

R2P

LIVE

R2PLive Working Paper Series
NO 1. / APR 2015

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a “Responsibility to Prevent (R2PT) Scale” to benchmark commitment to preventing genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article propose une échelle "responsabilité d'empêcher (R2PT)" pour évaluer l'engagement à empêcher la génocide, les crimes de guerres et la purification ethnique.

ABOUT R2PLIVE

R2PLive is a global portal of media articles related to the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principle. R2PLive tracks and archives articles that mention R2P, and categorizes them by variables such as region of origin, key themes, language, genre, and more. R2PLive is a project of the Canadian Centre for the Responsibility to Protect (CCR2P), a non-profit research organization based at the University of Toronto's Munk School of Global Affairs which aims to promote scholarly engagement and political implementation of the R2P principle. The CCR2P hopes that scholars, practitioners, civil society activists, students, and the general public will find it useful, and that it will serve to raise awareness of R2P issues in Canada and around the world. Note: R2PLive analysts used the search terms “responsibility to protect,” “R2P,” and “RtoP” to gather articles. At this time, articles that do not incorporate these terms are not included on the site.

R2PLive 2015 Managing Editors

Rachel J. Gunn is a third-year undergraduate pursuing an International Relations Specialist and an Economics Major at the University of Toronto. Her research interests cover R2P and South East Asia, economic history, the political economy of media, as well as data science and visualization. In 2013, she had the opportunity to research the political, economic, and historical factors embedded in R2P & Myanmar at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies. She is the recipient of the Margaret Macmillan Scholarship in Trinity One (International Relations).

Angel Difan Chu is in her third year pursuing a double major in History & International Relations and a minor in Italian. Angel is particularly interested in the ethnic conflict resolution aspect of R2P. A graduate of the Margaret Macmillan Trinity One Program, Angel is a recipient of the Trinity College In-Course Scholarship and a Dean's List Scholar.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Hrayr Tumasyan is an Analyst for R2PLive at CCR2P. He is a recent graduate of the University of Toronto with an Honours Bachelor's degree in Political Sciences and History. Hrayr has worked on research projects with the G8/G20 Research Group as a Research Analyst. He currently writes for the Canadian International Council (CIC) in Toronto.

The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Canadian Centre for the Responsibility to Protect and its affiliate organizations.

If you would like to download a copy of this report please visit www.r2plive.org or www.ccr2p.org

If you would like to be added to our mailing list or have questions about our publications please contact: managing.editor@ccr2p.org

RESPONSIBILITY TO PREVENT (R2PT) HOW TO MONITOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE NORM?

Executive Summary

This paper proposes to establish a single measure of a state's progress in employing the norms of Responsibility to Protect by analyzing the collective diplomatic, domestic and political policies as published and recorded by governments.

In the 2005 World Summit Outcome resolution document nations agreed to “encourage and help States... exercise...responsibility [to protect]”. Before this the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) published the *Responsibility to Protect* report which outlined the possible avenues nation states could undertake to reform and reorganize the way the international body cooperates in intervening and preventing conflicts and crimes.

Since its inception in 2001 and the Summit agreement in 2005, the rhetoric and discussions around Responsibility to Protect (or R2P) have evolved into various debates over its three main elements (as outlined in the ICISS Report) - Responsibility to Protect, Responsibility to React and Responsibility to Prevent. While the first two elements, specifically the nature of intervention, its composition and administrative structure, i.e. who should do the intervening and who is deemed as the one to be intervened upon, the commitment to prevent has remained the main consensus throughout the R2P discussions. Scholars and policy-makers alike have consistently agreed that the latter is both normatively and politically desirable. Furthermore, that it should be developed into a wider accepted policy norm.

This norm is outlined in the ICISS report as having the expressed desire to “close the gap between rhetorical support for prevention and tangible commitment”. This goal is stated as the ideal. The question now is whether those nations powerful enough to operationalize responsibility to prevent are closer to this ideal and whether Responsibility to Prevent has made an impact on the respective foreign policy patterns of these nations.

The Methodology

The key question to answer first when constructing a framework that would meet the purpose above is to find an appropriate schematic by which we measure and judge the progression of conforming to the norms of Responsibility to Prevent (or R2PT). Against what variables and in what formation do we organize the gathered available data? The key is to measure this gap between the ideal, as articulated in the ICISS report, and the reality extracted from the diplomatic, financial and political operations of a nation within a set time frame.

To achieve this, we can conduct an analysis similar to one often used in regulatory compliance and known as Gap Analysis. Gap Analysis is a means to compare the real performance of a company, institution or group with the potential or ideal performance as defined by a regulatory guideline, or management policies. For the purposes of this experiment we can use the core principle of comparing the real and the ideal performances of nations in order to discover the level of R2PT norm acceptance.

We will refer to the resulting measure that will show the size of such gap as the R2PT Norm Gap Index.

The challenge with developing such an index for the R2PT “compliance”, is that unlike other regulatory rules, the guidelines proposed by ICISS and the UN have yet to form a rigid and accepted regulatory rule set towards the operationalization of R2PT’s core norms. To rectify this issue we will be using the ICISS Report’s own suggested methods of implementation or listed examples as an estimation of proposed methods which we can extrapolate to real operationalization methods that are available to governments through commonly available diplomatic, economic and political instruments.

Responsibility to Prevent and the Norm Gap Matrix

Responsibility to Prevent, as a part of R2P's main three elements, is designed to address both the root causes and direct causes of internal conflict and other man-made crises putting population at risk. This study draws upon the ICISS report's R2PT specific section, which details the norms of R2PT. R2PT is divided into several sections, which describe the possible measures of operationalization and execution. These sections are *Commitment to Prevention, Early Warning and Analysis, Root Cause Prevention Efforts and Direct Prevention Efforts*. These four sections provide the principles for forming the two main parts of this analysis:

- A. Commitment to Prevention and Early Warning & Analysis, and
- B. Root Cause Prevention and Direct Prevention Efforts.

R2PT Norm GAP Matrix

		Presence of Responsibility to Prevent: Factors of Measurement		
		Expressed and Addressed Commitments		Participatory Commitments
Responsibility to Prevent Parts	Part A ICISS (3.2-3.4)	1. Proposed Foreign Policy Commitments	2. Executed Commitments (Institutional/Financial/Social Resource R2PT Related Allocation)	Involvement in Regional/International Dialogue and Cooperation
		Root Cause Prevention		Direct Prevention
	Part B ICISS (3.21-3.29)	Bilateral/Multilateral Development and Security Actions		Political/Diplomatic Direct Security/Aid Actions

Part A combines the sections *Commitment to Prevention and Early Warning and Analysis*, due to the shared themes on international cooperation in dialogue and multilateral operations as a method of identifying potential crises, while Part B combines sections *Root Cause Prevention Efforts and Direct Prevention Efforts* due to their shared themes of potential operationalization methods of the components in general Component A. Part A will discuss the diplomatic and international exchange aspect of R2PT and Part B will discuss the economic, political and legal aspects of enacting R2PT. Each of the Parts A and B is then given criteria for developing a measure, based on the definitions and components articulated in the respective sections of the ICISS report.

Each component is graded in level of effort needed to close the *gap* between the current performance in R2PT norm advancement and the theoretical ideal. This grading system normatively is represented as - Minimal Effort, Moderate Effort and Large Effort, while numerically it is represented as 1, 2, 3. Then the components are added together with a maximum score of 6. Depending on the numerical outcome the overall R2PT norm advancement is given a letter grade (i.e. A, B, C etc.) with the larger numerical values indicating more effort and thus a lower letter grade.

An Example Application: Canada's R2PT Index Score

As an example of what a completed analysis would look like, let's employ the mechanism described above to Canada. For this example, we will be setting a base year for later projects to be measured off of. This time frame will be from the 2005 World Summit until 2008. Of course the current issues in Iraq, Syria and Ukraine are the most popular topics in international peacekeeping and human rights, however, these topics would be more appropriate for the next round of analysis.

Here is the break down by Parts of the Index:

Canada's human rights and peacekeeping goals after the 2005 World Summit is dominated by the events in several key nations – Iraq, Haiti, Afghanistan, Ethiopia and Sudan. As the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) states in its *Statistical Report on Official Development Assistance for the Fiscal Year 2005-2006*, the nation's state above reached the majority of the 0.33% of GNI that was allotted to bilateral ODA transactions. From 2005 to 2008 Iraq and Afghanistan have traded places as the highest recipients of financial and institutional capital for the means of development. During this period Canada seemed to prioritize bilateral financial aid transactions with ODA's as the preferred method. When it comes to Expressed and Addressed Commitments there is certain momentum in financial and instrumental mobilization of capital and resources. Of course the allocation of resources is often uneven and at times incoherent to previously stated commitments.

In the case of the 2005-2008 period the number of development aid proposed to Haiti and Ethiopia in a 2005 statement by the Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada does not match its total allocated ODA and personnel submissions by 2007, 2008 fiscal year. From 2005-2008, Canada's bilateral and multilateral military and personnel security operations was mainly focused in the commitments to national development of Afghanistan. However, since then in 2007 Canada has attempted to increase its military intervention aspect in direct prevention. Less is placed into the Root Cause Prevention than Direct at this period (a trend we see to be on the rise after 2008 and especially with the recent counter-ISIS operations.)

For Part A, we can estimate that there is **Minimal Effort** needed in closing its rhetorical and realistic performances.

For Part B, we can estimate that in terms of Root Cause Prevention and Non-military lead development **Moderate Effort** is needed in closing its rhetorical and realistic performances.

Translated into numerical index form Canada's R2PT Index is a moderately good one. However, the score also highlights areas that need improvement.

2005-2008	
Canada's R2PT Index	
Responsibility to Prevent Components	Factors of Measurement
A: Commitment to Prevention ICISS (3.2-3.4)	1 <i>Minimal Effort</i>
B: Root Cause/Direct Prevention ICISS (3.21-3.29)	2 <i>Moderate Effort</i>
Total Score:	3

Consulted References

"Canada's Commitment to Human Rights." *Government of Canada, Foreign Affairs Trade and Development Canada, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs*, Government of Canada, 6 Mar. 2012. Web. 15 Mar. 2015. <http://www.international.gc.ca/rights-droits/commitment-engagement.aspx?lang=eng>

"Canadian International Development Platform" *Canadian International Development Agency and North-South Institute*. 2012. Web. 15 Mar. 2015. <http://cidpnsi.ca/blog/portfolio/canadas-foreign-aid/>

"Policy Brief: Operationalizing the Responsibility to Prevent" *Oxford Institute for Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict*. Web. 15 Mar. 2015. <http://www.elac.ox.ac.uk/downloads/elac%20operationalising%20the%20responsibility%20to%20prevent.pdf>

"Responsibility to Protect" *International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*. December 2001.

"Statistical Report on Official Development Assistance for the Fiscal Year 2005-2006" *Canadian International Development Agency*, May 2008. Web. 15. Mar. 2015. [http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUIImages/Publications/\\$file/StatisticalReport-ENG-2008-04-29_SM.pdf](http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUIImages/Publications/$file/StatisticalReport-ENG-2008-04-29_SM.pdf)