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I. INTRODUCTION

1. The African Union Peace and Security Department (PSD) hosted an Experts Meeting on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development (PCRD) in Africa on 6-7 February 2006 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The meeting was convened to discuss the draft policy framework for PCRD, produced on the basis of discussions of a concept paper presented at the 4th Brainstorming Retreat of the Peace and Security Council (PSC) and other members of the Permanent Representatives’ Committee (PRC) of the African Union (AU) on 4-5 September in Durban, South Africa.

2. Convened by the AU Commission, the Experts meeting was supported by SaferAfrica. Participants included members of the various departments within the AU Commission; members of the AU Peace and Security Council; the African Development Bank; AU specialized technical agencies; UN agencies, civil society groups, and bilateral aid agencies. (For list of participants, Annex 1).

3. Participants reviewed the draft policy framework on PCRD, making recommendations for changes and additions to each constitutive element, as well as to the document as a whole, with a view to enriching the policy framework (see agenda, Annex 2). For each session, a discussant gave an overview of the pertinent elements of the draft policy framework, while a facilitator chaired and guided the discussion. In particular, participants focused on the following elements:

   a) Mandate and Rationale of the PCRD;
   b) Principles underlying the implementation of PCRD;
   c) Benchmarks, standards and indicators for implementation, and sequencing, of PCRD activities under each constitutive element;
   d) Resource mobilisation and capacity building; and
   e) Actors, governance mechanisms and processes required for the implementation of PCRD activities.

4. Recommendations made on each section will inform the refinement of the draft policy document before its submission to a meeting of governmental experts for consideration in May 2006.

5. Suggestions pertaining to the revision of the document can be classified into two: those pertaining to structure and those that address content. With regard to the structure and organisation of the PCRD policy framework, participants recommended, inter alia:

   a) the separation of the normative and strategic elements from the operational;
   b) clear definitions of each constitutive element.;
   c) the inclusion of clear guidelines in the framework that would help to define the point at which the post-conflict phase ends;
d) the integration of the different constitutive elements and highlighting of cross-cutting issues.

e) prioritisation and sequencing of activities in the short-, medium- and long-term, or the emergency, transition and development phases;

f) organisation of activities within each constitutive element into clusters by theme;

g) alignment of benchmarks, standards and indicators with the activities listed, to ensure their coherence, relevance and validity; and

h) clarification of the roles and responsibilities of all actors—including civil society, governments and multi-laterals—at all levels (local, national, regional, continental and international) for the purposes of coordination as well as accountability and monitoring progress.

6. A number of changes and additions that apply to the content of the PCRD policy framework as a whole were also suggested. Some of the areas covered by these suggestions include:

a) the need to ensure that all PCRD activities contribute to the creation of a culture of peace in a post-conflict society;

b) the need to consider PCRD as part of a continuum of peace and security-related activities, including conflict prevention, management and resolution, and to ensure that it contributes to sustainable development;

c) the importance of conducting contextual or baseline analyses of countries emerging from conflict. Such analyses should precede and inform PCRD activities, help identify needs, be used as a basis for crafting intervention strategies, and to determine timing for action. They should also take account of local specificities including the political and social context, as well as local capacities and regional dynamics;

d) institutionalisation of monitoring and evaluation as part of the implementation process, to reduce the need for periodic assessments;

e) the need to devote special attention to groups with special needs, including women, children, the elderly, the disabled, people with HIV/AIDS, youth and child soldiers; and

f) Highlight the important role that can be played by arts, culture, education, science, technology and sport in the PCRD policy.

II. OPENING SESSION

7. The opening session was chaired by Mr. Geoffrey Mugumya, the Director of the Peace and Security Department of the Commission, and the opening address was given by the Commissioner for Peace and Security, Ambassador Said Djinnit. Ambassador
Djinnit outlined the history of the draft policy framework for PCRD, from its initial conception, through to the deliberations at the 4th Brainstorming Retreat of the PSC and PRC in Durban, South Africa on 4-5 September, 2005, to its current version which was the subject of this meeting. He stressed the need for African institutions to provide guidance to countries emerging from conflict and to become more involved in PCRD activities on the continent.

8. Amb. Djinnit underscored the significance of a policy framework on PCRD in anchoring reconstruction activities in the increasing number of countries emerging from conflict. At the time of the meeting, Liberia had embarked on the road to reconstruction, Burundi’s pledging conference was scheduled for 27th February 2006, and both the Democratic Republic of Congo and Somalia were possible candidates for post conflict reconstruction. He therefore urged participants to apply themselves to the task before them and to make contributions that will improve the quality of the draft policy document, and subsequently the reconstruction agenda in Africa.

9. The Chair of the Session, Geoffrey Mugumya, reiterated the Commissioner’s message and urged participants to focus specifically on: the elaboration of benchmarks, standards and indicators for each constitutive element; the sequencing of activities; and the institutional setup and mechanisms for implementation, including the relationship that should be developed with the newly formed UN Peacebuilding Commission.

SESSION II: MANDATE AND RATIONALE

10. Mr. El-Ghassim Wane, Head of the Conflict Management Division of the AU Commission, was the discussant during the session devoted to the mandate and rationale of the PCRD policy framework (paragraphs 10-17 of the draft). Brigadier-General Pal Martins, of SaferAfrica, facilitated the session. In his remarks, Mr. Wane identified four issues that the experts needed to help clarify in the PCRD policy framework. These were:

a) the role of the AU in PCRD, in particular, the relationship of the AU to the regional economic communities (RECs), and its role in the implementation of PCRD;

b) how to draw lessons from the experiences of AU institutions and other actors engaged in PCRD activities at national, regional and international level;

c) how to consolidate peace and contribute to long-term sustainable development; and

d) the mechanisms necessary for coordination of activities to enhance effective collaboration of all actors.

11. Brig-Gen Martins thanked the international partners present for their input, and underscored the importance of aligning the PCRD efforts of international partners with the AU-led process in order to ensure that international PCRD programmes support, rather than compete with, those of the AU. He also reminded participants that the longer-term goal of PCRD is sustainable development, and urged them to focus beyond short-term
stabilisation of post-conflict countries. Finally, participants were encouraged to contribute concrete suggestions for implementation modalities so that the PCRD policy framework could be rapidly adapted and utilised by countries emerging from conflict.

12. In general, participants accepted and agreed on the mandate and rationale for the PCRD framework, as stated in the draft policy. Most underscored the timeliness of the effort, the need to emphasize African ownership of PCRD processes, the importance of a good division of labour and clarity of the roles of various actors, particularly the RECs, and the value of an African framework that can act as a checklist for countries emerging from conflict. In addition, participants urged inclusion of the following in the revised document:

   a) the involvement of the AU in its entirety, beyond the Commission, and including the RECs and specialised institutions;
   b) elaboration of the relationship between the AU PCRD policy framework and the newly-established UN Peacebuilding Commission (PBC);
   c) recognition of the unique challenges posed by those countries whose institutions have been destroyed completely during conflicts, leaving no capacity to implement PCRD programmes;
   d) the possibility of citing Article 4(h) of the Constitutive Act of the African Union, which allows the AU to intervene in a Member State, as a basis for the AU’s role in PCRD, and
   e) reflection of experiences from countries currently engaged in post conflict reconstruction.

SESSION III: PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE PCRD FRAMEWORK

13. Ambassador Moussa Makan Camara, from the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie (OIF) facilitated the session on the underlying principles of the PCRD framework (paragraphs 18-22 of the draft). The discussant, Dr. Monica Juma, from SaferAfrica, presented the pillars constituting each of the principles and highlighted some challenges that these present for the AU, and for all actors engaged in PCRD activities on the continent.

14. Some of the challenges relating to the underlying principles of the PCRD policy framework include:

   a) how to augment AU leadership and ensure mutual accountability when most PCRD actors are not accountable to the AU;
   b) the need to accelerate the process of developing African common positions and definitions of key sub-elements of PCRD, such as DDR or SSR;
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c) ensuring strategic coherence between international PCRD processes and the AU process, including through harmonisation of activities and synchronisation of delivery, while ensuring that the AU maintains overall leadership;

d) ensuring that PCRD activities strengthen legitimate state authority, rather than undermine it;

e) ensuring that PCRD activities lead to the creation of credible institutions based on the principle of equitable distribution of power and wealth, so as to avoid the creation of new grievances that could re-ignite the conflict;

f) creating the space for post-conflict countries to determine and prioritise their own needs, and for beneficiaries of PCRD activities to participate in all phases of PCRD programmes;

g) mainstreaming capacity building into all of the constitutive elements of the PCRD policy framework and ensuring that genuine skills transfer takes place.

h) ensuring national ownership and participation in PCRD activities even if PCRD programmes are developed during peace talks, which do not necessarily involve all stakeholders.

15. Participants underscored that these principles relate to the management of PCRD efforts and therefore apply to and guide all activities and programmes undertaken across each constitutive element. The primary objective of having them is to ensure synergy of action and enhance effective and efficient delivery of services in a manner that leads towards a renewal of the society. In addition, participants emphasized the following:

   a) the importance of an integrated needs assessment in each post-conflict situation, which would form the basis for adapting the AU PCRD framework;

   b) the principle of gender equity and the participation of women;

   c) respect for human rights;

   d) the principle of partnership, at all levels, as a complement to the principles of African leadership and national ownership;

   e) inclusion of the principle of flexibility which, guided by regular assessments, would enable introduction of changes in strategy to respond to the impact/unintended consequences of PCRD activities; and

   f) the principle of subsidiarity, which guarantees local ownership and ensures participation and partnership at the national level, between African governments, and between African and international actors.
SESSION IV: CONSTITUTIVE ELEMENTS

i) SECURITY

16. The session devoted to security (paragraphs 24-26 of the draft) was facilitated by Dr. Roman Poeschke, of GTZ. Ms. Lu Ecclestone, from DFID, was the discussant.

17. The suggestions regarding the security section included the following:

   a) define security and its key elements such as human security, DDR and SSR, more precisely;
   b) be cognisant of the overall context/lack of security that is associated with countries emerging from conflict;
   c) conduct strategic analysis before embarking on PCRD activities to ensure a thorough understanding of the context in which security is to be re-established;
   d) distinguish between short-term stabilization and long term strategic measures;
   e) establish roles and responsibilities of all actors at local, national, regional, continental and international levels;
   f) determine key activities that can be undertaken before the signing of a peace agreement;
   g) pay special attention to the needs of child soldiers; and
   h) highlight the linkage between security and other constitutive elements, in particular human rights.

ii) POLITICAL GOVERNANCE AND TRANSITION

18. The session on Political Governance and Transition (paragraphs 27-30 of the draft) was facilitated by Ambassador Emile Ognimba, Director of the Department of Political Affairs. The discussants were Mr. Julian Brett, a consultant for DANIDA, and Dr. Jay Singh from USAID.

19. Participants noted:

   a) the need for a definition of governance, which includes the various constituent elements including participation, transparency, separation of powers, creation of a public (civil) service, the rule of law and independent civilian oversight, etc, most of which are often lacking in countries emerging from conflict. Such a definition would also need to consider how to include economic governance (including corruption) in this section;
b) the need to based PCRD activities on comprehensive contextual analysis of the socio-economic and political power relations at all levels of the society, including the identification of actual/potential spoilers;

c) role of civil society in enhancing governance, particularly in the immediate post-conflict period, when the government can outsource some services to civil society actors, for a limited time, until it attains the capacity to deliver;

d) the important role to be played by the civil service and representative organizations such as parliament, especially through the institution of checks and balances;

e) need to clarify the form of decentralisation proposed—whether it is a decentralisation of power, responsibility, financial management, etc.;

f) need to reconcile the principle of national ownership, which entails capacity, and the lack of such capacity in post-conflict countries, owing largely to the flight of human capital before and during conflict;

g) need to engage international capacity in ways that build and enhance, rather than limit or destroy, the opportunities for the building or enhancement of local capacity; and

h) institutionalisation of oversight structures and mechanisms.

iii) HUMAN RIGHTS, JUSTICE AND RECONCILIATION

20. The session on Human Rights, Justice and Reconciliation (paragraphs 31-34 of the draft) was facilitated by Ben Kioko, Legal Counsellor in the AU Legal Office. The discussants were Commissioner Ould Babana Mohamed Abdellahi of the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights and Mr. Assan from UNESCO.

21. Recommendations emerging from the discussion focused on the need to:

a) define the key concepts of human rights, justice and reconciliation, and to consider whether justice is to be viewed as part of governance, part of the protection of human rights, or a value on its own;

b) determine how to combine traditional or indigenous mechanisms for justice and reconciliation with modern legal systems;

c) clarify the role of the AU and its specialized mechanisms/organs, such as the ACHPR and the PSC, in the promotion and protection of human rights;

d) include reference to the promotion, in addition to the protection, of human rights;

e) underscore the importance of domestication and implementation of international human rights instruments, after ratifying and acceding to them, through domestic legislation, establishment and/or strengthening national human rights institutions and state reporting procedures;
f) provide for the involvement of civil society, including faith based organisations, in the protection and promotion of human rights, justice and reconciliation;

g) acknowledge that in countries emerging from conflict, not only must the rule of law be restored, but often national legal codes need to be reviewed as well;

h) undertake judicial reform in countries emerging from conflict;

i) provide for the freedom of expression, including free and independent media, in a post-conflict situation;

j) reject impunity completely;

k) balance context-based approaches for granting amnesty to promote reconciliation, against the need to provide justice;

l) emphasise and protect the right of each society emerging from conflict to choose between restorative and retributive justice, based on its needs;

m) include the application of international humanitarian law in post-conflict settings, especially with regard to prisoners of war;

n) promote institution-building in national institutions mandated to promote and protect human rights, such as the national commissions;

o) recognise and ensure the centrality of education and training in the promotion of human rights, justice, reconciliation and the culture of peace;

p) underscore the importance of education as a fundamental right, especially given demographic trends in countries emerging from conflict, and the overwhelming preponderance of the youth among combatants; and

q) address the needs of specific groups and groups with special needs.

22. Given the different activities that constitute this element, participants advised its classification into three subsections of human rights, justice and reconciliation.

iv) HUMANITARIAN/ EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

23. The session on Humanitarian/Emergency Assistance (paragraphs 35-38 of the draft) was facilitated by Mr. Ilunga Ngandu of UNHCR. The discussant was Nicholas Crawford from the WFP. The discussant emphasised the need to include emergency as an integral part of PCRD, and noted three reasons in support of this, namely:

a) that humanitarian needs increase after the signing of peace agreements and the subsequent return of refugees, IDPs, and ex-combatants. This period is also characterised by high expectations that could re-ignite conflict if assistance is not provided;
b) humanitarian activities can offset the risk for relapse into conflict associated with many post-conflict countries;

c) humanitarian programmes are good platforms for consolidating peace. If well-planned and executed, they can provide basis for a smooth transition from relief to development;

24. Suggestions made during the discussion included the need to:

  a) underscore the importance of meeting the population’s high expectations for peace dividends, and of avoiding a sudden cessation of humanitarian assistance after a conflict, to avoid a relapse into violence;
  
b) view humanitarian assistance as a basis for development, and as a platform on which to build broader PCRD programmes which require time for planning and implementation after a peace agreement is signed;
  
c) acknowledge humanitarian actors’ knowledge of risks, vulnerabilities and local capacities and incorporate such knowledge into PCRD planning and implementation;
  
d) cluster humanitarian activities into legal, operational and institutional measures. Legal measures include amnesty laws, housing and property rights; operational measures include the 4Rs (repatriation, reintegration, reconstruction and resettlement) approach in the planning and implementation of humanitarian and development programmes and the role of the security forces in reconstruction activities; and institutional measures, which include the creation of efficient and effective institutions and coordination mechanisms to meet humanitarian needs;
  
e) have a clear exit strategy, given that the line between emergency and longer-term development assistance is often blurred. Situations where emergency actions last for several years should be avoided. Instead, every effort should be made to expedite the transition from humanitarian relief to sustainable development assistance;
  
f) include reference to Member State reporting on humanitarian issues in the benchmarks of this element;
  
g) make reference to HIV/AIDS, which is totally lacking in the framework document. The end of conflict often sees a large rise in the incidence/rate of infection, as transport and trade routes, closed during war, are re-opened and people become more mobile. Prevention activities should form part of both the humanitarian and developmental activities;
  
h) make reference to particular problems with the funding process which, in the case of emergency relief, is often too slow; and
i) reflect on the value of existing tools (such as UNHCR’s 4Rs approach, UNDG guidelines on countries in transition, etc.) to improving this component of the AU policy framework.

25. Participants noted that given the centrality of humanitarian assistance in anchoring transition, the availability of funds and its timing is critical for relief and transition activities. It was also suggested that this constitutive element should follow immediately after the security element.

v) RECONSTRUCTION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

26. The session on Reconstruction and Socio-Economic Development (paragraphs 39-41 of the draft) was facilitated by Dr. René Kouassi, Director of the AU Commission Economic Affairs Department. The discussants were James Wahome from the African Development Bank, Victoria Sekitileko from the FAO and Ms. Katharina Schnoring from the IOM.

27. Participants urged the need to reconceptualise socio-economic development in post-war countries. Noting that traditionally socio-economic development is predicated on the existence of functioning systems, participants underscored that such structures are non-existent or severely disrupted in many post-conflict countries. A proposal was made to embrace the concept of countries emerging from conflict, which could form a basis for creating special mechanisms and procedures for such countries. The greatest challenge is ensuring that activities proceed while at the same time systems are being created.

28. Amongst the issues raised during the discussion included:

a) debt clearance and its impact on the budget of post-conflict countries, their ability to attract investment and their ability to implement PCRD programmes;

b) importance of rebuilding the data collection and analysis capacity of the government for assessing needs and monitoring progress in implementation of PCRD;

c) absence of financial management systems amongst local and national actors in post-conflict settings, which often disqualifies them from receiving the donor assistance they need;

d) need to brief the leaders of countries emerging from conflicts on ongoing international processes, such as WTO negotiations, so that they can participate effectively in international fora;

e) need for additional benchmarks for measuring progress in reconstruction and socio-economic development, such as decreased irregular migration, increased voluntary return and increased involvement of the diaspora in socio-economic development;

f) importance of assessing technological needs for reconstruction and development, such as technology for water, sanitation, and electricity, in
addition to environmental sustainability and capacity-building in generic technological skills;

g) payment of salaries and pensions, especially to the security forces and the civil service, to prevent corruption, address past grievances and ensure good governance;

h) need to include activities and indicators related to trade, agricultural infrastructure, banking and fiscal reform;

i) need to include reference to HIV/AIDS and other communicable diseases which impact on economic development;

j) need to make reference to environmental issues and the management of natural resources;

k) majority of African populations are involved in agriculture, and this sector therefore needs to be given a greater role in economic development;

l) impact of conflict on neighbouring countries, since trans-border trade and smuggling, illegal trafficking, large refugee influxes and political instability impact neighbouring states; and

m) need to deal with the gap between donor commitments and disbursement; and ensuring that funds are disbursed in a timely and predictable manner, through monitoring of resource flows.

vi) GENDER

29. The session on Gender (paragraphs 42-44 of the draft) was facilitated by Ms. Pamela Delargy from UNFPA. The discussant was Ms. Hodan Addou from UNIFEM. The discussant noted the need, as a starting point, to acknowledge gender inequity as an obstacle to development and indicate the milestones reached in attempts to address this global challenge.

30. The comments made during the discussion of this section include the following:

   a) the two-pronged approach of mainstreaming gender issues throughout the document while also devoting a separate section to gender is a good one, since women and girls are disproportionately affected by conflict and their needs deserve special attention;

   b) gender does not mean only women, but also includes men. In this light a proposal was made to change the title of the section to women and gender, and to include reference to specific problems faced by, for example, young boys, especially child soldiers;

   c) gender based violence is not only perpetrated against women, so definitions should include violence against boys as well and the security and justice sectors should be sensitised to all forms of gender based violence;
d) benchmarks for this section should include legislative indicators, such as "gender sensitive legal framework" and training of the judiciary and law enforcement agencies, etc.;

e) the need to include reference to reproductive health;

f) recognition that security-sector reform (SSR) and DDR often do not recognise or acknowledge the role of women in rebel movements – they are soldiers, sex-slaves, etc., and this needs to be taken into account when designing programmes;

g) there needs to be a conscious attempt to identify economic activities that would benefit women, especially in the agricultural sector; and

h) it would be helpful to have a gender focal point in the national coordinating/implementing body for PCRD, to assist with mainstreaming of gender.

SESSION V: RESOURCE MOBILISATION AND CAPACITY BUILDING

31. The session on resource mobilisation and capacity building (paragraphs 45-47 of the draft) was facilitated by Ms. Francesca Pavarini of the European Commission. The discussant was Mr. Yasuaki Aihara from JICA.

32. Some of the suggestions and comments made during discussion of this section included the:

a) importance of considering not only financial resources, but also human and technical resources, particularly when mobilising assistance from AU Member States;

b) importance of a national resource mobilisation strategy underpinned by a needs assessment, which includes among other things the rehabilitation of the financial and banking systems;

c) need for the AU to specify modalities for engagement of international actors in PCRD to ensure local capacity building and encourage use of local actors;

d) need to separate the AU’s coordination and advocacy role from the financial management of PCRD programmes. The AU can monitor disbursement of funds against donor pledges;

e) AU could engage donors to deal with post-conflict countries in a more flexible manner and to translate their commitments into actual assistance more rapidly and reliably;

f) AU could utilise and improve upon existing donor coordination mechanisms rather than inventing a new one for PCRD (see, for example, the Donor Coordination Review Forum, Donor Assistance Groups (DAG) at national level, etc);
g) private sector as an additional source of resources, both financial and technical. Public-private partnerships are also a good method of building capacity and transferring skills;

h) other sources of funding and non-financial resources are available for PCRD, including: remittances, the diaspora, repatriation of funds inappropriately moved to foreign accounts by former leaders, and South-South partnerships; and

i) need to further consider how a PCRD fund would be managed, if established; including the source of funding; and to draw lessons from existing models such as the Africa Peace Facility.

SESSION VI: ACTORS, GOVERNANCE MECHANISMS AND PROCESSES

i) REGIONAL AND NATIONAL

33. The session on regional and national actors, governance mechanisms and processes (paragraphs 51-56 and 61 of the draft) was facilitated by Mr. Sybert Liebenberg of CSIR. Discussants were representatives of the RECs (ECOWAS, EAC, COMESA, CENSAD and SADC).

34. Some of the comments and suggestions made during the discussion included the following:

a) the RECs are well-placed to serve as the operational base for the implementation and monitoring of PCRD programmes;

b) the PCRD policies and programmes of the RECs should be compatible with and complementary to the AU framework;

c) in addition to the RECs, other regional groups such as the Great Lakes Conference, the Nairobi Secretariat or the Mano River Union can also play a role in PCRD. The role of neighbouring states should also be highlighted;

d) an inter-ministerial committee at national level can oversee PCRD implementation, while a similar body should also be established at regional level to monitor and oversee progress in PCRD;

e) the possible composition, mandate and modalities of a PSC standing committee on PCRD deserve further discussion;

f) more attention should be given to community based organisations (CBOs), women’s organisations, faith-based organisations and other local civil society actors in developing and implementing PCRD programmes.

ii) CONTINENTAL AND INTERNATIONAL

35. The session on continental and international actors, governance mechanisms and processes (paragraphs 49-50 and 57-61 of the draft) was facilitated by Baboucarr Blaise
I. Jagne, Head of the Liaison office with the AU. The discussants were Mr. Kojo Busia of the UNECA and Ambassador Tim Clarke of the European Commission.

36. Some of the areas discussed in relation to this section included the:

a) possibility of the AU establishing and hosting a database of African expertise that could be made available to countries emerging from conflict. The AU could then provide assistance in matching available African capacities to the needs of post-conflict countries and facilitating their development;

b) importance of partnerships (between local actors; public and private sector; government and civil society; African institutions; international actors; etc) in all aspects of PCRD;

c) role of specialised technical institutions in providing training and creating human resource capacity;

d) possible relationship between the new UN Peace-building Commission and the AU with regard to PCRD programmes on the continent;

e) importance of credible and effective coordination and implementation mechanisms, as well as smooth and timely exchange of information amongst partners;

f) twinning of African and non-African partner institutions is an effective strategy for capacity building;

g) need to foster closer inter-departmental coordination within the AU and its specialised institutions.

h) need for close linkages between PCRD processes and mechanisms, and those relating to conflict prevention, management and resolution.

CONCLUSION AND WAY FORWARD

37. Mr. Wane explained that the rapporteurs of the meeting would produce a report of proceedings, and that the AU would further refine the draft policy document following a number of consultations including:

a) consultations with the RECs, and possibly with countries emerging from conflict, to examine lessons learned during PCRD implementation and to harmonise continental and regional initiatives; and

b) consultations with civil society to ensure broad participation in the development and eventual implementation of the policy framework;

38. Based on the recommendations of the experts meeting as well as the consultations, a drafting team comprising of the AU Commission, SaferAfrica and UNHCR will revise the draft policy framework. In view of this, Mr Wane encouraged participants to submit written comments to either Dr. Monica Juma (SaferAfrica) or Dr.
Befekadu Berhanu (UNHCR), for consideration and incorporation in the revised document.

38. The revised policy framework document on PCRD will then be submitted for review to a governmental experts meeting, scheduled for mid May 2006.

40. Mr. Wane then thanked SaferAfrica, and other partners for their continued support of the AU in the development of the PCRD policy framework, and all the participants for their attendance and effective participation.

41. The meeting adjourned at 17:00 on 7 February 2006.