

DIALOGUE IN ACTION: A CANDID CONVERSATION ON DELIVERING TOGETHER

INSTITUTIONAL LEAD

International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding

MODERATOR

Michael Callan

Director, Conflict Prevention, Stabilization and Peacebuilding Division
Global Affairs Canada

THEMATIC FOCUS

The International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Security (IDPS) brings together countries affected by conflict and fragility, development partners and civil society to build sustainable peace and development. The World Bank Group is increasingly focusing on fragile situations and supporting sustainable peace and development, and is this year developing a new Strategy for Fragility, Conflict and Violence (FCV). United Nations reform is geared for delivering together and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) is reorganized for improved crisis response, peacebuilding and development. This session reflected on the experiences of the IDPS and its relevance for the World Bank, UN and bilateral cooperation, and identified opportunities for delivering together in crisis response and long-term peacebuilding.

SUMMARY

The IDPS was created in 2008 as a platform to bring donors and recipients together in a forum where they all had an equal voice to discuss state-building and peacebuilding. The New Deal represents the core of the IDPS's work and is made up of five peacebuilding and state building goals. The work of the IDPS has been marked by several meaningful achievements. One example is the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16. This goal was one of the hardest to negotiate when the SDGs were written. There is also a need to talk about the entire 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, not just individual goals.

Purely humanitarian action has limits. It is usually aimed at reducing immediate suffering and achieving short-term goals. There is a need for strategic patience in the work of the IDPS. There have been several successful projects that have contributed to long-term results. A question that should be asked during humanitarian actions is: Who is the most vulnerable and in need of protection and aid? A programme should go beyond 'where' and 'how' and be concrete regarding activities carried out.

During humanitarian action it is important to talk to people on all levels of a conflict situation, not just prominent leaders. Some actors are likely to be interested in maintaining the conflict. It should be remembered that donors are working with established partners and banks to a higher degree now than before. Because of this, donors need to look at how they interact with different partners. They need to make sure that they establish contacts that enable them to speak up for those that do not have a voice.

Individuals working as a humanitarian coordinator in a recipient state need to be modest, competent and adept in risk management. There is a need to develop a process of learning and implementing lessons. For example, a humanitarian project or peace process that worked in a coastal state cannot always be transferred to a landlocked state. Donors have also tended to underestimate the need for consensus regarding what constitutes the issues during a humanitarian effort. Part of the dialogue

must be about establishing consensus among all actors involved in a crisis or conflict regarding what problems they face.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Today the space for civil society is shrinking at the same time as nationalism and unilateralism is challenging the multilateral approaches preferred by the IDPS. In this context the IDPS is putting the New Deal's principles into action and working to involve more states and partners in the dialogue.

Instead of talking about stabilization of weak states, donors should talk about expanding state authority. When donors refer to stability, they are working to bring accountable services to people on all levels of society in a recipient state. The inability of a state to do this is a trigger for conflicts and crises, as non-state actors take over the role of a state in areas it lacks the capacity to control.

A point raised during the session was that the international political context has changed since the creation of the IDPS in 2008. The IDPS function as a dialogue forum for donors and recipients rested on the implicit assumption that states that were not fragile were stable and resilient. New security challenges such as the disinformation, cybercrime and extremism has challenged this assumption.

A theme from the high-level session in the morning resurfaced. The question of institutional ownership over issues is important also in the context of the IDPS. Donor countries and donor organizations can work to strengthen the resilience of a fragile state. But it is important that the recipient state maintains ownership over the issues in question.



This session report was produced onsite at the 2019 Stockholm Forum on Peace and Development hosted by SIPRI and the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs. The report aims to reflect the session discussion. The views, information or opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of SIPRI, the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs or other institutes associated with the session.