

First Meeting of the Open Working Group on Monitoring Effectiveness in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations

Held: 2pm-5pm, 10 September. OECD Paris, OECD BB3

Participants:

Members of the open working group (in alphabetical order; also see table below)

- **Dr. Erin McCandless**, Associate Professor, School of Governance, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa, and Research Director, Forging Resilient Social Contracts, and Civil Society Co-chair of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Implementation Working Group, Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS)
- **Mr Habib Mayar**, Deputy Secretary General, G7+, and GPEDC Steering Committee member, Afghanistan
- **Mr Loïc Chemo**, Ingénieur Statisticien, Diplômé en Gestion de la Politique Economique Secrétaire du Comité Multi-Partenaires MINEPAT/SG/DSR, Cameroon
- **Mr Marc Anglade**, Cadre de Coordination de l'Aide Externe au Développement, Le Ministère de la Planification et de la Coopération Externe, Haiti
- **Mr. Mustakim Waid**, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Prime Minister, Federal Republic of Somalia (via video connection) Somalia
- **Mr Patrick Rabe**, Directorate-General Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid, Unit B2 Fragility and Resilience, European Commission
- **Mr Steen Andersen**, Fragile, Conflict and Violence Group (via video connection) World Bank Group; Stephanie Longden, Australian Delegation to the OECD Department of Foreign Affairs & Trade
- **Ms Yallena Cica**, Senior Policy Analyst, Planning and Deployments Division, Peace & Stabilization Operations Program (PSOPs), Canada

IDPS Secretariat

- Dr Kathryn Nwajiaku, Head IDPS Secretariat, OECD

INCAF Secretariat

- Mr Hugh Macleman, Policy Advisor & Head of INCAF Secretariat

Global Partnership Steering Committee Co-Chairs

- Mr Udo Weber, Deputy Head of Division, Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Germany
- Ms Lisa Royae, Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, Germany
- Ms Charlotte Francke, GIZ, Germany
- Mr Max Midekke, GIZ, Germany
- Mr Fabian Metz, GIZ, Germany

Global Partnership Joint Support Team

- Ms Hanna-Mari Kipelainen, Senior Policy Analyst and GPEDC JST Team Lead, OECD
- Ms Yuko Suzuki, Global Policy Advisor and GPEDC JST Team Lead, UNDP

- Mr Alejandro Guerrero, GPEDC Monitoring Co-ordinator, OEDC
- Ms Rebekah Chew, Policy Analyst, OECD
- Ms Piper Hart, Programme Analyst, UNDP

Institute for State Effectiveness

- Ms Marika Theros, Senior Fellow, Institute for State Effectiveness
- Ms Nelly Mecklenburg, Program Officer, Institute for State Effectiveness
- Ms Aleks Sladojevic, Program Officer, Institute for State Effectiveness

Apologies: Mr Bienvenu Hervé Kovoungbo, Directeur de la Coopération Multilatérale Co président du Groupe de Travail International de mise en œuvre du New Deal Ministère de l' Economie, du Plan et de la Coopération, Central African Republic

Open working group objective: As stated in the open working group (OWG) terms of reference, the objective of the open working group is, within the framework of established effectiveness principles and against the backdrop of the existing Global Partnership monitoring framework, to: 1) map key challenges for effective development co-operation in fragile and conflict-affected situations; 2) identify and recommend actions to address those challenges; and, 3) where current monitoring efforts do not suffice and data are needed to inform scaled efforts, guide the development of a monitoring approach to track progress on the identified actions for more effective development co-operation in fragile and conflict affected situations.

Meeting objective: To identify and discuss through informal exchange the key issues and challenges for effective development co-operation in fragile and conflict-affected situations.

Key discussion points: The below points were raised by the working group during the meeting.

1. Scope

- This work - to develop a tailored monitoring approach to track progress towards existing effectiveness commitments in fragile and conflict affected situations - takes place in the context of adapting the Global Partnership monitoring framework to the challenges of the 2030 Agenda. The first phase of adapting Global Partnership monitoring involved a review and strengthening of existing indicators. The second phase will look at adapting the framework with an initial focus on conflict and fragile affected situations.
- Feedback and lessons from the current and previous monitoring round is that fragile and conflict affected situations require a more tailored approach to monitoring effectiveness in these contexts.
- The support of the OWG will complement the Global Partnership Steering Committee, which is an oversight body of the Global Partnership.
- Global Partnership monitoring is voluntary, country-led and multi-stakeholder in nature. This work will adhere to the same principles.

2. Importance of delivering effectively in fragile and conflict affected situations

- It was noted that fragility is a significant challenge in the current development landscape. The number of fragile and conflict affected situations is increasing and extreme poverty will be disproportionately located in these contexts. These contexts are heavily dependent on development co-operation.
- In order to achieve the SDGs by 2030, effective use of resources in fragile and conflict affected situations is paramount.

3. Challenges to delivering effectively in fragile and conflict affected situations raised

- Overall, it was noted that challenges to ensuring effective development co-operation in fragile situations are not unlike those in non-fragile contexts, but usually amplified and more critical. For example, FDI is typically not present and ODA is often the biggest funding source in fragile contexts. As a result, a nuanced approach to monitoring is needed. Implementation of principles and best practice need to be tracked step by step. It was noted that there has been work done to track progress on the New Deal. There is also SDG monitoring. This work to adapt Global Partnership monitoring should draw on these and other approaches. It was advised that existing effectiveness principles need to be a starting point for this work.
- **Lack of trust.** It was noted that a lack of trust between donor governments and country governments in fragile and conflict affected situations exists. This can stem from a lack of development partner follow through on international commitments. It can also stem from worries about how civil society will engage, what priorities other partners will bring, and what is important to monitor and why. It was noted that lack of trust is a challenge in the current Global Partnership monitoring round, and suggested that a separate module could assist for countries where there is weak trust or it is difficult to develop a relationship with the government due to legitimacy issues. It was noted that building trust is not reflected in the current indicators.
- **Inclusive engagement.** Lack of consistent, meaningful engagement with civil society in development partnerships was cited as a challenge. It was noted that civil society plays a crucial role in development but also faces capacity constraints. The New Deal has improved this. There are still a lot of gaps. Using a fragility lens to prioritise and plan development efforts is important. Questions were raised on how to better engage with civil society, how to embed the effectiveness principles that already exist, and how to monitor the process. The shrinking of CSO space – both in fragile and non-fragile contexts - is affecting partnerships. Lack of inclusive engagement and lack of trust is exacerbated when partner countries insufficiently undertake and implement fragility assessments. Partner countries need to carry out these assessments in ways that foster trust amongst both civil society in their countries, and international donor partners by being transparent about outcomes of these assessments and ensuring meaningful, inclusive follow up.
- **Fragmentation.** Fragmentation of development co-operation was raised by partner countries. Several related points were raised:
 - Development partners are highly fragmented. There are too many partners, and there is a lack of alignment between technical and financial partners and national systems.
 - Development partners are not sufficiently engaging in efforts to risk share and use country systems.
 - Information gaps exist.
 - There is often slow responsiveness to changing country context.

- Overlaps and multiplicity of development efforts should be avoided. Small projects in multiple segments, results in a dispersion of efforts, increased transaction costs. There seems to be a 'missing middle' – either very large projects or quite small efforts.
 - Technical and financial partners do not have much impact with the local population due to fragmentation of development co-operation, only with high ranking officials.
 - There is a multiplicity of technical and financial partner's processes, guidelines, reporting procedures, and modalities. Partner countries have to invest human resources into ensuring each partner's separate procedures are respected.
 - There are parallel systems, institutions and ministries. This complicates alignment and harmonisation. This leads to insufficient alignment with public policy objectives, insufficient predictability, and discrepancy/interval between development co-operation and the budget process.
 - There are challenges associated with divergent priorities between governments and partners. On donor side, this includes pressures around risk. There is a lowering risk tolerance domestically and a stronger need to track where money is going (from domestic audience). In addition, there is a need for bilateral credit which is lost in multilateral aid. There is also more pressure to focus on domestic actors.
- **Lack of humanitarian, development, peace coherence.** Several points were noted regarding an insufficient link and dialogue between humanitarian action, longer-term development assistance, as well as peace and political actors.
 - It was suggested that it is important to look at the complete 'nexus' of actors, even military in some cases, to include humanitarian, development, peace and political actors. Some in the OWG are already doing this and trying to bring all partners together at country level.
 - Questions were raised on how development projects can be better structured to take over from humanitarian aid.
 - It was noted that there is a lack of coherence on and commitment to understanding and tracking progress on what drives conflict and fragility.
 - Several tools were mentioned, including Recovery and Peace Building Assessments, and Post-Disaster Needs Assessments.
 - Humanitarian actors are not bound by the principles of development co-operation.
 - Politics needs to be considered in all efforts, including development. Development workers have political sway as they represent the government so there is a political aspect to what they are doing.
- **Ownership.** Country ownership, one of the effectiveness principles was raised by almost every member of the OWG. Remarks included the following:
 - It was noted that ownership doesn't always mean the government but in certain cases refers to the people of the country.
 - Weak sense of ownership can start with the strategic results framework. One of the major problems is ensuring that each sectoral ministry feels ownership over the overall development strategy, which can be a challenge.
 - Ownership at the regional level (ie. subnational level) is also a challenge. Sometimes partners provide financing for NGOs who have not adequately considered local needs. In addition, regional authorities can lack expertise manage, track and monitor development activities.

- Setting up a mutual accountability framework is important for ownership as it is a mechanism for monitoring on how government and partners work together around national development plan.
 - Use of country systems is a tool for strengthening country ownership. Need to find innovative ways to use country systems. It was noted that legitimacy concerns can necessitate funding outside of government structures.
 - Partner countries can have weak/ ineffective institutions and it is not possible to use country systems. This needs to be kept in mind.
 - The need to provide CSOs with core funding was raised.
 - There is a lack of capacity and will of governments to prioritise and implement effectiveness principles. There are ongoing coordination challenges – all donors need to work better together.
 - Brain drain leads to limited absorptive capacity. Brain drain means there is not sufficient expertise and capacity within the country. When talented people leave capacity building and training need to start again with new people and it is very costly.
 - Weak absorption capacity can lead to mistrust of government systems.
 - Decades of violence in a country leads to dysfunctional institutions.
- **Data gaps.** Several points on data availability, legitimacy and focus were made:
 - Baseline data is often not sufficiently available in fragile contexts.
 - National statistical systems suffer from a lack of financial and human resources and technical skills. Capacity building support for central statistical institutions, and information systems, in addition to PFM, could be increased.
 - Conflict can often restrict government from accessing all parts of their territory.
 - Differentiated monitoring (third party, CSOs) could be used more often where normal monitoring approaches cannot be applied. However, there is often limited space for civil society in collecting data (structural issue).
 - Development partners could collectively do more to ensure data transparency and sharing datasets.
 - Legitimacy of data and who signs off on data given political legitimacy tensions can be an issue. This can also be an issue between national and sub-national authorities.
 - High-frequency surveys are being rolled out in risk prone areas and this could be an instrument to focus on. Innovative monitoring packages should also be considered. Tools like geospatial mapping should be a target for prioritisation.
 - Results focus can skew development efforts and activities toward measurable outcomes. This can result in development activities that are too focussed on physical and financial results rather than the well-being of the population and national socio-economic development.
 - It was also noted that there is a lack of evaluations that are carried out jointly with government that are then used to inform future development efforts.

4. Key challenges to monitoring

- In addition to the challenges to delivering effectively in fragile and conflict affected situations, it was also noted that there are several constraints when it comes to carrying out monitoring in these contexts. These consist of a general lack of capacity, time and resources.

5. Reflections on currently Global Partnership monitoring

- The discussion highlighted that all Global Partnership indicators are affected by the challenges raised. There are certain working assumptions around the current monitoring framework, especially around capacity and structures for engagement. This suggests that it may be necessary to adjust current indicators, but also to develop new indicators. Global Partnership monitoring currently does not capture capacity building, or political dialogue, leadership or legitimacy. The aim is to develop ‘actionable’ evidence that can be picked up by decision makers, which may involve breaking actions down into smaller steps.

Next steps:

- 16 October will be the second meeting of the OWG, to be held virtually.
- The second meeting will be informed by the first draft of a paper with initial thinking on adapting the monitoring framework.

Participants of the open working group:

Fragility and crisis units within multilateral organisations	World Bank Group: Mr Steen Andersen, Fragile, Conflict and Violence Group
	United Nations: (tbc)
OECD-DAC Member States that represent International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF) ¹	Australia: Ms Emily Rainey, Fragility and Conflict Section, Governance, Fragility and Water Branch, Development Policy Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade; Stephanie Longden, Australian Delegation to the OECD Department of Foreign Affairs & Trade
	European Commission: Mr Patrick Rabe, Directorate-General Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid, Unit B2 Fragility and Resilience
	Canada: Ms Yallena Cica, Senior Policy Analyst, Planning and Deployments Division, Peace & Stabilization Operations Program (PSOPs)
g7+ group of fragile and conflict-affected states ²	Afghanistan: Mr Habib Mayar, Deputy Secretary General, g7+, and GPEDC Steering Committee member
	Central African Republic: Mr Bienvenu Hervé Kovoungbo, Directeur de la Coopération Multilatérale Co président du Groupe de Travail International de mise en œuvre du New Deal Ministère de l' Economie, du Plan et de la Coopération
	Haiti: Mr Marc Anglade, Cadre de Coordination de l’Aide Externe au Développement, Le Ministère de la Planification et de la Coopération Externe
	Somalia: Mustakim Waid, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Prime Minister, Federal Republic of Somalia

¹ One of three member constituencies of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS)

² Ibid.

<p>Partner countries engaged with Global Partnership monitoring</p>	<p>Cameroon: Mr Loïc Chemo, Ingénieur Statisticien Diplômé en Gestion de la Politique Economique Secrétaire du Comité Multi-Partenaires MINEPAT/SG/DSR</p>
<p>Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS)³</p>	<p>Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS): Dr. Erin McCandless, Associate Professor, School of Governance, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa, and Research Director, Forging Resilient Social Contracts, and Civil Society Co-chair of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Implementation Working Group</p>

³ Ibid.