

Agency Coordinating Body for Afghan Relief & Development

ACBAR was created in August 1988 and has been providing the framework within which NGOs and civil society, the Afghan Government, the UN and bilateral donors can exchange information, share expertise and establish guidelines for a more coordinated, efficient and effective use of resources providing humanitarian and development assistance to the Afghan people. ACBAR's activities have focused heavily on information sharing with its members and to the aid community in general; coordination of activities at the national and regional levels and advocacy on a variety of humanitarian and development issues.

Afghanistan context in 2014

After more than three decades of violent conflict, Afghans are longing for peace. With the current international military mission coming to an end by 2014, the context for peace talks should be changing. However, development achievements are in real danger if resources were to decrease and if peace negotiations are exclude Afghan civil society. The reconciliation context is complex and Afghanistan may be defined as ongoing civil war;

- Civilians¹ are faring worse, reflecting a reversal in last year's trend of fewer civilian casualties. Comparing the first half of 2013 with the first half of 2012, a fifth more civilians were killed or injured in the fighting.
- Comparing 2013 with 2011, the most violent year since the current phase of the Afghan war started, more civilians have been injured and almost as many have been killed.

¹ Mid-year Report on protection of civilians in Armed conflict
UNAMA 2013 6 months reports

- The Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) is under-reporting civilian casualties they are causing.
- There is widespread and significant displacement amongst the Afghan population. It is caused mainly by conflict and natural disasters to a certain extent.
- Afghanistan has over 630,000 conflict-induced Internally Displaced People (IDPs)² by the end of 2013, with over 10,000 new IDPs profiled each month. Almost half of the current IDPs have been displaced since 2011.
- Refugee returns are at an all-time low since the beginning of the voluntary repatriation programme in 2002, with only 38,000 refugees returning in 2013. 2.49 million³ Afghan refugees remain registered in Iran (840,000) and Pakistan (1.65 million).
- War wounded casualties are also on the rise in different parts of the country, the increase in Helmand (South) even reaching 110% compared to 2011⁴.
- Humanitarian space is shrinking, as space is contested by all stakeholders GoA, AOGs and criminals.
- Violence inflicted on health workers, hospitals, clinics, ambulances, and patients continues. 2013 was a particularly challenging year with NGO health care projects and staff directly impacted in 111 security incidents.
- 74 percent⁵ of the world's illicit opium production came from Afghanistan, making it the world leader for 2012, SIGAR expressed concern of the possibility of a "Narco-state". More than 700,000 Afghans have no access to drug treatments.

² UNHCR October 2013 report

³ UNHCR 2012

⁴ NGO August 2013

⁵ The UNODC's 2013 World Drug Report

ECHO HIP cuts / Impacts

The information below had been received from VOICE NGO on 13th January 2014: "ECHO has therefore decided for now to reduce the contracting of actions under all HIPs. The envelope available for each HIP will be reduced by an average of 50%" Since, it seems the whole amount of the AFG HIP will be committed in 2014 but in several sequences, depending on payment credits obtained by the DG ECHO.

ACBAR is presenting the impact of this decision on Afghanistan needs.

HIP for Afghanistan is 28,5M Euros presented the 29th October 2014 to all ECHO partners Afghanistan.

- Based on 2013 humanitarian needs, ECHO's envisaged response:
 - **Support Services**
 - facilitation of access through humanitarian air transport
 - Provision of safety & security support to humanitarian agencies
 - **Coordination**
 - UNOCHA
 - Clusters support
 - ECHO Partners (ex Emergency Response)
 - **Protection**
 - **Access and Promotion of Humanitarian principles**
 - **Life-saving medical support**
 - **Relief assistance and support to recovery & reintegration**
 - **Care & maintenance support** for the most vulnerable elements of the Afghan refugees in Iran and Pakistan, and relief support for any fresh influx of displaced people.

Afghanistan leads in absolute number of attacks; in 2013 NGO were impacted in 228 security incidents.

Over 25,000 security incidents (all actors involved) occurred in Afghanistan in 2013.

Understanding the context is crucial to NGOs as 30 aid workers have been killed and 73 had been injured during the past 12 months in Afghanistan (2013).

ACBAR is asking ECHO Brussels to:

- Avoid bringing fragility to the humanitarian actors working in a situation already very fragile in itself. remain fully engaged in committing 100% HIP 2014 in Afghanistan until the last sequence to obtain payment credits
- Stabilize ECHO DG presence in Afghanistan for 2014

Risks of HIP reduction:

- 100 000 beneficiaries lose vital support for each million ECHO would not commit in Afghanistan.
- Afghanistan is one of the most complicated countries in the world, year of election, withdraw of NATO, political mandate of all the United Nations and implementation of the Tokyo framework will shrink and destabilize Non Governmental Organization.

Aid effectiveness recommendations

The mains challenges for Donors in Afghanistan

- To understand the global context (political, humanitarian, security and human) and link donor action development or security with this global context.
- To impose conditionality on donor funds Vs ARTF taking the lead and 'monitoring' all programs and co chairing with MoFIN the impact.
- To follow up AMP and TMAF constraints link with internal politics of Country donor or their own agenda, and also linking with the decreasing of active monitoring Cf. World Bank lead (as one responsible)

Aid should be given on multiyear contracts and on clear and applicable conditions.

▪ Service delivery and humanitarian access

A key theme for the New Deal is the effort to boost the Government's legitimacy and credibility by enabling and supporting its ability to deliver services to its people. This puts a significant emphasis on the Compact making a material difference in the lives of communities, and requires the right programs to be implemented in the right places the right way. Failure to do so could well undermine the space for humanitarian agencies to deliver humanitarian assistance to those who need it and according to internationally recognized humanitarian principles, including impartiality, neutrality and independence. These principles and the space for humanitarian actors to operate within must be respected and protected.

▪ Monitoring & Results Mechanisms

The AMP underlines the role of NGOs as critical in aid harmonization, and supporting monitoring and results mechanisms for aid effectiveness. This is an area for donors to support and protect NGOs by focusing

attention of the Government on monitoring & evaluation, at a central level, but also as an independent process for NGOs – who need to remain independent and neutral from the government. As such, agreeing on the need for reinforced M&E and results-based mechanisms, while protecting the humanitarian space for NGOs to achieve their mandate outside of government influence, but with government coordination.

▪ Constructive and accountable donor participation

For Afghanistan to successfully transform the lives of ordinary Afghans under the New Deal, donors must stay actively engaged in the process. They should ensure that their considerable financial investments are effectively and transparently distributed and used and provide technical support as necessary.

The lead donor must ensure effective coordination between donors supporting or engaged in New Deal priorities and reach out to other donors to ensure effective coordination with those working outside of the New Deal framework.

Donors have a key role in championing space for civil society engagement in compact mechanisms, facilitating this engagement—particularly where the Government is resistant to this engagement.

- Transparency of Aid from the GoA Vs sanctions from the donor
- Real monitoring on the field for GoA activity/ projects
- Real conditionality of Aid from donors; Clear counterpart of the fund from the GoA ex; Training police but they have to start a real hierarchy and sanction system inside of the Police / ANA (Martial court)
- Security of sub contractor ; political engagement from donor and GoA
- Mapping of development activity can occur vs no safe area

- Quality; ex: health system with a real standard, MoPH has a politic of savings fund.

Best practices for donors might be

- ECHO rules; no on budget and strict follow up / monitoring of all contracts.
- DIFID concept; huge, inclusive and real pre audit to make their own strategy and find the better partner, real coordination.

Best practices for NGOs might be

- Reaffirming political neutrality
- Negotiating access with UN shifting from an operational to an advocacy role
- Relying on long-term acceptance strategies with communities
- Phasing out from partnerships with governmental counterparts
- Partnering with national NGOs
- Adapting security rules
- Adopting sounder HR policies

Donor engagements and state building

The terms *state-building* and *fragile states* have various meanings that reflect the assumptions of those who are making them, and which change as the lessons of contemporary state-building scenarios are taken into consideration. For many international agencies and national governments, the understanding of these concepts is still a 'work in progress'. Further confusion is created by the huge overlap in meaning of terms such as *state building*, *peacemaking/peace-building*, *early recovery* and *stabilization*.

A *stable* or *resilient state* is one that has political legitimacy, resulting from the capacity of a state to effectively perform key functions, including ensuring security for its citizens and enabling social welfare and a profitable market. Fragility arises from dysfunctional political processes that do not deliver equilibrium between the expectations of state and citizen (OECD 2008).

Fragile states have weak governance, policies and institutions (World Bank 2008) and are unable or unwilling to create the economic, social and political conditions in which the rights of the population can be realized. They include those states that are unable to secure their borders and in some cases to secure anywhere outside the largest towns, that have dysfunctional markets that do not attract foreign investment, and that cannot provide services to the majority of the population. They are faced with economic stagnation, extreme poverty and violent conflict (Rosser 2006). Fragile states with conflict are often referred to as having a *complex emergency*. A sixth of the world's population of 6.5 billion is estimated to live in fragile states (OECD 2009). The term *failed state* is also sometimes used to refer to a state that does not have a monopoly on the use of force and does not have the legitimacy to protect its borders, its citizens or itself (MOD 2009). But the states currently regarded as being fragile are economically weak and vulnerable from chronic conflict, recurrent natural hazards and extreme poverty from which they are unable to recover.

Aid Management Policy (AMP)

The objective of developing the Aid Management Policy is to provide clear policy statements and action points on improving (a) coordination (b)

management (c) mobilization, and (d) effectiveness of aid. A clear policy on development assistance will serve as a practical and useful tool to both Government of Afghanistan (GoA) and its development partners in achieving the country's development agenda as efficiently as possible. As well, it will provide clear direction for dialogue between the GoA and the donor-community and perhaps improve the volume and speed of aid delivery to Afghanistan. The Aid Policy applies to all forms of aid flowing into Afghanistan both Official Development Assistance, those off budget spending on defense and security, funds spent by the Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) and those spent by the non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

How new deal appeared?

The International Dialogue on Peace-Building and State-Building (IDPS) is an outflow of the Accra High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (HLF3) held in September 2008. It aims to promote dialogue between fragile states and their international partners. The first IDPS was held in Dili, Timor-Leste in April 2010. Here, a group of 19 fragile states formed the g7+ in order to provide (i) a united global voice for fragile states; (ii) better partnerships and ownership in development co-operation; and (iii) policy advice. At the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (HLF4) in Busan, the 30th November 2011, the "New Deal on Fragile States" was presented.

The g7+ members are: Afghanistan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Liberia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, The Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Timor-Leste and Togo.

New Deal

Poor governance and lack of state capabilities in around 45 countries pose a threat to global security and development.

The involvement of the international community is required to help these states break out of their low development-high-conflict traps. Recent years have seen a number of notable initiatives, including a "New Deal on Fragile States" announced in November 2011 by the g7+ and their international partners.

Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework (TMAF)
July 8th 2012

(Art 1) The Afghan Government and the International Community reaffirm their partnership in the economic growth and development of Afghanistan through a process of mutual accountability in achieving mutually decided goals as laid out in this document, hereafter the "Tokyo Framework". The International Community's ability to sustain support for Afghanistan depends upon the Afghan Government delivering on its commitments described in the Tokyo Framework. This document establishes an approach based on mutual commitments of the Afghan Government and the International Community to help Afghanistan achieve its development and governance goals based on the International Community's commitments in the Tokyo Framework. The Tokyo Framework establishes a mechanism to monitor and review commitments on a regular basis.

The National Solidarity Program (NSP):

NSP was conceived and launched by the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD) in 2003. The NSP is designed to strengthen community level governance and to improve the access of rural communities to social and productive infrastructure and services by channeling resources to democratically-elected Community Development Councils (CDCs). The NSP outsources project implementation to facilitating partners that mobilize communities to form CDCs and provide CDCs technical guidance for managing block grants and planning and implementing subprojects at the village level. NSP receives support from the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA), the World Bank- administered Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF), and bilateral donors.

Alignment:

As meaning external partners are aligned with National Priority Program (NPP) strategy and the underlying principles of all donor programs and projects are consistent with the NPPs stated approach. Alignment is fully achieved when donor funded projects and the NPPs have common, unified, and consistent objectives, plans, programs, projects, and deliverables

On-budget:

All inflow of resources or spending, program and project aid, is aligned with the plans of budgetary units, are captured in the budget documentation, are appropriated by the parliament and managed through the treasury system.

National Priority Programs (NPPs):

A set of 22 priority programs announced at the Kabul Conference (2010) representing a prioritized and focused approach to Afghanistan National Development Strategy (ANDS) implementation including specific deliverables and costing of programs.

The Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF)

ARTF was first established in back in 2002 with nearly 10 or 12 years' service on now receiving 6.7 billion USD so far from 33 Donors. ARTF is a largest single source of support for the government budget and it works only financing programs implemented by the Afghan governments o all World Bank (WB) programs are *on budget* and flowing through the channel of Ministry of Finance and line Ministries are actually responsible for implementation of such projects. These projects are NSP; big basic education program equipment under MoEdu or Basic Health Package Services (BPHS) through MoPH.

For ARTF governance structure, WB has over all the steering committee consists of all 33 Donors and co-chaired by the Ministry of Finance and the World Bank administrator, they meet once a quarter and basically set policy/strategy for the usage of ARTF fund. In next step, beside having several other working groups which consist again of Ministry of Finance (MoFIN), the individual line Ministries as relevant particularly Donors, finally we have a management committee co-chaired by MoFIN and World Bank and consist of the some of the big aid development agencies such as UNDP, UNAMA, IDB and ADB.

On update to the ARTF framework when talk about allocation and what ARTF does, on annual basis we agree with Donors and government on financing

strategy that outline the different areas and we are 100% align with government priorities.

Due to Donors pressure WB currently moved away from process report to impact reporting for better response to donors that feed their requirements in a way they ask. They pooled together a result matrix that basically building indicators to all development projects.

National Transparency and Accountability Program (NTAP)

The NTAP is Afghanistan's second National Priority Program within the Governance development cluster.

Afghanistan, with the support of the international community has established NPPs to guide reconstruction assistance. The NTAP has failed to satisfactorily meet three "red lines" established by the international community. The red lines identified by State include unverified asset declarations by senior Afghan government officials, portions of the Access to Information Law draft that civil society finds problematic, and U.S. government concerns with amendments to the National Audit Law. USAID indicated that the NTAP may be considered at the next JCMB meeting scheduled for early 2014; however, the Afghan government is reportedly considering giving up on the NTAP.

What is Effective Aid?

Official aid is often criticized for not have contributed to economic growth and poverty reduction. This is of great concern given the role that aid is expected to play in achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

In the context of Afghanistan, effective aid can also be defined as achieving the ultimate goal of significantly reducing poverty and achieving progress in social indicators such as infant mortality rate, maternal mortality rate, literacy rate, life expectancy rate, and percent of population with access to potable water and percent of population with access to electricity.

Effectiveness can also be viewed from other dimensions such as: (i) speed and quality of programme implementation, (ii) improvements in the Government's ability to formulate, prioritize and execute a credible budget that helps bring about welfare improvements to the Afghan people, (iii) the amount of aid spent in the Afghan economy thus spurring private sector development as opposed to being spent outside or repatriated by foreign contractors, (iv) bringing about improvements in the security situation, (v) reducing poppy cultivation and most importantly (vi) achieving the generic concepts of effective aid under the Paris Declaration.