

Summary Record of the second meeting of the Sub-Group on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Indicators

Progress update since the last meeting

In the absence of the Working Group Co-Chairs (Francesca Bomboko, DRC and Henk-Jan Brinkman, PBSO), the meeting was chaired by Helder da Costa (Timor-Leste) and Gary Milante (World Bank). The Co-chairs reminded participants that the meeting in Copenhagen had agreed on a work program and ways of working, discussed broad parameters for indicator selection and developed an initial analytical framework for both the fragility spectrum and the PSG indicators. Since Copenhagen, and building on comments from working group members, a Co-Chairs meeting in Paris and consultations with the g7+ and the g7+ Co-Chair in Dili, the Co-Chairs have refined the framework and parameters for indicator selection.

Format of the fragility spectrum

A revised format of the fragility spectrum was presented to the group. The five stages of fragility are now presented in the horizontal axis. Additional columns have been added. Participants welcomed the new format but commented on the need to review the descriptions of the five stages of fragility. Some participants suggested to introduce “stabilization” as a phase, to separate “rebuild and reform” into two separate phases given that structural reform can often only effectively be pursued once there is some stability in place. Others suggested to reduce the number of phases to three or to leave the description of phases to the country. It was agreed to develop a glossary of key terms and participants suggested a number of terms that should be included in this glossary.

Next steps:

- Working Group Co-Chairs (in co-ordination with Co-Chairs of the implementation working group) will work on a glossary of key terms.

Analytical framework for the fragility spectrum and PSG indicators

The meeting spent considerable time reviewing the analytical framework. There was general agreement on the usefulness of the format and the inclusion of sub-dimensions and questions to help structure the assessment. To improve the document, the following overall comments and suggestions were made: i) questions should be simplified and reduced in number, ii) questions should be open-ended, iii) a number of overall questions for each PSG should be identified to guide the fragility assessment, in particular to identify drivers of conflict and fragility, iv) a brief description for each dimension should be added, iv) key concepts used by the analytical framework should be described as part of the glossary of key terms, vi) further guidance on how questions can be used in the assessment process (and by whom) should be developed (e.g. more detailed questions could be used by authors of the fragility assessment). Detailed feedback and concrete suggestions for changes to sub-dimensions and questions were given in break-out groups on each PSG and recorded by the Secretariat. It was highlighted that the revised framework will be used as a starting point for

piloting at the country level and that feedback and consultations from that process will play an important role to finalise the framework.

Next steps:

- Working Group Co-Chairs with support from the Secretariat will revise the analytical framework and questions based on the feedback from the working group
- A revised draft of the analytical framework will be circulated to working group members for comments and used at country-level as part of the roll out/testing of fragility assessments

Parameters and criteria for indicator selection

A break out group discussed the draft parameters for indicator selection. There was general agreement on the proposed parameters (which build on the g7+ policy and parameters). It was stressed that country ownership of indicators will need to be strengthened. Participants made some additional suggestions which will be taken up in a revised version of the parameters.

Next steps:

- Working Group Co-Chairs will revise the draft parameters based on the feedback from the working group

Rolling out the fragility assessment

A concept note on the roll out of the fragility assessment which has been developed based on consultations with the g7+ focal points was presented. The note suggest a roll-out (rather than a limited road-testing) in order to take advantage of opportunities arising from the development of PRSPs which is on-going in a number of g7+ countries.

Several questions and issues were raised by participants. It was suggested to clarify i) the list of key informants, ii) the processes that will be used to gather information beyond discussion with key informants (e.g. document reviews, focus group discussions, expert consultation etc.), iii) the relationship between the questions in the concept note and the questions in the analytical framework, iv) the role CSOs and international partners will play in the assessment process, v) how the fragility assessment links to existing national co-ordination processes and structures and vi) the link to the overall process for New Deal implementation. Several participants highlighted that it was unclear how the fragility assessment process relates to the identification of indicators. The note will need to clarify this important aspect.

Representatives from Sierra Leone, DRC, Somalia and Chad gave an update on current plans with regard to New Deal implementation, in particular related to plans to roll out the fragility assessment. In Sierra Leone, a team of international consultants from ODI has

recently arrived to support the fragility assessment process. The government has identified focal points for each PSG and a one-day consultation meeting for each PSG will be held in late June. The results will be brought together in a multi-stakeholder consultation. In DRC consultations on the analytical framework have been held, and a national consultant for each PSG has been identified. The assessment will be based on document reviews and consultations with key stakeholders. It is expected that the fragility assessment will be included in the PRSP document and completed by late August.

Next steps:

- The working group Co-chairs will revise the concept note for the roll out based on feedback from the meeting

Process for indicator selection and consultation

This item was not discussed in a dedicated session but over the course of the working group meeting participants raised a number of questions regarding the overall process on indicator development. Several working group members were concerned that there was lack of clarity on when and by whom indicators would be developed for the menu of indicators and the global indicators. The link between the country-level process and the working group process will need to be clarified, in particular the timeline and deliverables for September 2012. Several members also commented on the need to bring in technical expertise to ensure the identification of appropriate indicators. Finally, it was noted that the link between the roll out of fragility assessment and New Deal implementation overall would need to be clarified. The Co-chairs proposed to present key issues and challenges to the Steering Group meeting on 8 June for further guidance.

Next steps:

- Based on guidance from the Steering Group meeting, the Working group Co-chairs will present a revised process and timeline, and proposed deliverables for approval by the Steering Group.