I. Purpose of the meeting:

Discuss and agree on the framework and the content of a mid-year assessment of the progress in the implementation of the Roadmap of Actions in 2012.

II. Framework of the mid-year assessment:

A. Points of general agreement:

1. Assessment enhances accountability, helps consolidate information and analysis, serves as a reference point, ensures the members’ engagement and maintains focus on delivering results.
2. A mid-year assessment helps course correction and ensures focus on key deliverables ahead of the end of year assessment in December. It can draw on country engagement to inform broader and ‘whole of PBC” policy development.
3. The mid-year assessment process should be light (not overly bureaucratic) and should draw on views from and realities in the field.
4. In order to take the assessment forward, each Chair of configuration could be requested to share one to two pages structured around the following elements:
   a. Main objectives of each country configuration.
   b. Key results accomplished or expected under the three priority areas (NOT a list of activities).
   c. Preliminary analysis of problems and suggested solutions.

B. Other points deserving additional discussion:

1. Linkages of the PBC’s work with ongoing initiatives within the UN (e.g. Civilian Capacity Review) and outside the UN (e.g. New Deal).
2. Consideration of appropriate management tools for future assessments (e.g. SWAT, web-based platforms…etc).

III. Suggested elements to inform the assessment (by priority area):

The following elements/questions are drawn from the discussion on the substantive aspects of the identified three priority areas. For country configurations, these elements could help inform
sections b and c of the written submission (see above). Elements/questions marked for “PBSO actions” will be further discussed on the basis of input from the Office.

A. Resource mobilization, partnerships and capacity-building

1. **The PBC’s mandate aims at “marshalling” resources** which suggests alignment of resources behind identified peacebuilding priorities and broadening the donor-base for the countries on the agenda.

   - What has been the PBC’s approach to managing expectations and delivering on alignment and broadening the donor base in the countries on its agenda?
   - To what extent has the country-specific needs guided the PBC’s approach to this function?

2. **PBC mapping of resource flows and actors** is a crucial contribution of the PBC’s engagement to help identify resource gaps and overlaps.

   - How useful have been earlier mapping exercises (e.g. for CAR and Burundi)?

3. **Clarity on responsibilities for resource mobilization** within the PBC will help identify the roles of the Chair, members of the OC/CSCs, field-based actors and the Government concerned.

   - Has this function of the PBC been approached as a collective responsibility?

Elements/Questions for further reflection: (Action: PBSO)

   - Will the PBC benefit from a toolkit to guide its work in the area of resource mobilization?
   - What are the main options to develop a more practical approach to marshalling/mobilizing resources? (PBSO policy paper)
   - How can the mapping tool be further sharpened and feed into strengthening national donor coordination mechanisms? (e.g. AIMS project)
   - What real potentials exist in forging partnerships (with IFIs and AfDB)?
   - Should the PBC and PBSO consider a common replenishment strategy for the PBF?

B. Relationships within the United Nations

1. **The relationship with principle organs** should focus on mutually reinforcing objectives and on ensuring valued added of the PBC’s advice.

   - To what extent has the PBC been nimble in its advisory role?
   - What potentials do exist for a distinctive PBC advisory role?
   - To what extent can the joint membership support the relationship with principal organs?
2. **Relationship with the UN senior leadership in the field** is crucial for enhancing the PBC’s impact.

- What are the current channels for communications between the country configurations and the S/ERSGs in the field?
- To what extent have these channels helped coordination of functions and messages?
- Is there sufficient clarity on mutual expectations and respective roles?
- How can a strengthened relationship with the Security Council help clarify/strengthen the linkage between the PBC and UN Missions?

**Elements/Questions for further reflection:** *(Action: PBSO)*

- Information on the current functions of the Joint Steering Committees in the countries and opinion on whether or not these could represent mechanisms to support PBC’s engagement in the field.

C. **Working Methods**

1. There have been innovations in the PBC working methods to help in broadening engagement in support of the work of the Chairs of country configurations, including through the introduction of **steering groups**.

   - To what extent have steering groups helped mobilizing concrete support and contributions (intellectual and material) from member states?
   - What other options are available to ensure a balance between inclusiveness, transparency and efficiency in the work of country configurations?

2. The **support from capitals** to the PBC objectives and priority areas is crucial in generating broader and more result-oriented engagement of the membership.

   - To what extent has there been sufficient buy-in and support for the work of the PBC beyond New York?
   - What are possible options to raise the PBC’s profile among policy-makers in the capitals of member states? (e.g. annual main session, periodic High-Level Meetings…etc).

**Elements/Questions for further reflection:** *(Action: PBSO)*

- “Options paper” on certain areas for working methods.
- Ideas for strengthening a “whole of PBC approach”.
- Ideas for enhanced tools to assess progress against specific commitments in the various instruments of engagement.
- Effective and dynamic communications strategy in support of PBC objectives and needs (including web-based platforms and resources).