

**The Second Meeting of the Advisory Group of
the UN Secretary-General for the Peacebuilding Fund
27 – 28 October 2015, Washington DC**

Chair's Summary of the Meeting

The 4th Advisory Group of the Secretary-General met for its second meeting on 27-28 October 2015. In order to strengthen the partnership between the PBF and the World Bank, the meeting was convened in Washington DC, generously hosted by the World Bank's Fragility, Conflict and Violence group. Many sessions were co-organized with the Bank to explore how collaboration could be improved (see Agenda).

Implications of the AGE Review on the PBF strategy

PBSO briefed the Advisory Group on the Report of the Advisory Group of Experts for the 2015 Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture (AGE Report), highlighting the Report's reference to the changing nature of conflicts, the importance of conflict prevention and sustaining peace over the longer term, the criticality of political settlements and inclusive national ownership, the emphasis on partnership with the International Financial Institutions and regional organizations, the need to evolve the functioning of the PBC, and the urgency to focus on UN peacebuilding capacities. The MPTF Office presented in addition the financial status of the Fund, highlighting the 2015 low and uneven nature of PBF contributions, and recalling the AGE Report imperative call to find sustainable financing for the PBF.

PBSO noted that many of the recommendations of the AGE Report built on practices that the PBF had already begun. The Advisory Group's general views on the implications of the report can be summarized as follows:

- Agreed to the idea of trying to bring more experiences of the PBF to the Peacebuilding Commission, in more flexible ways as recommended by the AGE Report
- Agreed to PBSO's current practice of enhancing the use of the IRF, including through 'packages' of support with small executive committees, but encouraged PBSO not to abandon the PRF either
- Agreed with PBSO's approach to continue the practice of the Gender Promotion Initiative, as needed
- Advised that while PBSO should seek ways to interact with regional organizations and support their work in specific countries, but cautioned against directly financing regional organizations
- Advised that if the PBF is to remain relevant, it cannot avoid the global shift of attention to the Middle East and middle income countries, citing Libya in particular, noting that a relative deficit of attention may make it a good use of PBF resources
- Cautioned PBSO that undertaking research of global needs ('costing') for peacebuilding is a complicated endeavor, and that PBSO should be clear about the scope and purpose
- Expressed deep concern at the difficulties PBSO was facing to raise the targeted \$100m per year, and agreed to write directly to the Secretary-General to advise increased advocacy.
- Welcomed the call in the report for closer collaboration between the UN and the World Bank in general, and the use of the PBF as a critical instrument to advance that collaboration, as has been advocated by the Advisory Group over past years

Monitoring and Evaluation: Better monitoring, better evidence of peacebuilding results

PBSO/PBF and the World Bank Fragility, Conflict and Violence M&E Units made a joint presentation focusing on challenges around peacebuilding evidence. PBSO presented its 6-monthly PBF project progress analysis, highlighting how the shocks like Ebola, the electoral crisis in Burundi and conflict re-eruption in Yemen and South Sudan impacted on the PBF portfolio. Both organizations presented efforts underway to address challenges:

- Strong accompaniment at design and evaluation phases in particular;
- Proportionally more funding for M&E activities;
- More emphasis on independent monitoring and community based monitoring;
- Development of peacebuilding tools and training;
- Development of a global PBF results framework in two components: (i) a set of organization indicators measuring PBF effectiveness and efficiency; and (ii) a set of thematic outcome statements, theories of change and (eventually) indicators to guide PBF programme design in each of the 12 focus areas of PBF work;
- Development of a 'gapmap' of peacebuilding evidence, highlighting areas where there is existence or lack of robust global evidence (WB);
- Development of an M&E toolkit for WB FCV work, including (eventually) a public database of existing relevant indicators.

The Advisory Group:

- Encouraged the idea of undertaking joint PBF / Bank evaluations in one or two countries in the coming 6-9 months, perhaps in Somalia and CAR where the two organizations already collaborated on programmatic support to the respective Governments
- Noted and encouraged PBSO's work on the PBF Performance Management Plan, valuing PBSO's intention to have both organizational (management) and thematic components, noting that while some required indicators would be useful for its global narrative, the emphasis should remain on the utility of indicators for countries themselves
- Encouraged PBSO to think how SDG16 indicators could best be incorporated
- Advised PBSO to invest more efforts in collecting and analyzing lessons learned, including from past evaluations, and presenting these through strategic communications and user friendly tools, highlighting in particular where PBF has performed the most strongly.

Working Lunch with Executive Directors of the World Bank

A working lunch, hosted by the World Bank Senior Advisor to the President, Mr Colin Bruce, was organized with select Executive Directors who have an expressed interest in UN – World Bank collaboration, and/or where the same Member State had an explicit role in the follow-up to the Peacebuilding Review. The discussion highlighted the need to continue to invest in collaboration at the highest institutional levels for many years to come, and under-scored the complimentary roles of the two institutions. In particular, partnership offered a means to manage risks more effectively, by calling upon UN missions, for example, to help address political issues that are required in order to sustain peace and provide the foundation for longer-term development. The Peacebuilding Commission may play a particularly helpful role in this regard.

Collaboration with the World Bank on Analysis and Planning

A joint session with the World Bank looked at how the two institutions could do a better job of undertaking joint analysis and collaborating during planning stages, to ensure that strategies were aligned. Some outcomes included:

- a. Analysis and Planning (suggested lead PBF)
 - *Joint FCV/ PBSO annual work planning*: development of a forward calendar of priority countries for both sides, in order to set out collaboration possibilities for 2016, this could be proposed as part of workplanning for FY 2015/2016 to WB. There was an agreement to try and have at least two Bank-UN collaboration planning meetings, involving the PBF, twice per year
 - *Joint PBF / SPF collaboration* – development of a joint priority plan in at least one country in 2016, aligning diagnostics and strategy, but not mingling money - Paul Bance (new head of World Bank State and Peacebuilding Fund) coming to New York 24 November;
- b. *UN/WB collaboration on analysis and planning that may lead to the use of the Turnaround Facility in particular countries* – collaboration in the undertaking of fragility assessments and other analytical work (including other UN partners such as Department of Political Affairs) that may lead to activities that the UN could undertake, possibly financed by PBF, that could enhance the chances of accessing or implementing resources from the Turnaround Facility
- c. Thematic / Policy Issues (suggested lead PBC)
 - *Thematic/Substantive Dialogue* – both in plenary and in the margins references were made to the role of the Peacebuilding Commission as a convener on priority themes and countries. World Bank partners emphasized that their participation in Commission meetings will be more effective the more such meetings are outcome oriented, informal and substantive , whether on country or thematic issues.
- d. Operational
 - *Statement of principles on operationalising collaboration* A key concern expressed by several UN staff is that collaboration often means joint missions. This can be very difficult due to different security frameworks, authorising environments, and management accountabilities. A clearer agreement on how we operationalise collaboration (missions, use of joint data, tools etc.) would be useful, and especially earlier sharing of intentions and plans.
 - *PBSO as FCV 'entry point' into the UN* – PBSO to act as a convener, guide for FCV into the UN, connecting World Bank and UN staff on above issues.

Case study: World Bank – UN Collaboration in Central African Republic

A video-conference with Bangui enabled the World Bank Country Manager, Jean-Christophe Carret and the UN Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General Aurelien Agbénonci to present on their peacebuilding work in CAR, highlighting collaboration, particularly between the PBF and the Bank. They noted the success of the joint effort to prevent state collapse in 2014 through the payment of salaries, and the logistical (and security) coverage that MINUSCA is providing to efforts of the World Bank including for its nation-wide employment programme, for example. In addition, DSRSG Agbénonci noted that PBF provided fast support at critical stages, for instance through the urgent

rehabilitation of all police and gendarmerie stations in Bangui, without which other peacebuilding efforts would have not been possible.

Looking forward, it was noted that there should be a newly elected government in early 2016, which will have urgent requests for support. The World Bank will be undertaking a fragility assessment with an invitation to the UN side to participate and a particular eye on how it might support a submission for the Turnaround Facility. PBSO noted that with a new government in place it could start to look at a Peacebuilding and Recovery Facility grant, and that this presents an obvious opportunity for collaboration.

Thematic review on employment and peacebuilding

PBSO, the World Bank, UNDP and ILO are already collaborating to undertake a study on employment and peacebuilding. The PBF team itself has encouraged the study (led in PBSO by the Policy Branch) due to concerns over the effectiveness of its own employment programmes. The sessions benefited from a review of literature/current understanding by Professor Christopher Cramer, a presentation of the planned review itself (to be completed in early 2016), and an overview of what we know already about PBF-funded programmes in this area.

The Advisory Group:

- Greatly appreciated the effort to study further this complicated area of work, which is emphasized by political leaders in many settings, called for by the WDR 2011, instinctively recognized as important by many practitioners, yet extremely complex to disentangle in terms of what kinds of investments yield peacebuilding results
- Noted already some common themes, including that: the alienation of youth is perhaps more fundamental than having short-term (especially low-skilled) employment; activities that aim to support “at-risk youth and women” are likely insufficiently targeted on conflict drivers; and that there is a great paucity of labor-market data in peacebuilding settings
- Cautioned PBSO – particularly in advance of the findings and recommendations of the employment review next year – to be very demanding that any employment programmes are either (a) carefully targeted on specific populations that are related to conflict drivers, and that theories of change are presented as to how the relationship between the activity and peacebuilding will be assessed and/or (b) explicitly linked to larger and more sustainable employment programmes.

PBF direct support to governments and non-governmental organizations

As part of the PBF Business Plan 2014-16, and as further encouraged by recommendations from the AGE Report Peacebuilding Review, the PBF has taken measures to add options concerning how it can finance peacebuilding. PBF has already piloted direct financial support to Governments, namely through its payment of police and gendarmerie salaries in Central African Republic in 2014, and its steps to channel financing through the Government in Somalia in the near future. In terms of non-governmental organizations, PBSO’s policy is already to encourage support for national civil society via a supporting (technically *or* managerially) UN organization. The discussion at the Advisory Group focused on a third element in this area, namely the authorization of a select number of international NGOs to receive funding more directly from the PBF. PBSO highlighted that it expects such funding to be a very small portion of its overall financing, and is intended to strengthen partnerships of the UN with communities and civil society. PBSO noted it is exploring different

options, including having a global UN managing agent versus adjusting policies to allow for non-UN recipients directly.

The Advisory Group:

- In the majority encouraged PBSO to pursue the pilot activity, noting that as a pilot particular attention should be paid to the process of screening eligible NGOs and ensuring geographic diversity, as well as to the balance between strengthening coherence of the UN and involving non-UN partners.

Support and field visits of Advisory Group members

The Advisory Group endorsed the practice established in 2010 of ensuring field visits of the Advisory Group. For this Group, it was agreed to have a more flexible approach, in which while at least one group visit will be organized, Advisory Group members are also encouraged to participate in other ways with the Peacebuilding Fund's work, subject to their availability, on a pro-bono basis with expenses covered by the Fund.

Field Visit: The Advisory Group agreed to undertake a field visit in early/mid April 2016, to be organized by PBSO.

Ad-Hoc Support of Members: The Advisory Group members were keen on offering their support to PBSO including in country specific programme design, policy, and resource mobilization. The Group asked PBSO to contact its individual members with proposals for their assistance.

Next meeting: The Advisory Group agreed to hold its 3rd meeting on **28-29 April 2016**, following the field visit. The Group raised the following topics as its priorities for the next meeting: resource mobilization, follow up on the thematic review on unemployment and peacebuilding, strategic communication, forthcoming resolutions on Peacebuilding Architecture, gender and 1325 Review, PBC-PBF relations, and middle income country engagement.