

6 April 2011 10AM – 1PM

1. Introduction

Mobilizing resources for peacebuilding priorities for countries on its agenda is a key mandate of the Peacebuilding Commission. PBC and its various configurations have organized policy discussions and undertaken several actions to fulfill this mandate. Even so, there is recognition that the PBC needs to do much more to mobilize resources. Thus the 2010 Review of the United Nations peacekeeping architecture recommended that the PBC should “intensify overall resource mobilization efforts [and] ensure they are strongly attuned to development challenges with political implications”.

The forthcoming discussion by the Working Group on Lessons Learned on the theme of Resource Mobilization for Peacebuilding Priorities will include improved coordination especially with the World Bank, various entities within the UN system, and the PBF. In the previous discussions organized under the auspices of the PBC on resource mobilization, a vast range of issues was raised for consideration, including mobilizing the private sector, exploring South-South cooperation and cultivating new and emerging donors.

Before extending the frontiers of the Commission’s work on the theme of resource mobilization, the WGLL intends to reflect on the discussions so far, with a focus on the coordination issue, in an effort to clarify the added value of the findings of the WGLL, specify practical steps, and ensure clear follow-up. Their outcome should aim to have greater impact in the field where the PBC is currently engaged, as well as in potential countries to be included in the PBC agenda.

To this end, the forthcoming meeting aims to extract lessons learned from experiences in coordinating for prioritization and resource mobilization, and to identify practical actions to improve these efforts. While doing so, practical suggestions for enhancing national ownership and leadership will also be discussed.

¹ The Organisational Committee has devoted discussions to the Resource Mobilisation on 18 March 2009 and the Working Group on Lessons Learned devoted a session to the role of PBC in Marshalling Resources for Countries on its Agenda on 26 May 2010.

“multi-hatted” Deputy SRSG who is also the Resident Coordinator, and where relevant, the Humanitarian Coordinator, are needed to ensure this system-wide coherence.

The importance of developing partnerships with international and regional financial institutions was recognized in the resolution establishing the PBC, which states that representatives from the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and other institutional donors should be invited to participate in the meetings of the Commission. In the case of the World Bank, the collaboration has been buttressed by the World Bank-UN Partnership Framework for Crisis and Post-Crisis Situations signed in 2008 by the Secretary-General and the President of the World Bank.

There has been limited scope for the PBC to mobilize additional resources from the World Bank or for the Bank to scale up PBF investments. International Development Association (IDA) grants and loans are allocated among countries through a system based on Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) scores, which allows little scope for PBC influence. The Bank usually funds governments directly, while the PBF provides resources to UN agencies, funds and programmes. And PBF activities focus on sectors outside the Bank’s mandate, particularly SSR. The resources for the State- and Peace-building Fund (SPF), a special facility created in 2008, are also often limited.

However, there are other ways in which PBC’s partnerships with the World Bank, other regional and international institutions as well as the UN system can be enhanced. This includes combining collaboration at the policy level with strengthened coordination at the programmatic and operational levels. Such improved coordination should focus not only on headquarters level but also on the country level. Experience to date underlines the need to improve coordination in articulating respective instruments of engagement, in assisting in building or utilizing national capacity for their implementation and in mobilizing resources for relevant peacebuilding priorities. Moreover, it is important that Member States give consistent messages in respective intergovernmental organs, such as the PBC, Security Council and the Executive Boards of UN agencies, funds and programmes, and international financial institutions.

The following are examples of lessons learned, challenges, and issues currently being considered as experienced through the integration process that have implications for resource mobilization:

Lessons learned so far:

- Strong senior leadership engagement is required
- Determine the purpose of ISF for individual country situation
- Integrated coordination structures are prerequisite for ISF development and implementation
- Dedicated planning capacity is crucial
- Clear timelines and regular reporting are useful in maintaining momentum

Challenges:

Differences in institutional specialization, mandates, incentives and culture
Diverging expectations and perceptions of integration among Secretariat departments, missions, UN agencies and Member States
Continuing fragmentation within the UN system and limited 'whole of government' approach among Member States
Insufficient understanding and knowledge and uneven implementation of integration policies
Support related issues, including different administrative, personnel, and finance rules and systems for missions and UNCT members

Issues currently being considered:

The extent to which ISFs are reflected in budget mechanisms and other resource issues
The potential for pooled funding to support implementation of ISF priority areas
The utility of ISF for mobilizing fresh resources
Support to senior management and accountability for using integration to maximize UN entities' collective and individual impact

3. Questions to be addressed during the meeting

Building on the above-mentioned current practices, the PBC can play a role in increasing the peacebuilding focus of projects and programmes of regional and international development, humanitarian and financial institutions, including the World Bank and various entities of the UN system, as part of a coherent overall peacebuilding strategy. The following are some questions that member states may wish to reflect on in their interventions, in order to gain a common understanding on the way forward.

I. United Nations Institutional Processes:

a. National ownership

To enhance national ownership, decision-making by national actors with close collaboration of national partners/Partnership for Development, in the ISF programme/institutional framework

b. Shared priorities

How could we better relate and align peacebuilding priorities in ISFs, UNDAFs, and PRSPs?

The starting point for international assistance should be common assessments such as the Post-Conflict Needs Assessments (PCNAs), followed by a common country-led strategy. How can we develop consensus among peacebuilding stakeholders including donors and host government around a small number of priorities where we concentrate efforts in phased and sequential manner?

National ownership and shared priorities

In 2009, in its third year of engagement with Sierra Leone, the PBC embraced the Government of Sierra Leone's Agenda for Change and the United Nations Joint Vision for Sierra Leone. This new orientation was reflected in the Outcome Document of the PBC High Level Event of June 2009. By putting its weight behind a strategy owned by Sierra Leone, the PBC made the Agenda for Change the reference document for the whole international community. The process of designing a nationally owned peace consolidation strategy and having the PBC Grants support for the country is consistent with an approach of nationally owned and led process for developing shared peacebuilding priorities. Yet national ownership can usually be fully exercised only in the context of effective capacity. Building the technical and institutional capacity will be key to enhancing the national ownership and implementing shared priorities for peacebuilding.

Strong UN leadership in resource mobilization

In Sierra Leone, there is a single integrated leadership through the ERSG-- for UNIPSIL and the UNCT. The ERSG has proven particularly effective in the articulation of a joint vision for peacebuilding and development. The Joint Vision is fully aligned with the Agenda for Change and consists of programmes that are based on comparative advantages and capabilities on the UN family on the ground. It is also in tandem with the programmes of the other bilateral donors and multilateral donors, including the World Bank. The joint vision has strengthened the role of the ERSG as the UN system's effort around one document. However, in spite of the broad endorsement received by the international community, the Joint Vision still lacks the financial support necessary to see it fully implemented.

c. Strong UN leadership in resource mobilization

Is there enough effort on the part of

II. Funding for Peacebuilding Priorities:

a. Monitoring the status of resource mobilization and identifying gaps:

Is there any monitoring mechanism in place so that donors can timely grasp overall progress on system-wide priority programmes/projects and their status of resource mobilization? So that they know where to focus for resource allocation? What sort of reporting mechanism is needed to ensure to this effect? Do we have a functioning mechanism to map out what key actors are doing and help the PBC identify gaps? How could we address the unevenness of funding, namely certain sector attracting more funds than others? What are the reasons? If the bilateral donors are not channeling enough to fill the existing gaps, pooled funds, such as the PBF, the World Bank State- and Peace-building Fund and the UNDP Crisis Prevention and Recovery Trust Fund that are designed for quick and catalytic disbursement, should be used strategically. Is it happening? Are we utilizing the respective funding source based on its comparative advantage? Are we not using the catalytic funds for projects that can be funded by other sources?

Funding for Peacebuilding priorities in Central African Republic and Guinea Bissau

Both the Central African Republic and Guinea-Bissau suffer from a limited donor base. However, the lack of an effective donor coordination mechanism and system, allowing monitoring and tracking of resource flows, identification of overlaps and gaps, even with a narrow donor base, results in a loss of efficiency of the limited resources available.

In the cases of Central African Republic and Guinea-Bissau, the PBC has worked on the basis of mapping documents prepared by the SOP to identify resource flows in each of the peacebuilding priorities outlined in its Strategic Frameworks. This has allowed for the identification of those priorities and sectors that are under funded. Short of an alternative mechanism, this method proved to be relatively effective, in part due to the low quantity of available data. However, the tool only provides a factual snapshot at one particular moment in time of the funding situation, and does not allow for a more detailed or elaborate analysis of the data.

Collaboration between PBC / PBF and the World Bank

At present, the level of collaboration between the PBC and the World Bank on countries on the agenda of the PBC is the result of individual initiatives by the Chairs both in Washington and through WB country offices. As with other international or regional financial institutions, the World Bank's action in a country is defined by its Country Assistance Strategy (CAS), which generally is derived from and supports the implementation of a national Poverty Reduction Strategy, which makes it difficult for the WB to make specific commitments to implement PBC strategic frameworks. The Central African Republic configuration of the PBC is therefore working towards incorporating a solid peacebuilding component in the country's second generation Poverty Reduction Strategy, currently being developed, thus potentially eliminating the need for a separate peacebuilding strategy, coalescing the assistance of all partners around a single, nationally owned and internationally recognized document.

4. Outcome and follow-up:

In accordance with the Work Plan 2011, the outcome of the meeting will be consolidated by the Chair of the WGLL in the form of an action-oriented Chair's Summary, and shared with the OC and CSCs for utilization in their respective areas of competence. The meeting should help the WGLL initiate a process through which it would seek further elaboration on the aforementioned areas and discuss with a view to suggesting practical actions which the Country Configurations could consider as they develop their respective resource mobilization strategies for the countries on the PBC agenda.

In addition, the consolidation, outreach and dissemination of the findings will be pursued through various channels, including the following:

Strategic Frameworks Seminar--One dayization

March 29, 2011

1. Mr von der Schulenburg, Executive Representative for the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone (UNIPSIL), (To be confirmed)
2. Mrs Løj, Special Representative to the Secretary General for Liberia (UNMIL), via VTC
3. Mr Stan Nkwain, Deputy Director of UNDP-BCPR
4. A representative of the World Bank Fragile and Conflict Affected Countries Group (To be confirmed)