



INTERNATIONAL **DIALOGUE**
ON PEACEBUILDING & STATEBUILDING

Workshop: New Deal Instruments and Guidance

Document 01

SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUE WORKING GROUP
MEETING ON NEW DEAL IMPLEMENTATION
22-23 May 2015, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire



NEW DEAL IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP

WORKSHOP: NEW DEAL INSTRUMENTS AND GUIDANCE

BACKGROUND NOTE¹

Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire – 22 May 2015
Hotel Pullman, Rue Abdoulaye Fadiga, Abidjan

I. Purpose of this workshop

The commitment to ownership of the New Deal at country level suggests the importance of strategic reflection on New Deal implementation processes by those who have been engaged at the country level, over time. While attention has been placed on different instruments of the New Deal – notably the Fragility Assessments, Indicators, One-vision, One, plan, and Compacts– insufficient attention has been given to how these instruments build upon each other and feed into other national planning and monitoring processes. The [New Deal Monitoring Report](#), in particular, identified strengths and weaknesses in these processes, and in the linkages between them.

This is a particularly timely moment for reflection on these issues, as we collectively work to scale up New Deal implementation results on the ground, in 2015 when critical decisions will be taken on future of Dialogue and the New Deal itself. Drawing insights for the various Guidance notes on New Deal implementation, this workshop will enable cross cutting analysis and shared learning. The timing is also good as countries are considering re-doing or updating existing Fragility Assessments or designing Compacts in the light of recent events (e.g. Ebola, new political regimes in place, and/or the end of pilot period).

The objectives of this one day workshop are:

- To enable participants to begin to distil and share country level experiences of New Deal implementation, to reflect on the instruments (i.e. Fragility Assessments and Indicators, One vision, One plan / planning instruments, Compacts), the relationships between them, and the implications for Guidance Notes (*what kind of Guidance do we need?*)
- To agree on processes for updating guidance and the country level consultations in particular (scope, form, outputs, funding and timing)
- To agree on how country lesson learning can improve generic guidance for more effective New Deal implementation processes at country level

¹ Guidance notes/Documents sourced:
IGN: ND Implementation Guidance Note
FGN: Fragility Assessment Guidance Note
CGN: Compacts Guidance Note
PSI: Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Indicators

II. New Deal implementation: Overview of goals and strategy

The New Deal builds on the vision and principles articulated from the Millennium Declaration to the Monrovia Roadmap. It proposes 5 peacebuilding and statebuilding goals, focuses on new ways of engaging, and identifies commitments to build mutual trust and achieve better results in fragile states. It recognises that the success of these combined efforts depends on the leadership and commitment of the g7+ and international actors, and strong state-society relations. The overarching goal of the New Deal is: *putting countries in the lead of their own pathways out of fragility*. Representation of key societal stakeholders including youth, women and marginalised groups are also at the heart of the New Deal.

New Deal implementation means:

- **Agreeing to the use of PSGs, and developing indicators to measure progress towards these**
- **Commitment to FOCUS principles**, to support inclusive and country-led transitions out of fragility – *Fragility Assessment – Country-led One Vision, One Plan, Country Compact, Using the PSGs to monitor Progress and Support to inclusive and participatory political dialogue*
- **Commitment to TRUST principles**, by providing aid and managing resources more effectively, and aligning these resources for results – *enhancing Transparency, Risk management to use country systems, Strengthen national capacities and timeliness of aid, Improving the speed and predictability of funding to achieve better results.*

Strategy: 5 Steps to be taken to implement the New Deal² consist of:-

- 1. Building coalitions and support for New Deal implementation and identifying appropriate local coordination structures**
 - *Objective: brief key actors, establish across-government mandate, create a “New Deal task force”*
- 2. Organising a national workshop/discussion to kick start and advance New Deal implementation**
 - *Disseminating kick-start plans for and advance New Deal implementation and/or particular commitments towards this*
- 3. Reviewing and mapping current initiatives to the New Deal in the PSGs, FOCUS, TRUST areas: Identify gaps and build upon them**
 - *Objectives: Review what is already going on to implement the New Deal, realign activities and identify key areas/initiatives to advance implementation*
- 4. Agreeing on and developing an implementation strategy**
 - *Set out implementation strategy and initiate implementation*

Focusing on development goals without attention to fragility is likely to lead to neither peace nor development. While there is no single objective of New Deal implementation, the 2014 Monitoring Report suggests that New Deal implementation means changing “what” is done, and a change in “how” things are done, in supporting transitions from fragility towards greater resilience. The “what” is investing in the peacebuilding and statebuilding and also in ways that make aid more transparent and a framework for integrating donor financing. The “how”, on the other hand, is that Governments need to collaborate with other national stakeholders to forge a consensus on a few core priorities to achieve over the short-term.

² Guide for Implementing the New Deal, p.3-5.

Measuring progress in ND implementation

“Monitoring progress against the PSGs” has been at the heart of the New Deal since before its official signing. The New Deal underscores this, noting, “We will use the PSGs targets and indicators to monitor country-level progress”.

The Monitoring Framework was developed for New Deal signatories to report on the delivery of the New Deal commitments focused at the country level and at the global level. This report aimed to measure “behaviour change among national and international partners” (NDMR p.5). For this it looked at:

- In country surveys: existing country-level mechanisms and processes for dialogue, coordination, and information collection should be used, where possible;
- In donor surveys: corporate policies, systems and processes, as well as the extent to which they reflect – or require adaptation to – New Deal principles and commitments.

At global level progress on New Deal implementation has also been reflected upon in the technical working groups – both the Indicator Working Group and Implementation Working Group, and been the focus of various commissioned studies and processes generated by them.

Donors have supported Joint Country Reviews providing a more in depth assessment of implementation and feeding into the Monitoring Report in addition to taking their own survey. UNDP reports on New Deal progress supported by its New Deal Support Facility, with an emphasis on reporting on new activities and results, summarizing the past history of New Deal implementation in each country. The Global Partnership Report and OECD Peer Reviews, which take place every four years, have increasingly included reviews of INCAF donor Government and donor practice and systems in relation to New Deal and aid effectiveness commitments.

Together these sources have looked, from different angles, at the PSGs in different ways, including: 1) Implementation in relation to TRUST and FOCUS achievements 2) Implementation in relation to key challenges 3) Relevance of the New Deal for violent conflict and extreme fragility contexts.

Section 2: Country Status

Country	Fragility Assessment	Indicators (National; common)	One Vision, One Plan	Compact
Afghanistan	Planned for Q2-3 2015; GoA launched study (2014) to develop a conceptual framework of PSGs	-----	-----	Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework (TMAF) (2012)
CAR	Production of an ‘interim’ fragility matrix through consultations among key actors in Bangui	-----	Urgency Plan of the CAR Government for the period 2014-2016	Fragility matrix (2015)
DRC	Completed (2013) <i>(including CSO-led conflict/fragility analysis prior)</i>	Draft list completed. (Under review by the national statistical office)	‘Plan intégré’ was under development (then halted), to combine Addis Ababa Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework , and provide a basis for the PRSP II and DRC’s Vision 2035 in 2015	

Liberia	Completed (2012) ³ (desk review)	Fragility Spectrum and list of National PSG indicators developed (2012)	“Agenda for Transformation: Steps toward Liberia Rising 2030” (2013)	Outline/roadmap for the compact developed (June 2014)
Sierra Leone	Fragility Assessment and Fragility Spectrum (2012), updated in Q2 2014	Completed (under review by the national statistical office)	Completed: Sierra Leone's Agenda for Prosperity	Mutual Accountability Framework (MAF) (2014)
South Sudan	Fragility Assessment (2012)	Indicators in South Sudan are conditional pending a new FA	-----	Signing of the compact in December 2013 postponed.
Somalia	‘Light’ Fragility Assessment completed (2013) per PSG (tbc)	-----	-----	Somali Compact (September 2013) (November 2014)
Timor Leste	Fragility Assessment (2012), revision scheduled for June 2015	Updated Fragility Assessment is under consideration	-----	-----

Section 3: Guidance notes and country experiences on instruments

This section outlines the questions which will be asked in the workshop of participants. They are intended to guide country input into the discussions. It also includes information on what the current Guidance Notes on New Deal Implementation, Fragility Assessments and Compacts, currently say (see Room Documents)

QUESTION 1:

Has the Fragility Assessment effectively captured the drivers of conflict, fragility and resilience?

Supplementary questions:

- *What tools/frameworks were used (Fragility Spectrum, and, for example, conflict analysis or other tools) accurately capturing the drivers; are supplementary analyses/tools needed to do this? What are they?*
- *What is the plan for FA(s); how often will they be done, and is/how is this process being institutionalized in any way?*

What Guidance Notes say:

- A fragility assessment assesses a country’s causes, features and drivers of fragility as well as the sources of resilience within a country. It takes a look not only at historical legacies but also at more recent and current drivers of fragility, from the perspectives of the country’s citizens. (p.1, 3)
- The suggested agenda for the Fragility Assessment workshops starts group discussion with the question, “*What are the root causes of conflict, immediate drivers of conflict, and existing sources of resilience in our country?*” and asks people to consider the characteristics of each phase of fragility → resilience, alongside priority issues to monitor progress.

³ This version of a Fragility Assessment did not follow the standardized form used by g7+ and IDPS. Copies are still to be widely disseminated. The IDPS secretariat currently has in its possession “Country Progress Brief and Expected Country Results”, dated April 2013, presenting priority actions to design a Compact during course of 2014, also saying an FA “will need to be validated” (p.3).

QUESTION 2: *How is progress being measured towards New Deal implementation (i.e. progress in achieving PSGs and related indicators, implementation of compact)?*

Supplementary questions:

- *Were indicators developed for this purpose, and are they/how are they being utilised, to what effect?*
- *Is/how is progress being communicated in ways that build trust between New Deal stakeholders and national ownership of the New Deal process?*

What Guidance Notes say:

- FAs identify possible areas of incremental progress towards resilience, including targets in line with the New Deal's Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals. FAs aim at reflecting the views of those either affected by the current fragility or have a role in building peace and resilience. (FGN, p.3)
- A compact should include or be linked to a country-level mechanism to monitor the implementation of the New Deal commitments. (IGN, p.10)

QUESTION 3: *How are the FA and indicators feeding into the development of a Compact, national planning processes (including One Vision, One Plan), and international partner planning frameworks and strategies?*

Supplementary questions

- *Is there 'one vision-one plan' and how are the FA findings feeding into this?*
- *How are they informing UN, donor and other international partner planning frameworks and strategies in ways that offer lessons?*

What Guidance Notes say:

- FAs help fragile and conflict-affected states and development partners to assess and manage risks jointly; FAs identify critical fault lines that need to be considered by policy makers and planners when setting priorities and designing interventions. (FGN, p.3-4)
- FAs can provide a good basis for forging "one vision, one plan" for achieving country-specific PSGs, along with the related planning and financing instruments for implementing it. (FGN, p.4)
- Indicators are "to inform national development planning and priority setting processes (e.g. One Vision/One Plan, compacts)" (PSI p.4)
- Government needs to use the findings of a fragility assessment as an input towards forging appropriate policy outcomes. Thinking on how to link findings to existing policy and planning processes should be done **at the outset** of the fragility assessment process. (FGN, p.13)
- A compact is a mechanism to implement and deliver on the FOCUS and TRUST commitments in the New Deal, specifically the One Vision, One Plan." (IGN p.9)

QUESTION 4: *What lessons are emerging about these instruments (FA, indicators, One Vision, One Plan, Compacts): their development, use and sequencing, and about how, together, they 'add up' to effective New Deal implementation?*

Supplementary questions:

- *How did the FA process and findings feed into the development of the Compact? What aspects of the FA findings do the Compact address?*

What Guidance notes say

- Work on Instruments should be piloted by a national coalition ensuring common understanding of implementation principles and possibly a Task Force leading on ND implementation (IGN p.4)
- The use of instruments should “put countries in the lead of their own pathways out of fragility”. The FOCUS Instruments also include this. But the ‘S’ in FOCUS, for: “Support political dialogue and leadership”, is often forgotten
- As a basic minimum, fragility assessments should at least contribute to one key outcome: forging policy and programmes responses (and / or adapting existing ones) to address the key drivers of conflict and fragility. “One vision, one plan” followed by a compact would be the ideal outcome. (FGN, p.5)
- Indicators should be simple, relevant and practical. They should be easy to communicate and should measure real and broad progress in the PSG area in people’s everyday lives. (FGN p.15)
- A Compact is both an instrument and a process, to be light, overarching, providing a framework for ongoing political dialogue and for coordinating the role and support of what could be a wide range of political, security and development actors in a given post-conflict country. They are most effective when they are highly focused and establish clear priorities that can be realistically implemented over a short time frame. Basing compacts on the results of a fragility assessment can ensure that core priorities are properly identified at the national or sector level. (CGN, p. 2-3)
- A compact may still be useful as a guiding instrument for partners engaging at a later stage. Compacts can be adapted to a national or sector level, as their purpose would remain the same; Compacts define collective priorities and delivery methods, respectively the “what” and “how” of New Deal implementation. (CGN, p.3)
- It is essential that national actors take the lead. To be effective, compacts should enjoy broad political support, not only between the host government and its international partners, but also among civil society, political parties and those who hold power and influence over the development agenda in the host country. (CGN, p.3)