



# World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict and Violence (FCV)

## Consultation Meeting with Civil Society, New York

### Feedback Summary

---

**Date:** 25 April 2019

**Location:** International Peace Institute, New York

**Audience:** Civil society representatives

**Overview and Key Issues Discussed:** Ms. Jimena Leiva Roesh, Senior Fellow at IPI, welcomed the participants. Alexandre Marc, Chief Specialist on FCV from the WB, presented the FCV strategy concept. Participants were 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.

Specific Feedback from Stakeholders
<p><b>1. General Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeline – the WBG is operating primarily in the medium term, but situations on the ground change quickly. Is the thinking to make the WBG more agile in this regard?</li> <li>• Monitoring &amp; Evaluation is a major challenge for all organizations in the FCV space – we should work together to provide directions for improvement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Service delivery</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jobs in the private sector are important, but services like health care and education should come from the public sector as the private sector does not have the possibility to deliver the needed services for the poorest – it goes against the basic dynamics of the market.</li> <li>• Important to include the voices of the poorest and most excluded in designing service delivery programs.</li> <li>• Service delivery and state legitimacy seem to be correlated in the concept note, but this is not the case in reality. Governance drivers of legitimacy are essential. Be careful on the language.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Civic engagement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Civic engagement is important - particularly in decision-making over service delivery.</li> <li>• Mapping out the theory of change would be useful. The WBG should be very innovative in its approach to community involvement. There is a lot of knowledge available on what is effective and what are the negative impacts of some community engagement programs.</li> <li>• Important to navigate between the officially registered civil society organization that are often politically aligned/elite captured in many contexts and the more grassroots based organisations or the more unorganized engagement – important to reach these communities.</li> <li>• Appreciate the people-centered tone of the concept note. To include community-based organisations and women’s grassroots organisations would be important.</li> <li>• Very important to focus on <u>inclusive</u> organisations in WBG dialogue and partnerships – civil society engagement is essential but be aware of how inclusive (or not) various local organizations are.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Forced displacement</b></p>

<b>Specific Feedback from Stakeholders</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the progress in recent years. Innovation shown under the Refugee Sub-Window is appreciated – has a potential for being game changing. But real changes will happen in the way the WBG plans programming, and who is represented around the table.</li> <li>• Better indicators are needed that reflect the human development indicators for the displaced communities compared to the host communities.</li> <li>• What is the approach to Internally Displaced People?</li> </ul>
<b>5. Poverty</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extreme poverty feels like violence and is important. However, poverty is relative for people. While WBG statistics focus on extreme poverty, poverty is relative for people on the ground.</li> <li>• Austerity measures should not take away from social protection.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Gender</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please outline a stronger connection with the WB gender strategy.</li> <li>• How does the FCV strategy address the risks of gender-based violence, learning from WB experiences in DRC?</li> </ul>
<b>7. HDP Nexus</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus along the HDP nexus should be on addressing the underlying drivers of fragility.</li> <li>• The partnerships with humanitarian organizations call for critical questions around the principles – does the WBG recognize the ‘Do no Harm’ principles?</li> <li>• Social protection must stay financed, also in protracted crisis.</li> <li>• All actors need to get better at joint, or at least coordinated and shared, risk analysis.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Partnerships and People</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It’s hard to access the WBG at country-level and in the field. Easier to have access to the WBG in DC than at country-level. The presence of FCV advisers has helped (example of Chad) – please replicate this elsewhere.</li> <li>• Very important to engage with the community on the ground.</li> <li>• The partnership approach requires a new way of working of the WB. More partnership, less contracting.</li> <li>• Access to Bank staff on the ground is essential for partnerships.</li> </ul>
<b>9. Early Warning systems and conflict analysis</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciate the focus on prevention. Early warning systems are helping also on the ground, including community level conflict as well.</li> <li>• Please share more political economy analysis – very important also at local level for getting a clearer picture of conflict dynamics.</li> <li>• Early warning detection is essential – access to data is an issue. Piloting a data system with data on dehumanizing language, for example, and the frequency used by political elite. This is an early warning of conflict dynamics rising.</li> </ul>
<b>10. Children and youth</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children are not mentioned in the concept note – any approach to children?</li> <li>• Children and youth should have a more prominent place in the strategy. The early childhood and peacebuilding initiative from Northern Ireland is an interesting example of a peacebuilding initiative on early childhood, which developed social cohesion.</li> </ul>

**List of Participants:**

Lawrence	Aber	Professor of Psychology & Public Policy, New York University
Wafa	Al-Daily	Associate Director for Global Initiatives, Virginia Tech University
Christopher	Ankersen	Clinical Associate Professor, NYU Center for Global Affairs

Paige	Arthur	Deputy Director, Center on Int. Cooperation
Nazanin	Ash	Vice President, Global Policy and Advocacy, Int. Rescue Committee
Danielle	Berfond	Manager, The Bridgespan Group
Karen	Bernstein	Researcher, Beyond Conflict Innovation Lab
Rafia	Bhulai	Senior Programs Officer, Global Center on Cooperative Security
Cristina	Diez Saguillo	UN Representative, Int. Movement ATD Fourth World
Megan	Doherty	Senior Director, Policy and Advocacy, Mercy Corps
Yvan	Ilunga	Research Fellow, Rutgers University
Aprille	Knox	Senior Policy Associate, Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab
Margo	LaZaro	President & Chair, NGO Committee on Sustainable Development-NY
Rory	Macmillan	Partner, Macmillan Keck Attorneys & Solicitors
Lauren	Post	Senior Policy & Advocacy Officer, Int. Rescue Committee
Masooma	Rahmaty	Program Administrator, IPI
Jonas	Rolett	Special Advisor to the Chairman, Open Society Foundations
Jake	Sherman	Director, CPO, IPI
Laurie	Smolenski	Outreach and Development Officer, Institute for Economics and Peace Representative to the UN; Chair, VGIF; NGO Committee on Financing for Development
Anita	Thomas	

From the World Bank:

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

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