

Ottawa  
Monday, October-06-14

## Article 49 on South Sudan

### Developments in South Sudan Conflict: Rating IGAD

Our Articles 1 to 3 and 5 to 48 were situation analyses of the conflict in South Sudan. Our articles 4 (A), 4 (B) and 4 (C) were the first of our series on “Who is Who”. This article 49 is dedicated to rating IGAD. We do not mean to belittle the small regional organization, but to size it to its capabilities and trackrecord performance. We also mean that all stakeholders (Primary, Secondary and beneficiaries) are aware of the limitations of the organization they are dealing with.

#### Classification and comparison to African Regional Organizations

Regional Blocs Millions	Land Mass SQK	Population Millions	GDP US\$ Millions	Per Capita Income \$	Number of Member States					
Order	Order	Order	Order	Order	Order					
African Economic Community	29,910,442	1	853,520,010	1	2,053,706	1	2,406	7	54	1
Economic Community of West African States	5,112,903	8	300,000,000	3	1,322,452	2	3,888	3	15	3
Economic Community of Central African States	6,667,421	4	121,245,958	8	175,928	9	1,451	9	11	4
Southern African Development Community	9,822,959	3	233,944,179	4	737,335	3	3,152	5	15	3
East African Community	1,817,945 12		124,858,568	7	104,239	10	1,065	2	5	8
Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa	12,873,957	2	406,102,471	2	735,599	4	1,811	8	20	2
<b>Inter-Governmental Authority on Development. IGAD</b>	<b>5,233,604</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>187,969,775</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>225,049</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1,197</b>	<b>11</b>	7	<b>6</b>
Economic and Monetary Community of Central	3,020,142 10		34,970,529	12	85,136	12	2,435	6	6	7

Africa										
Southern African Customs Union	2,693,418 11		51,055,878 11		541,433 6		10,605	1	5	8
West African Economic and Monetary Union	3,505,375 8		80,865,222 10		101,640 11		1,267	10	8	5
Arab Magreb Union	5,782,140 6		84,185,073 9		491,276 7		5,836	2	5	8
Council of Arab Economic Unity	5,876,960 5		166,259,603 6		635,450 5		3,822	4	5	8

**To Note from the table**

1. IGAD ranks 7<sup>th</sup> out of 12 in land mass
2. It ranks 5<sup>th</sup> out of 12 in population (Thanks to Ethiopia and hence the current hegemony over IGAD)
3. It ranks 8<sup>th</sup> out of 12 in Gross Domestic Product
4. It ranks 11<sup>th</sup> out of 12 in per capita income, again due to the massive poverty in Ethiopia and no development projects of any size (as envisaged in the Founding Agreement) were implemented.
5. It ranks 6<sup>th</sup> out of 12 in the number of states under its membership.

**But that is not the end of the story:**

1. It is probably the poorest funded organization of the 12. International Donors do not take it for serious.
2. Its inception plan of projects costing \$500 million on paper were never implemented-not one “physical” “hard pillar” project was implemented.
3. It has been riddled with weak secretariat all along its history of IGADD (with double D) 1986-1995 and its new face 1995 to date.
4. It was brought to light and activity through the Sudan/SPLM/A CPA. Then it went back to sleep of failure after failure on Somalia.
5. Djibouti is not Luxemburg or Switzerland. Who else have their base in Djibouti? What regional clout or military might do they have?
6. The massive financial and professional and logistical support given by the IGAD Partners Forum (IPF) to the Kenya hosted activities of the CPA was unparalleled and does not show in the current South Sudan Conflict.

**Unless there is complete overhaul and implementation of:**

1. The “Weird” idea of “Envoys” to be turned into “Mediators” and they come with their political hats of their countries.
2. A clear and strong “Mandate” and ToR for the Mediators to have teeth and for the negotiating parties to know what those “teeth” are and where they are coming from.
3. The Mandate can only have teeth if the organization developing it can put their money, clout and physical force where their mouth is. That cannot be IGAD heads of state. Read our evaluation of IGAD in the table above and analysis of their own Founding Agreement 1995. Look into their communiqués: They “resolve” and want the “International Community” to “fund”.
4. A clear Declaration of Principles (DOP) agreed and signed to by the primary stakeholders.
5. Thematic (one by one) Approach to the intricate issues of the conflict and not the current “Holistic” and “Quasi Holistic” approach. Look at the good compilation document of Sept 22 but it is 76 pages long, bearing the views of 4 different stakeholders on over ten thematic areas? Who can possibly deal with all that? It took us 7 days to *just* study it.
6. Limiting the talks to ONLY the Primary Stakeholders (GRSS and the SPLM/A-IO). The rest are no more than of “Nuisance value”
7. Having a professionally diverse and competent technical team around and close to Mediation. “Plumbers” who can fix.
8. An immediate independent “Formative Evaluation” of the weak process so far and delivering professional recommendations on what can be done to have a “Process” and “Progress”
9. Evaluate, in depth: The host, the venue, the mediation team and the political will of all the stakeholders.

Unless that is done, we do not see light at the end of the tunnel.

**Some reflections on the Agreement Establishing the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD)  
Nairobi, 21 March 1996**

We see that the legal basis on which the IGAD was established was weak and lacked serious will and legitimacy. It was established through “An Assembly” (meeting) of the heads of State. It is a top-down organization that was not established through wider consensus of the Nationals under its umbrella. But that is history now.

In this section of the analysis, we are taking the document at face value and “de facto” agreement. We are also limiting our brief analysis to the Conflict Management Components enshrined in the Founding Agreement.

While the conflict of South Sudan is, if we like it or not, in the hands of IGAD now, and due to the less than credible “Outputs” let alone “Outcomes”, we must, ALL have a scrupulous approach to IGAD itself and its off-shoots.

1. Can they do the job?
2. Can the history of the CPA repeat itself
3. Is the collateral support and professional input that the conflict needs available?
4. Has the “metamorphic” phases of the conflict in South Sudan become ripe for such simplistic approached by Mediation to help resolve it? We are not talking about the “Human Suffering” which is a manifestation of the political conflict.
5. Is mediation’ Truly” aware of the complexity, gravity and intricate labyrinth of the conflict and its stakeholders to gear up resources to help resolve it?
6. Do the Envoys REALLY understand their role through a clear and doable mandate?

Well; we are not going to answer all those question otherwise we have to write a book.

**We will just take you on a tour along the clauses of the Founding Agreement.**

#### **Article 6A**

##### **Principles**

The Member States solemnly reaffirm their commitment to the following principles:

- a) The sovereign equality of all Member States;
- b) Non-interference in the internal affairs of Member States;
- c) The peaceful settlement of inter- and intra-State conflicts through dialogue;
- d) Maintenance of regional peace, stability and security;

#### **Article 7**

##### **Aims and Objectives**

- g) Promote peace and stability in the sub-region and create mechanisms within the sub-region for the prevention, management and resolution of inter and intra-State conflicts through dialogue;

#### **Article 9**

##### **The Assembly of Heads of State and Government**

- c) Give **guidelines** and **monitor** political issues especially on conflict prevention, management and resolution;

#### **Article 13 A**

##### **Areas of Cooperation**

Nothing in this spine article talks about political activities or forces in all its 20 sub articles. This is the backbone of IGAD in which they have failed

### **Article 18A**

#### **Conflict Resolution**

Member States shall act **collectively to preserve peace**, security and stability which are essential prerequisites for economic development and social progress. Accordingly Member States shall:

- a) **take effective collective measures to eliminate threats to regional co-operation peace and stability;**
- b) establish an effective mechanism of **consultation** and **cooperation** for the pacific settlement of differences and disputes;
- c) accept to deal with disputes between Member States within this sub-regional mechanism before they are referred to other regional or international organisations.

From where then did this “Bullying” and rough language and threats come from? Have they worked in 9 months? 4 officers who have no assets to talk about and have no intention to go to the States of the EU are sanctioned: Bravo! The rest was hollow talk.

We are still waiting for the TOR of Mediation. If we were SPLM/A-IO and or GRSS we will not board the plane to Ethiopia without sighting such a mandate as Public Document for all our peoples. My goodness! If a man and woman (only 2) want to get married there must be a deed! What about 10.6 million people?

Subsahara Centre

Ottawa

Canada