

UNDG-World Bank PCNA Review

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The overall objective of the review is to consolidate lessons learned from the experience to date with the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment (PCNA) process and related tools (including Transitional Results Matrices, or TRMs), and determine what steps need to be taken to strengthen these tools and their application.

Background Information

Post-Conflict Needs Assessments (PCNAs) are increasingly used by national and international actors as an entry point for conceptualizing, negotiating and financing a common shared strategy for recovery and development in fragile, post-conflict settings. The PCNA includes both the assessment of needs and the national prioritization and costing of needs in an accompanying transitional results matrix. Over the last decade, donors have attributed increasing importance to providing timely and substantive support to post-conflict recovery and peace building. A large part of this assistance has been mobilized via international reconstruction conferences, at which donors make pledges based on the overall assessment of post-conflict recovery needs.

The UN and World Bank in partnership have developed an agreed approach to supporting such needs assessments, national recovery plans and international donor conferences. In the last two years alone, joint UN/WB PCNA exercises were conducted in Iraq, Liberia, Haiti and Sudan. Following the PCNA processes, donor conferences were held at which pledges of over US \$40 billion were made. PCNA processes are currently ongoing in Somalia and Darfur.

In December 2005, a series of PCNA Roundtables were held for the UN and WB to begin to capture the key best practices and lessons learned from the past three years of PCNAs. The Roundtable proposed a joint program of work to improve the way that PCNAs are carried out and followed through, including the way the prioritized needs identified in the Transitional Results Matrix are implemented. Included in this joint work plan is the need for a review process of the recent experience with PCNAs to better understand their inputs and their outcomes, and improve upon existing tools and practice.

Scope and Methodology

The review has been broken down into two phases:

Phase One (*June through mid-September 2006*) will focus a retrospective stocktaking including a desk review of PCNA documentation to date and collection of supplementary information through phone and e-mail interviews in order to complete five PCNA case studies: Iraq, Liberia, Haiti, Sudan and a "real-time" case study on the ongoing PCNA in Somalia, as well as two comparison case studies for non-"PCNA" assessments in Afghanistan and Timor Leste. An internal website will be established of all available PCNA resource materials for the review team, as well as a list of key informants for each of the PCNAs under review to facilitate subsequent interviews. In order to fill information gaps, a limited number of field interviews will be planned to allow consultations with in-country missions, national partners, bilateral donors, and civil society and NGOs where lessons learned have not already been collected.

The objective of each case study will be to present a "snapshot" of the post-conflict needs assessment done in each country, documenting what happened and, to the extent available, the lessons learned during the assessment. The core operational issues and questions addressed in the case studies are identified in Appendix A of this TOR.

Both phases of the review will also examine the PCNA experience to date from a state-building perspective. In this regard, inputs will be provided from the UNDP/World Bank review of state-building in post-conflict planning processes, which will be carried out in close collaboration with UNDGO. Key issues to be examined will include: prioritization and sequencing of support; addressing national ownership and institutional capacity development; and capacities required within international

organizations and donors to assist the state-building process. The focal point in UNDP-BCPR responsible for the State Building review will participate in the PCNA review core team and focus specifically on the state-building component.

After Phase One is completed, an internal roundtable will be held to present and discuss the initial findings, discuss their implications and agree on the priority strategic questions to be explored in Phase Two. Roundtable participants would include the Phase One and Two review teams plus relevant colleagues from the UN and WB.

Phase Two (*mid-September through mid-December 2006*) will utilize the comprehensive base of information compiled during Phase One to investigate strategic themes that have emerged as priorities through field visits, key informant interviews and consultations with a wide range of stakeholders, including the Core Learning Group (see below), a donors reference group and the directorate level Steering Committee.

After Phase Two field visits and key informant interviews are completed, a Validation Workshop will be held to present the findings on key strategic themes investigated (with participants from the UN, WB, National partners, Donors and NGOs). Phase Two will then conclude with production of the Final Report with recommendations for future PCNAs on operational, strategic, state-building, and peacebuilding aspects, and recommendations for the revision of the Practical Guidebook on PCNAs and the Operational Note on TRMs, allocating responsibilities and specific tasks with an agreed timetable.

Management and Activities

Overall management, coordination and logistics of the review will be carried out by a Core Review Team comprised of members of the the Crisis and Post-Conflict cluster in the UN Development Group Office (UNDGO) and the Fragile States/LICUS group in the World Bank. The review will collaborate closely with the UNDP Bureau of Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction (BCPR) and the World Bank Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit (CPRU). The PCNA Core Review team in Phase One will be composed of two colleagues each from DGO and the WB, joined by one colleague from BCPR on the state-building component. They will coordinate with each other to mobilize and manage internal and consultant resources and be responsible for: 1) the conduct of the review; 2) coordinating a joint core learning group; 3) ensuring that all stakeholders are kept informed; and 4) disseminating the final report.

In order to investigate these agreed themes in Phase Two, the core review team will be joined three specialist consultants to conduct the field visits and key informant interviews needed to build upon the information presented from Phase One.

The Core Review Team will undertake the review in close collaboration with key stakeholders, including the UNDG/ECHA Working Group on Transition, through a Core Learning Group (CLG). This group will be co-chaired by DGO and the WB and will facilitate the team's access to agency-specific information and experience, meeting periodically to review the progress of the PCNA Review and outputs. During the course of Phase Two, a Donors Reference Group will also be established. The review will be carried out under the guidance of a small steering committee (at the Director level), which will be responsible for assessing and overseeing the quality of the review and its processes.

Phase One Activities:

- a. In reviewing the PCNA Library and working electronically with coordination focal points in the field, summarize the key characteristics of each PCNA (see Appendix A) to the extent possible.
- b. Draft individual case studies on the last four completed PCNAs, one real-time PCNA and two comparison cases, providing a concise overview of the information uncovered during the desk review.
- c. Identify similarities and differences between the different PCNAs, identifying particularly innovative practices.

- d. Conduct interviews to “fill in” the identified information gaps on operational questions through key informant interviews (telephone and e-mail) with UN and World Bank team members involved in the different PCNAs.
- e. Conduct a limited set of field interviews to allow consultations with in-country missions, national partners, bilateral donors, and civil society and NGOs. (Khartoum , Juba and Nairobi.)
- f. Organize roundtable to present the initial findings, discuss and validate them, and agree on the priority strategic themes to be explored in Phase Two (see Appendix B).

Phase Two Activities:

- a. Conduct consultations with Bank and UN staff and with in-country missions, national partners, bilateral donors, and other relevant actors (notably NGOs), to further inform the initial findings and to pursue in-depth the priority strategic themes agreed at the roundtable.
- b. Generate findings and recommendations for future PCNAs on strategic, operational, state-building, peacebuilding and security aspects, and as well as guidance on / drafts of suggested revisions to PCNA tools, guidance, and resources available.
- c. Provide observations on how the UN and WB might strengthen their contributions to PCNAs and deal with gaps and overlaps .
- d. Provide additional recommendations to national partners and donors for deepening their involvement in the PCNA process.

Products and Reporting

The review team is expected to produce the following:

1. Detailed TOR and timeline, shared with the UN Resident Coordinators and WB Country Directors of the PCNA countries, along with the broader community of practitioners and the core learning group .
2. Country-specific case studies, including lessons learned .
3. Internal Roundtable and report at the end of Phase One, including revised TORs for Phase Two.
4. A draft report of the PCNA Review for the Validation Workshop near the end of Phase Two.
5. The final report of the Review, with sections presenting findings and recommendations on strategic, operational, peace-building, state-building and security aspects, presented to both internal and external actors for their consideration in strengthening the PCNAs and TRMs and their implementation .
6. An action plan for the revision of the PCNA guidance and tools based on the outcome and outputs of the review.

Appendix A

List of questions to be considered during the Phase One desk review of past PCNAs:

- a) Origins of the PCNA (who requested it? how did it begin? What was political context/timing relative to peace agreements, etc.? Who was part of the design process? Who funded the initial start up (seed money)?
- b) What was the substantive purpose/other stated objectives of PCNA (e.g., vision, priorities, timing/duration, link to country development plans, etc)?
- c) How was the PCNA positioned within the national context? In the context of the transition timeline, what came before and after? What were or should have been the links with other processes: CAP, IMPP/PKO deployment, I-PRSP, etc.? What was the PCNAs relation to the regional context (including degree of involvement of regional bodies, etc.)?
- d) Who were the PCNA participants? What were the different roles and responsibilities? How were they organized? What measures were taken to ensure participation and consultation of the stakeholders? What was the degree to which PCNA was inclusive and participatory (who was on cluster teams? Consultations workshops? Validations workshops?); On what basis were decisions made about who should be consulted, periodicity of stakeholder consultations, inclusion of non-state actors and previous conflict parties?
- e) What were the administering and governance structure, roles and responsibilities (e.g., secretariat, steering committee, working groups, cluster teams, etc.)?
- f) How was the PCNA funded (UN and WB contributions, administrative body, donors, funding national participation, etc.)?
- g) Data on PCNA financials: what were the overall costs to conduct the PCNA? What were the overall pledges vs. overall funds received post -PCNA?
- h) What was the institutional support to PCNA (i.e. coordination structure at HQ and in the field)?
- i) How was the Donors Conference planned and supported? What were the outcomes and outputs? What was the role of key donors in driving the process?
- j) After the PCNA, what was the financing and implementation mechanism? Who supplied support/guidance to post-PCNA follow-up? To what extent was the implementation monitored and evaluated?
- k) What was the degree to which post-PCNA planning, activities and funding was driven by the agreed PCNA vision and articulated priorities in the TRM?
- l) What were the unique circumstances in each PCNA (i.e., delayed peace process, institutional capacity, regional instability, etc) that may have impacted on the outcomes?
- m) Was a thorough conflict analysis conducted to feed into the identification of priority clusters and to drive the prioritization process for the TRM; if not, what other criteria or processes were used to make the PCNAs "conflict-sensitive"?
- n) What was the degree to which cross-cutting issues were reflected in the PCNA outputs (both the synthesis report and the TRM priorities)? How were cross-cluster linkages reflected?
- o) Were the PCNA objectives, clusters and TRM priorities driven by strategic thinking about how to achieve sustained peace (both in the context of the peace agreement and through a focus on critical path actions that stabilize a fragile peace)? What mechanisms were used to prioritize and peacebuilding aspects of transition and reconstruction in the PCNA and subsequent recovery plans?
- p) Did the PCNA process, and its resultant assessment and TRM, include specific consideration of the full range of security sector issues critical to the transition period? What mechanisms were used to bring necessary expertise and consideration of these topics into the PCNA?
- q) Were the PCNA objectives, clusters and TRM priorities driven by strategic thinking about state-building, including identification and prioritization of critical path actions to (re-) establish core functions of the state? What mechanisms were used to bring necessary expertise and consideration of these topics into the PCNA? Additional questions to be considered during Phase One of the PCNA review specifically regarding State-building aspects will include (based on the

questions developed for the UNDP/World Bank review of state-building in post-conflict planning processes):

1. The concept of state building: Definition of core state functions and institutions:
 - a. How has the concept of state building been defined and applied during the PCNA processes, including the definition of core functions a state must be able to perform in a post-conflict society? Did the assessment include a comprehensive definition of governance structures, including a focus on the separation of powers between the legislative bodies, the executive branches and the judiciary and were all three pillars adequately addressed in the PCNA? Was there much debate about responsibility of core state functions—e.g., whether other actors like the private sector or civil society could replace the traditional state? If so, what was the nature of these discussions and did they have an impact on the conceptualization of the PCNA?
 - b. What institutions or institutional frameworks (coordination mechanisms, budget procedures etc.) have been identified as essential to re-establish the national capacity to perform the core state functions, including the ability to prepare and take decisions?
 - c. To what extent have sub-national aspects been included in the PCNAs?
 - d. What tools been developed to guide the selection of state functions to include in the PCNA framework?
2. Prioritization and sequencing:
 - a. Was the concept of core state functions and institutions so clearly defined that it could guide the discussions on prioritization and sequencing of activities? Was each category divided into sub-elements, which could be prioritized and sequenced? If not, was there at least some consensus on what were immediate as opposed to medium term state functions that needed to be restored?
 - b. Did the PCNA process include identification of immediate state-building needs, for example within the first half year? Did the prior conflict analysis address these immediate state-building needs?
 - c. Have strategies for national capacity building been developed for each category included in the PCNA?
3. Organization and management of the planning process:
 - a. How was the capacity of national institutions and structures assessed? Were any tools or guidelines available for the assessment of national capacity?
 - b. Did the assessment of the national capacity affect the organization of the planning process?
 - c. How were key national stakeholders identified? Were key national stakeholders outside the government/transitional authorities identified and included in the process? To what extent were gender, age and regional aspects taken into consideration when identifying key national stakeholders?
 - d. To what extent has national ownership been optimized throughout the process and have plans for gradual transfer of responsibilities been developed in country situations, where initial capacity has been limited?
 - e. Did narrow time frames for the PCNA processes (for example caused by donor conferences or political considerations) conflict with the objective of securing national ownership?
 - f. Was there any attempt to ensure that a national capacity building component was built into the PCNA process?
 - g. To what extent have national authorities taken on the oversight responsibility for peace-building and recovery activities? At what juncture did they take over responsibility? Was there variation across types of peace-building and recovery activities? If so, what were the factors that allowed for more rapid take over by national authorities?
 - h. To what extent have the funding mechanisms and the implementation strategies specified in the PCNAs supported the state-building objective?
4. International assistance:
 - a. Have there been examples where the strategic approach or activities described in the PCNA had a negative effect on the state-building agenda? Or whether the organizational setup of the PCNA process has had a negative effect?
 - b. What tools or guidelines, if any, would have facilitated the analyses on state-building issues during the PCNA process?

Appendix B

Key Strategic Themes and Issues to be considered in Phase Two

The UNDG and WB recognize that to achieve success in re-building post-conflict societies, a broad range of measures are needed to advance security, political and economic development, and moreover to protect and advance peacebuilding. Such measures must supplement the immediate aftermath of peace negotiations and require not only the support and will of all national parties involved, including civil society, but considerable and strategic human and financial resources of the international community to carry these efforts forward.

Phase Two will focus on: practical ways to improve the PCNA and related tools and increase understanding around the PCNA, enhance national and international stakeholders' capacities to undertake and implement a PCNA, and intensify the UN's and World Bank's coordination efforts so that national actors in transition countries are better supported.

In doing so, Phase Two will address the following five themes, which emerged from Phase One:

Strategic/Programmatic:

The PCNA as an assessment and planning process:

- . What are the criteria for initiating a PCNA? What are the objectives? What should not be the objectives of the PCNA?
- . Based on the five case studies, are there distinct typologies for international engagement, and what are the parameters that distinguish them? (For example, what was the humanitarian situation? Was the peace agreement signed before the PCNA, did the parties agree to a PCNA in the peace agreement, what kind of capacity and what level of national ownership existed before initiating the PCNA?)
- . How can expectations about the objectives, outcomes and implementation of the PCNA process be most effectively managed, ensuring explicit sharing of expectations across stakeholders **a priori**, and building in mechanisms to mediate conflicting or competing objectives in a dynamic way as the PCNA process, and the post-donors' conference period, progress? How can the "UN/WB-centric" nature of the PCNA be balanced with greater donor involvement in the discussions with national actors on policy and strategy?
- . How can international partners ensure that national participation in the PCNA is balanced and inclusive? How can the participation of non-state actors be ensured throughout the various stages of the process? How can the UN and WB ensure that local and community-level actors are included in the PCNA? What are the spectrum of issues and choices to be considered in defining how a PCNA will be "nationally owned"? What kind of guidance can be developed for a stakeholders' analysis during the preparatory phase?
- . What measures can be taken to achieve more effective prioritization and sequencing? Who should lead the prioritization exercise and decide who does what? Would it be desirable to minimize the number of clusters in order to directly support prioritization and sequencing, and to ensure the political credibility of national and international actors through success, and if so, what guidance is required to emphasize this with PCNA teams? How can the UN and WB ensure that absorptive and implementation capacity of relevant national actors has been assessed and that priorities reflect both the practicalities of the situation and the funding probabilities, and PCNA plans calibrated appropriately?
- . To what extent, and through what mechanisms, is capacity-building of institutions included in the PCNA process and for post-PCNA implementation and monitoring? How can the UN and WB institutionalize this and incorporate clear deliverables for national capacity-building linked to the prioritized actions presented in the TRM? How can priorities be coordinated with capacity building so that activities that deliver maximum impact with the least input of resources become central to the strategy?
- . What kind of capacity is needed to improve the cluster process during the assessment (in terms of staff, guidance, finances and time needed to complete the cluster work)? How can the PCNA team leaders or cluster leaders improve cross-cluster linkages and linkages with cross-cutting issues?
- . How can the PCNA team meaningfully integrate cross-cutting themes? What "best practices" were identified among the Phase One case-studies? Have cross-cutting themes been determined

based on country context? How have international mandates and national actors' priorities been balanced? How can focal points for cross-cutting themes prioritize their inputs to maximize effectiveness?

- . How can the UN ensure that PCNA processes are more closely linked to the CAP strategy and the IMPP? How can the UN seek to ensure that the CAP is also prioritized and reflects the practicalities of the situation? What actions might help link the IMPP more closely to PCNA processes and national priorities?
- . How can the UN and WB ensure that information is managed effectively both locally and globally, with effective use of information technology?
- . Would a more explicit focus in the guidance on the phases of the PCNA process and post-PCNA implementation (e.g. a modular approach with flexible timelines) allow better alignment with the political context? How can we ensure that there is appropriate transition and transfer of knowledge between the different phases? What kind of guidance is needed for a "modular" approach?

The PCNA as a platform for action in recovery and reconstruction :

- . How can national and international stakeholders ensure that the PCNA products (report and matrices) serve as the agreed basis for coordination and program activities throughout the transition? How can PCNA priorities be more adequately linked to national planning processes with a view towards the MDGs?
- . What changes need to take place to make the PCNA more effective as a results-focused actionable framework for recovery, and strengthen its subsequent implementation?
- . How can the implementation of the TRM best be monitored? What kind of mechanism is needed? How can we ensure bilateral donor involvement (beyond MDTF donors) as well as national leadership? According to the case studies, were the identified needs met? What are examples of best practice?
- . How might the PCNA (and PCNA products) open possibilities for increased partnerships and joint initiatives (UN-Bank, Bank-NGOs, Government-NGOs, trilateral initiatives with international partners and bilateral donors, involvement of private sector, etc.)? What are some examples among the five case-studies?
- . How can the UN and WB ensure that mechanisms for financing the TRM, including MDTFs where appropriate, are addressed during the PCNA? How might bilateral donors most effectively be included, at what points and in what PCNA fora? How do we ensure that funding across mechanisms is disbursed according to the needs and priorities of the TRM? How can we ensure that there is sufficient funding for early recovery activities vis-à-vis humanitarian and development needs?
- . What changes in donor engagement would deepen the linkages between the PCNA process and products and the subsequent recovery and reconstruction program (role in PCNA process, mechanism and depth of engagement, breadth of actors across diplomatic defense and development, etc.)?
- . What would be a more appropriate name for this process that balances the aspects of technical assessment, strategy development and recovery planning?

Institutional/Operational:

- . How can coordination in HQ and at country-level be improved between the UN and WB during the PCNA and throughout the implementation of the TRM? What are the comparative advantages of the UN and of the WB pre-, during and post- the PCNA process? Has the role of international actors during the PCNA and afterwards been clarified? How can the UN and WB better clarify and take up responsibilities in implementing the needs of the TRM, based on national capacity and identified gaps? What can be done to ensure this for future PCNAs? What kind of coordination mechanism is needed through the various stages of the PCNA process on the ground? What are examples of best practice among the Phase One case studies? How can the UN and WB ensure this mechanism is set up and functioning quickly, with adequate involvement from key multilateral, bilateral, and national actors?
- . How can the UN and WB ensure early financing to jump-start PCNA processes? Are there examples of best practices from the Phase One case-studies?

- . How can donors ensure that funding is made available in a way that permits accelerated commitment and disbursement of the funds?
- . How can the UNDG and WB better coordinate allocation of human and financial resources, ensuring necessary expertise at the critical points in the PCNA and post -PCNA process?
- . What additional training and human/financial resources are needed for the UN and WB to successfully participate in the PCNA? Is there sufficient understanding of the PCNA among the various agencies' HQs and in the field?

Peacebuilding

- . What guidance or tool can be provided to enable a conflict analysis that highlights the manifestations of the conflict in the preparatory phase or prior to the PCNA and facilitates a dialogue that would unveil the structural and root causes at an early stage and identify priority activities to address these issues?
- . How can peacebuilding objectives be more effectively addressed in future PCNAs so that the subsequent recovery plans prioritize peacebuilding as an overriding objective?
- . How can linkages be more clearly built between the PCNAs and other 'post -conflict' planning processes united by a common peace -building goal (security, political, economic and humanitarian)
- . How can linkages be built with the Peace -building Support Office?
- . To what extent should the PCNA process draw upon expertise from or content in related political processes, including peacekeeping operations mission planning and/or electoral planning?
- . What mechanisms and processes would produce a TRM whose prioritized actions had been filtered through criteria of "what are the key actions critical to sustaining the peace, and whose neglect or failure will destabilize the fragile transition"?
- . How can the PCNA better identify structures which can strengthen the peace process and solidify peace and avoid relapse into conflict, and requisite support for these structures during the transition period?
- . How can plans for the post-PCNA implementation / monitoring mechanism incorporate peacebuilding initiatives or by-products of the PCNA process, including carrying forward local partnerships and consultative mechanisms?

Security/Development Nexus

To what degree can the PCNA process reflect an understanding of the appropriate range of issues related to the *maintenance of security as well as issues in security sector transformation* , and how can those issues be more effectively identified, prioritized, and linked to the economic and social service delivery aspects that have historically dominated PCNAs:

- . Have PCNA cluster reports and/or the synthesis report been able to discuss security issues (including threats and weaknesses) in detail and thus affect the formulation and implementation of the TRM? If not, should they? If so, how can this best be achieved?
- . How can the PCNA process draw upon expertise from and content in related security processes, including peacekeeping operations mission planning, the work of other international organizations or bilateral security sector assistance?
- . To what extent have PCNA matrices addressed the range of issues covering both maintenance of security and the transformation of the security sector institutions – DDR, mine action, control of small arms and light weapons, security sector reform including military, police and corrections, illicit trafficking or organized crime – and what explicit linkages were drawn with economic development, social sector, and/or political issues? Should this coverage be deepened? If so, how? What could be the constraints in doing so? How can the PCNA engage with and sensitize national defense actors?

State-building:

To what extent should the PCNA process and related tools support *the restoration or creation of core state capacity in critical functions* , and how this can be more effectively addressed in future PCNAs:

- . Can an enhanced focus on core state capacities be utilized as one of the unifying objectives for PCNAs that, together with other objectives, strengthen the prioritization and sequencing of activities in the transition period?

- Would a more overt integration of this “state -building” objective strengthen the links to other post-conflict planning processes, including the IMPP and the national development frameworks (i -PRSP, PRSP, etc.) in a clear and practicable manner?
- If so, how can World Bank and UN capacities be improved to better facilitate this aspect of the PCNA processes?
- What are the most effective mechanisms for engaging early on with national authorities on “big-picture” questions about the desired state capacity in core functions, including in transitional settings where leaders may change quickly?