



INTERNATIONAL **DIALOGUE**  
ON PEACEBUILDING & STATEBUILDING

## New Deal Monitoring Report—Phase 2 Proposal *Document 14*

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



## ***Revised Options Note for launching 2<sup>nd</sup> Round of New Deal Monitoring Report: Phase II***

### **1. Introduction**

At the last meeting of the IWG – October 2014 – the ID Secretariat was charged with the responsibility of preparing the next round of monitoring. This was very much in line with the proposal outlined, which was briefly discussed. Whilst the proposal remains a useful guide (see Annexe 1) to the next round of monitoring, at the Steering Group meeting it was agreed that a significant number of alterations were required. The purpose of this proposal is to list them, with a view to collectively developing a clear Terms of Reference that will improve upon the proposal presented at the last Working Group meeting. The emphasis should be placed on improving upon the design and execution of the surveys in g7+ countries, and on combining survey data with more qualitative process-led observations in country.

The length of time taken to agree upon and commission the Independent Review has delayed this process. It was important to define clearly the scope of the work of the Independent Review before embarking on the TOR for the Monitoring Exercise, in order to ensure a clear delineation of responsibilities and scope for each process to feed into the other.

The current a proposal recommends a choice between two options:

- Either starting a New Deal Monitoring Round 2, in June; or
- Starting an Global partnership aligned process in September.

A draft Terms of Reference will now be drawn-up, based on a decision by IWG of which option will work best, or on how both might be combined.

Whichever option is chosen will draw lessons from the previous exercise, recommendations made by IWG members to improve upon it, and align it with the soon-to-be-commissioned Independent Review.

This TOR, once complete – end of first week of June 2015 – will be sent for consideration to members of the revived virtual reference group for the NDMR. **It would be useful if IWG members could declare their appetites for becoming involved in this group. It may be worth considering the Independent Review membership and the NDMR as the same** – in order to ensure computability and opportunities for synergies and integration between the two processes.

### **2. Improving the 2<sup>nd</sup> Round of the New Deal Monitoring exercise**

The following elements will be part of the TOR and are based on responses to the last NDMR exercise, expressed by IWG members.

### **General principles**

- A lighter New Deal Monitoring Report which would compare and contrast pilot and non-pilot countries, as well as progress since the 2014 NDMR, with carefully chosen country 'deep dives' (this is, however, what the Review tries to do – so duplication must be avoided).
- The results of this exercise should feed into the review and strategic discussions about the future of the ID/New Deal.
- Ensure that there is alignment and linking in with the Review – identify the entry points and linkages between the two.
- Ensure linkages with other monitoring processes in order to avoid duplication.
- Efforts should be made to link the result of the monitoring exercise to global processes – for example, on discussions on means of implementation of Goal 16, or to share what has been learned.
- Require clear identification of opportunities and moments – to determine calendar and the review of global processes, such as the post 2015 discussions, Global Partnership monitoring exercise, the UN Peacebuilding Architecture, Peace Operations, UN Financing for Development Conference, and especially on financing Goal 16.
- Sufficient resources must be made available, both financial and technical, to enable the reporting exercise to be well conducted.
- G7+ countries must be fully supported in completing the exercise.
- Civil society must be fully supported to participate in each country.
- Ensure that country 'deep dives' are performed in at least two places.
- Decide on whether and how monitoring indicators from Global Partnership can be used, and how the Dialogue exercise feeds into this process.
- Feed in results of on-going research elsewhere (ODI, g7+, bilateral donors), and build upon it.
- Build on conclusions from the last round of monitoring and focus on 'what progress' has been made since. For instance, this might include how far the recommendations of the last report have been put in place. Use the exercise process itself to increase sensitivity to the New Deal at the country level

### **Suggested Methodology: HOW for design and data collection**

- Ensure that Report is quantitative enough and actually digs into the detail of aid allocations and modalities of allocation by donors in g+7 pilot countries. This should address the problem with the last report when INCAF members did not provide disaggregated information for all g7+ countries.
- Each constituency should be able to conduct its separate survey / exercise – once a year – and then come together to harmonise results in a workshop setting, and present joint country-level inputs to the report.
- Scope, timing, level of detail, and guidance for conducting them, all need to be worked out and agreed upon in advance.
- The Review should continue to focus on FOCUS and TRUST for comparability. The Review takes care of the PSGs.

- In addition to the Survey, use the Monitoring the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations (2010) as a mode.
- Increase focus on country dialogue rather than the remote completion of written surveys.
- Greater involvement of civil society and reflection of civil society views must be incorporated in the design of methodology.

### **3. Global Partnership: Linkages, Trade-offs, and Timing?**

It would be desirable to link the NDMR process and the Global Partnership monitoring exercise, particularly given that the New Deal was partly a product of Busan, where the Global partnership decided to make conflict and fragility a priority, and recognized the need to avoid the duplication of monitoring exercises in the same country. The importance of fostering synergies between the two partnership experiences has long been recognised. Furthermore, the Global Partnership provides a forum for the amplification of the messages emerging from the NDMR, from which the New Deal and Dialogue can only benefit. Aligning the two processes is in principle desirable, but there may be trade-offs in terms of timing. The GP seeks to embark on its data gathering process, starting only in September, although the preparatory workshops will precede that period. If the results of the ND monitoring exercise are to feed into global processes, then a September start could be detrimental.

The IWG should make a decision about whether harmonisation and alignment with the Global Partnership exercise is feasible and/or desirable. In principle, after preliminary discussion, the ID and GP secretariat agreed that, pending approval by our respective co-chairs, it would be advantageous to Harmonise the 2<sup>nd</sup> Round of GP monitoring and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Round of New Deal monitoring. The purpose of trying to align them would be to avoid data collection duplication processes, which undermine the willingness of voluntary stakeholders to do the reporting.

Concretely aligning with the GP monitoring would mean, therefore, that instead of they doing one and we doing another in the countries where we have pilots, one single monitoring exercise would take place. We would be responsible for the indicators of relevance to the New Deal, and they would be responsible for the rest – but this would mean that there would be ‘one monitoring contact’ for each country. This also has implications for the methodology that will be developed.

Their data collection period begins in September. They have a number of indicators that are highly relevant to our work, some experimental ones to do with inclusion that are also of interest. They will also be holding a methodology workshop in Copenhagen in September/October with the approval of the framework in 3-4 September.

#### **Key questions raised by aligning New Deal to Global Partnership Monitoring exercises?**

- What should the IWG respond to GP (awaiting a response since May 4<sup>th</sup>!)
- They would like to know if there are ID funds for consultants to follow up the process in ND pilot countries.

**Next steps for GP alignment decisions:**

1. Identify whether we have funds to pay for consultants to assist with the monitoring in our pilots.
2. Look closely at the indicators and see whether we could work with them – I have their indicators and targets outline.
3. Should we stagger our monitoring exercises? Begin and then continue into September.
4. Identify which countries would be the focus of the monitoring – so far the list of countries that participated in their monitoring last time does not contain our pilot countries.
5. See whether it would be possible to align the timeframes, and what the TOR would look like.
6. See how to update the existing GP guidance note for methods- there is currently a paragraph –not very detailed– on synergies between the two monitoring processes.

**4. Timeline**

The options note presented at the last IWG steering group meeting, suggested a 7-month time frame--timed to coincide with the publication of the latest official OEC DAC statistics. We are clearly out of sync with this proposal, but we could envisage beginning to engage the virtual reference group on a proposed Terms of Reference by the middle of June. Updated revised provisional dates (If it is decided not to align with Global Partnership Process):

- March, launch revised surveys (June)
- June, submit survey responses (August)
- July, preliminary findings available (September)
- September, produce first draft (November)
- December, complete final draft (February)

## ANNEXE 1

### ***Taking Monitoring Forward – An Options Note***

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The first round of monitoring has come to a close with the completion of the 2014 New Deal Monitoring Report on 30 September 2014 – as agreed at the Implementation Working Group meeting held on 18 June 2014 in Freetown, Sierra Leone. This first round provides a wealth of lesson learned and new experiences, which provide a basis for adjusting the approach, accordingly, as it moves forward. This Options Note puts forward a number of options for discussion by the Implementation Working Group and decision by the Steering Group. The options put forward are limited to monitoring FOCUS / TRUST principles only, and do not extend to the PSGs.

#### **2. THE FIRST ROUND**

The monitoring approach for the first round consisted of two surveys: 1) the New Deal Country Survey, which was meant to be a joint exercise led by government yet supported by the donors and local civil society; and 2) the INCAF Member Survey, which was a donors-only exercise looking at headquarters-related reforms and was meant to be a complement to the Country Survey. 16 INCAF members and five g7+ governments participated in the monitoring exercise, as well as varying degrees of local civil-society participation. In addition, the civil-society platforms in Liberia and Somalia submitted their views on the New Deal, since their governments did not participate in this first round.

The key findings of this first round are:

- *The g7+ rate of participation was lower than expected.* Originally, all eight New Deal pilot countries were expected to take part in the monitoring process (with the later exception of the Central African Republic).
- *The quality of g7+ survey responses varied significantly.* This is not a surprise given the varying levels of capacity across the g7+ group, including their ability to get sufficient donor engagement.

- *INCAF members did not provide disaggregated information for all g7+ countries in a comprehensive way.* That being said, most of them met the minimum standards of the Surveys by providing relevant country examples.
- *Some quantitative survey questions did not prove appropriate.* Donors systems do not track the data required for providing a direct answer to questions 4.3 (INCAF Survey) and 9.3 (Country Survey).<sup>1</sup> No g7+ country provided disaggregated information for question 6.1 (Country Survey).<sup>2</sup>
- *Stronger consensus is needed about the outline / structure of the monitoring report.* The “zero” draft version of the Report contained a section on “Dealing with Crisis” that had been agreed to during a meeting of the IWG reference group, but not in Freetown.
- *Greater resources are needed to produce a more timely report (with sufficient follow up with partners).*

### 3. OPTIONS TO CONSIDER

In principle, monitoring efforts should be ongoing and not merely responsive to the launch of a new round of monitoring. As agreed at the Steering Group meeting in Juba in 2012, the surveys should be complemented by country case studies and independent technical reviews, on a “demand basis”.

Below are a number of options that needs to be discussed by the Implementation Working Group and that requires a decision by the Steering Group before further monitoring efforts are undertaken.

- *Frequency of the surveys:* should they be annual or bi-annual? This question should be considered in light of other complementary exercises, i.e. the quarterly country updates on New Deal implementation produced by UNDP and / or possible case studies, etc.
- *Joint or separate surveys:* they may be value in producing one survey per constituency (i.e. government, donor and civil society). This approach may be less of

---

<sup>1</sup> OECD provided an approximate answer to these questions during the revision phase of the Monitoring Report by cross-referencing the most relevant tracking codes in the Creditor Reporting System. Questions 4.3/9.3 are: % of aid to support capacity development and technical assistance that is provided through pooled-funding mechanisms.

<sup>2</sup> Question 6.3 is: What improvements have been made by government and development partners in the area of transparency?

a burden on g7+ government capacities and help to make each constituency's views clearer on issues of concern. Yet, it may undermine their ability to engage in dialogue and find common ground on such issues at country level.

- *Scope of the surveys:* the next round of surveys should be more focused on core priorities for implementing New Deal principles, and not seek to cover its full scope. Otherwise, the process will be too heavy and the rate of participation will be low.
- *Timing of the surveys:* the production of a final version of a monitoring report can take a minimum of 14 weeks as of the close of the data collection phase.<sup>3</sup> For optimal data on Official Development Assistance, it is best to complete the final report at the beginning of January. Indeed, high-level meetings / events will likely be the main influence on timing [see below for proposed roadmap and related details in the IWG work plan, 2014-15].
- *Level of survey guidance:* the International Dialogue Secretariat received only a few queries on the survey questions from partners. However, it may be a good idea to provide templates for presenting disaggregated information in the revised surveys for greater consistency and ease of analysis.
- *Standing arrangements for country support:* A number of g7+ countries highlighted the need for external support for convening meetings, collecting information, and completing the survey. The UNDP Support Facility – or any other development partner – should have standing arrangements for consultant support to all g7+ countries.

#### 4. PROPOSED ROADMAP

The milestones of the overall process for undertaking the next round of monitoring and producing the next monitoring report are as follows:

- March, launch revised surveys
- June, submit survey responses
- July, preliminary findings available
- September, produce first draft
- December, complete final draft

---

<sup>3</sup> This time estimate assumes that one ID Secretariat staff is available to allocate approximately one-third of his/her time during the production period and has the support of one senior consultant with at least 20 days to available for work. In addition, it also assumes that external partners meet deadlines for reviewing and clearing drafts of the report, as per an agreed production calendar. See annex for a proposed calendar.

The above is meant to outline the overall process and not necessarily advocate a specific time frame. Yet the proposed timing is organised around the release of the last year's data on Official Development Assistance by the OECD. The details of this road map are outlined in the IWG work plan, 2014-15.

## **5. NEXT STEPS**

In addition to the above options to consider, the IWG should seek to:

- Agree on a greater focus for the new surveys based on existing survey information and priorities for future dialogue and joint work.
- Revise survey questions, providing clearer language on the need for disaggregated information.
- Identify country options for case studies as a follow up to the first round of monitoring.
- Collaborate on a dissemination plan for the 2014 Monitoring Report.

## ANNEXE 2

### FINAL TERMS OF REFERENCE NEW DEAL MONITORING REPORT 2014

#### 1. BACKGROUND

Since 2011, 43 countries and organisations have endorsed the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States. In 2013, the International Dialogue (ID) Working Group of New Deal Implementation elaborated a monitoring framework to track progress among governments, donors and civil society in taking forward their commitments, both at the country and headquarters level.

On 17-19 June, several of these countries and organisations will meet in Freetown, Sierra Leone to take stock of progress on New Deal implementation in the context of the fourth global meeting of the International Dialogue. For this meeting, the ID Secretariat seeks to produce a monitoring report based on the findings of the two surveys filled out by countries and organisations.

To produce this monitoring report, the hiring of a consultant is envisaged (one mid-level consultant, supported by two ODI experts). This consultant would work under the overall direction of the ID Secretariat yet within the administrative arrangements of the contracting organisation (GIZ). The consultant will be supported by *ad hoc* advisory group, consisting of members from INCAF, g7+ focal points and Secretariat, and the Civil Society Platform on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding.

#### 2. SCOPE OF WORK

The consultant will be expected to produce the New Deal Monitoring Report. This will require them to review and analyse the findings of the New Deal Country Survey and the INCAF Member Survey, submitted to the ID Secretariat in late March 2014. The consultant will also be expected to follow up with some specific countries for further details. The Monitoring Report should provide a detailed overview of the main results achieved by g7+ countries, donors and civil society (hereafter referred to as “partners”), including an analysis of how they have (or have not) changed their way of working both on the ground, as well as at headquarters level (where relevant for donors). No travel is expected.

#### 3. SPECIFIC TASKS

The consultant is expected to take on the following specific tasks:

- Review and analyse the findings of the New Deal Country Survey (5) and INCAF Member Surveys (15);

- Identify the main results either in terms of dialogue, partnerships, innovative approaches, and the mutual accountability of partners;
- Draw out “success stories” among both g7+ countries, donors and civil society initiatives that can be highlighted;
- Identify key challenges experienced by partners in their efforts to engage in New Deal processes or implement their commitments.
- Suggest high-level strategic messages to be communicated through the Monitoring Report, drawing from the New Deal Progress Report, prepared for the Global Partnership’s High Level Meeting in Mexico (15-16 April) as well as other key documents;
- Solicit and integrate input from g7+ countries as needed (namely Liberia and Somalia) on their main results / challenges with respect to New Deal implementation (and this may require some follow up with locally-based donors);
- Produce a first draft for review by the ID Secretariat and the advisory group, and then integrate their input into a final draft in cooperation with ODI.

GIZ will have a role to control the quality of work done by the consultant at various intervals during the process. It will therefore be important for the latter to keep GIZ informed at all stages of work and share initial drafts with GIZ for comment and review prior to moving on to the next step in the calendar of activities, outlined below.

#### 4. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINES

It is envisaged that all work on the New Deal Monitoring Report will happen during May. The specific timelines for the deliverables are:

- Initial draft to be ready for review by GIZ, and then the ID Secretariat / the advisory group by 20 May;
- The initial draft will then be shared with the advisory group by 22 May, which will have till 26 May to provide feedback.
- Work with ODI experts to fine-tune the report and submit the final draft by 31 May to GIZ and the ID Secretariat.

#### 5. ESTIMATED BUDGET

A contract with a lump-sum budget of EUR 12,000 is expected to purchase about 20 days of consultant services.