



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

## Consultation Meeting with OCHA, New York

### Feedback Summary

---

**Date:** 25 April 2019

**Location:** UN Secretariat, New York

**Audience:** OCHA

**Overview and Key Issues Discussed:** World Bank Group representative 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.

Specific Feedback from Stakeholders
<p><b>1. General Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the engagement of the WB in the space of fragility, conflict and violence. It is a tectonic shift that has taken place over the last years.</li> <li>• Appreciate the shift from a focus on growth to a focus on peace. This creates the conceptual space for resolving some of the difficulties we have faced in converging humanitarian and development objectives.</li> <li>• If peace becomes the goal, the WBG has to have more difficult conversations with the government. Important to align our messages as an international community so we all send similar messages.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Partnerships</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to make sure that partners are not just treated as contracting/implementing partners, but that real partnerships are developed.</li> <li>• Be very careful of not undermining the very delicate coordination mechanisms that have been established among international actors in this space. Please take part in them.</li> <li>• Please work with the Resident Coordinators office and the Humanitarian Coordinators. With the reform they are empowered to be more of a counterpart for the WBG.</li> <li>• The WBG is needed from the stage of the analysis to the programming. The coherence is an essential part of the humanitarian-development challenge.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Humanitarian-development collaboration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to work differently across the humanitarian-development nexus. The humanitarian efforts will never be focused on promoting peace, but they can be more aware of the grievances and help towards addressing them.</li> <li>• New Way of Working – we see the importance of a common motivation/goal. Important to focus on collective outcomes – this is more important than more coordination. Would be great if WBG could align financing behind collective outcomes.</li> <li>• Learning from the Sahel: A lot of conversations are happening, but due to a lack of platforms, there is very little space to have coherent responses.</li> </ul>

## Specific Feedback from Stakeholders

- OCHA fully supports what IDA18 has helped the international community do in Yemen. However, it is important to be mindful that the large amounts of money that the WBG brings can be difficult to handle, considering the limited presence on the ground of most actors. There are not that many actors who can implement such large amounts of money – can be overwhelming. It is important to avoid that financing overwhelms programming.
- In Yemen, a clear comparative advantage of the WBG is bringing substantive engagement with the transitional government. Even when working through humanitarian partners the WBG adds a lot of value. For example, it brings a different engagement with the government and the private sector.
- OCHA used multidimensional risk indicators at subnational level in the Horn of Africa to map vulnerabilities. OCHA also used WBG data and other data. What transpired was not just a conceptual divide between the humanitarian and the development efforts – but also a geographical divide. So WBG strategy should look at a geographical reallocation of resources away from the center – and accept that with that comes higher risk taking.
- No need for crowding into the humanitarian space but focus more on macroeconomic stabilization measures that can have major humanitarian effects – for example stabilizing the national currency and central bank.
- Underlined the mix of chronic needs versus acute needs also in humanitarian response plans, which can blur the line between short-term humanitarian response and medium-term recovery/development.

### 4. *'Do no harm'*

- Appreciate the nexus approach. Would be important that the strategy explicitly recognizes that by working in the humanitarian space, it will need to recognize the principles of 'do no harm'. The volume of the Bank's engagement will risk harming otherwise.
- Important to strive for a better geographical balance in interventions – a rebalancing of center vs periphery.

### 5. *The four focus areas*

- Welcome the engagement in all four areas. Good to see the WBG remaining engaged in active conflict, where collaboration with the humanitarian organizations is central, but also in what the humanitarian agencies are always hoping that others will do: Focusing on escaping the fragility trap.
- There are examples of WB support to a peace process – for example in Cyprus. Is this something the Bank can do more of?
- Even with a non-political mandate, the political impact of the WB is important, for example on economic aspects where technical advice also for peace processes can be important.

### 6. *Financing instruments*

- Focus on providing the right financing at the right time and layer – for example use the macroeconomic financing also in acute crisis as it can have more of an impact than humanitarian funding can ever have.
- Be aware of 'the orphan stages' – moments of vulnerabilities where development aid stops but humanitarian aid does not come in. Less linearity would be impactful.
- Ensure that the instruments the WBG has are fit for purpose. Ex. the Crisis Response Window should be an instrument of first resort, not last resort. Not just in response to climate disaster but also manmade disasters.

### 7. *'People'*

- The deeper impact the WBG wishes to have in the field – away from the center - the less of a Bank it will need to be. You cannot engage if you are not present or cannot travel to the field.

### 8. *Displaced populations*

### Specific Feedback from Stakeholders

- Missing specific mentioning of Internally Displaced People.
- Working on social safety nets – how can the WBG work with the government to address the needs of the displaced populations?
- The Bank’s participation in policy dialogue processes around protracted displacement can have major impact on policy change and regulatory reform for refugees.
- Strong support to more analysis. Hope the Joint Data Center will work with OHCA’s Data Center in the Hague. Please also use the mechanism for clearing humanitarian data.
- The humanitarian community cannot address the needs of the displaced regarding more permanent housing, jobs, education – it is great that the WBG engages in this. But can be hard for the Bank to operate with two hats towards the government. Maybe a regional head can help – somebody beyond the daily relationship with the government.

### 9. *Analytical instruments*

- Can the Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (RPBAs) be more dynamic and flexible? To what extent is the WBG using them for programming? OCHA would prefer a lighter instrument.

### List of Participants:

From OCHA:

- Hansjoerg Strohmeyer, Policy Director, Policy Branch
- Dirk-Jan Omtzigt, Head, Humanitarian Financing Strategy and Analysis Unit
- Andreas Schuetz, Section Chief a.i., Policy Analysis and Innovation Section
- Antoine Gerard, Senior Humanitarian Affairs Adviser, Operations and Advocacy Division
- Juan Chaves-Gonzalez, Programme Advisor, Humanitarian Financing Strategy and Analysis Unit
- Greta Zeender, Adviser on Internal Displacement, Policy Advice and Planning Section
- Quynh Tran, Humanitarian Affairs Officer, Policy Branch
- Christoph Oberlack, Associate Expert, Intergovernmental Policy Section
- Christopher Gerlach, Associate Humanitarian Affairs Officer, Policy Analysis and Innovation Section

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