

**Discussion paper and expected outcomes –  
Concept Note of IWG meeting**  
*Document 01- For Discussion and Approval*

EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUE WORKING GROUP  
MEETING ON NEW DEAL IMPLEMENTATION  
1-2 June 2016, Nairobi, Kenya



## Discussion paper and expected outcomes – Concept Note of IWG meeting

*The objective of this note is to define the scope of outcomes of this 8<sup>th</sup> IWG Meeting.*

For almost a year, the International Dialogue has been engaged in constituency-wide reflection on what the New Deal and International Dialogue have achieved to date, what the new global landscape of rising conflict and fragility, and the new global development architecture, could mean for the Dialogue's future strategic direction. Underpinned by the results of the Independent Review, this process culminated in the adoption of the Stockholm Declaration on 5<sup>th</sup> April, when high level commitment was reaffirmed for the New Deal, as the most effective means of preventing and addressing the root causes of conflict and fragility, and delivering Agenda 2030 in fragile and conflict affected environments. At Stockholm, members also agreed that scaled up and improved country level implementation of the New Deal, needed to be the focus of International Dialogue's work moving forward, and that the IWG was to have a critical and more important role than ever, in ensuring this ambition is turned into reality.

**At this 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Implementation Working Group, the objective is to discuss and determine what the IWG's response to the call by the wider International Dialogue for a scaled up role in country level implementation, and what this will look like in practice. The IWG should use this meeting as the opportunity to identify how it will as a group contribute to ensuring the delivery of the Stockholm Commitments, with a specific focus on country level implementation, and how it will monitor them. This will also take into account the concrete ways forward outlined in the g7+ Kabul Communiqué.**

Key Objectives of the Meeting:

1. To come up with a revised mandate / TOR document which responds to the ID mandate renewal / strategy discussions: and the big question of 'what role for the IWG'?
2. To articulate clearly what focus on country implementation means in light of the ID mandate renewal – what role for the IWG (added value?) and what role for the wider International Dialogue – in particular given the Stockholm and Kabul Declarations and in light of the new Agenda 2030
3. To develop the outlines of a work plan AND transition plan from existing priorities to new ones. This plan should include countries and themes of focus
4. To discuss what mechanisms should be set up in country for taking implementation of New Deal principles forward
5. To consider resourcing – how this will be funded and staffed and what sort of support structure is needed for the IWG to deliver on its future workplan

### **I. Since we last met: Taking stock since Abidjan**

This section outlines decisions taken inside the Dialogue and ongoing processes outside the Dialogue that must be taken into account, in order to shape thinking within the IWG about the way forward.

A lot has happened since we last met in Abidjan in May 2015.

First, the international environment has changed. A new global architecture of Agenda 2030 has replaced the MDGs. Agenda 2030 recognises the centrality of peace to sustainable development. This at a time, when an upsurge in the number of conflict and scale of violence, coupled with forced migration unwitnessed in Europe since the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War, threaten to derail the universal ambitions of the SDGs. Fragility and conflict are as much a global as local problem. The inclusion of SDG 16, which reflects at least 3 of the PSGs, is the fruit of the labour of many ID members and others who fought to secure it. This new global operating environment potentially creates important opportunities for the International Dialogue to advance the New Deal as key to the delivery the 2030 agenda in fragile and conflict affected environments. **Articulating and effectively communicating precisely what the link between the New Deal principles and SDG framework is, and how it will be critical to SDG delivery, will be important in moving forward. Work is underway by an adhoc group of Dialogue members, on this. The IWG will have an opportunity at this meeting to review a draft document outlining work on this issue to date. The IWG will also have to take account of the results of deliberation on the draft document, and feed it into its new workplan.**

Secondly, the International Dialogue has commissioned an Independent Review of the New Deal and International Dialogue since 2011, which has now been published. This has provided us with an evidence base of what has happened at country level and global level and how the International Dialogue as a whole and through its members has shaped things. **The IWG will have to decide which of the recommendations from the Review, should be taken up by the IWG, given its resources, interests and existing capacities. The IWG could also use the results of the country level studies undertaken in this review, once appropriated at country level, to consider how to pursue future support to New Deal implementation, tailored to country needs.**

Since Abidjan, two ID Steering Group meetings have taken place, during which the contours of a strategy for a future International Dialogue have been sketched out. The strategy which received approval by Steering Group members for submission at the Global meeting, advocates a replication of the successes of the International Dialogue at international level at country level and by getting the three core constituencies of the Dialogue to work effectively together to advance New Deal implementation in country, with a wider array of partnership. **In the strategy a new and more important role is being assigned to the Implementation Working Group, as the vehicle through which enhanced New Deal implementation will be driven.** In the draft revised mandate document for the International Dialogue and draft revised TOR for the IWG, the IWG is supposed to identify countries and development partners with commitment to advance the New Deal, and align 'support' in the form of timely guidance / accompaniment, and shared learning, directed towards them. **The IWG will now have to review the new role being assigned to it as a group and define what specific role it has to play in this re-calibration of the International Dialogue's mandate and focus.**

At the Fifth Global meeting of the International Dialogue, on 5<sup>th</sup> April, members adopted the Stockholm Declaration and reaffirmed their commitment to the New Deal, as vital for leaving no-one behind and SDG delivery in fragile and conflict affected environments. Members re-announced commitments to preventing conflict and fragility by addressing its root causes, and working in more effective partnership with others. At the Global meeting, members also decided to extend the mandate of the International Dialogue for another 5 years, but charged the Steering Group with responsibility of hammering out what the details of what this mandate would look like, propose a work plan, identify what support structure would accompany

it and where it would be hosted. This work will begin in early June and a draft plan will be circulated for deliberation and approval by members by July (end).

Ten days prior to the Global meeting, the g7+ met at Ministerial level in Kabul, to identify priorities and review a future workplan. The Kabul Communiqué referenced in the Stockholm Declaration, emphasises the important role of the g7+ in New Deal implementation, the role of the g7+ in monitoring SDG implementation across g7+ countries, and the importance of advocating for tangible improvements in the ‘use of country systems’ – a focus on PFM – , the role of the private sector, and intensifying fragile-to-fragile cooperation. **Advancing and supporting New Deal implementation in g7+ countries, in line with country ownership and leadership principles, will mean taking full account of priorities identified by the g7+ group.**

Some important progress on the IWG’s existing work plan has also been made since we last met in Abidjan; notably with respect to a scaled up focus on priority countries, e.g. Central African Republic, finalisation of light guidance notes on New Deal implementation, and on support to country dialogues on the use of country systems. Advanced discussions are currently underway with focal points in Somalia and Afghanistan about how to support this process – although it will be important to discuss setting up a reference group within the IWG to guide this work.

Much work still remains to be done, with respect to completing work outstanding – notably finalising the ‘approach to crisis paper’, defining the next round of New Deal monitoring (the Review meant and the Agenda 2030 introduction, meant that a monitoring round in 2015 was not feasible). **The IWG will have to decide, in moving forward, how it transitions from these existing work plan priorities to a new focus. It must also be born in mind, that the current IWG work plan has been used as the basis for securing funding commitments, notably from the International Dialogue Secretariat’s principle funders, the EU (and soon, Sweden). BMZ, Finland and DFID have also contributed in the past.**

The IWG will have to decide on what the implications of developments since Abidjan should be, in practice, and what the role the IWG should now have. This will mean responding to the commitments outlined by the new global frameworks (Agenda 2030, Addis Agenda for Action, World Humanitarian Summit outcomes) and to the particular needs of each g7+ country (or those countries where the IWG seeks to focus its support ND implementation). The IWG needs to be forward looking and its members should be able to clearly articulate what the ‘offer’ and ‘added value’ of the group will be, to those with principal responsibility for New Deal implementation in country.

## II. Reviewing Recommendations for Improving on New Deal implementation

This section looks at concrete options for improving the implementation of the New Deal – identifies areas for improvement, and tools and processes at our disposal to make real progress on this. This discussion lay the foundations for a work plan for the next 18 months (and outline of which will be presented on as a slide at the IWG meeting)

The Independent Review, the Kabul communiqué and the Stockholm declaration, present us with a number of recommendations for improving implementation of the New Deal in the context of the new global architecture. These recommendations are both of a technical and political nature, some are both. The

current thematic focus of the IWG is already intended to improve implementation. The key priorities identified, in order to improve New Deal implementation, are **the need to strengthen partnerships, to strengthen engagement on the use of country systems, and to promote greater inclusivity in New Deal implementation**. While the Dialogue constituencies, supported by the IWG, will have to make progress along these lines, the issue of **measuring progress and being able to attribute it to the New Deal** will be critical, if the Dialogue is to be able to demonstrate that it is delivering on its commitment to implementing the New Deal.

The priorities currently being discussed at the Steering Group level and acknowledged at the Global meeting, are in line with some of the work already undertaken by the IWG and its members. Rather than a radical change in direction, the Steering Group is advocating an increased focus on implementation at country level as a general orientation of the Dialogue for the future. While important parts of this work have to be led at a political level (at a co-chair / ministerial level), much will have to be driven by g7+ countries themselves, and the technical support that can be provided by the IWG.

### **Strengthening New Deal implementation**

*Existing work:* In Abidjan, the concept of Country Dialogues was affirmed and three types of Country Dialogues were agreed to: the Use of Country systems; Transparency; and Reflecting on New Deal Instruments. There was also the sense that the first two could be combined given potential overlap and continuity of these discussions. The IWG discussion can reflect on the particular dialogues proposed. Some guidance has been produced on 'what a country Dialogue' is in the context of the New Deal.

*Possibilities for further work:* The Dialogue constituencies can strengthen relationships with focal points in g7+ countries, in order to better identify needs and opportunities for engagement, as well as learn from each country's experience. These strengthened lines of communication will also allow the Dialogue to build a stronger communication strategy around the achievements of the New Deal.

### **Strengthening partnerships**

*Existing work (to be reinforced):* The secretariat has initiated work engaging the **private sector**. Over the course of 2015, the Dialogue has engaged in a number of forums at global and national level to identify entry points and raise awareness of the New Deal amongst the private sector community. This strand of work is promising, and has yielded interesting outcomes, with private sector actors requesting more guidance. Country level engagement on the private sector is an important priority for many g7+ member countries, directly speaks to PSG 4 and 5.

Similarly, the Dialogue has also engaged with the **humanitarian community**, through an initial reflection on the relationship between the New Deal and the response to the Ebola crisis. It has also produced a draft document on the New Deal and its approach to crisis situations, sketching out how the principles of the New Deal could have an impact in contexts of crisis. This has also led to the Dialogue being represented at the World Humanitarian Summit, to explore further avenues for engagement. Building on this work, direct engagement in countries most affected by crises could be a way to demonstrate relevance to the New Deal, but also in ways that scale up joint ways of working (eg fragility and risk assessment, which build in resilience and political analysis) between humanitarian, development and political actors, guided by the New Deal principles

*Possibilities for further work:* The principles of the New Deal need to be socialised more widely outside the core constituencies of the Dialogue, in order to be recognised as *the* relevant approach to tackling challenges facing countries affected by conflict and fragility. This would mean promoting more and better private sector development and investment in fragile environments, and implementing our recommendations (once approved) for implementing the New Deal in crisis situations (with specific attention to the Central African Republic, possibly South Sudan). The approach could also be adapted for use by different actors, themes (e.g. Countering Violent Extremism) and country / regional contexts.

### **Use of country systems**

*Existing work:* The Implementation Working Group has responded to the request to develop guidance on the Use of Country systems. This methodology has been developed in collaboration with experts from CABRI and the Effective Institutions Platform (EIP), who presented it at the Paris Steering Group meeting in November 2015. This has led to further engagement with interested g7+ countries (Somalia and Afghanistan, as well as preliminary contacts with Liberia) to pilot this approach at country level.

*Possibility for further work:* Once the approach is piloted, there will be scope to replicate the approach and learn from this experience, invite other members for peer learning, and extend the methodology to other types of country dialogues, based on specific needs from g7+ countries.

### **Inclusivity in New Deal implementation**

*Existing work:* The 2015 Helsinki conference called for greater inclusivity in New Deal implementation, and explored options to ensure that the processes in place take into account all the constituencies of the Dialogue, including at country level. Country Dialogues on the role of civil society were proposed, as well as a more general mainstreaming of civil society within the New Deal process. Efforts were made to cast a gender perspective on Dialogue products and processes throughout the work of the IWG. Since this time an alternative view has evolved that inclusivity should be a cross-cutting issue across country dialogues and other instruments and processes of the New Deal.

*Further work:* Following up on the November 2015 17<sup>th</sup> Steering Group, lunchtime discussion on Improving the integration of gender perspectives in peacebuilding and statebuilding for New Deal implementation, the IWG could explore how gender equality instruments in country could be used to speed up and enhance New Deal implementation at a country level. The current (EU funded) workplan, already identifies a series of workshops to better engage civil society organisations with a focus on gender. Members also expressed the desire to explore options for better youth representation.

### **Measuring progress and attributing it to the New Deal**

*Existing work:* The IWG conducted an initial round of New Deal monitoring in 2014, commissioned a report, which has been launched and widely shared. It had initially been thought that a 2<sup>nd</sup> round of monitoring could be scheduled for 2015, to coincide with the Global Partnership's monitoring exercise. This was not feasible due to ongoing process of Review which took up much secretariat time, and demanded considerable input from g7+ and civil society focal points. The Independent review also yielded important results in 2015/2016, including rich comparable country case studies material on New Deal progress since 2011 in 5 g7+ countries. Plans are still underway to share the results of the Review with a wide audience, notably at the Global Partnership for Effective Development cooperation High Level Partnership Forum in Nairobi in November 2016.

In the current workplan, and as part of commitments made to the current funders of the Dialogue, in 2016, there will be a second round of Monitoring. This should take account of the problems encountered during the first phase, notably the lack of sufficient support at country level in completing survey questionnaires, and the absence of sufficiently robust data gathering from the international partner side. The new Agenda 2030 and SDG context will also need to be born in mind when agreeing upon a monitoring framework, that can capture at regular intervals progress on New Deal implementation (Focus and Trust).

The secretariat has commissioned and implemented a communication strategy since the IWG last met, which has significantly raised the public profile of the International Dialogue. An evidence base of what the New Deal looks like in practice, which can be shared by all Dialogue members, to tell the story of New Deal progress is still needed. There is work to be done to consolidate the work coming out of the Independent Review and the g7+ as well as civil society on this, to ensure that Dialogue members convey a consistent message about the Dialogue as a whole, and the New Deal. In November 2015 and February 2016, there were calls for the communications strategy to be adapted to national contexts. How the communications strategy is rolled out in the future, what its focus should be, how it will be resourced, and who will be responsible for executing it, are all questions that the IWG should consider, in conjunction with the Steering Group members and ID co-chairs.

**Further work:** 2<sup>nd</sup> Round of New Deal monitoring in line with SDG framework, roles, responsibilities and resourcing of communications and country level communication strategies, strategies, better horizontal and vertical communication

### III. The Role for the IWG

This section outlines the key questions about what the future role of the IWG should be – coming from the ID strategy, ID mandate and revised TOR for IWG (building on the section above) – and outline a set of decisions which the IWG would have to take in order to define its direction.

The IWG will have to consider what mechanisms are needed in country to support New Deal implementation. This will include a decision on focus:

- Which countries should be in focus? What members are willing to come forward (development partners) to drive New Deal implementation in particular countries?
- for proof of concept and evidence base; what themes?
- How can the Dialogue be strengthened at national levels; What role for focal points and how can wider ownership of the New Deal across government and society be supported?
- What does focus on country implementation mean (define clearly and pin down), who should take the political aspects forward and who should drive the technical side, how can IWG and ID chairs / steering group members work in tandem?
- What overarching strategic principles and tools (e.g. country dialogues, producing guidance, sharing knowledge) should be supported by the IWG? How can greater attention to strategy of New Deal implementation be nurtured in ways that are context driven and led?

The IWG will also need to explore where the role of the IWG stops and where ID chairs and the Steering Group's role starts, as well as the foreseen Political Strategy Working Group, who else must be at this table

to drive this forward, from within ID and outside ID (e.g. private sector, across government, civil society, private sector).

Specifying the role and added value of the IWG should take into account resources and capacities and be reflected in a revised mandate and Terms of Reference, with recommendations of possible revised membership and structure.

#### **IV. Ways of working and responsibilities**

This last, concluding section outlines the issues that will need to be addressed in the Terms of Reference to provide a structure that is fit for purpose and would allow us to deliver on the above sections.

##### **Issues for discussion and decision:**

The IWG is currently managed by a co-chairing arrangement, and supported by the secretariat of the IDPS. This structure currently drives much of the work forward. Other, more decentralised structures could be envisaged, with constituencies' secretariats taking more of a role in managing, and implementing specific areas work that are taken forward.

Similarly, the membership of the IWG would need to be clarified. Under current Terms of reference, members are self-appointed, and the role and responsibilities of members unclear. This discussion would also need to clarify the status of 'external' organisations, whose work closely aligns with the work of the IWG, such as UNDP, or increasingly, private sector and humanitarian organisations. An Observer status could be created or specific task force set up to reach out to these external organisations.

The relationship with implementing countries could also be formalised. There has been much reflection around a replication of the Dialogue structure at the country level, and/or providing specific support to the current g7+ focal points. The role of the IWG in this should be explored, as well as the communication lines to be set up and maintained between implementing countries and the IWG.

Finally, members could discuss current ways of working, such as regularity of communication, and the setting up of specific task force to take the work forward.