

Quick-scan: Typologies for agricultural development in fragile settings



Aid transitions in fragility and protracted crisis settings

July 2019
Rojan Bolling, Jacqueline Vrancken & Arthur Rempel

Content overview:

1.	Typologies for agricultural development in different fragile settings	1
2.	Method.....	2
3.	Quick-scan results	2
3.1	Framework comparison.....	2
3.2	Typologies of fragile settings.....	3
Annexes	8
Annex A.	Typology comparison	8
Annex B.	Draft framework.....	13

This report

This report is the first in a series of three reports published as part of the project 'Aid transitions in fragility and protracted crisis settings' for the Community of Practice on food security & stability, facilitated by the Food & Business Knowledge Platform. All reports will be made available [here](#).

Word of thanks to the reference group

A reference group reflected and advised on the initial outcomes of the two quick-scans undertaken as part of this project. This feedback and the knowledge gaps identified in the concluding chapter of this report informed research questions for the next phase of this project. We want to express our thanks to Frans Verberne (Food & Business Knowledge Platform), Hashi Abdullahi (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Astrid Mastebroek (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Gerrit-Jan van Uffelen (Wageningen CDI) and Inge Vos (ZOA) for sharing their valuable time and input.

Picture credit cover page: [UNMISS via Flickr](#)

1. Typologies for agricultural development in different fragile settings

With extreme poverty and hunger increasingly concentrated in fragile settings and humanitarian spending increasingly used in protracted crisis situations rather than short-term crisis response there is a need to: a) build upon market structures present in fragile and crisis-affected settings, and b) find approaches that can effectively promote long-term sustainable socio-economic development in fragile settings. Fragile settings, even those affected by conflict, are not economic voids. They harbour value chains, markets, agricultural production systems and various types of formal or informal governance arrangements. Basic laws of supply and demand function, and with the right intervention strategies contributions to greater stability and resilience can be made.

The overall goal of this exercise is to help achieve such transitions of aid strategies and programming along the humanitarian-development nexus in fragile settings. In the field, working towards such transitions on the one hand includes prepositioning humanitarian, recovery, rehabilitation and resilience interventions for linking up to long-term market-driven development. On the other hand it includes implementing agribusiness and agricultural value chain interventions in a variety of fragile settings that differ greatly in terms of the risks, challenges and opportunities present.

Good context analysis, conflict sensitivity, integrated approaches and effective coordination are all critical to achieve this successfully - a variety of toolboxes, frameworks and best practices are available to help. Yet limits to the effect of these tools exist in practice. Humanitarian actors often have little time for in-depth and comprehensive context analysis and are forced to give higher priority to identifying critical needs then, for instance, competitiveness and power in value chains. Likewise, when determining where to invest donor funding policymakers need to weigh the expected costs, benefits and risks. (1)NGOs have to take into account this process, which can make it more difficult to propose long-term development interventions in higher risk settings with more uncertain outcomes. This means that opportunities to contribute to greater stability and resilience through such interventions are lost.

Frameworks with typologies that can be used to set policy priorities, design interventions, and make critical choices about geography, targeting and management can be helpful to identify opportunities and decrease risk. They represent lessons from experience captured in systematic approaches, which can enable policymakers and practitioners to identify and act on opportunities to implement more market-driven agricultural interventions in fragile settings. Before starting the mapping of lessons in the second part of this exercise we therefore look at the available frameworks for policy and programming in fragile settings. Specifically we seek to identify whether any frameworks exist that capture the variety of circumstances within fragile countries with attention for agricultural programming.

In fragile countries one setting might be relatively stable, while another is in crisis. By differentiating between these varied circumstances we aim to contribute to a focus on the opportunities in fragile settings, rather than risks alone.

The quick-scan was guided by the following questions:

1. What models, frameworks or typologies can contribute to the planning and designing of (agricultural) development interventions in fragile settings?
2. What types of fragile settings can be identified in Dutch focus countries based on frameworks from (1)?
3. What is a suitable conceptual model to guide agricultural development planning in different fragile settings of Dutch focus countries?

2. Method

A systematic search was conducted to swiftly identify any relevant preexisting frameworks and typologies that already explore either fragility, agricultural development contexts or both. First 26 NGOs, multilateral organisations and development institutions were identified to create an inventory of publication libraries, with priority for Netherlands-based organisations. 23 publication libraries were existent, and along with using Google Search and Google Scholar search engines, 25 total platforms were used. Identical search terms were used in each of the 25 platforms to ensure consistency in our results. These included various combinations of: *fragile, framework, agriculture, food security, model, farmer, approach*.

In order to determine whether a document was relevant, we considered whether the document made any attempt to:

- Offer a fragility typology/classification, or
- Offer an agricultural development typology/classification, or
- Provide or assess development or policy support in varying states of fragility or agricultural contexts

Documents with at least one of these three criteria were selected for further analysis. This process resulted in the collection of 21 frameworks and documents that were deemed potentially useful. Documents that were publicly accessible in their entirety, and frameworks that focused on national and subnational level classifications and interventions were given priority. As a result, 10 frameworks in total - by 9 different organisations - were selected for comparison. Frameworks were then checked to see if they provided sufficient basis for insight into different fragility circumstances on sub-national or local level and whether they would be helpful to facilitate either policy planning or development programming for these different types of (sub-national) fragile settings.

3. Quick-scan results

During the quick-scan it became clear that frameworks or typologies covering both fragile settings and agricultural interventions were hard to find. Similarly there was a lack of frameworks that distinguished between different types of (sub-national) settings within fragile countries. See Annex A for the inventory of frameworks. Providing a comprehensive typology of different fragile settings in Dutch focus countries was therefore not possible. A suitable combination of insights from the different types of frameworks and additional literature was instead sought to draft a conceptual framework that could be further developed to help determine the feasibility of different types of agricultural development interventions in fragile settings on the local level. This draft model can be found in Annex B.

3.1 Framework comparison

Criteria for comparison

The framework documents were subsequently evaluated and compared using the following six criteria:

1. Does the framework include a fragility typology - that can either be used or adapted to match the possible fragility contexts of Netherlands development locations?
2. Does the framework include a typology of agriculture development context - varying by types of interventions, food systems, or food securities, food consumers, food producers?
3. Does the framework offer policy strategies that vary depending on fragility scenario/classification?
4. Does the framework offer policy strategies that vary depending on agriculture development context?
5. Does the framework offer recommendations for development practices that vary depending on fragility scenario/classification?
6. Does the framework offer recommendations for development practices that vary depending on agricultural intervention strategies?

A key observation is that none of the frameworks simultaneously incorporate a typology for states of fragility and one for agricultural development contexts or interventions. This supports our initial suspicion that a two-dimensional typology combining fragility and agricultural development contexts/interventions has been unexplored thus far.

Of the 10 typologies, five (ILO, WB, Mercy Corps, OECD, INSS) categorize different states of fragility, though it should be noted that these frameworks differ in approach. For instance, the World Bank identifies six key fragility challenges faced on both micro- and macroeconomic levels, while the OECD produces a multidimensional model spanning fragility in social, economic, environmental, and security dimensions. Uniquely, the INSS offers a more abstract framework by proposing to frame fragility as a “wicked problem” and to account for types of threats in addition to the degree of threats in fragile settings.

Three (DIE, FAO x 2) of the 10 frameworks hold an agricultural context or intervention typology as their core focus. Analogous to the fragility typologies, approaches vary here as well. The DIE’s revised “[Five Rural Worlds](#)” model (adapted from the OECD’s original framework) generates five distinct rural settings that are composed of different household and enterprise types - which allows for an inter-sectoral to intervention planning. Its focus on the sub-national level and a bottom-up, people-focused perspective was deemed useful to stimulate thinking about how agricultural interventions in fragile settings take shape locally, with attention for different stakeholders - this is further dissected in Section 3.2.

Three (ILO, INSS, WB) of the frameworks offer policy strategies as a function of degree of fragility, while only one (FAO) does so for agricultural context accounting for different phases of acute and chronic food insecurity. Unlike the three models offering policy console in fragile settings, the FAO’s food insecurity model strives to support both emergency and developmental initiatives. The aforementioned “Five Rural Worlds” model was constructed for developmental intervention purposes, though it can arguably serve as a tool for policymakers to understand the trade-offs between household and enterprise types that may arise as policies are generated.

This comparison exercise has revealed that fewer attempts have been made to construct typologies of agricultural contexts than to categorize states of fragility, though the DIE’s revised “Five Rural Worlds” model has potential as such due to its robustness and widespread applicability. Furthermore, attempts to produce fragility frameworks take multiple forms, suggesting that there is a lack of consensus as to what constitutes a “fragile state” - a conclusion which is unpacked in further detail in Section 3.2 below.

3.2 Typologies of fragile settings

The term “fragile setting” originates from discussions about the concept of fragile states. Although there is no set definition of a ‘fragile state’, key elements in common approaches to their analysis or categorization are the ability and willingness of a state to carry out certain core functions to meet the needs and expectations of its citizens.¹ Our analysis of several major fragility frameworks in combination with a [UNU-CPR review of 35 frameworks](#) that are increasingly being used by the international community to assess fragility, risk, and resilience reveals several limitations in existing approaches:

- Fragility continues to be analysed predominantly from a state-centric perspective, with a focus on state institutions.
- Fragility and resilience frameworks largely overlook the role of informal and sub-national institutions, despite their importance as a source of resilience in fragile and conflict affected settings.
- Resilience is largely viewed through the prism of disaster risk reduction with little emphasis on the political and institutional dimensions of risk.

¹ [Bosetti, L. Ivanovic, A and Munshey, M. \(2016\) Fragility, Risk and Resilience: A review of existing frameworks. UNU-CPR Background paper.](#)

- Few resilience frameworks are relevant to fragile and conflict-affected settings and provide prescriptions that are often unrealistic to implement for municipal authorities in fragile and conflict-affected contexts.
- No framework covers risk, fragility and resilience in a comprehensive way.

Shift towards ‘fragility lens’

One major development in recent analyses however includes the shift from focusing on ‘fragile states’ to looking at the state-society relationship and developing a more nuanced analysis that talks about ‘situations of fragility’.² The three frameworks included in the table below are examples of this. However, as is noted by the UNU-CPR review, despite this evolution in thinking, the various dimensions of fragility still remain largely focused on the state and its ability to deliver core functions. For example, the primary unit of analysis of the [OECD Multidimensional Fragility Framework](#) remains the (nation-)state and is yet unable to capture external and macro-level factors that spill over borders and sub-national and micro-level factors that indicate pockets of (in)stability within countries. Recognising the importance of horizontal society-society dynamics and vertical state-society dynamics, the OECD aims to explore further how to incorporate different layers of fragility beyond the nation state as they strive to promote development processes that are people-centred.

Another example is the [G7+ Fragility Spectrum](#) which purposely applies a broad definition of fragility to incorporate the diversity of experiences of fragility. Its spectrum is intended as a marker to provide insight into how fragility challenges are perceived. The [Fragility Compass](#) then visualises fragility as a cyclical process that involves recurring episodes of heightened and lowered fragility, highlighting resilience as a crucial component in every response. Its broadened design emphasizes the need for an analysis of factors or triggers driving fragility at local, national, and regional levels.

Enabling conditions for interventions in fragile environments

The shift towards viewing fragility on a spectrum of varying degrees, aspects and/or duration is useful to evaluate it as a dynamic process - as opposed to a static and institution-based condition. However, the ‘outcomes’ of the frameworks still provide classifications of fragility which are broad and not necessarily helpful to identify local opportunities for interventions in different areas within fragile countries. An important question that therefore remains is under what conditions interventions can be viable (and may help to mitigate factors and triggers that drive fragility) and how these may have to be adapted and supplemented in light of (changing) fragility dynamics.³

On the basis of the reviewed frameworks and literature we propose that the most useful typology to classify fragile settings for the purposes of this exercise is **governance**. This includes the state-society focus of many of the frameworks, but broadens the scope beyond the state and its institutions as the primary source of governance. As GIZ and IDS find in a review of rural development interventions in Afghanistan, DRC, Yemen, Nepal and Bolivia, what is needed for agricultural interventions in fragile settings - beyond technical assistance - is a governance oriented approach.⁴ Similarly, International Alert conclude that it is imperative to base initiatives addressing needs in fragile contexts (like their selected case in the DRC) on hybrid forms of multi-layered governance, particularly accounting for grassroots dynamics and knowledge⁵ (more on hybrid governance below). While in a Community of Practice meeting of the Food & Business Knowledge Platform it was reiterated that a critical component determining the success or failure of interventions in fragile states is not necessarily the institutional arrangements, but the support of people that make up these institutions.⁶

² idem

³ [Jütersonke, O. and Kobayashi, K. \(2015\) Employment and Decent Work in Fragile Settings: A compass to orient the world of work. Graduate Institute Geneva and the International Labour Organization](#)

⁴ [GIZ, IDS \(2014\) What works for rural development in fragile states?](#)

⁵ [Cuvelier, J. International Alert \(2010\) The Complexity of Resource Governance in a context of state fragility](#)

⁶ [F&BKP \(2019\) Supporting transitions towards market-based agriculture in fragile settings. Community of Practice meeting report.](#)

Framework	Definition	Factors	Classification
OECD Multidimensional Fragility Framework	The combination of exposure to risk and insufficient coping capacity of the state, system and/or communities to manage, absorb or mitigate those risks.	Multidimensional fragility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - political - societal - economic - environmental - security 	Cluster analysis: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) severe fragility 2) high fragility 3) moderate fragility 4) low fragility 5) minor fragility 6) non-fragile
G7+ Fragility Spectrum	A state of fragility can be understood as a period of time during nationhood when sustainable socio-economic development requires greater emphasis on complementary peacebuilding and statebuilding activities such as building inclusive political settlements, security, justice, jobs, good management of resources, and accountable and fair service delivery.	Country-specific fragility spectrum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusive politics - Security - Justice - Economic foundations - Revenues and services 	Stages of fragility: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Crisis 2) Rebuild and reform 3) Transition 4) Transformation 5) Resilience
ILO Fragility Compass	Fragility may be understood as sudden and/or cyclical situations in which one or more exogenous or endogenous risk factors exacerbate preexisting or emerging political instability and socio-economic vulnerability.	8 major “composite” contributing factors: <u>typical exogenous factors:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - catastrophic events - health epidemics - global trade or financial crises - weak democratic governance <u>typical endogenous factors:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - socio-political crisis - socio-economic inequalities and marginalization - external/internal armed groups <u>can have both exogenous and endogenous dimensions:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - migratory flows/population movements 	Intensity levels: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Minor disturbances 2) Major threat 3) Existential security threat

A useful framework that shows how governance conditions can vary to create different kinds of (enabling) environments is produced by the International Food Policy Institute (IFPRI). The table below shows the simplified framework that aims to help practitioners think about the feasibility of interventions by identifying both positive and negative factors affecting public spending responsiveness to the needs of the poor.⁷ Responsiveness of institutions is the key measure of these arrangements as it is a good indicator of

⁷ [International Food Policy Research Institute \(2014\) Global Nutrition Report 2014: Actions and Accountability to Accelerate the World's Progress on Nutrition](#)

capacity, state-society relations and is thought for a large part to result in state legitimacy - a core goal of state-building exercises promoted for fragile settings. The IFPRI justifies a focus on local governance and informal institutions in addition to state-actors by claiming that doing so minimizes transaction costs in “aggregating citizens’ preferences and giving them a voice” - a key feature of participatory budgeting and a proxy measure to account for fragility.

Table 2.1 The use of responsive institutional arrangements under different conceptual assumptions about governance

Conceptions of governance → ↓			First dimension: Citizens’ <i>rights</i> to compel government to act on their behalf are existent and enforced			
			No	Yes		
Third dimension: Government’s <i>interests</i> (absent incentives) are <i>intrinsically</i> the same as citizens’ interests	No	Second dimension: Government has high technical <i>capacity</i> (for example, ease in assessing impact of interventions on citizens’ welfare)	No	(1) “Roving bandits” → Public actors have no interest in responsive institutional arrangements (RIAs) as well as can avoid them	(2) Weak state capacity in a democracy → RIAs used by politicians to compensate for their technical constraints in identifying welfare-enhancing resource allocation, and to signal pro-citizen intent	Both theoretical and empirical application
			Yes	(3) “Stationary bandits” → RIAs are employed by government to complement its own knowledge about how to maintain citizens’ material well-being	(4) Principal-agent problems → RIAs used by citizens to reduce asymmetric information that disfavors them, for example, by bringing political decision-making process closer to people	
	Yes		No	(5) Information problems under “benevolent dictatorship” → RIAs reduce asymmetric information that disfavor public officials, by directly eliciting citizens’ needs	(6) Government failure → RIAs used by citizens and government to communicate citizens’ priorities, as technical input for resource allocation decisions	Only theoretical application
			Yes	(7) Unencumbered social planner model → Public actors have no need for RIAs	(8) Functional democracy, strong state capacity → RIAs as an integral element of governance	

Source: [IFPRI, 2016](#)

A framework differentiating enabling environments in fragile settings

Formal, state institutions coalesce with non-state, local actors in arrangements often referred to as forms of “hybrid governance.” This amalgamation of state and non-state institutions as a governance framework is nothing revolutionary and has been utilized repeatedly; in fact, local institutions have embedded themselves in arrangements with state actors in governing a variety of fragile settings across the African continent.⁸ Many fragile settings rely on a multitude of (un)official actors as far as their governance is concerned - including armed groups and customary authorities who can be in conflict with each other.⁹

We deem it imperative to include the existence of these various actors in any typology of fragile settings, so as to as best possible depict the multidimensional complexities that obstruct or facilitate implementation of interventions here. We should also mention here that in section 1 we indicated that the framework mapping in this initiative was guided by an attempt to identify different types of fragility spanning Dutch focus regions. Due to the limitations highlighted in the aforementioned fragility frameworks, and the limited time available for this exercise, we refocused our initiative to provide a draft framework applicable to all regions that stimulates thinking about what interventions are (and are not) suitable. This framework can be expanded later on if it is found useful in light of the outcomes of the mapping on lessons learned that is undertaken as a next exercise.

⁸ [Meagher, De Herdt and Titeca \(2014\) Unraveling public authority: paths of hybrid governance in Africa](#)

⁹ [Rijper, A. \(2013\) Fragile states or hybrid societies - Engaging in fragile settings](#)

To differentiate enabling environments for agricultural interventions in different sub-national fragile settings we therefore propose to use the following three indicators:

- 1) State institutions (at national and sub-national levels) legitimacy and capacity
- 2) Informal/customary institutions (primarily at sub-national and local levels) legitimacy and capacity
- 3) The cooperation/cohesion/complementarity of the two governance actors above

Using the above categories (see Annex B for visual depiction) to differentiate between sub-national fragile settings a framework can be drafted to help identify what approaches for agricultural interventions might be feasible under these different circumstances. The combinations of three governance indicators into five types can be juxtaposed with the farmer and farmer enterprise types identified in the Five Rural Worlds typology to determine different policy and intervention objectives for each target group under different circumstances.

Annexes

Annex A. Typology comparison

Name	Organisation	Typologies		Policy Strategies		Development Recommendations	
		1. Fragility Typology	2. Agriculture Development Context	3. By Fragility Context	4. By Agricultural Context	5. By Fragility Context	6. By Agricultural Context
Employment and Decent Work in Fragile Settings (2015)	Graduate Institute Geneva / ILO	Yes - the framework includes a risk analysis tool and intervention framework to help determine what employment interventions are appropriate to respond to different variations of fragility (risks)	No	Yes - the framework offers policymakers a way to prioritize between quantity or quality of jobs, and between immediate impact or longer term capacity or resilience building	No	No - but its risk framework is informed by a classification of risks in fragile settings, ordered by intensity	No
Integrated framework for jobs in fragile and conflict situations	World Bank	Yes - the framework categorizes fragile settings by six types of fragility challenges and matching key policy goals	No	Yes - each of the six fragility challenges, with matching policy goals, lists policy priorities for the macro/economy wide, emergency and livelihoods, and private sector development	No	No - but each policy priority area lists the type of programming needed. Additionally a separate framework helps policymakers think about how short-term entry points for interventions can be chosen to support long-term development goals as well.	No

Revised 'five rural worlds' model (2016)	DIE	No	Yes - the framework lists five types of 'rural worlds' that differentiate between household types in rural areas	No	No - the framework is meant to facilitate intervention planning. It can however contribute to an understanding of the trade-offs between targeting different types of households, farmers and agricultural enterprises	No	Yes - the framework helps think about targeting strategies for intervention design and planning by listing key characteristics and goals of different household and enterprise types to provide entry-points for interventions.
Strengthening sector policies for better food security and nutrition results (2018)	FAO	No	Yes - the framework differentiates between types of food systems from traditional to modern, listing their characteristics in the food supply chain from production to retail and markets	No	No - but the framework facilitates analysis of the current policies in place to find entry points for policy change to create nutrition-sensitive food systems	No	No
The food systems approach: sustainable solutions for a sufficient supply of healthy food (2018)	WEcR	No	No - but the framework does provide a comprehensive overview of a food system, including all the socio-economic and environmental drivers, activities in the food chain, as well as socio-economic, environmental and food security outcomes	No	No - but it does offer policymakers a framework that helps think about balancing different intervention outcomes (socio-economic, food security, environmental) and facilitates integrated approaches and policy coherence	No	No - but the framework does facilitate thinking about how interventions can strengthen each other to achieve change on a systems level

Resilience for Food Security in Complex Crises	Mercy Corps	Yes - the framework focuses on resilience capacities against high intensity shocks and low intensity stresses from conflict or the environment	No - but the framework does separate capacities to respond to shocks and stresses into food security outcomes built by different kinds of interventions	No - but the framework does offer insight into what interventions (to build certain capacities in response to certain conflict and environmental shocks) positively correlate with improved food security	No	Yes - the framework provides insight into what capacities result in improved food security under different kinds of shocks and stresses	No
States of Fragility 2018	OECD	Yes - they offer a multidimensional take on fragility spanning political, societal, economic, environmental and security relevance and further classify fragility on a continuum ranging from severe to minor, and then assign scores to various countries.	No	To some degree. The book offers in depth analysis of the financial flows and action options to address fragility in varying contexts (see 5), but the focus is on development contexts and for practitioners. That said policy strategists may find this helpful in sculpting their own policies	No	Yes. The bulk of this book builds on the resources for internal/external financing fragile states, constraints in achieving the SDGs, and assessing the "right" type of financing needed for fragile states. This culminates to the final chapter, in which they address the actions that the international community can take to better address fragility today, including how to include SDGs, accelerate aid, and methods of cost-effective prevention	No
Integrated Food Security Phase Classification	FAO	No	Yes - distinguish between acute and chronic food insecurity to give rise to their "phases" and "levels" of insecurity severity, respectively	No	Yes - the framework aims to provide tools to help decision makers respond in both emergency and development contexts. These tools are based under the premise that IPC helps analyze and	No	Yes - the framework aims to provide tools to help decision makers respond in both emergency and development contexts. These tools are based under the premise that IPC helps analyze and

					classify acute and chronic food insecurity.		classify acute and chronic food insecurity.
State fragility as a wicked problem	INSS	Proposes to enhance the understanding of policy implications of state fragility via three arguments: 1) Fragility should be viewed as a wicked problem 2) Categorize and rank fragility not just by degree but also by types and threats they pose 3) Integrating state-building literature and study of political dynamics of weak states	No	Yes - to some degree. The paper does an interesting job at depicting the government structures that could enable policy interventions to work in varying fragility "contexts" - though they synthesize various angles of categorizing fragility so their analysis is still very general	No	No - though the notion of expanding the way we characterize fragility contexts by their proposals (see 1) could give rise to useful links to development work and practice	No
The effectiveness of Private Sector Development Interventions in Fragile and conflict-affected situations evidence from evaluations	World Bank	Simple typology used to include 23 countries as FCS - categorized countries as in-conflict, post-conflict, fragile, and periodical/temporary conflict. Fragile in this case was linked to having governments that cannot or will not deliver core functions to the majority of its people," though they acknowledge that that there is no universally	No	No - the focus of the paper/document is in the private sector development interventions	No - the focus of the paper/document is on the private sector development interventions	They depict the qualities and attributes of successful projects (projects that reached their preestablished desired outcomes, like job creation, investment generation, and deployment of new farming methods). These qualities differ by project type (supporting SMEs, financing SMEs, Infrastructure, Business Environment) and	No - the focus of the paper/document is on the private sector development interventions in fragile and conflict affected areas, though agricultural initiatives were analyzed as part of the analysis

		accepted definition of fragile states				~somewhat~ by FCS classification	
--	--	---------------------------------------	--	--	--	----------------------------------	--

Annex B. Draft framework

<p style="text-align: center;">Governance-based Fragility </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Actor-centered Agricultural Contexts</p>	State Capacity & Legitimacy	<i>Low</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>
	Customary (informal) Capacity & Legitimacy	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>
	Cohesion & Complementarity	<i>Low</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Low</i>
	State of Fragility & Conflict	<i>Fragile</i>	<i>Risk of conflict?</i>	<i>Risk of conflict?</i>	<i>Risk of conflict</i>
		anarchy, low social organization, likely warlords/bandits/armed group oppression	state vacuum	outsourced governance, high dissatisfaction with state	Possible power struggle between state and customary institutions over what rules apply locally
	Rural World	Relative Frequency			
1	<i>Large-scale commercial agricultural households and enterprises</i>	Very small minority of households			
2	<i>Traditional landholder and enterprises, not internationally competitive</i>	Substantial number of rural households			
3	<i>Subsistence agricultural households and micro-enterprises</i>	Very large number of fishermen, pastoralists, smallholders and associated micro enterprises			
4	<i>Landless rural households and micro-enterprises</i>	N/A			
5	<i>Chronically poor rural households many no longer economically active</i>	N/A			