



**World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict and Violence (FCV)  
Consultation Meeting with the peace and security pillar of the UN,  
New York**

**Feedback Summary**

---

**Date: 23 April 2019**

**Location: UN Secretariat, New York**

**Audience: UN staff from the peace and security pillar**

**Overview and Key Issues Discussed:** World Bank Group representatives presented the FCV strategy concept. Participants were then invited to ask questions and to express their views. For purposes of conciseness, the following summary highlights comments and recommendations that were provided by individual representatives.

<b>Specific Feedback from Stakeholders</b>
<b>1. General Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Appreciate the changed approach from the Bank. The focus on government responsibilities is important.</li><li>• Good considerations about forced displacement, but what about Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)?</li><li>• Regional spillovers are important to address, but regional strategies are hard to handle.</li><li>• How can we together address territorial inequalities?</li><li>• How is addressing drivers of fragility different from the regular development? What type of changes can we as partners expect to see in the programming of the Bank?</li><li>• How will the Bank work effectively with post-conflict middle-income countries (MICs) outside both IDA and lists of fragile countries?</li></ul>
<b>2. Prevention</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Welcome that the pivot to prevention is the first pillar.</li><li>• What is the WBG aiming to prevent? Violence, human rights violations, conflict, crises...?</li><li>• How do we incentivize prevention? For governments and for the Bank.</li><li>• Challenge with prevention: Everybody agrees in principle - but concerns about interference and the complexity of multifaceted crises complicate and fragment interventions.</li><li>• What will be the approach to prevention in MICs?</li><li>• Prevention of violent extremism is an area where the Bank and the UN can work together under the counterterrorism strategy. Focus on violence risks.</li><li>• Will the WBG support civil society more? Democracy support should be part of prevention efforts. There should be more support to Community Driven Development and participation, enhancing national ownership.</li><li>• The WBG should add its weight more on policy dialogue related to prevention - long term engagement implies policy dialogue. The WBG could bring its capacities to strengthen political economy analysis in countries.</li></ul>

<b>Specific Feedback from Stakeholders</b>
<b>3. State legitimacy</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State legitimacy particularly important under the pillar ‘escaping fragility’. The clear link with community-driven development, inclusiveness is very good. Community inclusion also means inclusive local level decision making structures.</li> <li>• Would be good if the WBG would change its programming approach in areas where the government is the problem.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Climate – security</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate change a key risk. The UN Security Council is showing more and more interest in the risks that climate change causes for countries. None of the UN organizations are created to address this challenge – partnership is needed.</li> <li>• Climate and security – good to see how often it is mentioned in the concept note. Very high priority for the UN.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Partnerships</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example of Yemen: Model of cooperation between the UN and WB very good. How can we replicate that? Very useful to have a secondee from the Bank to the UN team.</li> <li>• Institutional inertia is hard to overcome. Will incentives be established to enhance partnerships? Can we expect changes in funding instruments to allow more collaboration between civil society in the WBG?</li> <li>• The UN does not have a list of fragile states - only Security Council lists. This means that when countries go off the Security Council agenda, the UN has very limited tools to engage. No mission = no money. How can the UN draw on WBG skill sets and funding in these cases?</li> <li>• Could the WBG also strengthen partnership at subnational and community level?</li> <li>• Ensure focus on regional approaches in strategy and consider working more with regional actors, such as the African Union.</li> <li>• Joint analysis could be made a requirement.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Natural resource management</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WBG has a clear added value – more so than the UN - in natural resource management. Helpful if the WBG can help with best practices – ‘do no harm’ for mining and investments in mining.</li> </ul>
<b>7. Transitions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transitions (i.e. closing of peacekeeping operations (PKO)) is a key moment of concentrated engagement in partnership. Very important to get the WBG involved – both in responding to the ‘financial cliff’ when a mission withdraws, but also to help ensure a continuation of the support that the PKOs provided. Especially regarding the footprint outside the capital. Civil Affairs and support to local governance are examples of areas that are not handed over to other UN actors. Dialogue should happen while the PKO is in place.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Peacebuilding</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to the UNSG Interim Sustaining Peace Report and many parallels in this to WBG FCV priorities. The concept note makes little mention of engaging in policy dialogue, which is strongly emphasized in the UNSG report.</li> <li>• Local level peacebuilding essential.</li> <li>• PNG is an example where the UN would like the Bank engaged in peacebuilding efforts with local communities. The Bank has said that the engagement is too small – how to do local peacebuilding in a way that works with Bank instruments?</li> <li>• How could the WB support peace negotiations? A financial package might influence the peace agreement outcomes. How to ensure coordinated action and support in this area?</li> </ul>

<b>Specific Feedback from Stakeholders</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important that the WB lends weight to diplomatic processes and coordinated policy dialogue.</li> </ul>
<b>9. Human rights</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the principles around addressing drivers of fragility are similar to the rights-based approach to development. How can the work OHCHR is doing feed into the risk analyses?</li> <li>• Good example of collaboration: OHCHR is doing a project together with the African Union with WB funding.</li> <li>• Consider using human rights indicators as part of Early Warning Systems.</li> </ul>
<b>10. Cybersecurity</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cybersecurity – potential extra impact in fragile countries. Seems that the WBG is more focused on the positive sides about new technology and connectivity – what about the risks?</li> </ul>

**List of Participants:**

Approx. 50 staff members from the UN peace and security pillar.

**From the World Bank:**

1. Alexandre Marc, Chief Technical Specialist, Fragility, Conflict and Violence
2. Steen Sonne Andersen, Program Coordinator, Fragility, Conflict and Violence
3. Sandra Jensen Landi, Senior Partnership Specialist, Fragility, Conflict and Violence
4. Sarah Cussen, International Affairs Officer, World Bank New York

**Prepared by:** Sandra Jensen Landi, slandi@worldbank.org