

PEACEBUILDING COMMISSION
WORKING GROUP ON LESSONS LEARNED

Initial findings of the Chair
on
**“Resource mobilization for peacebuilding priorities and improved
coordination among relevant actors”**

This paper has been prepared by the chair of the WGLL in an effort to identify ways for more efficient and effective engagement of the PBC vis-à-vis the countries on its agenda and various bodies of the UN and other institutions.

It is based on the WG discussion on 6 April 2011 as well as subsequent events, including the workshop organized by the International Peace Institute in collaboration with the PBSO on 19 April, and the PBC’s special event on the World Bank’s “World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development” on 29 April.

The paper is divided into two mutually complementary parts: the first part pulls together the salient policy issues and actions that the PBC can take for effective resource mobilization and advocacy; while the second part focuses on what can the PBC do to improve coordination among various actors for more effective mobilisation and use of resources in post conflict settings.

The followings are the main suggestions;

1. Resource mobilization and advocacy

- (1) To provide a platform for rallying various forms of international support**
- (2) To engage in discussions to devise mechanisms for flexible, predictable, rapid-response financing**
- (3) To use the PBF strategically for needs that may not be covered by other resources**
- (4) To enhance collaboration between the PBF/PBC and the World Bank in the field**

(5) To reach out to the African Development Bank and other international and regional financial institutions

(6) To organize occasions for advocacy to attract more resources

2. Improved coordination among relevant actors

(1) To provide support and facilitate integration and alignment behind a common vision and actions

(2) To encourage programmatic and operational integration with costing

(3) To find a practical context within various strategic instruments

(4) To remain targeted and focused with a limited set of priorities and proper sequencing

(5) To focus on the short term (1-3years) to maximize the PBC's comparative advantage

(6) To urge enhanced programming capacity on the ground

(7) To synchronize reporting and progress assessment

(8) To re-establish the working relationship with the field

1. Resource mobilization and advocacy

(1) To provide a platform for rallying various forms of international support

The PBC's role is to help overcome the fragmentation of international development efforts and use its political weight to bring the government's and development partners' priorities in line. Effective resource mobilization depends upon how well the UN and its partners can provide a platform to rally international financial, technical and political support. Various international funding windows are encouraged to align with the proposed overarching plan with costing as described in the next section (section 2.(2)). This will aid donors in specifying and monitoring areas of funding gaps.

This, however, does not indicate that the funding mechanism should be integrated into one single trust fund. A basket fund approach could put off some donors.

The PBC may also provide guidance to member states on delivering

consistent messages to relevant governing and executive boards of UN agencies, funds and programmes and international financial institutions.

(2)To engage in discussions to devise mechanisms for flexible, predictable, rapid-response financing

The fragmented administrative policies and regulations of various funding windows in the current system is cited both in the World Development Report 2011(WDR) and the independent report on civilian capacity as an obstacle to enhancing nimbleness and scaling up assistance in critical sectors in conflict-affected countries. The follow-up to the reports is underway to operationalize these findings by the UN and the World Bank. The PBC can provide a platform for such discussions for improvement.

It should be noted that the projects/programmes that are implemented by the proposed rapid-response financing should be catalytic, and sustained by subsequent development efforts.

(3)To use the PBF strategically for needs that may not be covered by other resources

The PBC role in resource mobilisation was meant to extend beyond the financial support through the PBF for countries on its agenda. At the same time, the PBF should not be viewed as another development fund for a “top up.” While the international community contemplates how to improve funding mechanisms, catalytic pooled funds such as the PBF, the World Bank State- and Peace-building Fund, and the UNDP Crisis Prevention and Recovery Trust Fund should be utilized strategically.

Given the limited resources, flexibility, and rapid response capability of the PBF, its allocation should be focused more closely on needs that may not be covered by other resources. The unevenness of funding often occurs as a result of risk-averse behavior of donors opting for safe, popular, and quick projects. Moreover, most donors are reluctant to support non-ODA expenditures, such as those for army reform and demilitarization programmes.

The peacebuilding priority plans designed for disbursing the PBF should be incorporated into the proposed single overarching document with costing mentioned in the next section (section 2.(2)), in order to ensure a clear picture of overall resource needs. This way partners can attain a stronger shared recognition of appropriate sources of funding and proper sequencing. This will also facilitate the PBC role of tapping sources that can be funded by resources other than the PBF.

(4)To enhance collaboration between the PBF/PBC and the World Bank in the field

The collaboration between the World Bank and the UN has been buttressed by the World Bank-UN Partnership Framework for Crisis and Post-Crisis Situation signed in 2008. The strengthened collaboration at the policy level should be translated into programmatic and operational collaboration in the field. The WDR opened a window of opportunity to that effect. The World Bank is working on how to incorporate the findings of the WDR and fragility-sensitive strategies to IDA16 by its mid-term review in 2012. The PBC should continue to urge both the UN and the World Bank to engage in joint programmes to seize the opportunity. The integrated strategy development process by the UN integrated missions/UNCT should involve the World Bank from inception, even if the Bank may not have a major role to play at that stage.

(5)To reach out to the African Development Bank and other international and regional financial institutions

In order to reach out to other financial institutions like the AfDB, combining collaboration at the policy level with strengthened coordination at the programmatic and operational levels is needed both at headquarters and in the field. The planned visit by the PBC Chairs' Group to the AfDB's headquarter will be a first step, and the PBC should urge AfDB and the UN to institutionalize the coordination and joint programming.

(6)To organize occasions for advocacy to attract more resources

One of the advantages that the PBC can bring to countries on its agenda is “international attention.” The PBC can complement the efforts made by the players on the ground through advocacy. Organizing occasions such as donor conferences, in collaboration with the concerned government, the UN, the World Bank or other cooperating partners who are rooted in the field, can be effective means for resource mobilization, if convened well-prepared in appropriate timing with clear objectives to yield concrete results.

2. Improved coordination among relevant actors

(1)To provide support and facilitate integration and alignment behind a common vision and actions

Peacebuilding relies on complementary partnerships among various actors who are governed by different mandates, decision-making structures, and funding arrangements. There are ongoing efforts to overcome the current fragmented approach across the UN system to “deliver as one” and to implement the Secretary-General’s June 2008 decision on integration by advancing such instruments as the Integrated Strategic Frameworks (ISFs) and Integrated (Mission) Task Forces.

Given that the PBC is not an implementing body, it should focus on facilitating and supporting the integration of all UN peacebuilding activities and collaboration among UN and non-UN actors on the ground. It is important to fully engage all stakeholders in the field, including the national government, in order to bring both the developmental and political aspects of peacebuilding into one coherent peacebuilding strategy with a focus on a limited set of priorities.

(2)To encourage programmatic and operational integration with costing

The work of the PBC to date has centered on drafting strategic peacebuilding frameworks and aligning them with other strategic development frameworks such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks

(UNDAFs).

In order to align the actions of relevant actors and effectively mobilize resources for priorities, sharing strategic visions is not enough. More focus should be directed towards encouraging the establishment of better collaboration at the programmatic and operational levels.

There is a need for a single overarching planning document that defines operationalised priorities with costing, based on comparative advantages and capabilities of actors on the ground. Analyses of the priorities in various instruments should be compiled in the document which should be shared by national governments, the UN system, the World Bank, the African Development Bank, donors and other stakeholders.

(3) To find a practical context within various strategic instruments

When designing a modality for engagement and mutual commitment, the PBC should take into account the individual context and evolution of strategic instruments. Various strategic documents such as PRSPs, UNDAFs, and ISFs have different timeframes, different actors and targets, different histories, and different degrees of national ownership. Furthermore, their methodologies evolved over years.

While aligning the modality of the PBC engagement (strategic frameworks, statements of mutual commitments, etc.) with other strategic development frameworks remains important, the proposed single overarching programmatic document should find a practical context. For example, the 3-year Liberia Peacebuilding Programme focuses on three areas insufficiently addressed in the PRSP for the remaining period of the current UNDAF; and it is recognized as the single document around which all stakeholders coalesce their efforts.

When considering the modality of the PBC engagement, the PBC, the UN, the World Bank and the host government should first agree on its timeframe and context within various strategic frameworks to avoid any duplication or gaps.

It should be noted that the comprehensive process of developing PRSPs and UNDAFs normally takes a long time and national governments may not have sufficient capacity to design and implement them, especially in the immediate aftermath of conflict. The World Development Report 2011(WDR) will provide further impetus to ongoing efforts to incorporate conflict analysis into PRSP.

(4)To remain targeted and focused with a limited set of priorities and proper sequencing

Even in countries that succeeded in developing overarching integrated plans with costing, such as Liberia with its Peacebuilding Programme and Sierra Leone with the UN Joint Vision, there remain constant challenges in staying targeted and focused with a limited set of priorities, as well as agreeing on timelines and sequencing. The PBC can support the leadership of both the government and the UN side to address the tendency of every Ministry and UN agency to push priorities in the direction of their given mandate. Setting the sequence of priorities is a critical decision that should be overseen and constantly reviewed by the Joint Steering Committee. The WDR 2011 has provided some indications for areas where the international community should focus, namely security, justice and jobs.

(5)To focus on the short term (1-3years) to maximize the PBC's comparative advantage

Peacebuilding is an incremental process, and a phased approach is needed. The PBC was established to address special situations in which the traditional development setup was insufficient. Therefore the concepts of time frame and proper sequencing should be introduced into the work of the PBC. If a phased approach could be introduced in the proposed single overarching programmatic document with costing, the PBC could work differently on projects/programmes for the short term and those for the mid to long term.

For development projects/programmes that will be tackled in the mid to long term, the PBC can focus on sensitizing development partners and donors to incorporate the necessary peacebuilding perspectives into their projects/programmes. On the other hand, the PBC has to pay special attention to those projects/programmes such as for SSR, rule of law, and reconciliation that are not in traditional development areas and that need to be addressed in the short term before development partners can respond on a regular voluntary-funding basis. (Further ref. at 1.(3))

The UN is currently drafting an “early peacebuilding strategy for peacekeepers” in an effort to operationally clarify the nexus between peacekeepers and other peacebuilding players. The PBC and the UN system should work together to devise mechanisms for effective programme delivery in the immediate aftermath period of conflict. (Further ref. at 1.(2))

(6) To urge enhanced programming capacity on the ground

There are some challenges posed by the lack of planning, programming, and implementing capacities on the ground, regardless of whether UN missions are present. When that is the case, the PBC, together with the UN leadership on the ground, should highlight these areas and urge relevant bodies to take practical steps to address them. This might include such measures as calling for special meetings on a certain sector, asking the relevant UN bodies to organize technical missions, etc. Without enhancing programming capacity on the ground, the international community will not be able to deliver.

The WDR revealed that there are critical programming, implementing and funding gaps in the international community’s responses, especially in sectors such as civil security, justice, and jobs. As also illustrated by the independent report on civilian capacity, the international community must address challenges in developing planning capacities for integrated strategies and aligning civilian deployment to that effect.

Furthermore, in Guinea, which is the first country on the PBC agenda

where there has been no UN mission, the UN system is being pressed to quickly develop a CSC mechanism for proper delivery in non-Mission environments.

(7) To synchronize reporting and progress assessment

It is desirable to synchronize the reporting obligations of various policy frameworks as much as possible. The reporting should be based on a single overarching document, and the UN missions/UNCTs and the host government should be involved in drafting reports as an expression of mutual accountability. If this is achieved, the bi-annual reports to the PBC can be an instrument to address: (i) the progress the Government is making towards achieving its own national priorities, (ii) how the international community has kept its pledges, (iii) how challenges, gaps, and new developments can be addressed, as well as identify bottlenecks within the Government and shortfalls in international support, with suggestions for overcoming these difficulties.

(8) To re-establish the working relationship with the field

There continues to be criticism that relations between the UN integrated missions/UNCTs and the PBC are not clearly defined. In order to enhance the understanding of the role of the PBC as an inter-governmental body and have its vision and policy direction shared by the UN system, the following steps may be useful:

- Periodic interaction via video links between the CSCs in New York and the steering committees represented by the government, UN leadership, and donors on the ground
- Periodic dialogue between CSC Chairs and UN system Integrated (Mission) Task Forces
- Interaction with SRSG/ERSG-led in-country coordination bodies that bring together the mission leadership and the UNCT during CSC missions to the field

xxxx