

## DIFFERENT CURRENCIES OR TWO SIDES OF THE SAME COIN?

### RECOMMENDATIONS

#### GLOBAL LEVEL

- 1 Leverage existing initiatives, develop a global platform to allow for regular multi-stakeholder discussions around the PVE and SDG 16 agendas.** This would connect the largely separate communities of practice that have emerged around each agenda; provide regular opportunities to explore ways in which a more integrated approach to implementation could benefit both agendas; offer civil society and local actors a seat at the table with national and global actors for discussions concerning the progress in, and obstacles to, implementing the two agendas; and provide a space for national and international actors to hear from grass-roots CSOs and other local actors on what's working and what is not to address these challenges and ways in which national and global entities can better support efforts to address them.
  - OECD member states should consider recommending that the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IPDS) be expanded to serve this purpose.
- 2 Advocate for an independent, vibrant civil society sector, which is critical to the realization of the “whole of society” approach that underpins the PVE and SDG 16 agendas.** This should include more joined-up advocacy at the global, regional, and national levels, and other collaborations among the different CSO networks and other constituencies that have emerged around the discrete, inter-related global agendas (e.g., PVE, SDG 16, WPS, YPS, and Sustaining Peace).

#### NATIONAL LEVEL

- 3 Develop country-based platforms in fragile and conflict-affected states that cut across the PVE and SDG 16 agendas.** These would bring together the often, separate communities of stakeholders working on the two agendas.
- 4 Enhance national-level inter-connectivity among multiple, inter-related strategies.**
- 5 Ensure meaningful involvement of civil society and other local actors, including municipalities, in policy formulation and programming decisions:** Donors, for example, should ensure that local actors, including civil society and municipalities, are meaningfully involved in the development of funding strategies, recognizing that such actors are often best-positioned to define the needs of their cities and communities, but that their voices and perspectives are too often insufficiently reflected in policymaking and programming processes and decisions.

#### DONORS & FUNDING

- 6 Local analysis and priorities should drive funding strategies:** Local priorities should be informing policymaking and programming decisions at every level. Independent, qualitative, and data-driven local research should inform funding strategies for addressing extremist violence and promoting justice, inclusion, and peace. Donors should co-invest in, share, compare, and regularly update local risk and needs analyses to inform their strategic funding priorities. This analysis should be shared with existing or potential implementers whenever possible.
- 7 Pursue more multi-donor funded initiatives that incentivize CSOs other local actors to develop proposals that cut across the SDG 16 and PVE agendas.** Donors should more often pursue “pooled funding” arrangements, recognizing that they create more opportunities for longer-term projects, risk-sharing, and upscaling through sustained economies of scale.

- 8 **Establish multi-donor funds at the country level to support locally led projects that promote peace, justice, and inclusion (and include those aimed at preventing violent extremism).** Such funds should be locally owned and driven by the needs and priorities of the relevant national and sub-national government and non-governmental stakeholders.
- 9 **Leverage global funds that support locally led PVE interventions to incentivize donors to support programs that integrate SDG 16 and PVE objectives.** This could begin with having GCERF incorporate SDG 16 indicators in its calls for proposals and gather and share data on how GCERF-funded projects are advancing both sets of objectives.
- 10 **Address practical challenges to allow more resources to be channeled to the community-based actors often at the intersection of the PVE and SDG 16 agendas:** Donors should offer flexibility commensurate with the different security, political, social, and organizational contexts in which CSOs are operating. Donors should be more cognizant of the logistical and operational constraints CSO grantees face, the demands of recipient communities, and the security concerns of individual practitioners. Awards should include adaptive management, both on the donor and grantee sides, and streamline approval processes to make changes to awards as needed.
- 11 **Be sensitive to language:** Recognizing that the use of PVE or “violent extremism” terminology has proven to be counterproductive in certain local contexts, as it can negatively impact actual work on the ground, international and national actors should allow locally-led programs to be framed around issues (e.g., social cohesion, resilience, justice, peace, and economic empowerment) and use labels and other language that are most likely to resonate with the beneficiaries and the wider community, irrespective of the global agenda or donor funding “bucket” to which they might be linked.

## DATA, ANALYSIS & ASSESSMENTS

- 12 **Promote more joined-up assessments that are informed by local practitioners, experts, and researchers:** Donors should move towards conducting joined-up, more comprehensive assessments that can better highlight the integrated nature of the needs and priorities of countries and communities. The assessments, which should be shared, as appropriate, with other donors, should be informed by local practitioners, experts, and researchers and take into account perspectives from marginalized/border communities and not just the capital.
- 13 **Enhance data collection and analysis on the inter-linkages between the SDG 16 and PVE agendas and how they can be further strengthened:** This could involve:
  - Reviewing the implementation of the UN Secretary-General's Plan of Action on PVE, including the development and implementation of national action plans inspired by the SG's Plan and member states' progress on advancing SDG 16 objectives, on a bi-annual basis; and
  - Including SDG 16 as a recurring agenda item in the semi-annual meetings of the PVE community of practice (CoP); and
  - Taking stock of which PVE activities are being undertaken in furtherance of SDG 16 in future reviews of this SDG.
- 14 **Leverage OECD DAC statistical and analytic capacities:** As a result of the 2016 update to the OECD's Official Development Assistance (ODA) guidelines, the 35 OECD member states can report funding for PVE activities as part of their annual development target. Although it is difficult to quantify the precise amounts, this change has allowed for additional development assistance to be used to address the drivers of violent extremism. However, there is more the OECD could be doing to influence the direction and quality of PVE programming, which in turn would facilitate understanding when and where PVE programs are advancing the SDG 16+ goals and where programmatic synergies between the two agenda could be enhanced.