



Thematic Session on Conflict and Fragility

Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness
Busan, Republic of Korea- BEXCO Centre
29 November 2011

I. Objectives

More than 1.5 billion people live in fragile and conflict-affected countries. Caught in cycles of poverty and violence, few of these countries will achieve a single Millennium Development Goal by 2015. The New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States (the New Deal) sets out five goals — legitimate politics, justice, security, economic foundations and revenues and services — to give clarity on the priorities in fragile states.

The objective of this session was to discuss good and weak donor performance in fragile states and to identify areas for improvement as the evidence base for the New Deal. Results from the 2011 Monitoring Survey of the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile Situations were used to frame the discussion. This session considered unfinished business and remaining challenges in the results and accountability agenda and proposed a building block to implement Busan commitments.

II. Participants

Co-moderators:

Mr. Tobias Nussbaum, Co-Chair of the OECD-DAC International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF)

Dr. James F. Kollie, Acting Deputy Minister for Regional & Sectoral Planning, Liberia

Panellists:

Ms. Helen Clark, Administrator, United Nations Development Programme

H.E. Samura Kamara, Minister of Finance, Sierra Leone

Mr. Peter Moors, Director General for Development Co-operation, Belgium

H.E. Gervais Rufyikiri, Second Vice-President, Burundi

Mr. Michael von der Schulenburg, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General, Sierra Leone

Mr. Joachim von Amsberg, Vice President, Operations Policy and Country Services, World Bank

Ms. Nancy Lindborg, Assistant Administrator, United States Agency for International Development

Dr. Mustafa Mastoor, Deputy Minister of Finance, Afghanistan

Mr. Paul Okumu, Head of Secretariat, Africa CSO Platform of Principled Partnership

H.E. Emilia Pires, Minister of Finance, Timor-Leste

III. Key issues discussed

Key findings from the FSP Survey

Mr. Nussbaum (Canada) provided an overview of the mixed progress reported in results of the 2011 Survey on the Implementation of the Fragile States Principles (FSP). The key finding of the survey is that most aid actors are not set up to meet the specific challenges posed by fragile situations and that they are not systematically able to translate commitments made by their headquarters into country-level changes.



Key points from the discussion

Mr. Moors (Belgium) made the case that lifting fragile states out of fragility will remain a major development challenge for the next decades and fragility will dominate the upcoming development agenda. Mr. Rufyikiri (Burundi) reminded participants about the importance of donors staying engaged long enough to give success a chance (FSP principle 9). He stated the example of Burundi, where donors are starting to withdraw support just at the time when Burundi can use aid with increasing effectiveness.

A pre-condition for overcoming fragility and conflict is to understand its causes and drivers. Ms. Pires (Timor-Leste) recalled the FSP Survey findings that demonstrate a lack of shared vision among all stakeholders in many settings because of a missing understanding for the local context.

A thorough understanding of context is a necessary starting point for a common strategy and a limited set of key priorities. Mr. von der Schulenburg (UNIPSIL) outlined the good example from Sierra Leone where from 32 different strategy documents (in 2008) the government came up with a single country strategy (the Agenda for Change), a prerequisite for effective and coherent action. Moreover, partner government leadership is critical for effective planning and implementation of such strategies.

Approaches focused on the MDGs or PRSPs are not always suitable: fragile settings require a sharp focus on a limited number of peacebuilding and statebuilding priorities. The FSP survey found that support to strengthening of key institutions essential for statebuilding remain limited.

Key areas requiring attention are: i) state-society relations, an inclusive political process and empowerment/participation of women as key actors for peace. Paul Okumu (Africa CSO Platform) mentioned the important role of civil society actors in mobilising citizens and referred to positive examples from DRC; ii) Building effective and accountable institutions to deliver security, justice and jobs and raise revenues. This is reflected in the International Dialogue's Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals; iii) Developing local capacity for conflict prevention and conflict resolution at all levels (Kenya provides a good example). UNDP's Helen Clark pointed out the need to stay engaged and invest in local capacity for conflict prevention, particularly early warning and response systems.

The way aid is delivered in situations of conflict and fragility matters. Issues specific to fragile states are: i) greater risks that outside assistance can do harm, in particular by bypassing governments by setting up parallel mechanisms, not being conflict sensitive or by concentrating aid on the capital and the periphery and/or in certain locations where donor interests are concentrated. Mr. Mastoor (Afghanistan), mentioned the Afghanistan case where too many donors and a reliance on parallel structures are not benefiting the country's development; ii) Donor programmes/projects are often "pre-packaged" and are often complex and ambitious, and tend not to take partner countries' capacity constraints into account; iii) Donors must take greater risks in their involvement with fragile states; Mr. von Amsberg (World Bank) pointed out the need for quicker responses and more predictable and sustainable financing; iv) Donors should work towards a whole-of-government approach as pointed out by Nancy Lindborg (USAID) who referred to the US Policy Directive on Development. The securitisation and militarisation of the aid agenda was raised as a concern - the challenge is to harness security issues for development, including issues of human security.

Finally, the meeting concluded that the major challenge for donors is to put into practice commitments, principles and policies they sign up to, i.e. to give a big political push to translate headquarters policy into practice on the ground. It was recognised that quality international engagement needs to be matched by partner country leadership, as for example shown by the successes of Rwanda. There was a strong consensus that the International Dialogue's New Deal



부산 세계개발원조총회
**4th High Level Forum
on Aid Effectiveness**
29 Nov –1 Dec 2011, Busan, Korea

represents an important step forward and a much needed action plan to change the way national and international actors work in fragile states.

IV. Main conclusions and next steps

Lifting states out of fragility will remain a major development challenge for the next decades, dominating the development agenda. As the push intensifies to turn words into action through the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, understanding good and weak donor performance in fragile states is essential. Good engagement starts with understanding the causes and drivers of fragility, and the unique context of each fragile state. Donors should be willing to take greater risks, formulating a common strategy with a sharp focus on just a few peacebuilding and statebuilding priorities, and dispensing funds more predictably and reliably. In addition, national and international efforts should help build state-society relations and effective, accountable institutions, and develop local capacity.