



## 1. QUESTIONS FOR “TAKE CONTEXT AS A STARTING POINT”

- a. Is there a process through which national and international actors conduct contextual analysis together when deciding priority actions, appropriate division of responsibilities, aid modalities etc.? Failing that, is the analysis shared among international actors?
- b. If there is shared analysis, does it translate into explicitly shared objectives? If there are no shared objectives, are they at least convergent, or are they undermining of each other?
- c. Does the main strategic framework identify causes of fragility? Is this analysis used to inform programming?
- d. Is the international community’s engagement based on a multi-stakeholder, multi-sector assessment of priorities? Are they sequenced?

## 2. QUESTIONS FOR “DO NO HARM”

- a. How is “do no harm” understood? What does it mean for national actors including national governments and civil society groups? Is this the same vision that international actors are working to?
- b. How is “do no harm” addressed? Is “do no harm” a consideration that is regularly included in programming? In monitoring and evaluation? Are there processes in place to monitor and adjust international engagements for negative impacts? Is there a process in place to collectively identify and address areas of potential policy incoherence in the engagement of the international community and within individual donor systems on different, related dossiers? For example immigration or hiring policies that cause brain drain; banking regulations that stimulate capital flight and allow money laundering; reform in one area that threatens to derail the transition, if any.
- c. Are international actors “doing no harm”? Is international engagement generally considered to be conflict sensitive? Or does international engagement have a negative impact on particular issues (*e.g.* aggravating societal divisions; weakening the legitimacy or capacity of the state)? Have the international actors been responsive to occurrences of policy incoherence?

## 3. QUESTIONS FOR “FOCUS ON STATEBUILDING AS THE CENTRAL OBJECTIVE”<sup>1</sup>

- a. Does the international community make concerted and sustained efforts to positively affect the accountability, legitimacy and/or capacity of the state to deliver key functions? With what impact?
- b. More generally, is the international community providing support in a way that strengthens or undermines the state?
- c. Are there shared statebuilding objectives (promoting state capacity,

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: Statebuilding is understood as aiming for both effective and accountable states. Strengthening the capacity of the executive at central level is only one, incomplete part of statebuilding.



- legitimacy or accountability) among international actors and with the government? Is there shared analysis of critical statebuilding areas to be strengthened?
- d. Do international actors factor in the potential impact on statebuilding when choosing a funding instrument over another?

#### 4. QUESTIONS FOR “PRIORITIZE PREVENTION”

- a. Does the international community have early warning and early response systems in place or otherwise proactively invest in crisis prevention (e.g. through contingency planning; through management of spoilers)?
- b. Has the international community taken action on those occasions (if any) where early warning systems indicated trouble ahead? If yes, what are the examples hereof? If not, why not?
- c. Does the international community invest in conflict prevention and/or strengthening conflict resolutions mechanisms?

#### 5. QUESTIONS FOR “RECOGNIZE THE LINKS AMONG POLITICAL, SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES”<sup>2</sup>

- a. Does the international community have a process for joint planning that integrates political, security and development dimensions and prioritisation?
- b. Are the goals of the different policy communities convergent? If not are they at least coherent? Are there recognised trade-offs?
- c. Are donors part of the political processes in which diplomats are taking part (if any such processes)? Are diplomats part of donor discussions?
- d. Does the international community have mechanisms to work across sectors (for example multi-sector missions, analysis, and planning across sectors, pooled funding, pooled staff or secondment schemes across sectors, and joint information management systems)?

#### 6. QUESTIONS FOR “PROMOTE NON-DISCRIMINATION AS A BASIS FOR INCLUSIVE AND STABLE SOCIETIES”<sup>3</sup>

- a. Does the international community explicitly promote human rights and inclusion of women, youth, the poor, minority or marginalized groups, through dialogue, programmes and/or capacity strengthening, and with what impact?
- b. Do international actors’ monitoring and evaluation systems disaggregate resource flows (e.g. going to the capital vs. the provinces, across gender lines, across social groups, across regions, etc.)? What about in

---

<sup>2</sup> Note: Principle #5 “Recognize the links among political, security and development objectives” emphasises the need for coherence across different policy communities. Principle #8 “Agree on practical coordination mechanisms among international actors” is about good coordination more generally, both within and across policy communities or sectors.

<sup>3</sup> Note: In the FSP survey, we take discrimination (Principle 6) as entailing an element of intent, whereas exclusion/inclusion (Principle 10) is the result of how programmes are implemented, regardless of their intent.



terms of results (e.g. access to health or education) with these different groups?

- c. Is the international community taking into account perspectives from different parts of society across social divides, in both programming and implementation?

### 7. QUESTIONS FOR “ALIGN WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES IN DIFFERENT WAYS ACCORDING TO CONTEXT”

- a. Does the international community broadly align its programmes with government-led national strategies or an international compact where they exist? And at sector level?
- b. Where such strategies and/or compacts do not exist, has the international community started an inclusive dialogue with government and/or civil society to identify a joint vision and strategy?
- c. Are views from civil society systematically taken into account, underpinned by an understanding of the makeup of civil society (representativeness and agendas of civil society organisations)?
- d. Does the international community make use of parallel project implementation units and is this practice justified at present?

### 8. QUESTIONS FOR “AGREE ON PRACTICAL COORDINATION MECHANISMS AMONG INTERNATIONAL ACTORS”

- a. Does government provide the main mechanisms for coordination among international actors? If yes, are international actors making use of them?
- b. If not, does the international community have a lead (for example the UN integrated mission where there is one)? Do international actors use or promote coordination mechanisms (for example integrated results framework, joint assessment missions, shared upstream analysis, multi-donor trust funds, joint offices, and common reporting and financial requirements)?
- c. Is there an agreed division of labour among international actors in the various sectors?

### 9. QUESTIONS FOR “ACT FAST... BUT STAY ENGAGED LONG ENOUGH TO GIVE SUCCESS A CHANCE”

- a. Are international actors flexibly adjusting modalities and levels of engagement according to changing circumstances (e.g. rapid response mechanism)?
- b. Do most international actors have a policy to stay engaged when government-to-government relations become difficult, for example through collaboration with NGOs or local authorities?
- c. In the past, have international actors who suspended or reduced their engagement in the country followed a step by step approach, discussing developments first with the partner government, considering switching to different modalities next and only cutting or reducing engagement in the last resort?
- d. Is international funding volatile (i.e. have there been aid shocks in past



years)? Is it predictable (i.e. to what extent are donors delivering on their Accra Agenda for Action commitment to provide three-to- five year expenditure and/or implementation plans; Do most international actors have five- (or more) year strategies)?

### 10. QUESTIONS FOR “AVOID POCKETS OF EXCLUSION

- a. In allocating resources globally, do most international actors take other international actors’ engagement into account? For example, is the country under consideration under-aided with regards to both needs and the quality of its policies and institutions?
- b. In allocating resources nationally, are there neglected provinces, sectors or social groups within the country? Are international actors sufficiently engaged beyond the capital city?
- c. How do international actors ensure no group is excluded? What tools are used to ascertain differentiated needs?
- d. Has international action exacerbated any inequalities across the country?