

same time, it is recognized that there are dangers in making a crude poverty-violence link, which may unfairly stigmatize marginalized populations (i.e. just because someone is poor does not make them predisposed towards violence). There must be a concentrated effort to tease out conceptions of human security held (either implicitly or explicitly) by other governments, especially those of the developing world. In terms of data and methodological challenges it is widely recognized by the research community that there are significant issues surrounding the quality and reliability of accessible data. Good data is hard to find. One daunting challenge is the lack of disaggregated data (e.g. sub-national data, data on ethnic minorities, data on those living in poverty, gender data) available to policy-makers. A consensus has to be reached on the legitimacy of data gathered by non-official (i.e. non-governmental or non-IGO) sources including NGOs or others working in the field. The point was also made that existing indexes tend to only use negative indicators (e.g. numbers of deaths from violence) to measure human security. There should be an effort to incorporate positive indicators (e.g. the capacity of a region to deal with an issue) into the indexes. Another on-going challenge is how to include other aspects of human security (e.g. the environment, susceptibility to disease), in the measurement index while making sure that it remains coherent and relevant for policy-makers.

Operationally, the overarching question that needs to be answered is why do we want a human security index? If that is answered positively, one of the most pressing problems is figuring out how to move beyond the inherently political and subjective nature of indexes so that a human security index could potentially be considered a legitimate measuring instrument. How do we target societies at risk? If human security stresses preventive over reactive measures, how can measuring human security contribute to prevention? The concept of human security is not readily accepted in Washington. Can the American security framework be massaged or circumvented?

The discussion identified a number of gaps in knowledge and information sharing about data and methodologies. The research and policy communities may still be unaware of some of the specialized data used by NGOs and others in the field. This data should be investigated and harnessed if useful. As of yet, subjective elements of human security have not been incorporated in measurement indexes. There is a disturbing lack of disaggregated data. Too few measures of human security examine disease. The measurement methodologies remain focused on vulnerabilities rather than capabilities. More time could be spent investigating coping strategies.

Finally, participants put forward four principal recommendations:

- Efforts need to be undertaken to design regional, national, and sub-national measures of human security.
- There needs to be a focus on the collection of disaggregated data.
- Finding existing indicators to use as proxies for human (in)security (e.g. levels of infant mortality have a strong correlation with regime stability), must be made a priority.
- There needs to be greater interaction, collaboration, and communication between the academic and policy-making communities interested in human security.

*Rapporteurs: Kyle Grayson, York University; Kate Woznow, University of British Columbia, (UBC)*