support framework compared to the earlier version PEAP 2002, this debate (which I find highly enlightening) seems to suggest Uganda might have to revise the PEAP again!

But perhaps before I rush to such a 'loaded' conclusion and for purposes of making the outcome of this debate more practical, it would be an interesting exercise to review the Uganda PEAP 2004/05 - 07/08 (see link below) and maybe other sample PEAPs/PRSPs as a case study/studies to test/assess how applicable the human security framework is (as a policy tool) in informing the design/focus of such important development plans. I believe the findings of such a study would enrich the recommendations referred to in question three above.

NB. UNDP Uganda was a lead partner in the PEAP revision process, including the mainstreaming of MDGs. For more details on PEAP 2004/5 - 2007/8 please refer to:
http://hdr.undp.org/docs/network/hdr_net/Uganda_PEAP_2005.zip

Thank you.

Rose K. Ssebatindira
Assistant Resident Representative
Crisis Prevention and Recovery
UNDP - Uganda

Olaf Juergensen, UNDP Jordan, wrote:

Greetings All,

I tend to agree that the use of the HSF as a discrete planning/operational tool has not always been intentionally (consciously?) applied, however, it has helped tremendously in understanding the shift in the political landscape and discourse around the link between the humanitarian/developmental consequences of good governance, peace and security.

As a tool for practitioners, HSF's real strength remains its ability to analyze and explain how moving towards a broader conceptual understanding of 'Freedom' has benefited those people most marginalized in so many of the societies in which UNDP is at work.

I would briefly like to touch on Question 1 "has the concept of human security been used in your country" and respond with a firm maybe as it relates to mine action.

In the field of demining the Jordan government is planning to clear its northern border with Syria, despite the numerous attempts by terrorists to infiltrate the Kingdom along the border. Why is Jordan doing this? Under the obligations of the Mine Ban Treaty, signatories are required to clear all mines on their territory within 10 years of ratification. Jordan takes this obligation seriously – but is it clearing the border so that arable land which has sat fallow for 25 years will be returned to productive use for burgeoning populations? Time will tell, but there is every indication that the mines will be replaced by electronic sensor devices and the fertile border will remain unused.

So have individual freedoms/security really been enhanced for the border populations? The land will likely remain a no-go zone despite the fundamental humanitarian goal of the Treaty having been fulfilled and terrorists will be faced with a new security system. The local populations will remain on the periphery of the fertile land due to the overriding pressure of state security.

Clearly the HSF is helpful in pinpointing these types of incongruities and I believe this is its strongest suit. As a tool for decision making at the UN, I see it filled with potential.

Olaf Juergensen
UN Chief Technical Advisor
National Committee for Demining & Rehabilitation

[Ivan Lupis](#), UN OCHA, wrote:

Dear all,

Following [Mehrnaz Mostafavi's message](#), I am posting, FYI, [OCHA's human security-based methodology for humanitarian early warning analysis and risk assessment](#). Please find a concise summary of the methodology and its key steps below. The complete methodology is included in an [attachment](http://hdr.undp.org/docs/network/hdr_net/HS_Ocha_EW_Methodology.pdf).

The methodology is divided into three main parts:

- (1) a "snapshot assessment" step (which will indicate whether a specific country/region merits a more thorough analysis regarding the risk of a man-made crisis or natural disaster);
- (2) a more thorough analytical approach using four broad Human Security Sectors to assess a particular country/region at risk of a crisis;
- (3) a scenario-building exercise which maps out potential humanitarian-related consequences and aids in the formulation of recommendations targeting those potential consequences.

In step two, four broad Human Security Sectors are to be used for conducting a thorough early warning/risk assessment analysis. As crises are most often the result of a complex interaction of many overlapping factors, they cannot be understood in terms of a single cause. Thus, it is essential to engage in a broad overview of key social, economic, political and environmental issues:

- 1) Social sector including key groups and actors; migration patterns; health; nutrition and food security and access to social services, shelter and water/sanitation;
- 2) Economic sector including state of livelihoods in the country/region of concern; equity and distribution of assets, resources and opportunities within the population; state of development in the country/region of concern; resource management;
- 3) Political sector including governance, state and institutions, and rule of law; human/civil rights and protection; security; regional and international influences;
- 4) Environmental sector including natural disasters, environmental degradation and technological hazards.

OCHA has developed (and continues to refine) a set of guiding questions for the analysis of each of the human security sectors (which can be found in the annex of the attached [document](#)). These questions are provided only as guiding/prompting tools to aid practitioners in capturing critical early warning-related information; thus, they do not have to be adhered to in a rigorous fashion. However, they do serve as an example of how one can go about assessing the human security-related conditions in a particular country or region.

Best regards

Ivan Lupis
Inter-Agency Internal Displacement Division
United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
Tel: 1 917 367 2056
Fax: 1 917 367 5274 or 7002
lupis@un.org

[Fakhruddin Azizi](#), UNDP Afghanistan, wrote:

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you for initiating this interesting discussion and for providing an excellent report. Below are specific and short comments re this discussion.

Has the concept of human security been used in your own country – and how useful has it proved to be? What were your experiences?

There has been considerable change in the political options of the country and a significant improvement in human security after the signing of the Bonn Agreement in December 2001. This brought about a clear roadmap and a timetable for the restoration of peace and security; reconstruction, the institutionalization of key organizations and the protection of human rights.

Following the fall of Taliban, the most notable evidence of the improved human security situation in the country is the cooperative atmosphere amongst people especially in the center and other provinces. During the Taliban regime, people were living in fear and there was no expectation of a positive change in their lives. There was no opportunity for girls to go to school; there was a high level of poverty and no job opportunities for the younger generation. A lack of health facilities resulted in Afghanistan being one of the world's poorest countries that has the lowest HDI.

The [National Human Development Report](#) charts Afghanistan's poor condition, but over the past years, access to education and health care has greatly improved. There is a great improvement on the communication side; in 2002/3 there were around 37,000 lines; now it increased to more than a million. This improvement in communication is an indication of the improvement in the living conditions of people and has it provided job opportunities to the younger generation.

Furthermore, during the past year, more than 3.6 million people returned to their country, almost more than 3 million girls have returned back to their schools and women actively participated in the recent political process. There has been a significant role of women in the Constitutional Loya Jirga (Great Council), presidential elections and finally the parliamentary. The Afghan constitution guarantees gender equality; and in the recent election, the number of women voters was remarkable.

Looking into the first question, there is a great improvement in terms of human security and this is considered central in initiating and planning projects and programmes in a country like Afghanistan. UNDP's role to promote human security is greatly appreciated by the people and the government. Afghans now see that after the Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) process, there are fewer guns in the hands of gunmen in comparison to the last few years. Afghans want the government to look at this issue more and more and reduce the power of commanders. Most of the people consider disarmament as a successful way in improving security.

Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) is considered as the main pillar of security sector reform. These pillars are DDR; creation of the Afghan National Army (ANA); Afghan National Police (ANP), reduction of drugs; and judicial reform.

UNDP also strongly supported the Afghan Mine Action Programme that provided the opportunity for refugees to repatriate and greatly contributed to the socio economic condition of the people. Afghanistan's New Beginnings Programme (ANBP) strongly contributed to the reduction to the threats to human security. ANBP contributed to making the provinces of Bamyán, Jalalabad, Kandahar, Gardez and Mazar-e-Sharif free of all known heavy weapons. The recent Disbandment of Illegal Armed Groups (DIAG) programme of UNDP will have a direct impact in reducing the threat to human security in the country.

Kind regards,

Fakhruddin Azizi
Programme Officer
United Nations Development Programme
Kabul, Afghanistan

[\[back to top\]](#)

Many thanks to Network members who contributed!

If you have more information that you would like to share with the network on this topic, please send it to:

<mailto:hdr-net@groups.undp.org>
[View the NHDR Workspace](#)