

Fulfilling New Deal commitments:

Recommendations from civil society on maximising peacebuilding results

August 2012

Our key messages:

1. Use the New Deal to **change national planning processes: make peacebuilding the priority**
2. **Make the most of the fragility assessment** as a chance to unite state, society and development partners behind a peacebuilding and statebuilding strategy and to build capacity for future cooperation
3. **Craft context-sensitive and people-focused indicators that will lead to common global measures** of progress towards PSGs
4. Work with CSOs to **make peace a global development priority for 2015**

1. Changing national planning processes: making peacebuilding the priority

The New Deal begins by recognising that: ‘The current ways of working in fragile states need serious improvement... results and value for money have been modest’. It follows from this that **the New Deal should inspire donors and partner countries to make significant changes in existing approaches to achieve better peacebuilding and statebuilding results.**

Each country has its own unique drivers of conflict and faces different levels and types of fragility, with its institutions and people displaying various types of resilience. Correspondingly, national and international **development frameworks** are at different stages of design and execution, and they **can and must reflect local conditions to have any value.**

Despite this reality, it is important that New Deal commitments change the shape and the outcomes of planning processes in pilot countries. This is not easy: existing planning processes such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) often involve significant consultation and detailed work that, once complete, cannot be easily revisited. Moreover, PRSPs typically involve the investment of the whole international development community at work in a country.

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.**

As lessons of the past have well documented, at the heart of a peacebuilding strategy lies the need to ensure that the efforts to achieve the five PSGs are not independent, sectoral efforts. They need to be underpinned and informed by a common analysis of the drivers of fragility, and concerted efforts to understand the interactions between different sectors and the PSGs. **They need, together, to constitute a strategy that will ensure peacebuilding and statebuilding results.** The basic principles of “Do No Harm” and the development of conflict sensitive policies and programmes are also central to achieving strong peacebuilding and development results.

Key recommendations:

- 1.1. Peacebuilding and statebuilding are not achievable only or primarily through better development co-operation. Therefore fragility assessments should meaningfully inform the strategy development of other branches of government that need to contribute to a joint effort to achieve progress in the political, security, justice, economic and social spheres.
- 1.2. Countries and their development partners should use their New Deal commitments to re-evaluate existing planning frameworks and processes, to ensure that they are conflict sensitive and will contribute towards peace and effective state institutions.
- 1.3. Government planning efforts with the intention of supporting peacebuilding and statebuilding should be integrated across sectors and re-focus on tackling the drivers of fragility, strengthening existing capacities and resilience.
- 1.4. To avoid the risk that fragility assessments will achieve limited visibility, participation and impact, there needs to be broad outreach across government, civil society, private sector actors, and the international development community to encourage uptake of new methods to guide policymaking and programming towards greater peacebuilding coherence.

2. Making the most of the fragility assessment

Civil society supports the New Deal commitment to develop fragility assessments that foster inclusive dialogue and lead to a greater focus on key peacebuilding and statebuilding challenges and opportunities. **The fragility assessment is an important step, but only the first step**, towards ensuring that better analysis informs planning and implementation processes, transforming conflicts and leading to lasting results.

Properly done, **fragility assessment processes can be seen as peacebuilding interventions in themselves**. The fragility assessment process should provide space for dialogue between stakeholders, demonstrate how collaboration between the civil society and governmental sectors can work in practice, build capacity for future engagement on substantive issues and set the standard in terms of a transparent and accountable approach to planning.

It is too often the case that good conflict and context analyses simply sit on the shelf, and are not used effectively when developing strategies, policies and programmes. Being able to ‘mainstream’ this analysis into programming and policy cycles requires particular awareness and skills. Given the target of completing **fragility assessments** in pilot countries by August 2012, it goes without saying that these **are inevitably rushed processes**. Yet at the same time, **there are still ways to ensure that “state-society relations” remain at the heart of the process and to maximise the peacebuilding contribution they can make**.

Fragility assessments can help to generate consensus among key stakeholders around the drivers of conflict and fragility and the relationships between them. **Together, stakeholders can identify strategic entry points for changing conflict dynamics and strengthening existing capacities for peace**. This collaboration will help to bring about a more coherent peacebuilding strategy, and provide a strong base to inform inclusive country ownership in implementing agreed priorities. Sharing experiences and lessons from the challenges faced during past peacebuilding and development efforts can also support the drive towards improved results.

Key recommendations:

- 2.1. Given the limited time and resources available it remains crucial that the first fragility assessments are seen as pilots – to be revised and revisited throughout the implementation of the New Deal, with greater attention to process, participation and results, over time.
- 2.2. The broadest possible participation by all groups (social, ethnic, religious, people of different geographic areas and ages, women and men, etc.), within an enabling environment for CSOs in line with the commitments made in Busan, is crucial.
- 2.3. Some actors' views will be hard to capture through workshops alone, and therefore other methods of consultation should be used. The New Deal commits signatories to seek the perspectives of citizens on the progress of implementation, which can best be done if their views are sought on the causes of conflict and fragility.
- 2.4. Responsibility for completing fragility assessments should not be transferred only to existing PRSP/MDG teams. As suggested in the official guidance, teams need to include experts in conflict analysis, peacebuilding strategy design and conflict-sensitive planning, implementation and M&E. In many countries, there are well-trained and experienced members of civil society and academia who can support these processes.
- 2.5. Civil society representation needs to be prominent on these teams. Governments should acknowledge, engage and support the focal points chosen by local civil society in consultation with the IDPS Civil Society Core Group.
- 2.6. While the Fragility Spectrum offers a tool to assess the status of the five PSGs, it will not by itself produce a peacebuilding strategy. To do so, fragility assessments should also assess:
 - All drivers of conflict and fragility – whether or not they fall under the PSGs
 - Actors in the context and their relationships – particularly “spoilers” who have a stake in preventing peace and stability
 - Local capacities for peace existing in society
 - Lessons from past peacebuilding and development efforts
 - Not only national dynamics but, where relevant, local, regional and global ones¹
 - Possible scenarios for the future.

3. Crafting context-sensitive & people-focused indicators that lead to common global measures

The World Development Report 2011 demonstrated the critical importance of public confidence in achieving successful transitions out of fragility. In fact, the real strength of the PSGs lies in their commitment to build states that are meeting the needs and fulfilling the rights of their people. **Indicators to measure progress towards PSGs are an opportunity to understand people's priorities better and give voice to their experience.**

It has been agreed that fragility assessments will lead to the development of lists of country indicators. **The Working Group on Indicators will then draw common indicators from these lists that will inform the development of a short list of global shared indicators.** This will help to ensure that global “templates” are not imposed from the top-down. The IDPS Working Group on indicators has also discussed a set of parameters to guide the indicator development process which civil society generally supports, with some possible additions, which we explore in our recommendations below.

¹ Although the New Deal frames solutions at the national level, local, regional and global factors may need to be addressed

At the same time, the movement towards shared indicators to track progress across countries is vital to increase global understanding of fragility and resilience across contexts and to enable the tracking of progress in the five PSG areas. Increasingly, this will provide an evidence base for effective responses to conflict and fragility. These shared indicators will also provide a constructive framework for mutual accountability on commitments by those who endorsed the New Deal. **Thus it is important that this challenging process is not rushed at either country or global levels and draws upon suitable expertise.**

The commitments of international partners have not yet been the focus of discussions on monitoring. Many of the donor practices contained in the New Deal are already articulated in the Paris, Accra and Busan commitments on improving aid effectiveness – for which monitoring frameworks are under development at the global level. **However, at present there is no discussion within the IDPS of monitoring donors' commitments** to collaborative measures and working practices specifically geared towards peacebuilding and conflict-sensitivity in fragile and conflict affected states.

Key recommendations:

- 3.1. Civil society strongly supports the efforts to develop indicators to help track progress towards PSG fulfilment.**
- 3.2. We recognise the need for work at country level to identify indicators to measure and incentivise change that fit each specific context, as a first step in the development of global shared indicators. Given the complexity of setting appropriate indicators, this process should not be rushed and should involve both civil society and experts in the monitoring and evaluation of peacebuilding.**
- 3.3. In addition to the useful official guidelines shared for indicator development, CSOs suggest the following as important considerations when choosing indicators:**
 - **Aim for broad, summative indicators reflecting whole of PSG outcomes, rather than only a narrow element of the overall goal.**
 - **Measure outcomes rather than inputs: for example, look at rates of violence rather than levels of security personnel.**
 - **Think through the likely behavioural response to prospective indicators. For example, if an indicator on the proportion of court cases processed is set, a natural response could be for cases to be rushed through the judiciary without an increase in access of people to justice. Indicators need to incentivise better quality of services –not simply increases in their quantity.**
 - **Capture equity dimensions, particularly with respect to societal groups: indicators showing distribution or disaggregation can help drive progress towards fairness – a key objective of peacebuilding efforts.**
 - **Measure empowerment: participation by people in improving the conditions affecting their lives across the PSG areas.**
 - **Include interim outcomes and targets that can set out the path towards success, to motivate commitment and action.**
 - **Set targets that are at once ambitious but also reasonably achievable.²**
 - **Most importantly, include indicators that 'capture population views of progress' in each indicator area.³ This will help governments focus on achieving societal support for peacebuilding processes and trust in the state.**

² Adapted from Carin B and Bates-Eamer N, 'Post-2015 Goals, Targets, and Indicators', (CIGI, KDI, HCRI, IFRC Background Paper, Paris, April 9-11, 2012), pp.4-5.

³ For example, for CSOs, core indicators would aim to show: (PSG1) How able do people of all groups feel to participate

These considerations can help each country to interpret PSG commitments in the best possible way, and develop sound building blocks for identifying shared indicators.

3.4. Following the World Development Report 2011, it is important that regional and global factors are addressed by the international community in support of progress made in country. Civil society urges international actors to consider

- Articulating commitments to support an enabling environment for New Deal implementation in country by common action to address ‘external stresses’ or ‘global factors’ such as illicit/irresponsible arms transfers, transnational crime, irresponsible natural resource exploitation, illicit financial flows and the unequal trade rules that disadvantage many fragile states;
- Developing indicators to measure these commitments; and
- Continuing to monitor implementation of the Fragile States Principles.

4. Making peace a global development priority for 2015

The New Deal contains a commitment to ‘work towards full consideration of the PSGs in the post-MDG development framework beyond 2015’. The Arab Spring and the Eurozone crisis have reminded us that all societies have the potential to become fragile and have tensions and conflicts that need to be constructively managed. **A framework under which all countries commit to a vision of development that incorporates core elements of peacebuilding could provide a significant stimulus for work to prevent conflicts before crises emerge.**

This is an opportunity for fragile states to lead the world in recognising and responding to fragility. Well-designed common indicators are also crucial as a contribution to the global development framework that will succeed the Millennium Development Goals at the end of 2015 – **which should include global targets and measures for addressing fragility and building sustainable peace.**

By recognising ‘peace and security’ as one of ‘four key dimensions of a more holistic approach’, the UN System Task Team on the Post 2015 UN Development Agenda has paved the way for success in this work, in its June 2012 report to the Secretary General. Despite this high-level recognition by the UN, a huge amount of dialogue and outreach will be needed to ensure that core commitments to foster sustainable peace are integrated into the post-2015 framework – particularly among member states.

in decision-making processes and to elect their leaders? (PSG2) How safe do people feel, and how well do they feel the different security providers are performing? (PSG3) Do people believe that major injustices are being tackled and do people feel confident in being able to access justice? (PSG4) Do people have fair access to decent work, education and skills training? Do people feel that enough is being done to develop economic opportunities in their area and tackle economic exclusion/discrimination? (PSG5) Are people able to access services and resources? Do people perceive progress in tackling corruption, and do they feel budgeted resources are being investing in public services?

Key recommendations:

- 4.1. CSOs strongly support the efforts of other IDPS stakeholders to integrate peacebuilding elements into the post-2015 framework and will work collaboratively towards this goal. IDPS stakeholders should link with CSOs to advance this progressive agenda.
- 4.2. Dialogue and outreach with policy communities around the world need to be initiated now to build understanding and reflection on how peacebuilding can be integrated into the framework. The efforts to promote PSGs will need to be sensitive to the political outlook of a range of governments. For example, civil society supports changing the language of PSG1 on 'legitimate politics' to 'inclusive politics', with the emphasis on encouraging people's participation in decision making.
- 4.3. The content of the PSGs – which are framed for the national level – should be supplemented with post-2015 commitments to address global factors that cause fragility – such as those identified in section 3.4 above.

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.

Since Busan we have re-established a core group with a new secretariat, and reached out – both with support from DFID, and with our own resources – to build up participation of CSOs from g7+ countries in our network. We have established focal points in each g7+ member country, and a number of other conflict-affected states. We have shared information and insights from each context among the group, and identified regional representatives to join our core group. We will continue to encourage broader participation in our network and the capacity of CSOs to engage on peacebuilding and statebuilding issues at country and global level.

As part of this, we will continue to provide regular written inputs on key issues of policy and practice under consideration by IDPS stakeholders. The purpose of this document is to provide recommendations from civil society, based on our experience, on how to maximise peacebuilding and statebuilding results in our collaborative efforts to follow up on the commitments made in the New Deal, the Monrovia Roadmap and the Dili Declaration.

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

3P Human Security (USA), ACDD GERDES (CAR), Africa CSO Platform 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, West 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).

For general information on CSO engagement in the IDPS, please contact François Lenfant, Cordaid: (francois.lenfant@cordaid.nl). For information regarding this Position Paper, please contact Larry Attree, Saferworld (lattice@saferworld.org.uk), and Melanie Cohen Greenberg, Alliance for Peacebuilding (melaniecg@allianceforpeacebuilding.org)