



Fifth Global Meeting of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding “Addressing Fragility and Building Peace in a Changing World”

CSPPS Key Points

Panel One: Preventing conflict and creating resilience: the role of the International Dialogue in addressing the root causes of conflict.

- As a global civil society grouping with members from across a range of conflict-affected countries, we are well positioned to identify common root causes of conflict: they range from factors such as poor governance, corrupt and repressive regimes, marginalisation of identity groups from jobs, inequitable access to natural resources, and intolerance between and within religious groups.
- Root causes of conflict and fragility are complex and difficult to define, and **nearly always context-specific**. Violent conflict occurs when a number of root causes interact with one another and with proximate and trigger factors that are often specific to an individual country or society.
- In the International Dialogue we should be focus on **developing long-term and transformative approaches to address root causes in ways that are sensitive and relevant to individual contexts**. I would like to make six points that we must consider as we move forward.
- The first is that, while useful for framing and ensuring that difficult issues are not ignored, **the PSGs should not be overly relied on** to guide action on addressing root causes. The PSGs are important, but they are only part of the picture. We need to continue to use the PSGs, but avoid the trap of generalised assumptions on common drivers of conflict. This only leads to template approaches that are context and conflict insensitive.
- Second, the International Dialogue must better acknowledge **the central role that fragility assessments play**. They are critical for identifying context-specific root drivers which need to be prioritised for action. Despite this, fragility assessments have not always been used. Somalia, for example, never completed one. They have not always been as honest and revealing as they should be – and, more importantly, they have not always been acted upon. Finally, we have not effectively used fragility assessments to identify drivers of resilience which would help us understand and support the endogenous forces and capacities that can drive transformative change and peace.
- Moving forward we need to ensure that every country conducts fragility assessments in a more meaningful way that captures drivers of conflict and resilience. Critically, we still have much more work to do on ensuring that compacts and other coordination mechanisms actually respond to the priority issues highlighted in fragility assessments. For example the need for reconciliation and trust building as key elements to address.

- Third, based on experience, we know that governments will not be able to address context-specific drivers of conflict if the **political systems that guide them are not accountable, inclusive, responsive, and independent of external interference**. Where political systems only represent the interests of some, the factors that drive others to taking up violence will go unaddressed. Where political systems remain unresponsive and unaccountable, states will fail to track or identify emerging drivers of conflict. More broadly, where a political settlement is not inclusive enough, efforts to strengthen and build the state may only make matters worse through lowering incentives to tackle what are often challenging issues.
- Moving forward, the Dialogue needs to think about how it can leverage the power of its membership in support of inclusive, accountable, responsive and independent political systems. More profoundly, the Dialogue should consider whether there are political situations where New Deal processes or statebuilding would only risk driving further conflict. Nonetheless, we should continue to acknowledge that peace will not be sustainable where the state does not have the capacity to address root drivers of conflict, so we must better understand the capacity constraints that governments face.
- Fourth, addressing root drivers will mean creating New Deal processes that are **inclusive enough to capture the needs and interests of people across society**. When those who are involved in processes to set development or peacebuilding priorities are the governing elites or sectional leaders then the priorities they choose will always fall short, sections of society will feel marginalised or unfairly treated, and conflict will be the price. Civil society can play a critical role in bridging state and society, as too can others like parliamentarians. However, the reality is that they do not always represent all voices in society.
- Going forward, we *all* need to work much harder to directly engage with society much more meaningfully. Making fragility assessments as inclusive and consultative as possible is one step, but we need to think bigger. The inclusion of women and girls will be especially critical. We have evidence that when they are given space to engage and have their voices heard, then it is more likely that processes will address a broader range of issues and be better designed and targeted to meet the needs of all members of society.
- Fifth, in today's globalised world we must acknowledge that the **drivers of conflict are increasingly transnational** and beyond the control of an individual state or society. Illicit financial flows, irresponsible arms flows, national security policies, extremist groups, climate change, global governance, and commercial interests are all global factors that interact with context-specific domestic vulnerabilities to conflict.
- We can no longer close our eyes to these issues and we can no longer be selective about which ones we talk about. Going forward, the International Dialogue needs to think about how it works collectively to address these factors and how **each member** takes appropriate responsibility and adequate action. Fingers need to be pointed in all directions.
- Finally, we must also be able to detect and respond to crisis early if we are to prevent serious shocks that can - sometimes overnight - completely undo painstaking and long-term progress made in addressing root drivers. We will need to innovate if we are to get this right. Going forward, an early warning coordination mechanism could capture daily conflict trends in member countries for the purposes of information sharing, and early response in the form of context specific strategic dialogues and coordination with other international actors. Here again the IDPS will need to draw on the collective political will of its membership to ensure that we do not simply watch while situations deteriorate, but act with the haste and urgency which we too often find ourselves wishing, in retrospect, that we had drawn upon much earlier.

Panel Two: Implementing Agenda 2030 using the New Deal principles

1) Background

- The IDPS membership invested significant resources and time to ensure that issues of peace, justice and governance were included in the new global development agenda. Having achieved this goal, it is now imperative that we lay out a clear vision for how the New Deal and the 2030 Agenda align and interact, in particular at country level – where we are focused to achieve New Deal implementation. As the SDGs move forward, it is essential that we harmonize the New Deal with the SDGs, to ensure that fragile and conflict affected states benefit from the full power of both frameworks.

2) Similarities and differences

- There are many similarities between the New Deal and the 2030 Agenda. Both are explicit that there can be no development without peace, and include a focus on issues related to justice, legitimate and inclusive politics, institutions, violence, services, revenue, and economic growth. Both focus on goals to be tracked with indicators.
- They are not, however, substitutes for one another. Important differences exist:
 - a) The New Deal is focused on unique contexts of fragile and conflict-affected states and focused national goals; the 2030 Agenda is universal and focused on global goals.
 - b) Peace is the dominant focus of the New Deal, but only one of 17 issues in the 2030 Agenda, where it is a risk of being crowded out.
 - c) The 2030 Agenda largely restricts its focus to outcomes; the New Deal includes a strong focus on processes and outcomes.
 - d) The 2030 Agenda has a strong focus on people and society, the New Deal has a stronger focus on institutions and statebuilding.
 - e) Global level drivers of conflict and other forms of finance are covered by the 2030 Agenda; the New Deal is focused on domestic drivers and has an emphasis on changing the way international aid is delivered.
- At the core of the New Deal lies a commitment to political dialogue with both civil society and international partners and a set of processes aimed at ensuring *context sensitive* approaches to peacebuilding and statebuilding – that should inform both national strategy and aid delivery. The New Deal developed its orientation with specific reference to countries affected by conflict and fragility, after recognition the millennium development goals did not reflect their needs and priorities, and, that they did not want to be judged by externally driven and templated measures.

3) Alignment at multiple levels

- Differences aside, the two frameworks clearly relate to and, in some cases, overlap with one another. The looming risk for IDPS members is that governments, donors and civil society fragment, with some working on the SDGs while others focus instead on the PSGs. Development coordination may become less coherent while process, reporting and monitoring becomes twice as burdensome. The opportunities for alignment, however, greatly outweigh the risks, and we must identify clearly where and how the New Deal and the SDGs can support one another.

- The New Deal and the IDPS are both initiatives that will help support the delivery of the SDGs in conflict-affected and fragile states. To start with, the 2030 Agenda is very clear that implementation at national level will need to be context sensitive: countries will decide how to integrate the 2030 Agenda into national planning processes in order to work towards the SDGs. Where appropriate, this means that New Deal processes at national level should be used as vehicle for action towards meeting the new development framework. Furthermore, the 2030 Agenda is also very clear on global multi-stakeholder partnerships beyond the United Nations as being key for the means of implementation. The IDPS could be considered one such multi-stakeholder partnership.
- Alignment should be sought at goal level: For example, meeting the first three PSGs (politics, justice, security) could be linked to meeting Goal 16, the fourth (economy) to Goal 8, and the fifth (revenue and services) to Goal 17. Progress towards the PSGs could thus be reported as progress towards these selected SDGs. We recognize that there may not be a one-to-one relationship between PSGs and SDG goals.
- Alignment should also occur at target level: The five PSGs could be used to frame and prioritise which SDG targets g7+ governments and donors will work towards in a specific context. An acceptable number of targets could be selected from the SDGs and grouped under each PSG – this would need to be done through an inclusive and consultative process. Furthermore, PSG sub-dimension priorities identified in g7+ country fragility assessments and compacts can also be aligned with specific SDG targets. The problem is that the targets may be too generic and be linked to a number of sub-priorities.
- Alignment through the indicators: SDGs propose global, regional, national and thematic indicators. Of the 34 PSG common indicators, 21 are directly captured in the global SDG indicator set, seven are weakly correlated and six are not captured at all. Monitoring both frameworks could thus largely be achieved using many of the same indicators. The additional six indicators not included in the SDG global indicators could be packaged together as a “thematic” set of conflict and fragility indicators that complement the global set. Country-specific New Deal indicators which have emerged in different contexts could be used as national SDG indicators.
- Alignment sounds like a technical process. However, making decisions about priorities and sequencing, while ensuring whole of government and whole society buy in is a political process. For either the 2030 Agenda or the New Deal to lead to change, we need to make sure they connect to and help build the conversation between leaders and the public about how to move forward in countries affected by conflict and fragility.

4) How the two frameworks can strengthen one another, and the implementation of both

- The New Deal can help countries to work towards the SDGs through the processes and mechanisms it uses. New Deal principles and instruments should be used to politically shape country owned processes and priority selection at the country level, specifically:
 - a) **Ensuring conflict sensitivity and clear strategy to achieve peace and development outcomes:** Making decisions about SDG priorities and their implementation should be informed by fragility assessments; this upholds the commitment towards ensuring that national development frameworks (and SDG implementation) will address the drivers of conflict and fragility. Towards this end, the **FOCUS principles** should continue to be used and strengthened as a powerful means for priority setting. Specifically, this means supporting political and strategic decision-making around sequencing. This analysis needs to be infused into national

development plans; we have deep concern that SDGs are already being infused in frameworks without attention to this analysis.

- b) The dialogue mechanisms created around the New Deal should continue to be leveraged to discuss progress towards the SDGs. Country leadership, when genuinely inclusive of people and society and not just the governing elites and their supporters, should continue to shape donor priorities. The **TRUST principles** should continue to be used by donors and recipients to guide peacebuilding and development in countries affected by conflict and fragility. Aligning the SDGs and PSGs will provide a platform for new donors to engage and potentially also adopt these principles.
 - c) That the New Deal already has gone through a process of setting indicators means that g7+ countries are more **potentially more prepared than others to monitor** issues related to peace, governance and justice.
 - d) The IDPS and the New Deal process are **forums to discuss progress** towards meeting the SDGs in FCAS, but also the world's progress in meeting the commitment to promote peace as one of five cross-cutting priorities in the 2030 Agenda.
- At the same time, the launch of the 2030 Agenda is an opportunity to strengthen the New Deal. Specifically:
 - a) The 2030 Agenda can be used to deepen and broaden buy-in to the New Deal, for example getting a wider number of official actors from both recipient and donor countries to join dialogues and coordinate.
 - b) The broader set of financing and development cooperation mechanisms the 2030 Agenda proposes, as well as its focus on transnational issues, will help the IDPS look beyond aid.
 - c) The 2030 Agenda's strong focus on people and society should allow us to see through the limitations of what has sometimes been an overly state- and institution-centric process.
 - d) The strong emphasis on multi-stakeholder partnership in the 2030 Agenda provides an opportunity for civil society and other actors to be given a meaningful seat at the New Deal table.
 - e) That the 2030 Agenda is strongly focused on outcomes and the primacy of national context when defining the means provides an opportunity for us to reconfirm that template approaches to conflict, fragility and development will always fall short.
 - f) The strong focus on monitoring and indicators in the 2030 Agenda could provide extra support for efforts to build data-gathering capacities, both within states and in societies.

5) Taking the IDPS global

- Finally, given that the 2030 Agenda has been agreed through the UN provides opportunities to engage a wider set of international actors on the experience of the New Deal and of g7+ countries in promoting peaceful, just and inclusive societies. The IDPS has lessons to share and it should actively seek to engage in UN SDG processes as well as with other relevant multi-stakeholder partnerships, such as the Effective Institutions Platform, the Open Government Partnership and the Praia Group on Governance Statistics.
- In late June, two g7+ countries (Sierra Leone and Togo) will take part in the first Follow-up and Review process to be held at the SDG High Level Political Forum in New York. This will provide an

opportunity to demonstrate progress made through the New Deal process in g7+ countries and demonstrate alignment between the two frameworks.

- The IDPS worked hard to ensure that the issues that matter for it were included in the SDGs. IDPS members will need to continue to work with one another to ensure that their interests are considered at the UN and that issues of peace remain at the top of the international community's development agenda.

Final Session: The Future of the IDPS

Reaffirm the commitment to the tripartite arrangement

The uniqueness of the International Dialogue as being an interface that brings together on a same footing developing countries, donors and Civil Society needs to be one of the main points to put forward. The partnership constitutes a unique platform to collectively address challenges related to fragility and conflict.

In any given circumstance it is of key strategic importance to create a shared understanding of the drivers of conflict and instability and to identify pathways to resilience. In doing so specific attention needs to be given to role of women in efforts to strive for ending violence and building peace. Next to this we call upon all here to support the implementation of UNSCR2250 and bring on board youth as change agents and participants on pathways towards resilience.

In the context of today's world the New Deal goals and principles are an unique foundation on which coordinated and concerted action can be discussed and agreed upon.

Therefore we as civil society concur to the proposed mandate renewal and are in agreement to confer responsibility on the IDPS Steering Group to work out the necessary details for a results oriented and transformative work plan that will, inter alia, address governance issues that need to be solidified to support the three key constituencies to work together in dialogue and to bolster its relevance in the world today.

In moving forward let us commit ourselves to work together to ensure that root causes of conflict are identified and effectively addressed; that we work together in dialogue towards constructive state society relations that can help define and address pathways to stability and resilience; and that we work together to plan towards positive and transformative societal changes that will ensure that trust and equity is anchored and that ensures that no one is left behind.