RECOVERY & PEACEBUILDING ASSESSMENTS TOOLKIT

This document provides additional guidance for Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments, and supplements the RPBA Practical Note to Assessment and Planning

RECOVERY & PEACEBUILDING ASSESSMENTS TOOLKIT

CONTENTS

A. Guidance for prioritization and costing

Table of Contents

1   Introduction

Prioritisation and costing are amongst the most challenging aspects of an RPBA. Prioritisation is a two-fold process, starting within the thematic groups that are formed around the peacebuilding objectives defined for the RPBA, and followed by a screening across thematic groups to ensure consistency and feasibility.

This guidance note sets out some of the ways was in which thematic groups have been organised in different assessments, and lessons learned from these. The guidance then provides information on how to prioritise and cost interventions, and by doing so how to ensure that the assessment focuses on a realistic set of key priorities to address the causes of crisis, and lays the foundations for sustained recovery and peace.

2   Organisation of Thematic Groups

To function well, each thematic group will need to define who leads the group, and define the core members of its working group. ToR for each thematic group should clearly define these along with specific responsibilities expected from each member. Existing coordination forums (such as the humanitarian cluster system) are often natural partners to a thematic group, with several clusters and coordination forums contributing to the thematic note.

In Cameroon for example, the leadership of each thematic groups was a focal point assigned by the Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Development, with the working groups comprising national and international consultants. In C.A.R, significant contributions were made by the coordination forums established under the UNDPKO mission and UN Humanitarian Country Team (UNHCT).

Information and data will largely be provided from existing sources of government and its key national and international partners. In addition, data may be available based on the surveys and tools identified at the start of the assessment.

Producing the thematic notes is often the most time consuming part of the RPBA, and three important lessons have been learned from previous assessments.

1. Thematic notes usually take from one to three months to complete. Setting and keeping deadlines for submission of data and for drafting of reports is important, particularly as several thematic groups will be working at the same time.
2. The momentum at the launch of the RPBA can quickly be lost, and the thematic note left to a small number of people. Defining tasks amongst the wider stakeholders at the outset can help maintain engagement.
3. Clarifying the process for prioritisation and costing at the outset helps to maintain focus. The thematic note cannot respond to all recovery needs, as the delivery capacity and finance will almost certainly not be available to allow this. The note therefore needs to be limited to addressing those recovery and peacebuilding needs that are most urgent and achievable.

3   Prioritisation

3.1   Overview

As noted in the guidance, the most important, delicate, and substantive phase of an RPBA is reaching consensus around recovery and peacebuilding priorities, and the actions required to implement them.

Prioritisation ensures the RPBA retains a focus on addressing the key drivers of crisis. It ensures that key actions can be addressed within the agreed time-frame for the plan, and that each action takes account of the required delivery capacity and policy environment.

In order to ensure that the thematic priorities are consistent with the recovery and peacebuilding objectives of the RPBA, a number of prioritization criteria will be determined and validated during the scoping mission. Examples from Ukraine, C.A.R and Cameroon are shown in Box I.

> ### *Box 1: Prioritization criteria used in different RPBAs*
>
> Eastern Ukraine (Subnational scope; 2014)
> - Urgency and criticality of needs, and the feasibility of rapid action (key infrastructure, short- term jobs, IDP essential welfare)
> - Minimum security and operating conditions
> - Stabilizing affected populations (IDPs in host communities)
> - Social cohesion initiatives
> - Immediately feasible, rapid, and visible impacts
>
> Central African Republic (National scope; 2016)
> - Will the activity have an immediate and visible impact on peacebuilding and recovery and/or on reducing critical risks and fragility factors?
> - Will the activity directly target the poorest and most vulnerable population groups and households and/or the most disenfranchised parts of the country?
> - Can the activity be realistically implemented in the planned time frame within the security context, given existing implementation (national/international) and absorptive capacities and available resources?
> - Does the activity establish essential systems and/or the prior reforms required to rebuild state legitimacy?
>
> Cameroun (Subnational scope; 2017)
> - Risk management: has a direct impact on recovery, peace, and the risks of future crisis, and reduces the dependence of the population on humanitarian aid.
> - Realism: can be achieved taking into account actual implementation capacities and the necessary security and access conditions.
> - Coherence: combines emergency and long-term actions, and brings together different actors.
> - Catalytic effect: establishes systems and capacities for effective implementation.

3.2   Prioritisation criteria

Based on the experience from these assessments, a generic set of criteria is set out below. In addition, these are summarized in a table in Annex I, which also includes an option to score activities against these criteria. This may be useful in guiding conversations on prioritization.

The use of the following criteria should clearly be adapted to the specific context of the RPBA.

3.2.1 Is the proposed action important in ensuring continued peace and stability?

- Are there milestones in a political process that need supporting such as an election process?
- Are there key security arrangements or processes whose absence would jeopardise peace and stability?

3.2.2 Does the action have an immediate impact/peace dividend?

- Does the activity promote progress on national reconciliation?
- Does the activity build people's confidence?
- Does the activity reduce the critical risks that underpin the country's fragility?

These often include areas of human security and access to justice, of reconciliation and social cohesion, of government capacity to deliver basic services, and the conditions for safe, dignified and voluntary return of refugees and those internally displaced.

3.2.3 Is the activity feasible within the security environment?

- For example, there may be geographic areas where safe return of IDPs is feasible in the short term, and where government personnel and civil society have secure access to deliver services. Other geographic areas may first need actions to enhance security before returns and service delivery can commence.

3.2.4 Is the activity implementable within the agreed timeframe?

- An RPBA is not a long-term development plan. Typical time-frames for an RPBA are three to five years.
- Prioritisation will have to recognize this time-frame, and recognize that areas emerging from crisis are usually experiencing a reduction in the capacity to deliver services.
- Can the activity be realistically implemented? And if so, should it be immediate or over the medium term? Should it be allocated for example to year 1, year 2, year 3, or years 4-5?

3.2.5 Is the action realistic given delivery capacity?

- After crisis, government capacity will usually be challenged. Prioritisation will therefore need to be very realistic in terms of those activities that can be implemented based on existing government capacity or where appropriate non-government capacity.
- Thematic teams will need to propose actions to strengthen the capacity of national and sub-national teams where needed. Given the time required to build and strengthen sub-national government capacity for delivery, interventions will need to be sequenced to take this into account.

3.2.6 Does the action target the most vulnerable and marginalised communities?

- The RPBA will usually foresee a phased implementation, and thematic teams should look to give priority to those who are most vulnerable.
- In recent assessments this has included those who are displaced or seeking refuge in neighbouring countries, those who are in highly insecure environments, and those whose community cohesion has been fractured by crisis.

Vulnerability will vary across geographic areas, across communities, and within communities. It may not be feasible in a medium term recovery plan to provide for example basic services across all geographic areas affected by crisis, so thematic groups will need to decide the sequencing of delivery.

3.2.7 Does the action require a geographical prioritization?

- Where should the activity be implemented first, and how will it be sequenced?
- Is there a logic to a geographic phasing? A phasing by administrative areas? By rural or urban areas, or dry or humid zones etc.?

3.2.8 Does the action need to distinguish between population groups?

- Are there population groups that need particular focus? And have these been accounted for? Are there particular needs for example of youth, women, or nomadic populations?

3.2.9 Does the proposed action take account of existing and potential financial resources?

- As a government plan, the first consideration should be towards the available finance from government towards the prioritized actions. The government may then look for international support where funding gaps are identified.
- Given competing global demands, it is important to be realistic in terms of available finance.

3.2.10 Are policy reforms identified?

- The RPBA will identify key areas of reform that are needed for recovery and peacebuilding.
- If for example a policy on DDR or return of displaced populations is needed, this should be sequenced so that the policy can be developed before interventions are programmed.

3.2.11 Is the action coherent across thematic areas?

- Does the actions require coordination across different stakeholders (i.e. between ministries, between government and partners, between humanitarian and development actors)?
- Are actions consolidated into one thematic area? Or spilt across thematic areas?

3.3 Avoiding overlaps

In order to avoid overlaps between thematic areas, meetings are organised between thematic working groups to ensure consistency. There will be instances where an

activity can be considered relevant for two thematic areas and a decision will be needed on how to deal with these activities.

> Depending on the context, activities related to Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) can be addressed either in the education sector or in the employment sector.
>
> In the analysis section of the thematic notes, the thematic groups will address this topic in only one of these two sectors, while making references to it in the other sector, if necessary. However, in the results matrix and the costing table, the activity will be addressed in one sector only.

4 Costing

4.1 Overview

The RPBA will usually include an estimation of the costs of priority recovery actions. The costs will be listed in a summary table of the synthesis report and will be presented in full in the costing tables.

Costs will be derived from several sources including relevant ministries, donors and humanitarian agencies, and unit costs from national and sectoral strategies. To the extent possible, unit costs and numbers of beneficiaries/units will be provided to allow for updating of costs if needed.

4.2 The Results Matrix

4.2.1 Overview

Each thematic group will develop a results matrix determining the priority strategic activities and their related costs. An example of a results matrix is given below, with descriptions then provided against each part of the matrix.

Key challenges are highlighted and discussed, including the links to humanitarian funding, an approach to recurrent costs, and an approach to national and sub-national costs.

4.2.2 Links to Humanitarian Funding

Most RPBAs will be undertaken in a situation where there is on-going humanitarian assistance. This raises several important questions;

- Which activities and costs in the humanitarian planning documents should be included in an RPBA ?
- What future activities and costs should move from a humanitarian planning framework to an recovery and peace-building framework ?

The context will obviously determine the best approach. There will be contexts where it makes sense to strengthen in the short term the transition from humanitarian to development and peace financing, whilst in other cases (as was decided in C.A.R) it may be too early to include humanitarian activities in an RPBA.

From previous assessments, humanitarian activities are generally
included if they are consistent with the thematic scope of the RPBA, and consistent with
the RPBA planning process and time-frame.

Challenges can arise on time-frames, as the humanitarian planning cycle is generally one
year, and the RPBA plan usually 3 to 5 years. Where the planning cycles do not coincide
(with for example a humanitarian plan available for the period in which the RPBA is
being undertaken) experience from previous RBPAs has suggested two solutions,

- Based on discussions with humanitarian actors, to incorporate into the RPBA a
  percentage of the total amount of the HRP of the current year and to do the same
  for the subsequent years of the RPBA. This will be based on the assumption that
  RPBA implementation will lead to the improvement of the humanitarian
  situation.
- Design more detailed scenarios by making assumptions regarding the number of
  beneficiaries (number of returnees and refugees over the next years for
  example).

Annex II: Results Matrix

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Thematic Area (Security, forced displacement and protection // Governance and basic social services // Econom							
Strategic vision							
Component							
Sub-component (if necessary)							
				Period			
Strategic results	**Strategic programs (ie. Priority activities)**		**Baseline (to provide if relevant, available and quantitative data easily accessible)**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Years 4-5**
Increased internal access greatly facilitates the movement of people and goods	Rehabilitate X km of rural roads and roads (road section to determine and list if relevant)		Out of 2'000 km of rural roads, 300 are considered in average or good condition and the rest is in poor condition		X	X	X
	Carry out preliminary studies for new road sections, including rural roads		Strategic planning document for the road sector; List of feasibility studies already available				X

H	I	J	K	L	O	R	S
nic and territorial integration //Access to land, livestock and production // Youth)							
Costs (FCFA)					**Financing gap (FCFA)**	**Indicator**	**Implementation and financing mecanism**
Year 1	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Years 4-5**	**Total**			
						X km of roads rehabilitated	
						Studies completed	

4.2.3 How-to guide

<u>Thematic area</u>: Insert name of your thematic area.

<u>Strategic vision</u>: Define the general development objective of your thematic area in the short and medium to long term (2-3 lines).

<u>Component</u>: The thematic area is organised by components. Try to avoid having too many components.
Examples: Basic social services; Infrastructures

<u>Sub-component</u>: If necessary, disaggregate the component into one or more sub-components. Again, try and avoid too many sub-components.
Examples: Education, health, water and sanitation, etc. for basic social services; Roads, energy, ICT, etc. for infrastructures

<u>Strategic results (column A)</u>: Determine the expected results. It is important for thematic groups not just to define objectives, components and activities, but also to clearly formulate the results that they are looking for as part of the process. The strategic result is thus the overall development objective of the thematic area in the short and medium term (*Examples: Teacher training is strengthened; Increased internal access facilitates the movement of people and goods*). Several strategic results help achieve the development objective of the thematic area.

<u>Strategic programs or priority activities (column B)</u>: Formulate the activities in a strategic and concise way. The formulation of activities should be clear and concrete in order to assess the costs. If an activity targets for example only one region or administrative areas, make sure to indicate this when the activity is formulated.

<u>Baseline (Column C)</u>: Describe the baseline and the needs by activity. Only complete this column if the information and data are easily available and if the data is relevant.

<u>Period (Columns D to G)</u>: The duration of the RPBA (determined during the scoping mission) is usually three to five years. For each activity, the thematic groups will determine the implementation period. Be realistic, as for some sectors or type of activity, project preparation and the mobilization of required financial resources takes time. List all the activities and determine a realistic implementation period. Avoid formulating all activities across a five-year plan as some activities only require a one or two-year for implementation.

<u>Costing (Columns H to L)</u>: Based on the breakdown of activities in columns D to G, associated costs will be shown in columns H to L. The costing exercise will take into account the following principles:

➢ Choice of currency: the costs will be given in local currency. A column in foreign currencies (US Dollars, Euros) will be added if necessary (in this case, use an Excel formula to convert the costs from local to foreign currency and make sure to refer to the exchange rate given in a separate cell in order to be able to modify the exchange rate for the entire costing table quickly and in a transparent way).
➢ Costs calculations: to the extent possible, costs will be calculated based on unit costs and numbers of beneficiaries/units. Use Excel formulas to calculate costs, such as unit

costs * number of units/beneficiaries. Some thematic groups
have found it helpful to use a separate spreadsheet for detailed calculations and
through an excel formula to integrate into the results matrix. This can make it easier to
see an overview of the units and unit costs and to revise, adapt and change these.
Assumptions and sources will be documented in two additional columns (for example,
columns V and W). Examples of the types of unit costs that should be collected early
on to facilitate the costing exercise are cost of road construction per kilometer, unit
cost of a health structure, a school, a borehole, a well, a courthouse.

➢ Activities such as workshops, training sessions, sectoral studies, social cohesion
activities, policy reform, etc., may require projection of costs. In this case the more
detail that can be given (i.e. number of participants * unit cost such as per diems,
transportation costs, hotel, logistics) the better.

➢ Some activities will be budgeted at zero cost for two reasons: (i) the activity is
considered a priority in two thematic areas but will only be budgeted in one of the two
thematic areas; and (ii) it is a core government expenditure (salaries, maintenance
costs): see box 4 below.

➢ The costing exercise may include implementation costs for areas such as security and
access. In these cases each thematic team should use similar costings.

> ### *Box 4. Should recurrent costs be integrated?*
>
> Recurrent costs for salaries and administration:
> The wage and operating expenses of the administrations are core government expenditure and as a matter of principle excluded from the costing.
>
> Recurrent expenditure for the maintenance of infrastructure (including roads, water, electricity, ICT):
> There may be an interest in quantifying the maintenance costs generated by investments and rehabilitation work identified in the RPBA; work that will lead to an increase in current budget. Understanding the maintenance costs is needed firstly to ensure sustainability of the infrastructure, and secondly to ensure that the increase in the current budget does not lead to unsustainable state debt.
>
> That said, usually RPBAs are cautious in this areas as (i) the objective is to focus on process and priorities, and not to divert too much attention to an overly detailed costing exercise, and (ii) the RPBA is not a project document that requires a very detailed budgeting of activities. Integration of maintenance costs may therefore require a level of detail that is inconsistent with this RPBA costing methodology. As a result, maintenance costs are generally not included in the RPBA costing.
>
> In some cases however, it might make sense to estimate, and possibly integrate these costs, for example at the government's request (as was the case in the North-East Nigeria RPBA). If so, two options can be considered:
>
> - Ratio costing of maintenance costs. This method has the advantage of remaining at a strategic costing level (in accordance with the RPBA principles). It assumes ratios are known. Where ratios are not known this will require in-depth technical work to determine ratios for each sector, to validate working assumptions with technical ministries, and present results in a transparent way. Ratios refer to the percentage of the cost of the initial investment that has to be budgeted annually to maintain the sustainability of the infrastructure. Ratios can be very different according to sectors and types of infrastructure, the lifetime of the infrastructure, its use, climatic conditions, etc.
> - Detailed costing of maintenance costs. This method is precise, but requires very substantial and time-consuming work (for instance, calculating the maintenance costs of administrative buildings would imply calculating costs per m^2 of walls, door unit, window unit, etc.). Given the uncertainties that often surround the implementation of RPBA activities, this level of detail is not generally used.

- ➤ The costing exercise will remain at a strategic level. It will not be necessary to go into too much detail (do not breakdown the costs at a non-strategic level, for example the costs of motorbikes for project teams)
- ➤ Be realistic when assessing costs. Take into account current sectoral budgets, financing capacities of the state and partners, as well as absorption/disbursement capacity of the areas targeted by the RPBA.

> ➢ The costs presented in the matrix are the costs that will be disbursed over the five-year period of the RPBA. For activities that will extend beyond the five-year plan, in particular infrastructure projects or long-term development programs, only the share of costs to be disbursed in the five-year period of the RPBA will be accounted for and this will be documented in column R (for example, 20% of the road X to Y built). Use Excel formulas, such as ⇒ overall cost of the project/program * the percentage of funds disbursed over the period (example of the road X to Y: 10 million in investment * 20% over the period = 2 million).
> ➢ In general costs are broken down over the full period of the RPBA. Disbursements tend to increase over the RPBA as the capacity for delivery increases.

Financing gap (Column O): This will build on work started during the scoping mission, where existing programmes of government and the international community will be identified. The aim in this part of the matrix is to determine the financing gap. To that end, secured funding will be deducted from the total cost calculated for each activity (column L). The sources of these funds will be identified and documented in Column S. Secured funds will include the national budget allocation or upcoming national budget to some sectors and activities identified by the RPBA, programs and projects of partners and humanitarian activities.

Example: for sub-national RPBAs, expected and/or allocated resources in the targeted regions will be listed. This can be complex, especially for programs with a national scope or programs and themes that imply action at the central government level (governance, public financial management, etc.)

Indicator (Column R): Determine the indicators for each activity. These are results indicators and not outcome or impact indicators. These indicators are directly linked to the strategic activities. For each indicator, the thematic groups will specify: (i) the quantities or number of beneficiaries; (ii) if the activity will be implemented over a five-year period; or (iii) if activities extend beyond the five-year plan, (for example infrastructure projects) (if so, only the share of costs to be disbursed in the five-year period of the RPBA will be accounted for).

Implementation and financing mechanism (Column S): Specify the implementation structure, if known (for example: ministry X, project Y); provide the source of secured funding if known (this column needs to be well articulated with section 3 of the thematic note).

RPBAs with a national scope:
The scope of the RPBA being national, the assumption is that the country is faced with a widespread transitional situation. Capacity building, reforms and the development of strategies at the national level should therefore be included as priorities, if relevant.

If sectoral strategies are lacking, their formulation may be listed as priority activities for the first year of the RPBA. Therefore, the challenge will be to anticipate what the priorities of this strategy could be for the following years, and to evaluate their costs to be integrated in the RPBA. Workshops can outline likely strategic priorities and give inputs for an approximate costing. This preliminary work can contribute to the initial work of formulating sectoral strategies.

If capacity-building activities are identified as necessary, in particular to strengthen central government functions, specific measures and a consistent and/or lump sum budget may be allocated. In the case of the C.A.R RPBA, in a context of severely limited government capacity, it was considered necessary to allocate 5% of the total RPBA amount to capacity building activities for the administration, a prerequisite for the successful implementation of the RPBA.

RPBAs with a subnational scope:
National sectoral strategies will usually be available. If so, the aim will be to implement them in the geographical area targeted by the RPBA (for example, if a conflict or the marginalization of a region has led to the ineffective implementation of national strategies) and, if necessary, a differentiated implementation of the strategies will be proposed to take into account the specific challenges of that geographical area (eg to take into account geographical isolation and low population density, cultural or religious differences / demands, for instance for nomadic populations).

Annex I: Prioritisation Criteria Score Card

No	Prioritisation Criteria	Score from 1 (lowest score) to 5 (highest score)
1	Is the proposed action important in ensuring continued peace and stability?	
2	Does the action have an immediate impact / peace dividend?	
3	Is the action feasible within the security environment?	
4	Is the activity implementable within the agreed time-frame?	
5	Is the action realistic given delivery capacity?	
6	Does the action target the most vulnerable and marginalized communities?	
7	Does the action require a geographic prioritization?	
8	Does the action need to distinguish between population groups?	
9	Does the proposed action take account of existing and potential financial resources?	
10	Are policy reforms identified?	
11	Is the action coherent across thematic areas?	

B. Tools used in RPBAs

Tools Used in RPBAs		
Country	**Tools**	**Process/Relevance**
Ukraine RPA 2014	Conflict Analysis	The Ukraine RPA conducted a two-step conflict analysis. An initial desk-based conflict analysis was complemented by a tripartite field mission to further develop the analysis. Two versions of this conflict analysis were created: (1) a full, extensive version, and (2), a summarized version covering key conflict drivers and establishing the parameters for the peacebuilding plan. The summarized version of the analysis was circulated to the government to establish consensus on the drivers of conflict and peacebuilding priorities. The conflict analysis also mapped out possible scenarios of crisis evolution, and prospects for peace, with a view to identifying the strategic and operational implications of these scenarios for the implementation of the recovery strategies and interventions proposed under the RPBA. The analysis guided the development of the framework of strategic outcomes and priorities for recovery which were in turn based on the need to start to address the structural drivers of crisis identified in the context analysis.
	Stakeholder/Core Government Functions Analysis	At the time of the assessment, the government of Ukraine had several agencies dealing with various aspects of the conflict's impact. The RPA team conducted a stakeholder and core government functions analysis to develop a thorough understanding of government and stakeholder capacities. This was used as the basis for implementation options and institutional arrangements for the RPA's recommendations.
	Displacement Analysis	Internal displacement emerged as one of the most important impacts of the conflict. As such, the RPA team utilized the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) to track migration flow and IDP registration. Data was also collected by the State Emergency Service of Ukraine (SES) was unreliable due to the absence of a central registry, and diverse IDP registration across localities and government agencies. As a result, the DTM used data from IOM and other agencies to augment and verify government data.

	Damage, Loss, and Needs Assessment	Given the scale of impact on physical infrastructure and on associated service delivery, the team utilized a Damage, Loss and Needs assessment methodology to estimate the impact on such sectors as transportation, health and education. The team estimated the impact of the conflict, and the resources needed to reconstruct affected infrastructure and respite social services.
	Gender Analysis	UN Women provided the RPA team with a gender expert to work alongside sector teams to ensure that gender sensitivity was maintained in the development of their sector reports. IN addition to being a resource person for the sector teams, the expert also circulated a checklist against which sector teams would compare their assessments and recommendations.
Mali MIEC 2015	Conflict Analysis / Joint Narrative	As a first step in the MIEC process, the assessment developed a joint narrative of the conflict in order to bring the various partners in agreement about the root causes of the conflict. The team relied on the issues identified and agreements reached in the Peace Accord as a basis of its shared narrative. The Agreement itself drew upon existing Fragility Assessments carried out by the World Bank, studies of grievances in the northern regions, and other reports. The analysis identified the structural drivers of crisis, and guided the development of the framework of strategic outcomes and priorities for recovery. Addressing structural drivers was the governing consideration behind the formulation of sector recovery strategies, and provided the means for the prioritization and sequencing of the needs identified in the three components of the assessment.
	Household and Perception Survey	Given restricted access due to security concerns, and the need to incorporate the views of the public into developing the peacebuilding plan, 4 surveys were carried through assistance from the World Bank poverty team. First, a regionally representative household survey was conducted that explored different aspects of the lives and livelihood of people in northern Mali, their perceptions about physical security, and their views on possible initiatives that could be implemented to consolidate peace and security. Second, a survey was carried out with administrative and traditional authorities in communities where households were surveyed. This survey collected the opinions of the authorities to assess their priorities concerning economic activities, access to basic infrastructure, perception regarding the social welfare of the population, and the existence of social investment projects. Third, a survey was conducted in health centers in the three regions in the north to assess the impact of the crisis on the functioning of health centers, movement of staff, and current needs of

		these centers in terms of supplies. Finally, a survey was carried out with displaced persons and refugees in the camps in Mauritania and Niger, to assess their priorities and collect ideas on actions that could be implemented to restore peace and security in Mali.
	Sector and Thematic Analysis	The MIEC collected and collated information via fifteen sector notes, each including a situation analysis, an expected results matrix for the planned transition period and outlining the main activities to be implemented. These sectoral analyses served as primary instruments of data collection. The recommendations of the sector notes were synthesized into thematic notes. Four prioritization criteria were used to prioritize the recommendations of each sector note, and those of the thematic notes. These included the immediacy of impact on peacebuilding; the ease of implementation; whether the activity targeted urgent priorities, and whether it addressed the needs of the most vulnerable.
North-East Nigeria RPBA 2016	Conflict Analysis	To appropriately inform the RPBA process, a robust conflict analysis was conducted, and circulated to the government to establish consensus. The conflict analysis also mapped out possible scenarios of crisis evolution and prospects for peace. The analysis also identified the strategic and operational implications of these scenarios for the implementation of the recovery strategies and interventions proposed under the RPBA. The analysis identified the structural drivers of crisis, and guided the development of the framework of strategic outcomes and priorities for recovery. Addressing structural drivers identified by the analysis was the governing consideration behind the formulation of sector recovery strategies, and provided the means for the prioritization and sequencing of the needs identified in the three components of the assessment.
	Satellite Imagery Based Analysis	The continuing violence made several of the worst affected areas inaccessible to the RPBA and government officials. As a result, the team had to rely on alternative sources of data collection. A private firm was hired to conduct satellite imagery based analysis. This technology was used to estimate the impact of the violence on physical infrastructure such as roads, and on the environment. It also used night lights analysis to augment the findings of the displacement analysis.
	Displacement Analysis	The Displacement Tracking Matrix was utilized to feed the analysis, tracking migration flow and IDP registration. The social team also researched and recommended return

		strategies through desk based reviews, interviews with relevant stakeholders, and scenario planning.
		The analysis also reported on displacement-related impacts and needs allowing each state to develop the targeted recovery interventions. Due to the highly volatile and fluid nature of the conflict, the displacement analysis was updated several times throughout the RPBA process.
	Gender Checklist	UN Women provided the RPBA team with a gender expert to work alongside sector and component teams to ensure that gender sensitivity was maintained in the development of their respective reports. To ensure this, the expert circulated a checklist against which sector and component teams would compare the development of their assessments and recommendations. Notably, as a result of this, social cohesion and violence prevention, including sexual and gender based violence (SGBV), were costed as an impact and an intervention in the Peace Building, Stability and Social Cohesion component of the report.
	Stakeholder and Capacity Analysis	As the RPBA process unfolded, the team also conducted a stakeholder and capacity analysis with a view to establishing the financing and implementation options for the RPBA's recommendations. The analysis was conducted through an initial desk review, and augmented through learnings from the RPBA missions.
	Damage, Loss and Needs Analysis	Given the scale of impact on physical infrastructure and on associated service delivery, the team utilized a Damage, Loss and Needs assessment methodology to estimate the impact on such sectors as transportation, health and education. The team estimated the impact of the conflict, and the resources needed to reconstruct affected infrastructure and respite social services.
Central African Republic RCPCA 2016	Conflict Analysis	As a first step in the RCPCA process, a robust conflict analysis was conducted. Two versions of this conflict analysis were created: (1) a full, extensive version, and (2), a summarized version covering key conflict drivers and establishing the parameters for the peacebuilding plan. The summarized version of the analysis was circulated to the government to establish consensus. The analysis guided the development of the framework of strategic outcomes and priorities for recovery based on the structural drivers of crisis. This framework provided the means for the prioritization and sequencing of the needs identified in the assessment.
	Stakeholder and Capacity Analysis	As the RCPCA process unfolded, the team also conducted a stakeholder and capacity analysis with a view to establishing the financing and implementation options for the RCPCA's recommendations. It reviewed existing institutional structures, financing

	instruments, coordination mechanisms and partnerships, and highlighted the need for a new partnership grounded in mutual accountability. The analysis also explicated institutional and financing arrangements to support recovery implementation. The analysis led to the development of the Mutual Accountability Framework (CEM-RCA) which aimed to ensure that support provided by the international community to address national priorities in a transparent and accountable way. Monitoring was also integrated into the institutional framework to ensure a global approach between the RCPCA and the CEM-RCA.
Household and Perceptions Survey	As part of the RCPCA, Central African Institute of Statistics, Economic and Social Studies (ICASEES) conducted a national survey, with financial and technical support from the World Bank, to collect information about the state of the nation and the development priorities of local authorities and citizens. The survey, known as the National Communes and Households Survey, was comprised of two components: a commune survey and a household survey. The commune survey collected information on current conditions in all communes of the CAR and on local perspectives of security and policy priorities. Through interviews with local authorities, the survey gathered information on local infrastructure, health and education facilities, local governance, economic activities, conflict, security and violence. In addition, the survey asks about perceptions of socioeconomic and security conditions in the principal town of the commune, and about policy priorities for the commune with respect to three themes: peace, reconciliation, and security; good governance and the provision of basic services; and economic recovery. The household survey collected information on household socioeconomic well-being, perceptions of security and economic conditions, and opinions on policy priorities, complementing the data from the commune survey.
Sector and Thematic Analysis	The analysis and recommendations in the assessment were informed by the technical work undertaken in sector notes. The sector notes were combined to prepare the assessment's three thematic notes and accompanying results matrixes. Prioritization and sequencing was sought along four variables: (1) time; (2) sectors, (3) geographical areas, and (4) population groups. Prioritization and sequencing were also guided by a number of assumptions about the future implementation environment, such as security and strong national engagement and dialogue.
Mutual Coordination Framework	The RCPCA recognized that its successful implementation needed to be grounded in a renewed partnership between the government and international partners based on mutual accountability. At the heart of a new partnership framework between the

		government and international partners was an agreement on a limited number of priorities and an associated government commitment toward a set of milestones. The partnership was institutionalized through a Mutual Commitment Framework. The Framework was in line with UN Security Council Resolution 2301, and included commitments of international partners in accordance with the principles of aid effectiveness as set out in the New Deal, and so ensure their cohesion. It also strengthened the dialogue on transparency and accountability.
Cameroon RPC 2018	Conflict Analysis / Joint Narrative	As a first step in the RPC process, the assessment developed a joint narrative of the conflict in order to bring the various partners in agreement about the root causes of the conflict. The team relied on the issues identified in previous studies of the conflict. The analysis identified the and impact of the crisis and vulnerability factors, and guided the development of the framework of strategic outcomes and priorities for recovery. Addressing structural vulnerability was the governing consideration behind the formulation of sector recovery strategies, and provided the means for the prioritization and sequencing of the needs identified in the three components of the assessment.
	Component and Thematic Analysis	The RPC collected and collated information via eighteen component reports, each including a situation analysis, an expected results matrix for the planned transition period and outlining the main activities to be implemented. These sectoral analyses served as primary instruments of data collection. The recommendations of the sector notes were synthesized into thematic notes. Four prioritization criteria were used to prioritize the recommendations of each sector note, and those of the thematic notes. These included that the interventions contribute directly and efficiently to sustainable recovery; that interventions are realistic regarding implementation capacities, security conditions, access, etc.; that there is a healthy mix of immediate and long-term interventions measures; and that the interventions create a positive dynamic to redress crisis and fragility.
	Displacement analysis	The RPC assessment and strategy focused on sustainable solutions to the challenges of forced displacement (priorities related to refugees, internally displaced populations, returnees, and host communities). In this spirit, the first thematic area of the RPC assessment on "forced displacement, protection, and human security". IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) was used the primary source of displacement information, and was combined with analyses from other organizations to maintain a up-to-date understanding of the displacement landscape.

	Household and Perceptions Survey	In order to inform the prioritization process, qualitative and quantitative data on public perceptions was collected via surveys, and focus groups conducted with households, communes, and affected communities. The surveys were conducted by the National Institute of Statistics (INS) and by the Research Institute for Development (RIDEV). RIDEV also organized focus groups as part of a more qualitative approach to data and information gathering in the areas most impacted by the crises.
	Mutual Accountability Framework	The RCP recommended a Mutual Accountability Framework between the government and partners, and served to strengthen the partnership and ensure efficient implementation of RPC priorities. It outlined shared commitments and key milestones to ensure that necessary actions are taken to enable the implementation of the RPC strategy. It also served as a strategic partnership, and an anchor point for dialogue between the government and partners.

Process Checklist for Leadership Team

Phase	Activity	Action	Comments
PRE-ASSESSMENT	1. Early discussions to establish the need for an RPBA	✓ Focal point in EU/UN/WB country offices identified. ✓ HLAG and / or HQ focal points identified. ✓ National government focal point identified. ✓ Other key stakeholders (donors, regional organisations, development banks) identified.	Discussions on an RPBA may start at country office level, stem from the country monitoring of HLAG, or from a request from national or regional government. The need and added value of an RPBA starts to be determined at this stage.
	2. Pre-assessment mapping and scoping mission	Pre-assessment mapping in place. ✓ Collation and sharing of existing and planned programmes of key stakeholders. ✓ Collation and sharing of country analysis ✓ Develop and share joint analysis of causes of crisis	Experience has shown that the more preparation that is carried out in advance of a scoping mission, then the more productive the mission. This is not always feasible, but where time permits this should be undertaken.

		Scoping Mission organized ✓ ToR agreed with country leadership, government and HLAG ✓ Team members identified from each institution. ✓ Focal point(s) in country identified for logistics and organisation of meetings. ✓ Dates agreed. ✓ Financing (e.g. transport, meeting venues) identified.	The scoping mission should meet with a wide range of stakeholders across government and its partners, including the donor community, civil society, and the private sector. A mission outside of the capital is often needed. To achieve this will require focal points and setting up of meetings and field missions in advance of arrival in country.
	3. Formal Agreement on whether to conduct an RPBA	Undertake Scoping Mission ✓ Meetings with key stakeholders. ✓ Analysis of context and causes of crisis to define peacebuilding objectives. ✓ Define added value of RPBA in relation to other planning tools.	A scoping mission should be just that. It is undertaken to understand the context and to help determine whether the RPBA is a suitable and appropriate investment of time and resources.

		✓ Decision on whether an RPBA is appropriate.
		✓ If an RPBA is appropriate, prepare a draft Aide Memoire incorporating at a minimum,
		   ○ Rationale for PRBA
		   ○ Peacebuilding objectives
		   ○ Time-frame
		   ○ Outputs and end point
			If a decision is made to undertake an RPBA, a draft aide-memoire will be prepared during the scoping mission. Experience has shown that the more detail included in the aide-memoire, then the easier the transition from scoping mission to launch of the assessment.

ASSESSMENT, PRIORITIZATION AND PLANNING	4. Assessment of Recovery and Peacebuilding Needs	Preparing for the assessment ✓ Roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders identified. ✓ Leadership team or joint leader identified. ✓ Team members identified, including leads and support for thematic groups. ✓ Resources (for internal travel, meetings and workshops etc) identified. ✓ Joint narrative on causes of crisis agreed in final draft. ✓ Analysis of existing and planned government and key partner projects and programmes prepared.	There is often a sense of urgency to move from the scoping mission to launch. Experience has shown that the most efficient path to the assessments is to have the main building blocks in place. This means ensuring that teams are identified and available for deployments at the same time (and ideally for the same duration), that roles and responsibilities between the government and key stakeholders are defined.
		Assessment Launch ✓ Launch event held.	The launch may be a single meeting (as in Cameroon), hosted by the national lead agency and attended by key national partners, or may be a more comprehensive event (as in Nigeria) attended by a wide section of government and non-government agencies and incorporating elements of information sharing and training.
	5. Prioritise and present priorities in a strategic, implementable recovery and peacebuilding plan and results matrix.	✓ Assessment tools and surveys identified and undertaken	A separate guidance note details surveys and tools used in previous assessments. In particular the *perception survey* needs to be scheduled and started as early as possible so results can be used in the report.
		✓ Define process for developing joint narrative. ✓ Joint narrative developed and agreed	Building on the draft joint narrative (see 4 above) a process should be identified with government for finalization. This may involve (as in Cameroon and Nigeria) meetings in the capital and regions. The final document will be shaped and supported by outputs from the assessment tools and surveys identified above.

		✓ Thematic notes produced	Separate guidance is available setting out how thematic groups can organize themselves, and how they can cost and prioritise interventions. Production of thematic notes is often the most time consuming part of the assessment. It is also important to maintain the momentum and collaboration between the national stakeholders and their international partners.
		✓ Prioritisation of activities within thematic notes and across assessment as a whole.	The guidance referred to above includes notes on how to prioritise interventions. This is a crucial part of the assessment, moving from a long list of needs to a shorter list of priorities that are central to peacebuilding and achievable within the time-frame and human/financial resources anticipated.
		✓ Assessment report produced based on thematic notes and joint narrative	The final report will need to be produced by core RPBA team members working across government and the key stakeholders to the RPBA.
	6. Outline implementation (including coordination, monitoring and evaluation arrangements), and financing options.	✓ ToR developed for implementation and financing mission. ✓ Team members identified and dates agreed. ✓ Mission undertaken and mission report agreed.	Experience from previous assessments has shown the importance of identifying implementation and financing arrangements as part of the RPBA. This can avoid several months of delay between the completion of the RPBA and the implementation of identified recovery and peacebuilding priorities.

VALIDATION AND	7. Formal validation of recovery and peacebuilding plan and results matrix	✓ Validation workshop to across government and key stakeholders. o Dates and venue finalized. o Invitations distributed. o Talking points for Joint Declaration partners. ✓ Priorities validated.	The validation workshop is important in providing an opportunity for formal endorsement across government, and in providing feeding back to the range of stakeholders consulted at the outset.
	8. Lessons learned	✓ Draft lessons learned paper developed. ✓ Comments received from key RPBA partners. ✓ Lessons learned finalized.	