



Pathways for Peace and Sustaining Peace: Aligning the two processes of implementation

Meeting Note from Experts-Level Discussion

Introduction

On 30 January 2019, the second in a series of roundtable discussions was held exploring what is meant by the operationalization of “Sustaining Peace” among the UN, World Bank, Member States and civil society (see annex for more details on the series). Building on the discussions from the first session in December 2018, over twenty-five experts from across sectors explored the linkages between the UN’s Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda (comprised of both the UN resolutions and Secretary-General’s report) and the follow up on the UN-World Bank report, *Pathways for Peace* (P4P) released in 2018. The meeting explored how this agenda and efforts to implement the recommendations of the study could complement each other and promote a necessary change in the way the international community supports national governments in identifying and addressing risks for an escalation or eruption of violent conflict. The following note is a short summary of the discussions.

The intersection of Sustaining Peace and *Pathways for Peace*

The discussions started with an elaboration on how the linkages are understood between Sustaining Peace as a policy agenda and the P4P as a shared analytical study that aims to identify and analyze the intersections between development processes and conflict prevention efforts. As a report, P4P drills deeper into some specific aspects of the UN’s Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda, looking at root causes and the role of grievances in conflict. It advocates for recognizing exclusion and inequality as powerful potential drivers of conflict, highlights the need for greater intersectionality between security and diplomatic instruments and calls for using all tools available for conflict prevention, including humanitarian and development programs. In its recommendations, P4P urges international actors to invest more in upstream prevention by presenting the economic arguments for this approach, including the cost savings involved in the long term. Through quantitative and case study analysis, the report underscores that aid alone or a singular focus on security efforts are insufficient to maintain stability or sustain peace and calls for recognition of the interdependence of political arrangements buttressed by security and development.

With the extensive evidence and case studies reflected in the P4P report, the findings provide a strong basis and justification for the UN’s Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda and make a strong case for greater focus and increased resources for preventive action rather than crisis management. The report, however, does not outline a set of tools to implement this approach.

In this regard, the UN’s Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda is reinforced by the findings of P4P, advocating for certain changes in planning and programming that are very much in line with the recommendations within P4P. Still, these will need to be further operationalized. Foremost, a mix of tools and interventions that operate across sectors will be required. The

messaging on cross-sector, preventive approaches are particularly relevant for the UN Secretariat, regional and country presences, as many of the problems the organization is tasked with include issues of domestic fragility, including institutional weakness, and polarization among groups.

Opportunities and Challenges to Implementation

The meeting also offered an opportunity to discuss the work being done to implement the recommendations of P4P by the UN and the World Bank at the headquarters and country-levels, as well as the ways it is impacting programming. An implementation plan has been developed and interim reports are expected by both the UN and the World Bank, although these are yet to be finalized. Both the World Bank and the UN Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) have selected pilot countries where particular focus is being placed on implementation of the study's findings.

On the UN's side, PBSO and Country Teams are working to implement P4P in Zimbabwe, Lebanon and Burkina Faso through work with national governments to develop a risk analysis framework that analyses risk through a preventative lens and connects it to programming. Burkina Faso is also a pilot country for Sustaining Peace, and in terms of the implementation of the UN's Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace recommendations, this work is more focused on changes within the UN presence on the ground, as well as changes in the way programs are supported from New York.

From the World Bank's side, the implementation takes place through a Risk Management Facility that focuses on risk and conflict in Niger, Guinea, Tajikistan and Nepal. In this work, the World Bank is developing risk frameworks with the government to assist them in better identifying risk and mitigating it through development strategies. The pilot countries represent the range of opportunities and challenges in engaging with government actors, and in exploring how best to address causes of conflict through development and investment. In Niger, for instance, the Bank will be investing in funding security efforts in marginalized border areas, as well as mitigating climate change and demographic challenges, which are seen as potential causes of conflict. This investment shows a change in the focus of the World Bank's programming with investment in issue areas with a more preventative incentive to avoid potential conflict in the long term rather than guided primarily by potential economic gains.

Linked to country work, participants in the discussion considered ways to integrate the UN's approach of implementing P4P and the UN's Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda more broadly, connecting both implementation strategies and approaches to see how they can support each other. A few key potential avenues for greater synergy stood out, including risk analysis; linking the political with developmental work; partnerships with stakeholders outside the UN and World Bank systems; and financing.

Risk Analysis

One common area of opportunity identified, although also acknowledged as a challenge, was proper risk analysis to inform policy and practice. Both P4P and the UN's Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda highlight the need for more integrated conflict and risk analysis, to promote a shared understanding by all actors in the country and to inform programming.

On the UN's side, there are areas of opportunity to integrate this approach. Currently, there is a lack of consideration of prevention in UN Development Assistant Frameworks (UNDAFs) with limited analysis of root causes of conflict or tools to develop this analysis. There is also a lack of coordination and/or platforms for prevention discussions with national governments. However, the UNDAF is being revised with new guidelines that are to be used in devising new development

strategies. A central element of these new UNDAFs is to consider more prevention-based work and to examine what it means to invest in prevention at the country level. The Common Country Analysis (CCA) is another tool that offers an opportunity to initiate this coordinated risk analysis as it is supposed to form the basis of the UNDAF and connect to the strategies of the Agencies, Funds and Programs at country level.

Another area of opportunity is the UNDP-DPPA Joint Programme for Conflict Prevention that manages Peace and Development Advisors (PDAs). PDAs are meant to provide the additional analytical capacity to bridge the political and development activities of the UN, in support of national prevention capacities. PDAs and their analysis can then infuse UNCT strategies and programming to be more conflict sensitive. For example, in Liberia, the two PDAs work with the Political Coordinator to support the Resident Coordinator in his good offices role, working to coordinate with the UNCT and external partners to gather information and connect this risk analysis and planning processes with in the UNCT.

Participants agreed that more is needed in this area and three recommendations were suggested, including:

- 1) *Developing a protocol to exchange or generate joint risk analysis between diverse and relevant partners;*
- 2) *Agreeing to share analysis with government in certain situations and creating platforms for discussion with key actors; and*
- 3) *Improving analytical capacities internally.*

However, questions were raised about the utility of developing new and time-consuming protocols. Participants encouraged identifying methods for sharing risk analyses, rather than aiming for joint analysis between all actors. The UN Regional Monthly Review (RMR) process was cited by multiple people as a process that should be given more attention and capitalized on, as it should anchor the prevention conversation at the country, regional and headquarters level. The revised UNDAF – and the process around it – should also serve in country as a mechanism for joint analysis. However, it was cautioned that parallel work should be avoided, and that one avenue be chosen as the primary analytical instrument.

Linking Politics and Development

The World Bank's implementation of P4P recommendations is taking the institution further into the political sphere than ever before. It is making progress in working in fragile contexts and on issues related to fragility, and it has scaled up its work in conflict situations. However, this new engagement is raising questions for Country Directors about how far into political issues they can and should go. The World Bank has encountered problems in addressing these political questions, and in shifting the programming to focus on drivers of conflict. As an institution that works through projects, it is also struggling to implement P4P recommendations that do not lend themselves to being projectized. Further, there is still a lack of clarity on how to manage situations where governments are themselves part of the problem due to lack of political will or sufficient resources to engage on implementing P4P recommendations.

For now, individual World Bank Country Directors are working to gauge how best to engage with governments and what aspects of the P4P study can be implemented based on their operating context. The World Bank is in the process of developing an internal strategy that focuses on fragility, conflict and violence, which will help create leverage by identifying incentive systems and pathways to get more government engagement. This strategy will be presented to its Board for

approval in the fall of 2019 and should then be integrated into all elements of its work. Given that the UN is more accustomed and has the mandate to engage with governments on political issues, it was suggested that its comparative advantage in this regard should be considered and leveraged in partnership with the World Bank to advance prevention efforts at country level.

Partnerships

While there are some challenges to implementation of the UN’s Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda and P4P, work is on-going and will continue. It was suggested that the World Bank and UN as institutions learn from each other and the various challenges and strengths each has in order to increase effectiveness. It was also recommended that the World Bank and UN at headquarters and country level look at strengthening partnerships with civil society, regional intergovernmental organizations, humanitarian actors, and other stakeholders to help with implementation. Implementation of the Sustaining Peace agenda and the P4P’s recommendations will also require bringing in other influential Member States like China and Russia and to deal with the conservative geopolitical environment.

Connected to this, though, is the need for the UN and World Bank to strengthen their partnership at all levels. The recent meeting in Dakar of five Resident Coordinators and World Bank country directors to discuss progress, challenges and think through how the two institutions can support each other in country is a step towards progress in changing the operating procedures of these two institutions to encourage more collaborative work.

Experiences from the Field: UNICEF Programme in Democratic Republic of Congo

During the meeting valuable insight were shared about on-the-ground realities of implementation of programmatic efforts aimed at addressing exclusion and inequalities in the Democratic Republic of Congo. UNICEF is using a community-based approach to do risk assessed work on service provision, trying to increase equitable access. This programme operationalizes the recommendations coming from P4P and sustaining peace in trying to address exclusion and focus on resiliencies. It was also mentioned that P4P helped legitimize the program’s work on improving the quality and access to social services and enabled more informed discussions on drivers of conflict at different levels. The programme focused on building conflict prevention capacities as well as access to food, water, education and health and social services, supporting multi-sector forums that analyzed risk and provided solutions. Further, it established local peace committees, training participants on conflict transformation, and gave communities funds to implement activities that address specific issues.

This UNICEF programme has had success, including building upon past initiatives to improve capacity; engaging and empowering children and youth in reintegration services; and training communities on recovery, prevention and nonviolence. However, challenges were also present, including on how to measure impact; the need to strengthen the case for resilience programs at the individual and community levels; and the long-term nature of peacebuilding in fragile communities. From the implementation experiences in the DRC, it was recommended that more attention be focused on resiliency programming, especially at the local and community levels and where government is weak; to improve interagency coordination; and to get donors to commit to long-term funding driven by the objectives of the beneficiaries.

Financing for Sustaining Peace and P4P

One issue raised by all participants is the challenge of funding. While some progress has been made, there is still a significant imbalance in funding for peacebuilding and prevention activities in comparison to the large budgets for humanitarian response or peacekeeping. It is critical that funding increase, including by better optimizing the preventative aspects of funding in other sectors. Stronger messaging to donors on the need for long-term, predictable funds for peacebuilding that are accessible to grassroots organizations is still needed. The need for greater resources also reinforces the call for stronger partnerships. Recognizing that only 10% of the resources for development are channeled through the UN, there are several actors, including the World Bank, that could potentially contribute more to peacebuilding. The key will be to understand and build on comparative advantages to advance the overall objectives of sustainable peace and development.

Existing funding mechanisms, such as the Women's Peace and Humanitarian Fund (WPHF) can be used both as a good practice example, and to generate adequate and accessible funding for implementing the UN's Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda. It will be essential to engage with these existing instruments to ensure that Sustaining Peace and P4P recommendations are integrated into their decision-making processes.

Coordinating and integrating the implementation of P4P and the UN's Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda is also critical in terms of ensuring that the limited funding is allocated effectively. In more explicitly connecting these processes, there may be more available funding for initiatives which support the objectives of both rather than duplicate efforts. Moving towards a more preventative approach through conflict sensitive programming based on shared risk analysis will connect P4P and Sustaining Peace agenda, as well as other areas of work including mediation, peacekeeping and preventing violent extremism. This may also uncover new pools of funds for prevention-based work. Conversely, failing to coordinate work will risk fragmentation of funding and implementation.

Conclusion

P4P provides a solid evidence base for the UN's Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace agenda, and the recommendations from the UN Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace resolutions and report offer methods to implement P4P. Both support and reinforce each other. However, implementation will require considerations of change management and the way to adapt the way in which the UN and World Bank operates at headquarter and country-level. P4P has been praised as an excellent partnership initiative by the UN and World Bank and this partnership should continue in the implementation phase. This will necessitate looking at and reforming the cultures, incentives and expertise of each organization, and being more creative in political engagements. Partnerships will also be key, not only in using the different political leverages of the World Bank and UN, but on building broader coalitions to create new pathways for prevention. Ultimately, work in operationalizing prevention will require the right money, people and leadership at the country-level to effect change and to open space for dialogue on risks with an engaged national government.

The series will continue with its next session in February 2019.



Operationalizing Sustaining Peace: A Series of Expert Roundtables

Sustaining Peace, as defined in dual UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions (A/70/262 and S/2016/2282) is “a goal and a process to build a common vision of a society, ensuring that the needs of all segments of the population are taken into account, which encompasses activities aimed at preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict, addressing root causes, assisting parties to conflict to end hostilities, ensuring national reconciliation, and moving towards recovery, reconstruction and development”. This definition contextualizes peacebuilding as a process that is relevant and necessary throughout the conflict cycle, rather than solely an action taken after conflict termination, and correspondingly shifts the starting point of analysis to understanding risk and resilience in a society, and preventative rather than reactive operations.

In January 2018, the Secretary-General released his report outlining ways in which the UN is implementing the Sustaining Peace approach and proposing ways to further the process. And, in April 2018, another set of dual resolutions were passed endorsing the continued implementation of the recommendations on Sustaining Peace. These resolutions requested an interim report on Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace in 2019 and second report following up on the implementation in connection with the 2020 review of the UN’s peacebuilding architecture.

Despite all the endorsement for continued work on embracing the word and spirit of the parallel resolutions, there is still a gap in understanding what this means in practice and the implication of the changes that are called for at regional and country level. To support and inform preparations for the 2019 and 2020 reports, the International Peace Institute (IPI), the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation (DHF) and the Global Network of Women Peacebuilders (GNWP) are convening a series of roundtable discussion to examine the operationalization of Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace.

The overall objective of this series is to strengthen and implementation of the UN’s peacebuilding and sustaining peace agenda, at the country and regional levels. The discussion series will contribute to this objective through:

- Creating a space for key global policy- and decision-makers to develop a shared understanding of the UN’s peacebuilding and sustaining peace agenda at the practical level, informed by the perspectives of the practitioners, women’s rights organizations and other civil society groups working on the ground.
- Fostering discussions on how to advance efforts at sustaining peace in practice at the country level and identifying concrete steps that need to be taken for effective and locally-driven implementation.
- Contributing to the assessment of the ongoing efforts to change the way peacebuilding is undertaken, by the UN and other actors on the ground and highlighting examples and cases that demonstrate whether the UN is having positive influence on the way peacebuilding is undertaken.

The Series

This series aims to convene experts in peacebuilding and sustaining peace to discuss key thematic areas that emerge in connection to the implementation of the Sustaining Peace resolutions. Participants will include experts from civil society, member states, UN Agencies, Funds and Programs and the UN secretariat. The roundtables will be by invitation only and will be held as off-the record discussions. A short non-attribution summary note will be developed based on the discussions held.

The aim will be to hold one roundtable per month focused on topics related to implementing the Sustaining Peace resolutions in practice. The topics listed below are indicative and may be adapted based on what UN representatives, Member States and civil society partners deem to be timely and useful. As much as possible the discussions will be grounded in country cases with experiences of local, national and regional actors as well as international actors working at country and regional levels presented.

Potential Topics

- 1) How do we understand the operationalization of Sustaining Peace? - glancing backwards before moving ahead
- 2) The Peace, Development and Humanitarian Nexus vs. Sustaining Peace: Are we coordinating and breaking silos?
- 3) Sustaining Peace and SDG16: How do these frameworks interact (in preparation for the HLPF 2019)?
- 4) Partnerships for Sustaining Peace: The role of civil society
- 5) Tools to implement Sustaining Peace: The role of the Youth, Peace and Security Agenda.
- 6) A gender perspective to Sustaining Peace.
- 7) Pathways to Peace and Sustaining Peace: the UN - World Bank partnership at country level
- 8) The new RC system and Sustaining Peace: potential and reality