

**Report by the Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned
to the Organizational Committee
of the Peacebuilding Commission
on the findings of Resource Mobilization
and Mapping of Relevant Actors**

17 Oct 2012

Introduction

The Working Group on Lessons Learned held two meetings in the first half of the year. The first meeting was convened on 13 June at the Japanese mission with experts on NGOs, Foundations, and Private sector, all working in the field of peacebuilding. The aim of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for the Working Group to understand the characteristic and comparative advantages of some of the new forms of donors. This meeting was followed by a meeting on 3 July, on “Resource Mobilization and Mapping of Relevant Actors” which was organized in close cooperation with the Guinea Configuration.

1. Lessons learned from doing mapping manually

The current aid reporting systems, such as the OECD DAC, is organized retrospectively, meaning the information which are made available are usually 1~2 years old and are not useful in identifying the *current* funding gaps. The Working Group’s attempt, with the Guinea Configuration, was to capture the *current* funding gap by having the members of the configuration submit information on projects they are implementing or planning under the three peacebuilding priorities and to map that into a chart. This was in line with the process that The Guinea Configuration had initiated in the preparation for the review of the Statement of Mutual Commitments (SMC).

The process was not simple, but rather time-consuming and quite complex for the following reasons. **First**, the donors report on projects in different forms, making it difficult to have accurate and unified data. **Second**, it is difficult to differentiate between committed values and disbursed values. **Third**, it is difficult to incorporate

non-monetary contributions, such as in-kind contributions into the chart. **Fourth**, many of the commitments under the PBC's SMC are political, which meant that the progress was not necessarily easy to capture through charting of resource flows. **Finally**, the amount of resources going into one sector does not necessarily correspond to the impact and progress it is generating on the ground.

These are glimpses of problems which post-conflict countries face in trying to manage aid flows and to establish effective mechanisms for aid coordination, including their own national planning and budgeting processes.

Ideally, the system should be based in the capital where the information on assistance is captured centrally. However, regardless of the format, the need to understand resource flow, in order to use them for future resource mobilization, remains the same. In this regard and in the Working Group's Initial Findings document, the Working Group recommended to the PBC to consider advocating with donors for accurate and frequent reporting of the aid flow and to assist the country in devising a resource mobilization strategy, which allows the government to assess and prioritize their national resource mobilization efforts.

(2) Suggested next steps on how to make use of the mapping

Mapping and generating information on the projects implemented under the peacebuilding priorities are not and should not be the end point of the PBC's work. Although situations will differ among different configurations and will be decided between the Configuration membership and the government of the agenda country, the following are options for making use of the mapping exercise:

First, the mapping can be used as a tool to prioritize areas for and strategize on efforts for resource mobilization. The mapping can initiate a discussion on identifying the peacebuilding priorities for which the agenda country wishes the PBC to support in mobilizing resources, bearing in mind political developments and the actual impact felt on the ground that might not be well captured by a mapping chart. The role of the foundations and private sector, which was discussed in the June meeting of the WGLL, can also come into play here.

Second, the PBC can help advocate for a more systematic Aid Information Management

Systems (AIMS) which will encompass wider development than just the peacebuilding priorities. This will take some initial investments but could provide useful results in the long run, as it again gives the country more accurate tool to strategize. PBSO is currently undertaking the AIMS project in Liberia under the EU funding and it will be important to elaborate on the practical opportunities of and challenges facing this project for possible emulation in other countries on the agenda.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the pilot mapping with the Guinea Configuration has highlighted many difficulties and challenges which a recipient country faces in mapping and understanding the overall aid flows into its own country. However, the WGLL also learned the importance of establishing the basic source of information in order to use as the basis to construct an effective resource mobilization strategy or an outreach strategy. The Chair of the Working Group believes that there is an important role which the PBC can play in supporting agenda countries manage aid flows, encourage prioritization as a precursor for an effective resource mobilization strategy.

Of course, the PBC must always be careful not to merely add another layer of bureaucratic work to already overstretched governments. At the same time, national ownership is crucial in taking forward resource mobilization efforts. To complement national ownership, the PBC members are encouraged to engage proactively either through direct assistance or experience sharing in mapping and resource mobilization.
