

Unclassified

DCD/DIR(2006)12



Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques  
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

29-Mar-2006

English - Or. English

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE

DCD/DIR(2006)12  
Unclassified

**UPDATE ON SECURITY SYSTEM REFORM FOLLOWING THE GHANA PRACTITIONERS' WORKSHOP**

*Attached is an update on the DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation's (CPDC) workstream on Security System Reform together with the Executive Summary of the report from the SSR Practitioners Workshop held in Ghana 5-7 December 2005. The purpose of this workshop was to bring together policy makers and practitioners from OECD and partner countries to discuss and develop the draft Implementation Framework on Security System Reform (IF-SSR).*

Mark Downes: Tel: +33 1 45 24 15 07; Fax: +33 (0)1 44 20 61 47, mark.downes@oecd.org  
Lisa Williams: Tel. +33(0)1 45 24 90 27, Fax: +33 (0)1 44 20 61 47, lisa.williams@oecd.org

JT03206612

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine  
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

English - Or. English



ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTION DE LA COOPERATION POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE

Le Directeur  
The Director

DCD/DIR(2006)12

28 March 2006

To: DAC Delegates

**Update on Security System Reform following Ghana Practitioners' Workshop**

I am writing to follow-up on my letter [DCD/DIR(2005)37], informing members of the SSR Practitioners Workshop organised by the DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation (CPDC) held in Ghana 5-7 December 2005. The workshop, organised with the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Centre, brought together practitioners from the development community with their military, intelligence, police, prisons, civil society, judicial and customs services colleagues. Practitioners brought experience from Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Lesotho, Malawi, Nigeria, Panama, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan and Uganda.

The workshop marked an important step in the development of the Implementation Framework on Security System Reform (IF-SSR), which is central to the CPDC work plan for 2005-6. The Framework aims to translate the *DAC Guidance on Security System Reform and Governance* (2005) into an operational tool which will help guide, co-ordinate, align, monitor and evaluate SSR activities by DAC member governments in the field. It will help practitioners in supporting appropriate, integrated and realistic approaches to SSR programming.

The Workshop Report, (the Executive Summary of which is attached to this letter) highlighted a number of critical success factors central to the assessment, design and implementation of security system reform. Field-level practitioners expressed their need for more specific guidance on engaging in sub-sector security reforms (e.g. prisons or police) and how to link-up with other aspects of the security system. The work so far has demonstrated that OECD governments need to do more to ensure greater coherence with regard to SSR across their administrations.

As part of the next phase of the Implementation Framework, each CPDC member is encouraged to coordinate feedback (and provide practical case study examples) from all stakeholders from across their government administration, including colleagues from the Defence, Interior and Justice Ministries and members of the Parliamentary Committee that deal with security sector issues. We understand that some members have established whole-of-government working groups on SSR to facilitate this feedback process.


A revised version of the IF-SSR, which takes into account the outcomes of the Ghana workshop, will be available to CPDC Members for comment before the end of this month. The next phase of this

work entails translating the IF-SSR into a practical manual which will be presented to the DAC later in 2006.

At the recent meeting of the CPDC Network, members underlined the importance of pilot testing the IF-SSR, and reviewing its potential as a co-ordination mechanism at field level. The SSR Task Team Meeting on 16 June will discuss a proposal on piloting of the Implementation Framework.

We will keep you informed of further developments in this critical area of development assistance.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Roeskau". The signature is stylized with a large, looped initial 'M' and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Michael Roeskau

*Towards Development an Implementation Framework for Security System Reform (IF-SSR)*

**SSR Practitioners Workshop, Ghana 5-7 December 2005**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Introduction**

1. Security system reform (SSR) policy experts and practitioners from OECD and developing countries met in Ghana on 5-7 December 2005 to discuss the development of the draft Implementation Framework (IF-SSR) designed to operationalise the *OECD-DAC Guidelines on Security System Reform and Governance*, approved by Development Ministers and Agency Heads in 2004 (See Annex 1 for the workshop agenda and Annex 2 for background on the IF-SSR). The Workshop was organised by the DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation (CPDC) in conjunction with the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Center (KAIPTC). It was facilitated by the consortium engaged by the CPDC to develop the draft IF-SSR. This team included representatives from Clingendael (Luc van de Goor, Hans Hoebeke), SaferWorld (Andrew McLean, Paul Eavis) and the University of Bradford (Professor Malcolm Chalmers, Christopher Cushing, and Owen Greene). Around fifty participants took part, and brought together practitioners from the development community with their military, intelligence, police, prisons, civil society, judicial and customs services colleagues. OECD DAC member states represented included Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, UK, US, and international organisations represented included the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Practitioners present had experience from Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Lesotho, Malawi, Nigeria, Panama, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan and Uganda.

2. The Workshop was opened by the KAIPTC Deputy Commandant, Colonel Werner Rauber. Graham Thompson, (SSR Advisor, DFID and Chair of the SSR Task Team of the OECD DAC Network on CPDC) and Mark Downes (from the Secretariat for the CPDC, OECD Development Cooperation Directorate) then made some opening remarks, welcoming participants to the Workshop. This was followed by a plenary presentation by Professor Malcolm Chalmers, University of Bradford.

3. Professor Chalmers explained that the Workshop's main purpose was to provide practitioner input for the IF-SSR. The CPDC Network therefore welcomed comment and critique which would allow the Framework to be better informed by practitioner experience. He explained the main definitions used in the IF-SSR, including the broad definition of the 'security system' to include a range of state and non-state security 'sectors'. The IF-SSR took as its starting point the 2004 DAC Guidance on *Security System Reform and Governance: Policy and Good Practice* which focuses on the promotion of security from violence for the poor and develops basic principles for SSR. Professor Chalmers went on to outline the structure of the initial draft of the IF-SSR, which provides guidance on 'entry points' (or opportunities for engagement) for SSR at systemic, thematic and sectoral levels.

4. The workshop was mainly spent in break-out groups with experts discussing the specific sections of the draft IF-SSR most relevant to their work. The break-out groups were held on days one and two, and

experts focused on specific sections of the draft IF-SSR in detail before reporting their conclusions to the plenary workshop.

- "*Analysing the Country Context and Drivers of Change*", the main focus of the first set of Breakout Groups, examined how to develop system-wide assessments and how to ensure linkages between reforms across the security system.
- "*Designing SSR Programmes*", the main focus of the second set of Breakout Groups was how to operationalise SSR principles within different post-conflict and development situations.
- "*Sector-Specific Needs and Approaches*", the main focus of the third set of Breakout Groups, covered: (a) Defence; (b) Intelligence; (c) Justice and Prisons; (d) National Strategic Planning; (e) Police; (f) Border Management, Customs & Immigration; and (g) Civil Society and Civilian Oversight Bodies. In order to reflect particular inter-sectoral linkages, three Joint Breakout Groups were also organised on (h) Defence, DDR and SALW; (i) National Strategic Planning and Intelligence; and (j) Justice, Prisons, Police, Customs, Immigration.
- "*Monitoring and Evaluation*" sessions involved discussions how to monitor the progress and evaluate the impact of SSR programmes and other issues, including: the objectives of M&E, common challenges of evaluating SSR programmes; building local ownership through participatory evaluations; and measuring local ownership and partnerships.

5. Day Three began with structured discussion of the role of the international community in supporting SSR. In six separate Breakout Groups, participants were asked to identify common problems in, and make recommendations for, improving, international engagement at each stage of the Programme Cycle: Assessment; Design; Implementation; Monitoring and Evaluation.

6. The Workshop concluded with a wrap-up session, and selected points from this are included at the end of this report.

7. This executive summary draws on the reports from all three days, focusing on the Key Issues and highlighting the Main Recommendations. It summarises the main suggestions from participants of how to enhance the draft framework. Full unedited reports of each Breakout Group are available upon request from the OECD DAC Secretariat.

8. In addition to the facilitators for the meeting, the rapporteurs and chairs for the various breakout groups included Adedeji Ebo, Innocent Chukwuma, Lu Ecclestone, Rod Evans, Ann Fitz Gerald, Yannick Hingorani, Benjamin Kunbuor, Graham Mathias, Laurie Nathan, Uju Ogomoh, Gordon Peake, Jonathan Sandy, Peter Viner and Peter Wilson. The Workshop Organisers would like to thank them all for their invaluable contributions.

9. Participants at the workshop believed that the primary audience of the IF-SSR is the member states of the OECD, and in particular policy officers, desk officers and practitioners involved in SSR within their governments, from development agencies, foreign affairs and defence. At the same time, it is intended to be valuable for a wider audience in the OECD's partner countries, both inside and outside government. For example, the principles and guidelines, as well as operational recommendations, developed through the OECD process could be used by regional and sub-regional organisations (such as ECOWAS) to develop their own policies and practices on SSR. Once approved, the IF-SSR will also be useful as a means for partner countries to hold OECD members to account for the way in which they support SSR.

10. Participants at the Workshop welcomed the draft IF-SSR as an important step forward in turning OECD policy into improved practice by its member states. The overall conclusion was that the draft report

provides a good basis for the development of the IF-SSR and, once it has been further developed to reflect the recommendations of the workshop, should be translated into a practical handbook to maximise its accessibility for practitioners. They valued the opportunity to be consulted in the process and were keen to remain involved, both in providing further inputs into the IF-SSR and as part of its dissemination. They particularly welcomed the fact that the workshop was being held in Ghana rather than in an OECD member state. This was an encouraging symbol of the OECD's commitment to working closely with partner countries and country-based practitioners.

## **Key Issues**

### ***Critical success factors for SSR***

11. The importance of political will, building understanding and dialogue, developing popular support and addressing both opponents and drivers of change were repeatedly emphasised by participants. Effective SSR programmes should seek to address these issues throughout each stage of the programme cycle.

### ***Assessment***

12. Participants agreed that comprehensive assessments underpin effective SSR programmes. The emphasis in the draft IF-SSR on conducting political analysis, assessing the security context, analysing the capacity and governance of the security sector, and assessing the needs of the poor was welcomed. It was suggested that these should be combined into one assessment framework for practitioners. Ideally, a comprehensive assessment should be carried out before the development of a SSR programme. In contexts where this proves impossible due to pressure of time and urgent needs, participants suggested that a pre-assessment should be conducted at the outset to identify immediate needs and then a more comprehensive assessment carried out in the inception phase to inform longer-term programme design. It was recognised that, on occasion, only through developing relationships and establishing credibility during such an inception phase, is it possible to gain the access necessary to deliver a truly informed assessment.

### ***Programme design***

13. The emphasis in the IF-SSR on designing integrated SSR programmes was welcomed, but it was also emphasised that one-off or compartmentalised approaches should be avoided. It was recognised that comprehensive approaches may be too complex, particularly at the outset. Participants suggested taking a problem-solving approach to SSR, with programmes designed to address key needs (e.g. crime prevention or prison overcrowding) identified by local stakeholders and then seeking to develop outwards to address linkages to other aspects of the security system. It was felt that such an issue-based approach was more beneficial than trying to start from the point of developing a system-wide programme and would enable linkages to be addressed more naturally. Participants agreed that the sectoral division of the implementation section in the IF-SSR is valuable for practitioners but suggested that greater emphasis should be given to highlighting linkages to other aspects of the security system. The risks of starting an SSR programme without a proper preparatory period were emphasised by participants and it was suggested that programmes should include an inception phase designed to build support among key stakeholders, conduct a comprehensive assessment, test assumptions and conduct pilot projects to identify locally-effective approaches. System-wide issues should be identified and addressed in any inception phase in order to ensure integrated programmes over time and provide a working knowledge of the linkages as reform evolves.

***Implementation***

14. Participants stressed the benefits of national strategic planning to SSR programmes to help situate reforms in a broader context and increase national ownership. It was suggested that, where possible, this should be the starting point for SSR programmes. The need for donor co-ordination throughout programme implementation was repeatedly emphasised, and participants agreed that it is important that structures are developed to enable this, led by the partner government. The development of national institutions to lead and coordinate implementation was strongly emphasised. Participants also highlighted the need for a strategy to build popular support, encourage political will and address the issue of those who may not support reforms.

***Monitoring and evaluation***

15. Participants discussed experiences of using different indicators to measure progress and agreed that qualitative indicators that focused on local people's perceptions of security were most effective. The need to build local capacity for monitoring and evaluation and to use participatory methodologies was emphasised. The lack of effective monitoring and evaluation was seen by participants as a common failing of SSR programmes. It was suggested that the OECD should hold a separate workshop on M&E in order to help develop guidance on this subject in the IF-SSR.

***Dealing with specific country contexts***

16. International engagement with SSR needs to be sensitive to specific country context at every stage, from assessment through design to implementation and M&E. For example, the nature of, and opportunities for, engagement are likely to differ significantly between immediate post-conflict and non-post-conflict environments, as well as between countries where there is strong high-level buy-in to broadbased SSR and those where there is not.

***The role of the international community***

17. The workshop concluded with a session discussing the role of the international community in SSR. Participants agreed that international actors have an important role to play in supporting reforms but emphasised that (with the exception of certain post-conflict contexts where authority is given for an executive role) the role of the international community is to support, not to implement. The need for increased donor co-ordination was highlighted as vital to effective support for reforms. Another clear message was the importance of OECD governments implementing their commitments to follow whole-of-government approaches in SSR. The role of development, diplomatic, security and military actors in SSR was highlighted but the importance and responsibility of coordination was repeatedly stressed. Participants agreed that the section on the role of the international community in the IF-SSR should be enhanced with a strong set of recommendations for international actors engaging in SSR.

**Main Recommendations and Next steps**

18. Participants welcomed the draft IF-SSR, and in particular emphasised the importance of the comprehensive approach to SSR. It was noted that, if a document like this had been available to practitioners recently involved in Sierra Leone, it would have been very useful. It could have had an important role, for example, in relation to the inclusion of SSR into the Lome Peace Accord. SSR requires significant human resources to be effective, and international actors needed to think through how local partners can be empowered to lead SSR – through advice, mentoring and coaching – in order to sustain it in the long term. More needs to be done to build synergies between DDR and SSR, for example in relation to information exchanges. SSR is not only useful in post-conflict situations. It can also play an important

part in providing an enabling environment for development, and should be an integral part of national development programming and PRSP processes.

### *Main recommendations*

19. A number of critical success factors central to the assessment, design and implementation of security system reform were highlighted during the discussions in Ghana. Some of the main findings include:

1. It was recognised that **SSR is a process that is bound to involve risk**. Guidance on how to manage risk must therefore be an important part of the IF-SSR.
2. The **linkages between the sectors of the security system**, and between the security system and wider national objectives, are central to SSR policy and practice. The IF-SSR must therefore continue to emphasise means by which sector-specific reform can be integrated into wider reform efforts and objectives, as well as national development frameworks and strategies. For example, the Workshop has underlined the opportunity that PRSPs present for supporting processes that enable the development of security and justice policies designed to meet the needs of people.
3. The importance of undertaking **comprehensive assessments** to underpin effective SSR programmes was underlined. Such assessments should include political analysis, assessing the security context, analysing the capacity and governance of the security sector, and assessing the needs of the poor. The need to avoid short assessment processes that are not sufficiently in-depth was emphasised. The Workshop confirmed the draft IF-SSR emphasis on the importance of a thorough assessment of the country context as a precondition for effective SSR programmes. In turn, this raised important questions about how inception periods and pilot projects, if set within a broader programme framework; can play a very useful role in delivering the level of insight required to inform the development of a long-term flexible SSR programme. The issue of the type of team required to deliver initial assessments was also relevant.
4. The need to **design integrated and sequenced SSR programmes** is central to the success of reforms. One-off or compartmentalised approaches should be avoided. For example, it is clear that the reform of the police service cannot be undertaken in isolation, and must be linked to other reforms such as justice and prison reform.
5. Partner and OECD Governments should take **an ‘issue-based’ approach** that focuses on problem-solving – where a specific security issue (e.g. justice reform) is considered in order to support better understanding and assessment of the wider system. This would be more beneficial than trying to develop a system-wide programme at the outset and would enable linkages to be addressed more naturally and eventually lead to an integrated approach to security system reform. Focusing on problem-solving (e.g. how to increase public trust in the police or how to reduce human rights violations) would allow for the development of programmes that are designed to address key needs (e.g. crime prevention or prison overcrowding) and enhance support for the reform process.
6. There is **significant practitioner demand for sector specific guidance** (e.g. dealing with prison reform or police reform) highlighting linkages to other aspects of the security system.
7. OECD governments need to do more **to ensure greater coherence with regard to SSR** across their government administrations. As part of the next phase of the implementation framework, members are encouraged to establish an internal working group from across their government administration, including colleagues from the Defence, Interior and Justice Ministries and members of the Parliamentary Committees dealing with security sector issues, to provide comments and feedback.



8. The need to identify **gaps and deepen the current version** of the draft Implementation Framework. For example, the Workshop contributed to practical understanding of the complexities of the debate on local ownership, and it was noted that this was a key area for further development. Further work will also be required to develop information on monitoring and evaluation. In general further examples will be required. Practitioners were invited to contribute written examples of their experiences in the field including examples of where things did not go as planned.
9. In relation to potential **future outreach activities**, African colleagues at the workshop emphasised that sub-regional and regional security organisations, such as the AU and ECOWAS, should consider adapting the OECD DAC agreed SSR principles to meet their own needs.
10. The importance of **piloting the IF-SSR** was underlined, and **its potential as a co-ordination mechanism** at field level highlighted. High priority should also be given to bringing in more international actors from the diplomatic and security communities in order to further address the whole-of-government dimensions of SSR engagement. Further engagement of senior development agency officials will be key in order to further high-level 'buy-in' to SSR.

### *Concrete Next Steps*

20. In order to further strengthen the IF-SSR process itself, participants put forward four key recommendations for next steps in its development:

- A separate practitioners' workshop should be held in order to support the development of the IF-SSR guidelines on Monitoring and Evaluation.
- The OECD should be encouraged to identify opportunities to test the IF-SSR through scenario exercises, including at least one post-conflict and one non-post-conflict situation.
- OECD should seek further opportunities to bring the community of practitioners together before the completion of the IF-SSR process, for example around the scenario exercises.
- The IF-SSR development process should continue to encourage the active input of partner country representatives. Possibilities include encouraging local networks to contribute to the development of scenarios, as well as exploring ways in which the OECD process can link into SSR policy processes in regional and sub-regional organisations.

## ANNEX 1 - AGENDA



## SSR PRACTITIONERS WORKSHOP

*Towards Developing an  
Implementation Framework for Security System Reform (IF-SSR)*

Kofi Annan International Peace Keeping Center (KAIPTC)  
Accra, Ghana  
5-7 December 2005

**Monday, 5 December 2005**

08:30 – 09:00	Registration
09:00 – 09:30	<p>Welcome and Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major General John Kofi Attipoe, Commandant of the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Center</li> <li>• Graham Thompson, SSR Advisor, DFID, and Chair of the SSR Taskteam of the OECD/DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation</li> </ul>
09:30 -10:30	<p>Presentation of the IF-SSR Process and Workshop Outline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Mark Downes, Development Co-operation Directorate of the OECD</li> <li>• Professor Malcolm Chamlers (Centre for International Co-operation and Security – Bradford University)</li> </ul>
10:30 -11:00	Coffee
11:00 – 13:00	<p>Introduction to System-Wide Approaches and Issues for Multi-sectoral Groups, e.g. assessments, contexts, entry points and challenges.</p> <p>Breakout Session I - Developing System-wide Assessments and Vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drivers of Change and Political Economy Analysis</li> <li>• Analysing the Security Context</li> <li>• Assessing the Causes of Insecurity/Needs of the Poor</li> <li>• Assessing issues of Governance and Capacity within the Security System</li> </ul>

13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 15:00	Report back from Breakout Session I
15:00 – 15:30	Coffee
15:30 – 17:00	<p>Critical Success Factors, Common Challenges and Getting Started</p> <p>Breakout Session II – operationalising SSR principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creative ways to get local ownership and incentives for reform</li> <li>• Dealing with spoilers and political challenges</li> <li>• How to ensure a system-wide approach</li> <li>• Building understanding, dialogue and political will</li> <li>• Risks in developing SSR programme</li> </ul>
17:00 – 18:3	Report back from Breakout Session II
18:30– 19:30	Reception hosted by the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Center

### Tuesday, 6 December 2005

09:00 – 11:00	<p><b>Introduction on Sector-specific Needs and Approaches</b></p> <p>Sector-specific needs and approaches, e.g. design, implementation and programme objectives, key actors and linking sector work to system-wide approaches.</p> <p>Breakout Session III – each break out group should consider sector specific:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objectives</li> <li>• Assessments</li> <li>• Key Actors</li> <li>• Entry Points</li> <li>• Design Issues</li> <li>• Linkages to wider SSR</li> <li>• Sequencing and Prioritization</li> <li>• Implementation</li> </ul>
11:00 – 11:30	Coffee
11:30 – 12:30	Breakout Session III – continued
12:30 -13:30	Lunch
13:30 15:00	<p>Breakout Session III – continued</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common Challenges</li> <li>• Post-conflict Issues</li> <li>• Monitoring and Evaluation</li> </ul> <p>From 14:30 to 15:30 the police and the justice &amp; prisons breakout groups will join up to discuss linkages between these areas. In addition, a multi-sector group will meet during this hour to look at SALW/DDR linkages to activities across sectors.</p>

15:00 -15:30	Coffee
15:30 – 17:30	<p>Report back from Breakout Session III</p> <p>Report by cluster – following by Q and A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Strategic Planning; Intelligence; Civilian Oversight Bodies and Civil Society</li> <li>• Police, Justice and Prisons</li> <li>• Defense; SALW/DDR and Border Management (customs and immigration)</li> </ul>

**Wednesday, 7 December 2005**

09:00 – 11:00	<p>For <b>Facilitators and the Rapporteurs</b>: meeting to finalize Breakout Group Summaries.</p> <p>This will take place at the KAIPTC – departure from the Dutch Hotel is organized for 0815.</p>
10:30	<b>For non-facilitators and non-Rapporteurs</b> : Departure from Dutch Hotel to KAIPTC
11:00 – 13:00	<p>Breakout Session IV – how to improve the strategic framework for international engagement and the role of the international community at each stage of the programme cycle?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment</li> <li>• Design</li> <li>• Implementation</li> <li>• Evaluation</li> </ul>
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 15:30	<p>Report Back – Breakout Session IV</p> <p>Discussants on Report Back :</p> <p>Jonathan Sandy – a perspective from a national reform process Graham Thompson – a perspective from a Donor Agency</p>
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee
16:00 – 17:30	<p>Plenary Discussion on IF-SSR and outcomes for the Workshop</p> <p>Followed by:</p> <p>Conclusions and Next Steps</p>

## ANNEX 2 - BACKGROUND

### *DAC Guidelines on Security System Reform and Governance*

1. In April 2004, Ministers and Agency Heads at the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) High Level Meeting approved a Ministerial Policy Statement and accompanying paper on Security System Reform, Security System Reform and Governance: Policy and Good Practice, A DAC Reference Document.<sup>1</sup> This document provides fundamental principles for engaging with SSR by OECD members, and recommends approaches and good practice examples in this area. It is part of an intensified engagement by development actors with the 'human security' agenda, which emphasises that security from violence is fundamental to people's livelihoods and to sustainable economic, social and political development. As SSR is a tool for conflict prevention and peacebuilding, this work expands on the OECD DAC activities on conflict prevention, peacebuilding and governance, including The DAC Guidelines: Helping Prevent Violent Conflict, and complements the work currently under way on 'Drivers of Change' in the DAC Network on Governance and the work of the Fragile States Group.

### *Moving from policy to practice: developing an "Implementation Framework for Security System Reform (IF-SSR)"*

2. Recognising that policy without an impact on behaviour change at field level is of little value, the DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation (CPDC) has worked over the last year on operationalising the SSR Guidance. The development of a focussed and practical field manual, the "Implementation Framework on Security System Reform (IF-SSR)", aims to help guide, co-ordinate, align, monitor and evaluate SSR activities in the field.

3. While acknowledging and reflecting the highly political nature of reforms within the security system, the IF-SSR also aims to provide practical guidance on how to engage in and undertake security reforms in difficult post-conflict and fragile state environments. It is envisaged that this work will include a system-wide assessment and evaluation framework; and will provide system and sector specific guidance on entry points and activities. Through a review of existing practice and a focus on operational realities, this work aims to help strengthen:

- The ability of partner governments to understand and engage with the SSR agenda and build capacity to implement it.
- The ability of international actors to engage more effectively and on a more sustainable basis, with partner governments. This work establishes priority areas for action, given the reality of limited resources.
- The coherence of donor government and multilateral organisation practice by facilitating the formulation of a joined-up plan for their own individual engagement.
- The effectiveness of support to partner country civil society so that they can deepen their engagement in the SSR agenda and push reform from the bottom up, directing their efforts where they can be most effective.

4. OECD DAC member states recognise that the translation of policy-level recommendations into changes in country-level practice is bound to be a complex and often difficult process for which no simple

---

<sup>1</sup> OECD DAC, *Security System Reform and Governance: Policy and Good Practice, A DAC Reference Document*, 2004, p. 3.

“blueprint” or “roadmap” approaches can be designed. It is also clear that SSR requires the collaboration of a wide range of actors – local, national, regional, international; governmental and non-governmental – with expertise in the various issues and processes involved.

5. The IF-SSR process consists of three phases:

- In the first phase, starting in late September 2005 and lasting two months, produced an initial draft of the IF-SSR.
- In the second phase, a SSR Practitioners Workshop was held at the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Center, Ghana on 5-7 December 2005. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss the main findings of the initial draft of the IF-SSR, to share and document examples of good and bad SSR experience and to further develop a shared understanding of SSR processes and needs. The initial draft of the IF-SSR is being revised to take this feedback into account.
- In the third phase, the revised draft of the IF-SSR will be used as the basis for producing a Practical Manual on ‘Implementing SSR’. This will transform the IF-SSR into user-friendly formats, e.g. including CD-ROM’s and an internet-accessible guide. The manual will be presented to the DAC later in 2006.