



TOR for the Independent Review

Document 11

INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUE STEERING GROUP MEETING
25 May 2015, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire



DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE

Taking the New Deal to the Next Level

An Independent Review of the New Deal and International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding

1. Background

Development effectiveness in fragile states has been a concern of national and international partners for a long time. One important reason was the recognition that despite some progress, most Fragile and Conflict-Affected States (FCAS) had persistently been off-track to meet the MDGs. Several initiatives were developed to address some of the obstacles to effective engagement in such contexts. These included the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations (Fragile States Principles), adopted in 2007, which OECD-DAC members committed to follow when engaging in fragile states.

Whilst comprehensive, aimed at promoting “whole-of-government” approaches by development partners and based on the best knowledge and experience available at the time, the Fragile States Principles were not the result of a jointly-owned effort with concerned partner countries. At the 3rd High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra, Ghana in 2008, a number of fragile states called for a dialogue in which they could have an equal voice with development partners in establishing peacebuilding and statebuilding priorities. The International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (the International Dialogue) was thus created in 2008, comprising a group of fragile states (later adopting the name “g7+”), civil society representatives and development partners, with a mandate to develop a set of peacebuilding and statebuilding objectives and an action plan for effective engagement in fragile states.

Under the leadership of the g7+ group of fragile states and through a consultative process that included fragile and conflict affected countries, development partners, and civil society organisations, priorities were identified for how to address the blockages to effective cooperation in fragile states. The New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, the result of this process, was launched at the 4th High Level Forum in Busan, Korea in 2011. Since then, the New Deal has received strong support. Over 40 countries and organisations signed up to it and committed to its implementation, including the UN Development Group following the strong encouragement by the UN Secretary General. This was particularly important in broadening the ownership of the New Deal beyond OECD donors and recipient countries.

Through the New Deal, development partners committed themselves to supporting country-owned, country-led transitions out of fragility, upholding and adopting aid effectiveness in fragile states as a way of channelling aid (TRUST). Fragile states governments in turn committed themselves to consultative, inclusive planning processes which were contextually defined (FOCUS). Both parties committed themselves to pursuing the five Peacebuilding and Statebuilding goals (PSGs) as interim objectives to guide development efforts in countries affected by conflict and fragility.

1. **Inclusive Politics** - Foster inclusive political settlements and conflict resolution,
2. **Security** - Establish and strengthen people’s security
3. **Justice** - Address injustices and increase people’s access to justice;

4. **Economic Foundations** - Generate employment and improve livelihoods and
5. **Revenues & Services** - Manage revenue and build capacity for accountable and fair service delivery.

Together all members of the International Dialogue (development partners, g7+ governments and civil society organisations) agreed to set of indicators for measuring progress on the peacebuilding and statebuilding goals.

Insert Infographic on New Deal – FOCUS, TRUST and PSGs

Since its launch, the New Deal has been implemented in 7 pilot countries and has been used to guide international and national efforts to improve cooperation in fragile contexts. A New Deal Monitoring Report concluded in 2014, based on a survey of g7+ countries and INCAF donor agencies, focusing in particular on the FOCUS and TRUST principles found that the results of the New Deal implementation so far have been mixed.

The report calls for three improvements (i) Orienting political dialogue, country plans and implementation modalities towards the PSGs; (ii) Agreeing on a few desired results for building core national capacities for the immediate and short term; (iii) Linking desired results to new approaches for identifying and managing risk jointly on the ground .The report also emphasises the need to integrate the New Deal into peacebuilding processes at the early stages, to plan for peace before the conflict ends, to build the PSGs into peace agreements, giving sufficient attention to PSG 1 (Legitimate Politics) in the immediate post-conflict period, clear prioritisation of post-conflict interventions and stronger co-operation with non-State actors who have been undertaking vital support roles during the conflict.

The conclusions of the New Deal Monitoring Report have been endorsed by all members of the Dialogue and provide evidence that the Dialogue has been able to collectively monitor progress on New Deal implementation and come up with a potentially powerful tool for potentially holding members to account.

The International Dialogue crafted and then championed the New Deal until it was finally endorsed in Busan. The New Deal document itself explicitly recognized the role of the Dialogue in supporting members to implement, monitor and report on the delivery of their commitments. Yet transforming itself from an advocacy platform into one that supports and monitors implementation has been challenging for the International Dialogue. Between 2012 and 2014, the Dialogue commissioned two member-led reviews, to rethink its ambition, mandate, governance structure and working arrangements. The reviews concluded that a balance needed to be struck between the Dialogue as a global forum for mutual accountability and standard setting, and the Dialogue as a vehicle for supporting country-level New Deal implementation.

This review will explore these issues in some depth. It will examine in particular how the Dialogue’s own ways of working and internal challenges have shaped progress on New Deal implementation, identified in the observations of the New Deal Monitoring report, and identify how the Dialogue and New Deal might be adapted to take fuller account of the broader changes which have taken place in their institutional operating environments.

2. Justification for the review

With the New Deal coming to the end of its trial period in pilot countries and the International Dialogue soon coming to the end of its mandate period, 2015 is a year of reflection and assessment to take stock of what has been achieved, how to take the New Deal agenda forward, including the role performed by International Dialogue as a forum.

3. Objectives

The Review has 4 main objectives:

1. To identify and analyse how the New Deal has shaped global ideas, norms, policy and practice guidance about how to engage in fragile and conflict affected environments and support transitions out of conflict and fragility (Normative environment)
2. To identify and analyse how far the New Deal framework for peacebuilding and statebuilding has been implemented at a country level in pilot countries, and how the New Deal principles more broadly speaking have shaped development practice, government and civil society action in both New Deal pilot and non-pilot countries (New Deal implementation)
3. To assess the relative contribution of the International Dialogue to the above, identify its strengths and weaknesses in shaping global policy thinking and donor and government practice at a country level (International Dialogue)
4. To identify obstacles to progress, distils lessons learned, and make recommendations about what is needed to take the New Deal to the next level, as a global practice standard for engagement in fragile states (Recommendations)

The objectives are listed in order of priority and cover both the New Deal and the Dialogue. Two thirds of the Review will be devoted to looking backwards and charting what the impact of the New Deal has been in terms of spearheading new ways of working amongst development partners and country governments and one third will be spent looking forward and recommending the design of new structures and frameworks fit for purpose – to take the New Deal to the next level, in the post-2015 context

4. Scope of the Work (*how the objectives will be achieved*)

The Review should first provide a clear account of what the New Deal and Dialogue have achieved so far. The conclusions of the New Deal Monitoring Report (2014) universally endorsed by the three constituencies of the International Dialogue, provide a useful starting point. But the Review will add an additional focus by examining support to the achievement of the PSGs. Unlike the Monitoring report, this Review will also look at the extent to which the New Deal has shaped the normative environment and influenced strategies and approaches to engagement in FCAS. This will mean looking at the New Deal beyond its implementation as a template of tools. Secondly the review will look at the contribution of the International Dialogue, notably the results of its outputs, and its working practices. Third, it will identify where blockages lie, and suggest what changes need to be made to the New Deal and to the International Dialogue, to make them both fit for the purpose of inducing radical changes in the way development partners and FCAS governments address the peacebuilding and statebuilding challenges they face

i. Normative Environment

This section will analyse and describe the extent to which the New Deal has made an impact at the global level in shaping norms and ideas about how to engage in fragile and conflict-affected environments and how to promote peacebuilding and statebuilding. It will explore the current narratives in the areas listed below,

ascertain where progress has been made, and identify where the challenges remain. This section of the Review will look in particular at how influential the New Deal has been in shaping the post-2015 discussions, the multilateral peacebuilding architecture, global approaches to crisis (conflict resurgence) and shocks (epidemics such as the Ebola Virus Disease outbreak; from which some 9000 people were killed in three g7+ countries)

ii. New Deal implementation at country level: from template to integrated, tailor-made approaches

Given the centrality of the FOCUS, TRUST and the PSGs to the founding principles of the International Dialogue, the Review will assess progress on all three pillars. It will not duplicate, but will draw heavily on and complement the findings of the New Deal Monitoring Report 2014, by focussing more squarely on support to and implementation of the PSGs and updating the data to include more recent experience. It will similarly identify where there continue to be gaps and make recommendations about how these might be overcome.

The current New Deal Monitoring Report only includes data up to 2013/4. This review will update the findings with respect to the TRUST and FOCUS principles. In updating the 2014 NDMR, it will assess whether the inclusion of data from 2015 makes any difference to the overall findings.

This will mean assessing the extent to which the FOCUS principles have made an impact in planning and consultation processes at country level in g7+ countries and at global level. This will also include documenting any changes perceptible in the content of planning documents and planning processes in partner countries (ministry of finance, other line ministries) and local government agencies/decentralised authorities, that appear to reflect the influence of the New Deal. It will assess the relevance of the FOCUS principles and quality of country ownership – by asking questions about who is involved in formulating priorities and in implementing both in government and outside of government; about how Fragility Assessments, Compacts and One Vision/One plan are conducted and linked – the Review will explore whether civil society and marginalised groups are involved (i.e. How has inclusivity been championed/supported).

PSGs

While the PSGs will be a focus of the Review, this will not be an assessment of progress in achieving the PSGs themselves at country level. Given what evidence tells us about the long timeframes needed to transform institutions, the short timeframe of the Review (2011/12-2015) does not allow for any assessment of impact at this stage. The Review will look instead at the extent to which the PSGs feature in funding instruments and practices, and the extent to which g7+ governments are referencing the PSGs in their national planning and monitoring frameworks.

Crisis situations

Variations across countries, particularly where progress in implementation has stopped and re-started, or stopped all together, will need to be highlighted, with an assessment of what the consequences have been, particularly of more loose and more rigid interpretations of New Deal implementation (particularly in crisis situations). How shocks, like Ebola, or conflict relapse (South Sudan, CAR) have shaped New Deal implementation will be examined as part of the country case studies.

What difference a template-based approach has made?

The Review will look at what the added value of the New Deal has been, in improving on past best practice approaches in fragile and conflict affected situations. In this section, the contractor will look beyond the extent to which the New Deal has been implemented to the letter (a 'box-ticking approach') but instead to the extent to which the existence of the New Deal has actually enabled development partners and g7+ and other FCAS country governments to improve upon the delivery of core New Deal principles, arguably originally in the Fragile States Principles (2007, <http://www.oecd.org/dacfragilestates/fragilestatesprinciplesprinciple1.htm>). The aim is to capture , the extent to which these core principles more generally (taking politics/context as starting point, inclusivity, building effective institutions and sound state/citizen relations, basic aid effectiveness) have shaped government and donor practices at a country level, since the existence of the New Deal.

iii. International Dialogue

This section will look at both the International Dialogue's overall output and working practices and arrangements in order to ascertain whether they have served as an effective support mechanism for the implementation of the New Deal in the different contexts of the g7+ pilot countries, as well as for global advocacy and standard/practice setting. In terms of output, it will examine to what extent the production of knowledge products and guidance tools has served to shape the global agenda, and New Deal implementation in g7+ pilot countries. It will also look at other International Dialogue inspired forms of 'engagement' to assess their impact on New Deal implementation in countries including 'High Level Visits' by the OECD DAC Chair, in conjunction with g7+ / Dialogue Co-chairs.

It will then look at the operating practices/ways of working of the Dialogue (governance structures, statutory meeting arrangements, working groups, working relationships between each of the its member constituencies and secretariats, and the role of the Dialogue secretariat) and the extent to which these have helped to shaped global standards and country level implementation. In this regard, a key question will be the role played by the Dialogue (through its working practices and knowledge production) in enabling the New Deal to remain a 'relevant' framework for response to recurrent (CAR, South Sudan) and emerging crises (outside g7+ countries, rising violence, repercussions of Arab Spring) and shocks (Ebola virus outbreak).

iv. Recommendations for taking New Deal to the next level.

This section will identify what the blockages to progress have been in all three areas, and put forward recommendations for New Deal and International Dialogue actual and potential stakeholders about how to overcome them and o take forward a more effective and reinvigorated New Deal. This year the MDGs will give way to a universal framework based on the Sustainable Development Goals, yet to be agreed upon. At the same time, two major UN reviews are taking place in 2015, which are likely to shape the context in which the New Deal Review is received; the UN review of Peace Operations undertaken by the High Level Independent Panel (HLP), and a review of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture (PBA) being undertaken by the Advisory Group of Experts. This Review's recommendations will take account of the results of these processes. It will show how the lessons of the New Deal and the International Dialogue can best feed into the post-2015 development framework as well as the overall re-thinking of the international peacebuilding architecture, which both the New Deal and the International Dialogue aimed to shape.

5. Methodological Approach

A learning process

The Review is principally a learning process and not an evaluation. Yet two key OECD-DAC evaluation criteria - 'effectiveness' and 'relevance' - will guide it. In terms of effectiveness, it will assess the extent to which the Dialogue and New Deal have achieved their objectives since the endorsement of the New Deal in 2011, whether they are likely to be achieved, and what the major factors are in influencing achievement. In terms of 'relevance', the review will look at to what extent the New Deal and Dialogue continue to be aligned to the priorities of all three constituencies and of the principal stakeholders of fragile and conflict affected countries (adapted from *The DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance*, OECD (1991))

Learning from other post Busan monitoring / assessment initiatives

While the New Deal has its roots in processes that long predated Busan, the questions this review is asking -- about the extent to which the basic aid effectiveness principles enshrined in the Busan agreement have been effectively implemented -- are precisely the same questions that other parallel initiatives which grew out of Busan are asking themselves.¹ Several Busan initiatives have or will have conducted a variety of similar monitoring exercises to assess progress. The contractor will be expected to build on International Dialogue Secretariat engagement with these processes, and the networks established, to develop useful methodological approaches for data collection, particularly where the scope exists for thematic and geographic synergies (e.g. work on the same countries and same themes). The contractor will be expected (with ID secretariat support) to engage directly with individuals and processes associated with the above, to draw out shared lessons (for example on the use of country systems and capacity building, public private dialogues), and feed the results into the overall conclusions and recommendations.

This Review will draw on the general lessons, and results of the monitoring exercises undertaken by these initiatives; particularly in New Deal pilot countries, to enhance the observations of the Review, particularly with respect to the TRUST principles. Where necessary, the International Dialogue Secretariat can facilitate this lesson learning process between the Global Partnership, Effective Institutions platform and International Health Partnership.

Analytical AND forward-looking recommendations

One-third of the Review will be spent analysing the current state of the New Deal and Dialogue at global and country levels AND provide a set of forward-looking proposals which map out what the New Deal and the Dialogue could look like in the future. The review should analyse over time what difference the New Deal and the Dialogue have made, and also provide recommendations for how both can be improved/changed/restructured. Analysis and recommendations should be both general and specific to countries. The Review should analyse progress and gaps in New Deal implementation relative to country specific situations and make country specific recommendations about tracking progress with clear targets and timelines.

The Review will take full account of other significant evaluation processes and events (see above), which are likely to shape the development cooperation and peacebuilding and statebuilding landscape. By the time the review is completed, the post-2015 discussions will have given birth to an SDG framework, in which a goal on peaceful and inclusive societies may have been secured. By that time, the UN Financing for Development conference in Addis will have paved the way for new commitments likely to impact directly or indirectly on

¹ These include the Global Partnership on Effective Development Cooperation, the Effective Institutions Platform, and International Health Partnership plus.

the g7+ constituencies of fragile states. In addition, the UN will have concluded two major reviews on its Peacebuilding Architecture and Peace operations more broadly speaking. In addition, the Security Council will have conducted a High Level Review, with in-country consultations, of its Resolution 1325, to eliminate all forms for violence against women. In West Africa, the agenda for post Ebola recovery in the three affected countries will have been mapped out. The Review report will need to adapt and tailor its recommendations for ways forward, to speak to the results of these global processes, to ensure maximum traction.

Data sources

The Review should involve the triangulation of information/data derived from three main sources (literature review, key informants and case study based field work) whose purpose will be to provide answers to the four key questions:

1. What impact has the New Deal had so far in shaping global norms and ideas about how to engage in FCAS and more generally about peacebuilding and statebuilding?
2. Has the New Deal changed the ways development partners and fragile states governments are doing business, and what difference (if any) is this beginning to make to addressing conflict and fragility issues in these contexts?
3. What has the contribution of the Dialogue been to the above, if any?
4. What have the main gaps and weaknesses been with the New Deal and Dialogue, and how could both change to give a renewed boost to the New Deal and make it relevant to recurrent and emerging crises and new forms of fragility?

Desk review and inception report

The review will begin with an examination of externally generated literature on the New Deal and a Review of internal (ID Secretariat generated, INCAF Secretariat and INCAF member generated) documentation – policy framework and OECD-DAC peer reviews, the INCAF stocktaking exercise/political strategy, and other externally commissioned reports (from research institutions, think tanks, NGOs) and engage with on-going research processes, particularly about the New Deal or related peacebuilding/statebuilding reviews (e.g. UN Peacebuilding Architecture Review, Peacekeeping Review, ODI PSG studies, and ODI New Deal case study pilot country studies). The inception report submitted should include detailed indications of the methodological approach and the sources to be consulted, with timelines.

Place of the New Deal Monitoring Report

The New Deal Monitoring Report 2014 will be used to gather information, as well as the sources referred to above. In addition the methodology used to develop the report (survey of INCAF donors and g7+ country survey) will be used to update the report for 2015. The methodology will be adapted in the light of the recommendations made by the International Dialogue Steering Group and Implementation Working Group meetings in October 2014, for more qualitative and participatory country case study based approaches, which allow for more inclusion of multiple stakeholder voices in g7+ countries (see Summary Record of IWG meeting, and ID Steering Group meeting, October 2014).

Key informant interviews

A range of key informants will need to be identified and interviewed by the contractor, which will include a focus specifically on the Dialogue, its secretariat, its membership and governance structure past and present, and a targeting of influential Dialogue members, who have championed the New Deal in the past and

present. The potential contractor will be expected to outline a methodology for identifying key informants, which ensures the widest possible consultation and integration of a variety of perspectives, from New Deal initiators/champions and others. A potential contractor would be expected to provide a structured categorisation of key informants accompanied by a rationale, which reflects a grasp of the complexities of the Dialogue's organisational structure, the manner in which it has evolved over time, and the separate but related question of New Deal implementation.

Snowballing techniques and semi-structured questionnaires and qualitative research methods more generally, should be privileged, but in ways that allow for comparability of results/responses. Key informants could include members of each of the three International Dialogue constituencies: donors, g7+ country governments and civil society organisations (New Deal focal points and non-focal points for all three), as well as academics/think tanks with experience/involvement in New Deal implementation/influential policy analysis, past and present, and with relevant expertise on humanitarian issues, gender and conflict sensitivity. The International Dialogue Secretariat and Dialogue networks will guide and facilitate access to potential interviewees, both at headquarters and country level. Qualitative interviews with the International Dialogue steering group and wider International Dialogue membership should seek to gather member view on achievements of the Dialogue, suggestions for improvements, and how the Dialogue and New Deal have to adapt to the post-2015 Sustainable Development agenda context. It should analyse the International Dialogue as a whole and as a sum of its different parts (donors, g7+ countries, and civil society) and how they work together. This should include: the Governance structure (co-Chairs and 3 secretariats); the Steering Group, the working groups (new and former, reference groups), their output (e.g. guidance notes, global advocacy e.g. on post 2015) and institutional procedures (meetings).

Case studies and field work

Country case studies on all the New Deal pilot countries, 1 non-pilot g7+ country and 1 non g7+ country will be carried out. This will not necessarily mean that consultants will conduct field work in each country. At least 4 countries will be the subject of 'deep dive' field research, with secondary documentation and parallel consultations via Dialogue processes used to build up a picture of New Deal implementation in those countries where field research is not possible. Where field visits are conducted, consultants will be expected to conduct consultations outside the capital cities, and consult with a variety of stakeholders, including civil society actors, both within and outside the New Deal focal point networks. The contractor will be expected to advance a feasible costing of the field work proposal.

The New Deal Monitoring Report will be used to provide important information which will feed into the country case studies and other sources cited in the 'desk review/Inception report' section. Ongoing country consultations (country dialogues on transparency and use of country systems, fragility assessment and compact guidance lesson learning workshops, and other New Deal related processes) will be used as sites of observation, particularly where fully fledged separate field work exercises are not feasible, as well as pre-New Deal documentation. The contractors will also draw on documentation on donor engagement and government planning practices, in the g7+ case studied pilot country prior to New Deal implementation, to assess 'the difference' the deliberate implementation of the New Deal has made. The contractor will be expected to draw up a methodological framework which will allow comparisons between and within country case studies (over time) and to extrapolate from cases general conclusions. The methodology adopted for the case studies should allow for maximum comparability. The results of each case study can be written up in summary form in short annexes (no more than 5 pages each).

The country case studies will particularly bring to light, how, whether and in what ways the International Dialogue has played a role (Secretariat/ID constituency/individual member level) in facilitating New Deal implementation. The Review will also take context as the starting point, and include consideration of the political, social and economic trajectories within each pilot and non-pilot during the New Deal implementation period, as well as of the development cooperation and peace and security landscape. The purpose will be to weigh up how context specific factors, and donor practices and behaviour have both shaped New Deal implementation and been shaped by it.

Interpretation

The contractor will be expected to design a clear and explicitly laid out methodology for interpreting the information from all three sources and extrapolating from the country case studies to come up with more general answers to the core questions.

Weighting – New Deal vs Dialogue

In compiling the Review report, the consultants will be expected to focus more on the New Deal than on the International Dialogue. When assessing the contribution of the International Dialogue, the focus will be more on substance (i.e. what the Dialogue has done, output) than on its internal processes. Yet some consideration will be given to how the working practices and methods of the Dialogue have shaped, helped, or / and hindered New Deal implementation and uptake at global and country levels. The Review will be expected to put forward recommendations about the design of the most appropriate institutional architecture to drive the New Deal forward, in a post 2015 context.

6. Timeframe:

This timeframe is indicative, and relates to a set of deliverables against which the contractor’s work will be assessed. The proposal submitted should include, a more feasible time frame, which should include a clear costing and time planning for county level work. Time should be included in the calendar proposed for interlocutors to be given advance warning of arrival of contract research team, to allow them sufficient time to engage.

Milestone	By (date)
Inception report and methodological background for Q2	20/04/15
Task Force / Reference Group Feedback on Inception Report	30/04/15
Report Back – Steering Group Meeting Abidjan	25/05/2015
Draft 1	30/06/15
Task Force /Reference Group Feedback on draft 1	10/07/15

Draft 2 (quasi-final text)	1/09/15
Task Force /Reference Group Final feedback on draft 2	14/09/15
Final Draft (Draft 2 with adjustments)	19/10/15
Review Summary: Short version with main messages Draft 1	30/10/15
ID secretariat feedback on Review Summary	5/11/15
Final Review Summary	20/11/15
Independent Review Global Meeting presentation	January 2016 (tbc)
Independent Review Launch	January 2016 (tbc)

A **nine month** time frame is envisaged between the production of the inception report (April/May 2015) to production of the final report (December 2015).

The final report should be ready by December 2015. This will allow sufficient time for a review and circulation well prior to the expiration of the New Deal mandate and the Global International Dialogue meeting (first quarter 2016).

7. Deliverables

The contractor will be the team leader of the Independent Review. As **team leader, the contractor will be** responsible for producing the following deliverables:

1. Inception Report (3 weeks after commission)
2. Interim Report (2 months after commission)
3. (draft) Final Report (5 months after commission)
4. (final) Final Report (6 months after commission)
5. a four page summary document with key messages.

The 5 outputs will be reviewed by the International Dialogue Secretariat and the International Dialogue Task Force, specially set up to oversee the conceptualisation and management of the Independent Review, representing the three constituencies of the International Dialogue, via telephone conferences or/ and when members are not available, via input through email.

Report Structure

- **The Key questions listed above must serve as guide to the way in which the report is written up.**
- **Length:** The final report should aim to be no more than **40-60 pages** in length and the summary note no longer than 4 pages.

- **Annexes:** Should include **Country case studies of 5 pages** in length each.
- **Style.** The report should be written in a way that is appealing to policy makers (evidence-based, factual, accurate) yet **accessible** to the general public (avoiding jargon, explaining terms, etc.); it should not be written in the style of an academic paper.
- **Brief illustrative examples:** The report should also include specific sections on New Deal pilot and non-pilot countries. They should be presented in summary form and include text box summaries, as part of the main document. They should ‘tell stories’ that can be used by policy advisers in their governments / agencies to convey ‘the difference the New Deal and the Dialogue has made’, (parliaments, press, etc.); which are also meaningful outside of the context of the report. More detailed versions of the pilot country case studies should be provided in the annexes – see above.
- **References:** The report should also contain where necessary full bibliographic references, in brackets and a list of references at the end of each section. Remarks and explanations should be provided in the form of endnotes after each section.
- **Summary main messages:** The summary main messages document should be an attractive, very readable stand-alone summary of the report, 4pages long, and include basic graphic illustrations.

As team leader, the contractor may also be asked to contribute to the dissemination of the report by providing support to launch events; preparation of blog posts; and material for web dissemination (including social media and interactive graphs for the website).

8. Reporting / Management

The contractor will report directly to the Head of the International Dialogue secretariat who will be responsible for overseeing the quality control of the report, during its various iterations. The task force / reference group will be made up of at least two representatives of each of the core constituencies of the Dialogue (g7+, INCAF, Civil Society), will include a maximum of 8 responsible for guiding the process at 4 key stages: (i) the drafting of the TOR, (ii) a review of the inception report, (iii) a review of an interim report and a (iv) review of the final report. A smaller ‘core group’ of volunteers, will work with the Secretariat during each of these stages to oversee more regularly the work of the contractor and ensure timely delivery. While broad inclusiveness is key, and openness of members of the dialogue to responding to Reviews requests / questions will be critical, the Review will take care to not unduly interfere with the overall International Dialogue work plan priorities for 2015

9. Profile sought

The work will be carried out by a consortium of individuals with a proven track record of working on fragility, peacebuilding, and statebuilding issues in the context of international development cooperation. They should have some basic familiarity with the New Deal and the Dialogue, but equally should not have been too closely involved with International Dialogue members or the New Deal. This is in order to maximise the scope for independence and for the consultants recruited to bring a fresh external perspective. Members of the team should reflect the three constituencies of the Dialogue and will have demonstrable expertise of working with donors, governments and civil society. The team will be led by a team leader/manager, with responsibility for pulling the report together. Research units at universities particularly from g7+ countries, where possible, should be tapped into by the consortium, which should preferably involve some collaboration with consultants working in the Global South. Individual members of the team will have a

specific remit (on specific case studied countries and/or assigned to particular questions). Consultants conducting the pilot country-case studies will need to have specific country knowledge as well as of the New Deal, Dialogue, fragility, peacebuilding and statebuilding agenda. The consortium team will have to demonstrate three further relevant competences: knowledge and experience of the humanitarian field, conflict sensitivity and gender.

The team should be able to demonstrate some expertise in organisational/change management to increase the scope for uptake of final recommendations to improve New Deal implementation at country level. The team will include a mix of individuals with excellent command of written and spoken English (particularly overall team leaders) and a good working knowledge of French and/or Portuguese given the languages spoken in the g7+ pilot countries and the need to conduct interviews.

The team will need to ensure good knowledge management and adequate quality control of the process. How this will be undertaken needs to be explained clearly in the proposal required for candidates interested in this work.

General qualifications

- At least 10 years of experience with international development cooperation, specifically on peacebuilding, statebuilding, conflict and fragility questions;
- Experience with evaluation of peacebuilding development cooperation at programme and policy level (at least three references);
- Advance knowledge of and familiarity with the New Deal and International Dialogue (yet limited experience as an official contractor to International Dialogue constituency members);
- Expert knowledge of qualitative research and evaluation methodology;
- Experience with meta-evaluations;
- Excellent writing and communication skills.

10. Budget

Resources available: 100EUR