

## CSO Position Statement

Third meeting of the working group on PSG indicators  
New York, 27-28 September 2012

### Key Messages

- **Fragility assessment processes need to be carried out with more time, and with broader state and societal participation;** this will foster a sense of ownership and lay a basis for state-society-international partner compacts and peacebuilding and statebuilding results.
- **PRSPs are not, by themselves, strategies for addressing fragility and violent conflict;** Peacebuilding should be the first priority and lens for national planning processes in conflict-affected countries.
- **For fragility assessments to have impact, they:**
  - **must not be viewed as one-off events;**
  - **must better incorporate analysis of the drivers of conflict and fragility;**
  - **need to provide the foundation for the implementation of the New Deal more broadly; and**
  - **must elicit and incorporate lessons.**
- **Continued and strengthened engagement of civil society** – in particular, at this point, within the indicator development process – **is key to ensuring implementation processes are broadly owned across not only government but also society.**
- **Inclusive efforts to develop credible indicators at country level that provide the basis for shared g7+ country indicators need to be intensified; these should guide efforts to include peacebuilding elements within the post-2015 development framework.**

### Reflecting on the fragility assessment processes

1. **Fragility assessment processes need to be carried out with more time, and with broader societal participation; this will foster a sense of ownership and lay a basis for state-society-international partner compacts and peacebuilding and statebuilding results.**

*We welcome the focus the fragility assessments have created for more inclusive analysis and decision-making on peacebuilding and statebuilding priorities. In the pilot countries civil society has been invited to participate in the process, although not invited in all cases to join the Task teams at country level to engage in and design fragility assessment process and implementation of the New Deal – a commitment made in Nairobi.*

*We acknowledge and support the efforts by g7+ leadership to slow this process down, to ensure the fragility assessments provide space for dialogue, build ownership and produce quality results.*

*Generally sub-national levels are not meaningfully involved yet, and where outreach has occurred, it has too often been about ‘validating’ what has been agreed at national levels. It should be remembered that these are pilots. If we look to the PRSP processes by comparison, so too were the first attempts – iPRSPs – often rushed and lacking in meaningful participation. Over time and with commitment they have become better at ensuring national participation and ownership of their results.*

**2. An integrated approach to peacebuilding – including security, justice, politics and development requires ‘whole of government’ and ‘whole of society’ engagement: efforts should be redoubled towards achieving more broad based country ownership of the peace agenda.**

*The five PSGs for the first time provide a substantive policy framework to move countries out of fragility that genuinely engage the security-political-development spectrum, which we strongly support. More consideration should be given to ensuring these processes genuinely become whole of government approaches – both across government and society. Discussions of fragility and conflict need to be owned by other institutions beyond Ministries of Finance. Greater efforts are needed ensure that the links with other ministries, offices and bureaux are strengthened. It is also vital that Ministries of the Interior play a central role, to ensure sub-national levels are deeply engaged in the process. Civil society actors are central to engaging society more broadly, and will be better able to perform key roles if they are officially part of the management structures, and resourced for these purposes.*

*In promoting broadly-based country ownership, the role and nature of international support needs to be clarified. We believe that the role of international actors in assessment and planning processes should be of a facilitative, and accompanying nature, providing technical support with a focus on building national capacities to do this work in the future, and not more.*

**3. Recognizing that pilot countries are aligning the New Deal to their PRSPs, it must underscored that PRSPs are not, by themselves, strategies for addressing fragility and violent conflict; Peacebuilding should be the first priority and lens for national planning processes in conflict-affected countries.**

*The desire for one national plan is understandable given limited capacities and resources alongside the diversity of demands in any conflict-affected society. For PRSPs to serve this aim effectively they need to be significantly adapted. As stated in our August 2012 position statement, ‘it is important that New Deal commitments change the shape and the outcomes of planning processes in pilot countries. Existing planning processes such as PRSP often involve significant consultation and detailed work that, once complete, cannot be easily revisited. Despite short timelines and limited resources, fragility assessments should not be cursorily subsumed into existing planning processes. For the New Deal to be ‘new’, and for peacebuilding and statebuilding results to be achieved, there needs to be a serious commitment to ensuring that fragility assessments inform a new vision and plan.’*

*To ensure the achievement of the PSGs are not simply subsumed into the PRSP and that they actually achieve peacebuilding and statebuilding results, an autonomous structure or process is needed. This would ensure that development actions undertaken as part of PRSP implementation are complemented by other actions needed to achieve PSGs. A specific set of skills is needed to inject peacebuilding approaches into policy-making, planning and programming across government.*

## Ensuring Fragility Assessments have Impact

### **4. Fragility assessments are not / should not be viewed as one-off events.**

*Fragility and violent conflict, it is widely recognized, bring about quick changes that require flexible and rapid responses. Conflict or fragility assessments can help prepare for different eventualities by including an element of scenario planning. However, they also need to occur regularly in order to ensure that timely action is taken to respond to changing priorities. Fragility assessments cannot be one-off events; capacities for ongoing assessment and conflict-sensitive planning need to be maintained and strengthened. Such capacities should exist within government and civil society, and be brought together through formalized structures or processes that meet occasionally for this purpose. Ideally, a small office could be maintained to monitor and analyze key drivers of conflict on a continuous basis, and initiate appropriate responses across government. Clear commitments should be made at national levels about the regularity of these assessments, how they will inform planning, and the structures and processes through which this will occur.*

*The Liberia Peacebuilding Office (PBO) situated within the Ministry of Internal Affairs provides a useful example, where United Nations PBF resources supported training in peacebuilding monitoring and evaluation and conflict sensitive planning. The PBO is supporting the mainstreaming of these issues through government policy and planning efforts.*

### **5. The commitment to ensuring that analysis of the drivers of fragility and conflict guides strategy, planning and implementation requires strengthened capacities and resources.**

*It is clear that the capacity to infuse conflict analysis and conflict sensitivity within the fragility spectrums is limited. Resources need to be put towards enhancing capacities in this area. It is important for international partners, governments and civil society to identify and nurture existing local capacities to conduct proper conflict analysis and produce high quality assessments. Assessments should involve sub-national levels and even local communities with the aim of ensuring ownership of the assessment and subsequent priority responses. It is also imperative that capacity and resources are mobilized to link the outcome of fragility assessments with other policy processes that follow including national budgeting, planning and implementation processes.*

### **6. New Deal implementation needs to clearly build upon fragility assessment processes.**

*As the implementation working group agenda starts rolling out, they are running inception workshops in a few countries. Civil society suggests that a set of overall guidelines and principles linking the work of the two working groups are developed to ensure consistency and continuity. However, due to differences in national level contexts, it is important to strike a proper balance between guidelines and frameworks to be followed and the national realities surrounding these processes.*

*During the pilots, countries have had a good deal of autonomy in how they have executed their fragility assessments. However we note that for the purpose of consistency, comparison and joint learning, there is a need for agreed basic principles to be maintained – i.e. meaningful multi-stakeholder involvement including civil society at all levels, and ensuring strong focus on the drivers of conflict and*

*fragility is maintained throughout the assessment and planning/implementation processes.*

*The New Deal implementation process overall needs to be guided by: lessons of the pilots; an ongoing commitment to assessing conflict and fragility dynamics; and a commitment to develop response strategies through broadly owned processes. For purpose of meaningful review, it is important to establish coordination mechanisms that keep all involved stakeholders informed throughout the entire cycle of the process.*

*Above all, social compacts developed through the New Deal must not simply reflect donor – government concerns, interests and relationships. Instead, they need to represent commitments by the state towards society that society understands, supports and can hold states to account for achieving. The New Deal presents an opportunity to genuinely deepen state-society relationships that lie at the heart of effective peacebuilding and statebuilding. It is primarily when such compacts have been put in place that predictable financial support through country systems can make a significant contribution to sustained peace.*

**7. Lessons need to be elicited and shared to ensure continual improvement in New Deal implementation, both within pilot countries and beyond.**

*One of the key objectives of the IDPS was to serve as a platform for learning and sharing of best practices. The need to agree on mechanisms and spaces for formal reflection and learning outside of the meetings and working groups is paramount. Civil society is ready to provide support in this area.*

*It is a critical time to gather and reflect upon the lessons learned to date, and the g7+ effort in this regard is welcomed. Civil society would like to partake in reviews, and it will be important for independent studies to also be fostered. It will be important to critically reflect, together, on how we understand and identify evidence of improved peacebuilding and statebuilding, and whether/how the efforts made to implement different elements of the New Deal have meeting of PSGs contributed to peacebuilding and statebuilding results.*

**8. Continued and improved engagement of civil society is key to ensuring implementation processes are broadly owned across not only government but also society; Civil society can facilitate the strengthening of indicators that reflect local concerns and realities, collecting meaningful data, and monitoring the agreements of the New Deal.**

*Civil society can play a vital role in deepening the value and impact of the New Deal process. For this to occur civil society must be engaged from the beginning of processes and in a systematic manner. Civil society can and should make significant contributions to the design and monitoring of indicators, and to national processes to enhance data collections systems for PSG monitoring – especially those that take account of the all-important ‘views of people on results achieved’.*

***Civil society encourages the five pilot countries to select a civil society member as the third member of their team for the October South-South knowledge exchange on indicators in Nairobi.***

## Moving towards the development of shared/global indicators and post-2015 agenda

9. Intensify inclusive efforts to develop credible indicators at country level to measure peacebuilding and statebuilding that provide the basis for shared g7+ country indicators; these should guide efforts to include peacebuilding elements within the post-2015 development framework.

*Understanding and evaluating what constitutes successful peacebuilding and statebuilding is always, first and foremost, a contextually grounded exercise. At the same time, the PSGs represent commitments in different areas of public life that drive healthy state-society relations and are relevant in all societies.*

*While the development of country level indicators as part of the fragility assessments is underway, this has been a relatively weak link in the process overall. The processes have been rushed and accompanied in some cases by confusion, and the ensuing results have been uneven in quality.*

*Credible shared indicators need to emerge from solid country level analyses, even if this takes longer than anticipated. Civil society participation will facilitate the development of credible, robust and locally meaningful measures that can motivate progress and ensure accountability for results achieved.*

*We would also take this opportunity to re-emphasise that disaggregation of data – by sex, age, geography, ethnicity, religion, caste and income group - is indeed important for looking across the new goals to analyse the fairness of access to resources, services and benefits. Doing so is crucial, because fairness, and the perception of it between different social groups, is very often a key driver of enmities that fuel conflict.*

*This document has been prepared by the network of civil society organisations that are committed to engaging with the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS). We support the commitment to achieve peacebuilding and statebuilding goals (PSGs) set out in the New Deal, and are committed ourselves to promote and ensure their fulfilment.*

The following organizations take part in the IDPS civil society core group:

**3P Human Security (USA), ACDD GERDDES (CAR), Africa CSO Platform on Principled Partnership Secretariat (Kenya), Alliance for Peacebuilding (USA), CDA Collaborative Learning Projects (USA, Canada), CECIDE (Guinea), Conciliation Resources (UK), Cordaid (Netherlands), FECCIWA (Togo), FONGTIL (Timor Leste), Forum National sur la dette et la pauvreté (Côte d'Ivoire), Gender and Economic Alternative Trust (Zimbabwe), Generation Agency for Development and Transformation (South Sudan), GPPAC (Netherlands), Interpeace (UK), National Peace Campaign (Nepal), New African Research and Development Agency (Liberia), North-South Institute (Canada), PREGESCO (Regional, Central Africa), Puntland Non-State Actors Association (Somalia), People's Coalition on Food Sovereignty (Philippines), Renforcement Capacités OSC (DRC), REPAOC (Sénégal, Regional), Réseau Femmes et paix (Burundi), Saferworld (UK), Tiri (UK), WACSI (Ghana), WANEP (Ghana), World Vision (Global).**