

BRIDGING THE DEVELOPMENT FINANCING GAP

CONTRIBUTORS: GARY MILANTE AND JAEYEON LEE (SIPRI), AND LUCIENNE HEYWORTH (MA CANDIDATE, UPPSALA UNIVERSITY)

INTRODUCTION

Peacebuilding is integrally linked to development. However, only a small fraction of global official development assistance (ODA) is used for peacebuilding activities. Because the effectiveness of peacebuilding is difficult to measure relative to other development outcomes, ‘value for money’ arguments may contribute to the financing shortage.

In order to resolve on-going and future conflicts, the gap between existing peacebuilding funding and the outstanding financial need must be assessed and filled. In particular, it is important to consider the scope of global peacebuilding requirements in support of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as well as the range of resources that could be leveraged to meet them. Despite the challenges, new financing mechanisms are emerging to supplement existing financing for peacebuilding and development in fragile contexts.

This brief examines how existing financing instruments—such as domestic revenues, global financing, ODA, and private sector contributions—and new mechanisms could be combined and coordinated. In light of the UN’s first World Humanitarian Summit (Istanbul, Turkey, May 2016), peacebuilding needs are considered with an eye to humanitarian needs and appeals.

FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

In 2013, approximately 16 per cent of ODA was spent on peacebuilding activities. In its Peacebuilding Architecture Review, the UN calls for a better assessment of global peacebuilding needs. To do so, the full scope of interventions and peacebuilding activities should be identified and mapped, together with their outcomes.

Issues of ownership and dependency are often raised as barriers to comprehensively assessing peacebuilding needs, particularly as they relate to differences in self-reliance and self-sufficiency in a number of post-conflict and fragile situations. The extent to which ownership and dependency issues affect the composition of nationally- and internationally-led peacebuilding activities is also a source of debate. In the past, joint needs assessments (post-conflict and post-disaster) have been extremely useful for focusing analysis and providing a country-level evaluation of peacebuilding needs. In this respect, joint needs assessments often act as an analogue to humanitarian appeals and could be coordinated with humanitarian appeals in the future.

The scope of peacebuilding needs, globally and at the country level, is still largely unknown. The concept itself requires further defining and should be included in deeper analyses of expenditures, assessments and evaluations on the effectiveness of peacebuilding activities.

Peacebuilding needs compete with and compliment humanitarian needs and appeals. The international community must respond to these assessments more strategically by, for example, integrating urgent humanitarian needs into 20- or 30-year peacebuilding and development strategies. Looking back, Korea’s post-conflict reconstruction illustrates how activities then associated with development also functioned as peacebuilding activities.

Labelling and categorizing activities (as peacekeeping, peacebuilding, development or humanitarian, for instance) can limit funding and constrains the way in they are framed and employed in response to peacebuilding needs. Coordination between development and humanitarian actors remains a challenge whereas a lack of clarity regarding the source and purpose of different funding streams is the primary issue for governments. On the other



hand, establishing special financing targets for marginalized groups, namely women youth, could help to ensure that they are included in peacebuilding and able to contribute in a meaningful way.

Questions remain unanswered on issues related to the gaps of unmet peacebuilding needs. For example, civil society organizations are generally underfunded and women's organizations are an especially vulnerable subset of civil society organizations with regard to funding. It is unclear what the gendered aspects of development funding are, and what the relationship is between shrinking aid, gender-programmed aid and peacebuilding in the SDG era.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Improve the measurement of peacebuilding activities and outcomes.

- As peacebuilding is an integral component of sustainable development, indicators will be necessary now for baselining where and how peacebuilding progress is being made and how it contributes to SDG success. Such indicators can close the policy-to-practice feedback loop: External communication about peacebuilding relies on sound measures of 'peace'.

2. Support developing countries in developing financing coordination mechanisms.

- Many developing countries need support to improve coordination instruments that enable them to follow funding and project streams within their respective foci.
- There should be formal recognition for and practical initiatives to match interventions and coordination approaches to the needs of the specific conflict context, including religious, cultural, economic and political realities on the ground.

3. Funders should develop messaging around how to drive long-term priority setting.

- Short-term 'count'-based outcomes are not sufficient to overcome challenges.