

MEETING NOTE: SEMINAR ON INTEGRATED PEACEBUILDING STRATEGIES

Introduction

In cooperation with the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), the International Peace Academy (IPA) and the Center on International Cooperation (CIC) organized an informal seminar on integrated peacebuilding strategies on March 1, 2007 (see attached agenda) in New York.¹ The resolutions establishing the Peacebuilding Commission call upon the body to “advise and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict recovery,” but what constitutes an “integrated peacebuilding strategy” remains unclear. This seminar was designed to provide a forum to discuss elements of integrated peacebuilding strategies and to identify the comparative advantage of the PBC in advising or proposing them.

The meeting was the first in a planned series of informal events designed to support the PBC and PBSO by providing access to outside experts and fora for discussion of substantive issues related to peacebuilding.

Lessons from the field

Nature of transitions: The process of transition is intrinsically complex. Despite the tendency within the UN and the international system to speak of discrete phases of transition, in reality it is difficult to draw a clear line between these phases. Attempts to define transition timelines are usually exercises in semantics. Political, security, economic and social aspects of peacebuilding are interrelated, and mutually reinforcing, making these perceived boundaries somewhat fluid in reality. One of the key opportunities and comparative advantages for the PBC lies in ensuring that these gray areas of transition are understood and supported.

Competing priorities: Transitions are also complicated by competing needs, and competing and diverse actors. In a post-conflict context, where the needs of the population are urgent but the ability of the state to deliver services is compromised, everything is a priority. Needs from security to health to infrastructure to food all require immediate attention, yet multiple capacity deficits limit the state’s ability to respond to these needs. Further complicating these environments are the presence of numerous and diverse actors – national and international – each with competing agendas, mandates and priorities. The challenge of

¹ Participants included members of the PBC, PBSO staff, and a small number of observers from the Secretariat as well as panelists on the agenda.

post-conflict peacebuilding is to prioritize these needs and rationalize the roles of this multiplicity of actors.

Implementation challenges: The real challenge of securing a lasting peace does not lie in securing a formal peace agreement, but in implementing the contents of that agreement. Experience argues that parties to both the agreement and the implementation phase must remain engaged and are often more effective if they operate within a formal institutional structure that perpetuates contact, supports dialogue, and ensures that political, security, economic and institutional programming responds to realities from the ground. Such a structure also creates a sense of commitment that is essential to hold both the international community and its local interlocutors equally to account.

Primacy of the field: Peacebuilding cannot be driven by imperatives from capitals or headquarters, although these will continue to inform and influence, but rather, must be guided by the facts on the ground. The process must be institutionalized in a way that establishes the ‘field’ as the primary venue where strategies are shaped and implemented. International actors and their representatives in the field are crucial to this process, but national actors – the parties to the conflict, national political elites, and the population itself – are ultimately the owners of peacebuilding.

National ownership: The process of creating a national strategy carries intrinsic risks. There is a substantial opportunity for unforeseen losers to emerge from this process – particularly from capacity gaps that affect particular programmes or salient groupings – and their marginalization can lead to the recurrence of conflict. Peacebuilding must take account of the political nature and potential impact of development-related plans.

Plans that are considered ‘nationally owned’ at early stages are often abandoned when a government is elected, which can undermine legitimacy and allow supply-driven aid and assistance. Ensuring continuity of national ownership – and attention to this ignored trouble spot of transition – is a further area of opportunity for the PBC.

On the other hand, the presence of an elected government alone does not obviate the need for attention to spoilers. Political and security concerns must be addressed through the beginnings of the development phase, especially after the end of a peacekeeping mission. This further highlights the importance of peacebuilding as a tool for ensuring balance.

Drivers of conflict: National planning tends to focus on ending violence and war, rather than building peace, and is complicated by the natural tendency of political elites to acquire and consolidate power, rather than seek stability. In particular, this identifies a need to address factors which, if left unattended, might provoke a recurrence of conflict. The PBC, supported by the PBSO and external actors, should try to understand these factors better and draw attention to them when neglected.

Programming in countries emerging from conflict must address both structural causes of conflict and initiate the process of recovery. A strategy, therefore, should be seen as a roadmap that articulates the relationships between causes of conflict and actors, in order to allow prioritization and progress towards a sustainable peace.

Six lessons on strategy: Experience has taught us the following six lessons:

1. A strategy cannot be an end in itself; it is only a means to peace.
2. Strategies must be driven by realities on the ground, and must recognize when good is good enough.
3. Strategies must blend national ownership with international partnership.
4. Strategies must include capacity building from the outset.
5. Strategies must recognize the regional dimensions of conflict.
6. Finally, strategies will be judged by results on the ground.

Existing strategy tools and the challenge of integration

Current tools: In the past fifteen years, significant progress has been made in integrating approaches towards post-conflict assistance, bridging the all-too-common divides between actors and issue areas. Today, there exists a wide range of fora for donor coordination (conferences, consultative groups), tools for assessing needs in post-conflict countries (PCNAs, etc.), systems for inter-agency planning and implementation (integrated mission planning, etc.) and pooled funding mechanisms (multi donor trust funds). Attached as a separate Annex is a list of key processes with basic definitions and analysis.

Challenges for integration: Despite this progress, the proliferation of tools (and their accompanying acronyms) both taxes the capacity of the state to maintain a steady direction and challenges the coherence of the international community. Within the UN system, the plethora of departments, funds, programs and agencies involved in peacebuilding has been a perpetual challenge to coherence. Frameworks and tools still tend to reflect a supply- and mandate-driven mentality. Some agencies continue to work either under strictly humanitarian or development mindsets, which are ill-adapted to respond to the integrated challenges of peacebuilding.

The integrated mission planning process: The UN's 'integrated mission planning' process (IMPP) underwent review in 2006 and a new protocol was developed to address perceived problems. This protocol is organized around three broad stages: 'advance planning,' involving the development of strategic options for UN engagement, 'operational planning,' involving the operationalization of the draft mission plan and the transition of authority to an SRSG, and 'review and transition planning' through which the plan is continuously updated and issues of draw-down and transition addressed. The system has yet to be implemented, however, and is likely to be simplified in the next six months. There is a clear opportunity for the PBSO to provide input into this process as plans are being developed in DPKO.

Strategic direction for the UN system: There is clear evidence of the need for greater strategic direction for the UN system. Before operational planning begins and before an SRSG is appointed, the UN needs to have a clear understanding of the in-country dynamics and causes of conflict, so that it can clarify goals, identify risks, and develop strategies accordingly. The PBC and the PBSO may have distinct comparative advantages here. The PBSO, for example, could review strategy documents (such as the IMPP), call attention to potential risks, and generally advise as to whether overarching peacebuilding objectives are

addressed. The PBC, alternately, could provide strategic input to the Security Council in the lead-up to the authorization of a peace operation.

The roles of the PBC and PBSO

A strategic role: It is important that the PBC, and PBSO, establish added value in the context of all these processes. Overall, the PBC should not micro-manage or duplicate existing processes but rather offer a “second set of eyes” to identify gaps and ensure that key needs are not neglected. This requires that they have a broad understanding of conflict drivers – both in general and in specific cases – as well as priorities and linkages between issues in a given country.

Entry points: There are two time frames in which the PBC might particularly be called upon to add value. The first is at an early stage in the implementation of a peace agreement when, all too often, the Security Council and other actors are absorbed by security concerns and pay little attention to institutional capacity building, development issues and economic recovery needs (a powerful example being the current planning for Timor Leste). The PBC is well-placed to advocate for a more coherent approach that avoids the artificial distinctions often made between peacekeeping and transition/recovery/development.

The second is at a later stage when troops are withdrawn, attention diminishes and financial assistance may dwindle. At this point, vital peacebuilding needs, especially those related to security and spoilers, may go unaddressed. Here, the PBC will be well placed to bring continued attention to the countries in question and to forge a political consensus around peacebuilding goals and commitments.

Tracking progress: The PBC also has an important role to play in tracking progress in the countries on its agenda. Yet the lack of indicators – both qualitative and quantitative – continues to make it difficult to identify best practices, so further research and work is urgently needed. Input from civil society on these issues is essential to avoid them being ‘academic’ or overly generic benchmarks for peacebuilding.

Focus on implementation: The international system is capable of creating strategies, but less capable of implementing them, much as donors frequently make pledges, but do not always make good on their commitments. The PBC, with PBSO support, can work to ensure focus on tangible delivery.

Forging a compact: Implementation is also a two-way street, and international commitment must be matched by commitment from post-conflict authorities. The concept of a ‘compact,’ is perhaps useful here, and the PBC could play a valuable role in tracking mutual commitments and taking advantage of its intergovernmental mandate. .


Conclusion

The UN’s new peacebuilding architecture was designed to help secure transitions from conflict to sustainable peace through the proposal of integrated strategies and the identification of best practices. It is clear that the ownership of strategies must remain with

affected countries, and that the PBC and PBSO should contribute to peacebuilding without creating unnecessary transaction costs or layers of bureaucracy. It is also evident that the PBC and PBSO have significant comparative advantages in providing input across the international system, and throughout the lifecycle of a country's emergence from conflict, to integrate and balance short- and medium-term priorities.

These points of comparative advantage reinforce the idea that the role of the PBC as an inter-governmental body is to secure attention and political commitments for countries under its consideration, while the PBSO can play an important advisory role for processes within the UN Secretariat, such as the integrated mission planning process. Both can also serve a catalytic function. There are several points of intervention where the PBC and PBSO can accomplish these goals:

1. At the outset of a mission, ensuring that developmental concerns are addressed (PBC through advice to Security Council; PBSO providing inputs to IMPP or related processes).
2. During a mission, tracking risks to peacebuilding and identifying best practices (PBSO).
3. During late transition, ensuring that continued political and security vulnerabilities are addressed and minimizing aid gaps (PBC as advocate).
4. Throughout, ensuring that the unique context of the country is taken into account and that strategies and programmes are as 'nationally owned' as possible (PBC as advocate; PBSO as ensuring access to quality analysis).



SEMINAR ON INTEGRATED PEACEBUILDING STRATEGIES

March 1, 2007

The New York Helmsley Hotel
Turtle Bay Suite, Third Floor
212 East 42nd Street

AGENDA

8:45 **Informal Breakfast**

9:15 **Welcome and Introduction**

- Terje Rød-Larsen, President, IPA
- Bruce Jones, Co-Director, CIC

9:30 **Session 1: Reflections on Past Experiences in Strategic Approaches to Peacebuilding**

Chair: Teresa Whitfield, Director, Conflict Prevention and Peace Forum

- Youssef Mahmoud, Executive Representative of the Secretary-General for Burundi
- Terje Rød-Larsen, President, IPA
- Discussant: Charles Call, Senior Adviser on Peacebuilding, IPA

Speakers will review past experience and highlight key challenges, key lessons about how to integrate the development, political and security elements into common strategy. Questions for discussion include:

- *What are the main political risks at different stages of transition, e.g. after the signing of a peace agreement, or as a peacekeeping mission draws down?*
- *What are the components of an integrated strategy to reduce these risks?*
- *What lessons may be drawn from current and previous field experiences?*

10:30 **Session 2: Existing Strategy Tools for Peacebuilding**

Chair: Charles Call, Senior Adviser on Peacebuilding, IPA

- Margaret Carey, Advisor, UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations
- Jean-Luc Siblot, Head of Crisis and Post Conflict Cluster, UN Development Group Office
- Oscar A. Avalle, Special Representative of the World Bank (a.i.) to the United Nations

Speakers will elucidate existing tools, and identify gaps, covering the span of early peacekeeping planning, early reconstruction planning, and the move towards regular development planning mechanisms. Questions for discussion include:

- *What is the state of existing planning processes?*
- *Where are gaps in existing strategic planning processes?*

- *What are the components of an integrated strategy to consolidate successful peacebuilding efforts?*

11:30

Coffee Break

11:45

Session 3: Open Discussion: Role of the PBC in Developing Strategic Approaches

Chair: Thant Myint-U, Visiting Senior Fellow, IPA

- Opening remarks: Bruce Jones, Co-Director, CIC

Participants will discuss ideas for how the PBC can help ensure that there is an integrated strategy for peacebuilding for countries on its agenda, while locating these proposals within the context of earlier discussion on lessons from the field and existing processes. Questions for discussion include:

- *How can the PBC/PBSO ensure more adequate attention to development and statebuilding issues in early Security Council deliberations on missions?*
- *How can the PBC/PBSO help ensure that political and security vulnerabilities are taken into account even as the focus shifts to sustainable development over the long term?*
- *How should the PBC/PBSO relate to DPKO, UNDP, the World Bank, and other actors in identifying gaps and integrating strategies?*
- *How should the PBC/PBSO ensure that it adds value without duplicating existing efforts?*
- *How can the PBC/PBSO mobilize donor commitments and hold donors to account?*

1:00

Meeting Concludes

- Carolyn McAskie, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support

ANNEX: KEY CONFLICT-RELEVANT PROCESSES

INTEGRATED MISSION PLANNING PROCESS (IMPP)

Actors: Led by DPKO, integrates other UN agencies and UN Secretariat actors in theory; in practice, primarily DPKO

Objective: Formalize the strategy for a peacekeeping mission

Timing: Subsequent to SC Resolution; prior to mission deployment

Overview: The integrated mission concept was developed with the aim of enhancing the consistency of the UN message and the efficiency of UN operations and country teams. At its core is the political authority of the SRSG over the entire UN system on the ground, balanced by enhanced interaction with humanitarian and development actors, usually via a multi-hatted Deputy SRSG and some form of inter-agency strategic planning group at field level. In planning and supporting the mission, the ideal is for a similarly ‘joined up’ process at headquarters, led by DPKO but also involving other departments and the UN country team.

Analysis: The integrated mission planning process has long been seen criticized as too military and not sufficiently ‘integrated.’ In 2005, the Secretary-General’s Policy Committee determined that DPKO should remain the lead planning department for complex, multi-dimensional operations, but with strengthened inputs from humanitarian and development actors (through the creation of small planning cells by UNDG and ECHA).

In 2006, the process was completely reviewed and updated around three main stages; ‘advance planning,’ involving the development of strategic options for UN engagement leading to a concept of operations that can be put to the Security Council; ‘operational planning,’ involving the operationalization of the draft mission plan and the transition of authority to the SRSG as soon as one is appointed; and ‘review and transition planning’ through which the plan is continuously updated and issues of draw-down and transition addressed. This approach envisages the PBSO (as the main strategic tool of the Secretary-General) being involved at the front end and DPKO retaining its operational lead. However, this system remains to be implemented in practice.

POST-CONFLICT NEEDS ASSESSMENT (PCNA)

Actors: World Bank and UNDG

Objective: Identify key needs for reconstruction in post-conflict country

Timing: Generally after the cessation of conflict; often concurrent with deployment of PK mission or early stages, but can occur earlier

Overview: Post-Conflict Needs Assessments (PCNAs) are multilateral exercises undertaken by the UNDG and the World Bank in countries emerging from conflict, undertaken in collaboration with the national government and with the cooperation of donor

countries. PCNAs provide the foundation for developing shared recovery plans and a basis for resource mobilization at donor conferences. Between 2003 and 2006, joint UN/World Bank PCNA exercises were conducted in Iraq, Liberia, Haiti and Sudan and got underway in Darfur and Somalia. They include both the assessment and costing of needs and the prioritization of results in an accompanying Transitional Results Matrix (TRM).

The concept of the Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) emerged in East Timor, was further piloted in Liberia (as the JNA) and Iraq and appears to have reached coherence in Sudan and Darfur. A JAM is essentially a different acronym for a similar process; one that avoids the label 'post-conflict'.

Analysis: In May 2006, the UN and World Bank launched a review of PCNAs. So far, the review has concluded that PCNAs have served as an effective analytical platform for resource mobilization but have been less successful as an actionable recovery plan. It has been recognized that the fragility of post-conflict settings must be better taken into account, for example through greater operational urgency, attention to the particular challenges created by the existence of short-term transitional governments, an emphasis on conflict/risk analysis and security concerns and articulation of stabilization measures addressing the risk of conflict relapse as well as transformation measures focused on achieving the MDGs. Although there is some external support for the PCNA methodology, a frequent external criticism is that PCNA teams do not adequately leverage existing knowledge/surveys done by NGOs that have remained in country throughout conflict.

INTERIM POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGY PAPER / POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGY PAPER (I-PRSP/PRSP)

Actors: National Government and World Bank/IMF

Objective: Create a national, multi-year strategy for development and poverty reduction

Timing: Later stage. Occasionally an I-PRSP may be started while a peacekeeping mission is in-country, but it is more likely to happen later; certainly after initial elections.

Overview: PRSPs are prepared by governments in low-income countries through a process involving domestic stakeholders as well as external development partners, including the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. Updated every three years with annual progress reports, PRSPs describe the country's macroeconomic, structural and social policies and programs over the medium-term horizon and lay out proposed programmes to promote broad-based growth and reduce poverty, as well as the associated external financing needs and major sources of financing. The PRSP approach was initiated by the Bank and IMF in 1999 and provides the operational basis for Fund and Bank concessional lending and debt relief under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative.

An I-PRSP is a bridge document for a country emerging from crisis or conflict, and unable to complete a full PRSP. I-PRSPs summarize the current knowledge and analysis of a country's poverty situation, describe the existing poverty reduction strategy, and lay out the process for producing a fully developed PRSP in a

participatory fashion. I-PRSPs have been used in Comoros, DRC, Republic of Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Liberia, Macedonia (FYR) and Uzbekistan. Many other countries have graduated from an I-PRSP to a PRSP including Burundi and Sierra Leone.

Analysis: The PRSP approach has been amended since 1999 to place more emphasis on country ownership rather than the IFI requirements, though achieving both ownership and accountability remains an ongoing concern. There has also been recognition of the need to tailor the methodology towards conflict-affected and fragile states and to strengthen the medium-term focus of the approach. For example, recognizing the weak institutional capacities of low-income governments in 2001, a multi-donor trust fund was established to support capacity-building. The major criticism of the PRSP is that despite its claim to be a nationally-led process, it remains a Bank-authored document whose intent is to justify programming that the World Bank desires to implement.

COMMON COUNTRY ASSESSMENT / UN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK (CCA/UNDAF)

Actors: United Nations system, led by UNDP

Objective: Articulate the UN strategy for assistance to a country

Timing: Later stage; generally pre-dates the PRSP, varies widely with respect to I-PRSP. After the PCNA.

Overview: The CCA is a UN system-wide instrument for analyzing and identifying key development issues. The CCA refers to both a process of assessment and the product, which seeks to integrate national priorities, and focus on the Millennium Development Goals. It corresponds partially to the World Bank's Country Assistance Strategy.

The UNDAF is the operational consequence of a CCA. It is a single document that provides the strategic framework for the operational activities of the United Nations system at the country level, mandating a collective, coherent and integrated United Nations system response to national priorities and needs within the framework of the MDGs. The latest guidelines for preparing CCAs/UNDAFs were released in February 2007 and include more information on conflict prevention and disaster risk reduction.

Analysis: As with the PRSP process, the question of local ownership and buy-in looms large. The argument is made that the CCA and UNDAF processes are not fundamentally locally owned, but respond to objectives of the wider system; critics respond that all development processes at the strategic level must be led by a national government. Again, the issue of limited national capacity plays a large role, as does the independence of UN agencies and entities.