International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding
19th Steering Group Meeting
28 & 30 November 2017, Nairobi, Kenya

Key Decisions

- The revised version of the IDP S’ draft strategy was approved pending the integration of further comments by members in the coming weeks.
- The draft work plan of the Secretariat was welcomed as a good start, but members requested more time for internal consultation and to identify champions.
- Members reviewed the budget and financing plan, which will be revised to ensure that it supports the delivery of the International Dialogue Strategy as a whole.
- The European Union agreed to take over the Co-chair position of the International Dialogue’s Implementation Working Group from the United States (INCAF), subject to confirmation by their hierarchy, and the Central African Republic was nominated for the g7+ IWG Co-Chair position.
- The draft Terms of Reference of the IWG were discussed and reviewed, and will be finalised following the adoption of the IDPS Strategy.
- Members agreed to integrate gender sensitivity and women’s empowerment into the IDPS work, and reviewed the draft Action Plan, which will be further revised in light of further comments.
- Members acknowledged the importance of the private sector work but insisted on aligning its ambition and scope to the available resources and on being more systematically informed about it.
- Sweden announced the continuation of its financial support to the Secretariat in 2017. The OECD reconfirmed its willingness to host the Secretariat but reminded members that it is their responsibility to fund its operation.
- The 6th Global Meeting will be on 10 May 2017 in Bangui, Central African Republic. The next Steering Group and IWG meetings will be in April 2017, on the margins of the World Bank’s Spring Meetings.

Day 1 – 28/11/2016

1. Opening Session

The Co-Chairs welcomed participants, reminding them of the importance of this Steering Group meeting for the future of the International Dialogue. At this meeting, members were expected to agree upon the Strategy and work priorities of the International Dialogue and to have a substantive and conclusive discussion about the structures that will be required to support the delivery of the mandate. The first day of the meeting was structured around 9 sessions, during which members discussed the draft Strategy for the International Dialogue (session 2), the draft Terms of Reference for the IWG (session 3), the country-level support and structures required to deliver on the mandates (session 4), the International Dialogue Secretariat support and funding (session 6), and three thematic sessions on the Centre for International Co-operation’s work on Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies (session 5), the draft proposal for a Gender Action Plan (session 7), and the private sector work of the International Dialogue (session 8).

Conclusions | Next Steps

- The 18th Steering Group Meeting Summary Record was approved as amended, including minor corrections to language around the Independent Review and the link between the SDGs and New Deal.
2. International Dialogue Strategy

The Co-Chairs introduced the draft Strategy document. This document is the product of several months of consultation, and benefits from inputs from all constituencies. It presents a short background detailing what we have achieved and what we need to continue improving, and it presents 6 outcomes and a tentative work plan to fulfil them.

Discussion

- The work plan’s ambition to be global-light and country-heavy was recognised as the right one. However, members noted the need to retain a focus on global relevance and to continue working internationally. They also stressed the need for constituencies to identify issues and potential solutions at country-level, making use of the proposed tri-partite mechanisms, and to connect with existing initiatives beyond the International Dialogue space. More generally, members stressed the importance of assessing and considering the feasibility of proposals.

- On the governance arrangements, members requested a better definition of the Steering Group’s decision-making role. More generally, they requested increased clarity on how the entire International Dialogue membership is engaged and involved, beyond members who are part of the Steering Group or the IWG. CSPPS expressed a desire to rebalance the Steering Group composition given that currently there are 11 seats for INCAF, 11 for g7+, and four for CSPPS.

- Members requested clarification on the various roles of the bodies of the International Dialogue and the division of labour among them, and the need to distinguish between individual and collective responsibilities, as this would facilitate identifying champions for the different areas of work and prevent overlap between the various mandates.

- Members agreed that the IWG ToRs should be revised once the Strategy has been approved.

- Some members noted that the International Dialogue should increase its linkages to operational work but ensure that the New Deal was not seen as “a project” but a set of principles. Work at country-level should be based on an assessment of what is needed, when, and where. Some members also noted the importance of fostering political will at the regional level.

- Members also requested adjusting the proposal for the tri-partite mechanisms at country-level to take account of existing structures, and indicating a clear timeline for piloting this approach.

- On country dialogues, members noted that the list required further work and discussion. For some members, the content of the dialogues should be dictated by the context, and its structure should be determined in consultation with the constituencies. For others, country dialogues should connect with the work plan, be demand driven, and should be seen as a means to an end. Some members also reflected on the limitations of individual country dialogues in advancing the New Deal.

- On monitoring, members requested more clarity, including what will be monitored and how. Some noted that members are responsible for implementing the principles of the New Deal, and that the International Dialogue provides a forum for accountability, for discussing challenges and ways to address them, and for sharing experiences. (This discussion was continued during the session on the IWG, see below).

- Members noted that there is a need for a better understanding of the different processes and initiatives that are already taking place. This includes reflecting more on what members are already doing, and tailoring the International Dialogue’s contributions accordingly.

- Members also discussed the gap in knowledge and understanding of the New Deal principles at country-level, and indicated that strengthening the role of focal points could be part of the solution.

- Members stressed the need to highlight the added value of the Dialogue as a tri-partite partnership where members engage in frank and open dialogue to learn lessons from each other and use this collective knowledge to catalyse changes in behaviour at the global and country-levels.
• Members suggested strengthening the language on prevention, on addressing the root causes, and on peacebuilding, in line with the Stockholm Declaration.
• Members also stressed the need for a better articulation of successes to date and of properly breaking down the timelines for meeting objectives.
• Some members suggested that the Strategy needs a deeper consideration of what is happening around the world, and that it needs to clarify where the International Dialogue can make a difference.
• There was consensus on the important role of the International Dialogue Secretariat in coordination and monitoring. For some members, the Secretariat’s primary responsibilities are fundraising, supporting the Co-Chairs, and facilitating monitoring. For others, it should facilitate International Dialogue work and processes through technical, logistical, and financial support, rather than deliver the actual outputs. Some members also encouraged more active constituency secretariats. Members discussed the need to strengthen language on the need for communication within and between constituencies. This includes members’ responsibilities to communicate and raise awareness of the New Deal within their own agencies and governments, and communication between Co-Chairs, constituencies, and working groups. It also includes increased clarity about external communication efforts and how previous work to develop a communications strategy will be taken forward in the future.

Conclusions | Next Steps
• The Strategy was generally welcomed by members as a useful contribution to operationalising the Stockholm Declaration commitments.
• Participants suggested a number of areas which can be further improved to ensure the document adequately reflects the collective concerns of all members.
• The Co-Chairs agreed to revise the Strategy document in light of the discussion and present it for approval on the second day of the 19th Steering Group meeting on 30 November 2016.

3. Draft Terms of Reference of Implementation Working Group

Room Document 4 “Draft Terms of Reference – Implementation Working Group” was presented by IWG co-Chair Erin McCandless. Moving forward, the proposed main areas of focus for the IWG are: monitoring and assessment of progress and challenges on New Deal implementation at country-level; supporting country-led dialogues to identify and overcome challenges; strengthening capacity to advance New Deal implementation; and shaping global advocacy efforts for scaled up and improved implementation. A cross-cutting theme is the unblocking of obstacles to New Deal realisation at the country-level by analysing challenges, sharing lessons and insights across countries and between country and global levels. In addition, the IWG has a crucial role to play in reporting challenges to the IDPS Steering Committee, with recommendations on how to overcome them. The IWG has three designated Co-Chairs, representing the IDPS constituencies (g7+, INCAF and CSPPS constituencies), which rotate every two years. They will liaise with in-country tripartite mechanisms in g7+ countries. Members of the IWG (up to 10 from each constituency) are expected to be champions of particular IWG priorities or themes, to move the IWG agenda forward independently, and to report to the Co-Chairs.

Discussion
• Members discussed the need to clarify the roles, responsibilities, ways of working, and communication mechanisms of the IWG and increase clarity on the role of in-country focal points, especially considering their important role in replicating the Dialogue structure at country-level. The IWG Co-Chairs also stressed the importance of ensuring dynamic and consistent participation in the working group.
On the role of the IWG, for some members the group should act as a facilitator and aggregator of resources, working on mapping, supporting, and enabling, instead of implementing different aspects of the New Deal. For others, the IWG’s main purpose is to find collective solutions to the issues that members cannot solve individually.

Members also reiterated the need to clarify the link between the IWG and the UNDP New Deal Facility.

On monitoring, some members noted the need for a globally-agreed log frame, produced through a consultative process, against which to measure progress. Some suggested looking at how the three partners implement the New Deal in their strategies, assessing the structures that could enable implementation. Some members also suggested an increased focus on peer-to-peer reporting.

The proposed country dialogues were discussed but members requested further assessment of the mechanisms and initiatives that are already in place. Members noted the need to have a clearer added value proposition for the Dialogue’s work on country dialogues. Some members also requested more clarity in terms of how countries would participate and how they would be financed.

The capacity building elements of the proposal were also discussed. However, members noted that the language should be changed to clarify that the IWG will not engage in capacity building, but instead advocate for it and support it where possible. Some members also noted the need to avoid bypassing actors and structures on the ground when engaging in country-level implementation.

Conclusion | Next Steps

The draft IWG Terms of Reference and work priorities will be revised in the light of the final International Dialogue Strategy, and feedback received at this session.

4. Support required to deliver on the mandate: Country-level support and structures

Two Room Documents were submitted as background documents for discussion: Room Document 6 “Draft proposal for in-country mechanisms” outlining terms of reference for ID focal points in g7+ countries to replicate tri-partite dialogue at country-level and Room Document 7 on “Country Dialogues: What, When and How” outlining processes for identifying and addressing obstacles to the application of the New Deal principles at the country-level.

Discussion

On the replication of the International Dialogue structure at country level, members agreed that work on reducing the gap between the global and country-level discussions must be scaled up and that this would help to improve the communication between the global-level discussions and the operational-level work.

Some members expressed concern that the proposal ran the risk of coming up against the same stumbling blocks as the Lead Donors initiative. Others noted that the Lead Donors system failed because it was seen as requiring increased financial commitment, whereas this one is focused first and foremost on improving communication between three parts of the Dialogue at country-level. Members suggested that a clear timeline for piloting this approach could be incorporated.

Members had different views on the number of focal points that INCAF should have at country-level (e.g. one for all or one each). There was some consensus on the utility of having more than a single INCAF focal point for all INCAF members.

For some members, context-specific mechanisms (identified or created) where regular tri-partite dialogue was possible / already happening, were key. For others, focal points could also be called ‘champions’ who kick-start or re-energise implementation.
• On Country Dialogues, members reiterated their request for mapping existing initiatives and mechanisms for dialogue at country-level, in order to assess where there is added value for the International Dialogue. Some members felt there should be more acknowledgement that dialogues can be both political and technical. They insisted that, given the nature of this forum, serious attention should also be paid to the political.

Conclusion | Next Steps
• Australia announced its willingness to be the INCAF focal point in the Pacific region. It sees this as an opportunity to challenge itself as a donor to understand the International Dialogue, its principles, and how to take that forward.
• All constituencies were requested to communicate the names and agencies of their focal points to the IWG Co-Chairs and the International Dialogue Secretariat by 15 December 2016.

5. Briefing session on CIC work on Peaceful, Just, and Inclusive Societies

David Steven, Senior Fellow and Associate Director at New York University's Center on International Cooperation, briefed the Steering Group on their work on “Delivering SDG16+”. Agenda 2030 states that “there can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development.” The new agenda sets ambitious targets for tackling violence, insecurity and injustice, and for strengthening the governance and institutions that will underpin a more sustainable future. These targets are of critical importance at a time when large numbers of people feel that development has left them behind, have low levels of trust in institutions, and are worried about violence and instability. In recent years, many countries have made significant progress on peace, access to justice and inclusive institutions, but an analysis of the targets demonstrates that accelerating their delivery poses daunting challenges. CIC, in association with the governments of Brazil and Switzerland, is working with other UN member states, international organisations, global partnerships, civil society, and the private sector to explore these challenges. Contact the Secretariat for a copy of the presentation and briefing paper.

Conclusion | Next Steps
The International Dialogue should consider how, in widening and deepening its partnerships, as part of the fulfilment of its Stockholm Commitments, it might engage with the work being led by CIC, which INCAF co-chair Switzerland is supporting.

6. International Dialogue Secretariat: Support and Funding

At this session, members were presented with a proposal (Room Document 8) which outlined the basic role of the Secretariat and a budget for supporting the delivery of the 6 outcomes found in the draft Strategy in 2017-18. This document also provides a budget projection for the period 2019-2021, in line with the current mandate of the Dialogue, which was extended in Stockholm at the 5th Global meeting.

Discussion
• One member, Canada, urged a reconsideration of the role of the Secretariat and the need to have one. In their view, both the International Dialogue Secretariat and its work plan should be eliminated in favour of aggregating the work plans of individual constituencies.
• The majority of members expressed support for a fit-for-purpose Secretariat with clearly defined functions and the ability to facilitate the International Dialogue processes and support the implementation and monitoring of the Stockholm Declaration and the New Deal.
• The Co-Chairs acknowledged the financial contributions that the Secretariat has received in the last two years, from Germany, the European Union, Finland, and Sweden. They also welcomed a discussion on the figures proposed, the scope of the work, and ways to fund the Secretariat.
• Some members expressed concern about a perceived lack of enthusiasm to financially support the work of the Secretariat. They noted that Secretariat services are needed to, at a minimum, support the Co-Chairs, the IWG and other working groups, and to facilitate IDPS meetings and events.
• Members agreed that the role of the Secretariat should be more clearly stated. One member, UNDP, suggested that the role of the Secretariat should be primarily focused on convening Dialogue processes and separated from project functions which could be funded according to need and available resources.
• Other members who viewed the role of the Secretariat as both about co-ordination and facilitation, and helping members remain on track and monitor progress. They raised concerns that a project-by-project fundraising Secretariat would not help the Secretariat overcome what was a constraining constant fund-seeking imperative.
• Members encouraged better co-ordination to ensure that there is no overlap between the work and functions of the different secretariats and insisted on the need for members to think collectively and openly about how the work of the IDPS secretariat would be funded and how the work of the individual secretariats / constituencies would be funded.

Conclusions | Next Steps
• The budget proposal will be revised in light of the discussions and in light of the revised Strategy document to ensure that it better supports the delivery of the IDPS Strategy as a whole and takes fuller account of what individual members and constituencies will be responsible for.

7. Draft Gender Action plan proposal consultation

Room Document 9 “Operationalisation of the Stockholm Declaration: Draft Proposal for an IDPS Action Plan on Gender” was presented for discussion by Diana Koester. She highlighted the origins of the proposal in previous IDPS discussions on gender, the need to operationalise the Stockholm commitments, commitments outlined in the Kabul Declaration and Berlin Declaration, to gender sensitivity and women’s empowerment. She also emphasised the importance of seeing the proposal as draft, and as an attempt to integrate gender sensitivity and women’s empowerment concerns into the different elements of the strategy, rather than as something separate and additional, mapping what is already in place, and strengthening and leveraging what is already happening. Nikki de Zwaan, Programme Manager for Security and Justice, at Cordaid, also presented an ‘Integrating Gender in Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Toolkit’, and suggested that the IDPS could explore how to use it as a means to operationalise its Stockholm Commitments on gender. Rather the Action Plan will complement the overall IDPS work plan by facilitating the inclusion of gender-sensitivity throughout IDPS activities; efficient coordination of these efforts; tracking of progress; and communication of IDPS work and commitments in this area.

Discussion
• Members agreed that mainstreaming gender into the work of the International Dialogue, particularly that of the IWG, is important, and that having a specific focus on gender was critical to making sure that it did not get forgotten. However, some noted that a new work stream was not feasible at this time.
• They also noted the importance of avoiding duplication of efforts, particularly given the resource constraints.
• There was some debate among members about what the research says about the causal link between violence against women and women’s exclusion from peacebuilding and statebuilding as a cause of conflict.
• Members emphasised the need for the International Dialogue to be kept informed about work being undertaken elsewhere – so that its knowledge is robust and up to date.
• The presenters noted that the proposal is not for additional work.

Conclusion | Next Steps
• The proposals will be revised based on feedback received in Nairobi and suggested revisions to the overall Dialogue strategy.
• A new proposal will be sent out as a draft Action Plan for feedback.
• This feedback will be used to revise the draft action plan which could be annexed to the Strategy and work plan, before end 2016, and approved by written procedure.

8. Private Sector Thematic Session

The Head of the International Dialogue Secretariat presented a brief overview of the work that the Secretariat has been leading on the private sector, based on a mandate received by Steering Group members in 2014, to develop work in this area. Because scheduled report-backs to the Steering Group have often been postponed due to lack of time, at the last Steering Group meeting (November 2015), members expressed an interest in organising a special thematic meeting, to better understand the work in this area, showcase their own work, and work out where to take it next.

Discussions
• Although the time for discussion was reduced, members were able to get a clearer sense of what the International Dialogue was doing in this area.
• They learnt that the private sector work developed out of a collective decision taken by the International Dialogue in 2013/14, to develop a 'New Deal' for the private sector and engage more directly with private sector actors. This resulted in a strategy developed in January 2015, translating what a New Deal for the private sector would look like in practice. The focus of the strategy was three pronged: i. Making guidance on responsible business accessible to businesses, governments and development partners in fragile and conflict-affected contexts; ii. Promoting sector-specific public/private dialogues in line with New Deal principles in four g7+ countries (Sierra Leone, Liberia, DRC, and Afghanistan) and iii. Country and sector specific thematic research on how to promote more and better business and investment.
• This work has been funded principally by contributions from BMZ and the EU, featuring in the two grant proposals, based on the International Dialogue's 2015-2016 work plan. Outputs have included guidance on promoting responsible business and investment in fragile contexts and one public-private dialogue workshop in the ICT sector in Sierra Leone. Further progress has been held back, due to lack of resources (human and financial).
• The World Bank noted how well-received the brochure was, which summarised key standards for responsible business conduct pertinent to fragile and conflict-affected countries; published in 2015.
• This led to a second phase of this guidance work, tailored to investor communities, funded by BNP Paribas Investment Partners (Asset managers). This work is nearing completion.
• Members welcomed this work. CSPPS expressed an interest in the Dialogue working more on this theme, and engaging members more fully.
• Other members raised concerns about how to engage with this work, given the resource constraints.
• Members also requested information on how much BNP Paribas was investing in the Dialogue and whether members had been informed in advance. The Secretariat informed members that BNP’s grant of 15KEUR was managed by the OECD, which undertook the necessary fiduciary controls.
• Members requested being kept more systematically informed and consulted about new partnerships.
• Members requested greater deliberation and oversight regarding funding by non-Discussion
• Members recognised the importance of working in engaging the private sector in development efforts, however, they insisted on aligning the ambition and scope to available resources.
• Members also noted that building economic foundations (PSG 4) goes beyond private sector engagement.

9. Day One Closing, Summary, and Next Steps

Conclusions | Next Steps
• The Co-Chairs summarised the day’s discussions and outlined the procedure for presenting the outcomes of the deliberations on the second day of the Steering Group meeting.
• Members agreed to a revision of the Strategy document in light of the discussions.
• The Secretariat was tasked with revising the strategy, and summarising the proposed changes, to enable members to deliberate on them, prior to the 2nd Day of the Steering Group meeting.
• The revised Strategy document was tabled for approval on the 2nd Day of the Steering Group meeting.
• The IWG was to meet informally in the evening of Day 1. The results of their deliberations would also be used to feed into the 2nd Day of the Steering Group meeting.

Day 2 – 30/11/2016

1. Opening Session

This second part of the meeting was Co-Chaired by H.E. Minister Isabella Lövin of Sweden and H.E. Minister Abdullahi Sheikh Ali, Deputy Minister of Planning of Somalia (who stood in for g7+ Chair and IDPS Co-chair, Minister Momodu Lamin Kargbo. Mr. Saroj Jha, the Senior Director of Fragility, Conflict, and Violence at the World Bank, welcomed members on behalf of the World Bank, which hosted the meeting.

2. Strategy, work plan, and support structures

The International Dialogue Secretariat reported back on the discussions from day 1, providing an overview of the suggested changes to the Strategy document (see session 2, day 1 summary). Members from each of the constituencies, and the IWG Co-chairs provided inputs on the discussions and decisions.

Discussion
• Minister Lövin reminded members of the process through which the Strategy was developed. Starting with the discussions in Paris in November 2015, members have discussed the added value of this unique platform for linking politics and development. Through the Stockholm Declaration, members agreed to increase the focus on addressing the root causes of fragility and
conflict, to improve co-ordination and co-operation, and to improve country-level implementation through, amongst other means, improved dialogue at country-level.

- The IWG Co-Chairs provided an overview of the work to develop new Terms of Reference for the IWG, the technical body of the Dialogue, which seeks to agree on common priorities for implementation in line with the Stockholm Declaration and the 2030 Agenda. The draft TORs will be revised in light of the final Strategy document.
- The European Union agreed to take over the Co-chair position of the International Dialogue’s Implementation Working Group from the United States (INCAF), subject to confirmation by their hierarchy, and the Central African Republic was nominated for the g7+ IWG Co-Chair position.
- Switzerland, as INCAF Co-Chair, expressed support for approving the strategy on a preliminary basis, pending the suggested modifications outlined by the Secretariat and a further round of consultation by written procedure.
- The g7+ Secretariat expressed its support for the Strategy on behalf of its constituency, on a provisional basis, pending the suggested modifications and the additional round of consultations.
- The CSPPS Secretariat welcomed the draft Strategy and the opportunity to conduct a further round of consultations. It expressed support for endorsing the Strategy on a preliminary basis, pending the modifications outlined and the results of an additional round of consultations.

Conclusions | Next Steps
- The revised version of the IDPS’ draft strategy was approved pending the integration of further comments by members in the coming weeks.

3. Funding Plan to Support the International Dialogue Secretariat

During this session, members discussed the funding plan for the Secretariat and had the opportunity to announce financial pledges for its operation.

Discussion
- Brenda Killen, Deputy Director of the OECD Development Co-Operation Directorate, which hosts the International Dialogue Secretariat, noted that the OECD remains proud to continue to be associated with the International Dialogue. She reconfirmed the OECD’s willingness to host the Secretariat but reminded members that it is their responsibility to fund its operation.
- Canada expressed reservations with respect to the differentiation between the International Dialogue and its Secretariat. They noted that in contributing to INCAF, they feel they contribute to the Dialogue’s work. Canada also noted a desire for a reduced role of the Secretariat, limited to facilitating certain aspects of the work.
- Sweden announced the continuation of its financial support to the Secretariat in 2017.

Conclusions | Next Steps
The Co-Chairs announced their intention to reach out to members, especially those in the Steering Group, to follow up on potential financial contributions to the Secretariat, before the end of 2016.

4. Updates

Updates
- The g7+ Secretariat provided an update on different recent initiatives of the g7+, including the high-level mission to the Central African Republic; the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding with the World Bank; support to the CAR pledging conference; the g7+ Technical Meeting in Dili, Timor-Leste; work on the SDG monitoring and reporting mechanism; work on papers on the Use of Country Systems and lessons learnt from fragility assessments; and its
increased focus on Fragile-to-Fragile co-operation, which going forward will account for 60% of its work. The Secretariat also announced that talks are underway to host the next g7+ Ministerial meeting in the Union of the Comoros.

• The INCAF Secretariat provided an update on its recent work, including a guidance note presented in December 2015 looking at approaches to risk and a number of fundamentals that should be in place to mitigate it; a human resource management paper; a paper on good donorship published in April 2016; and a recent paper on ‘Hitting The Target But Missing The Point’ on PSG1. The States of Fragility Report 2016 was launched in Nairobi at the HLM2, which analyses violence and introduces a new multi-dimensional model of fragility. The first report resulting from the GENDERNET – INCAF collaboration will be published at the end of 2016.

• The CSPPS Secretariat provided an update on its recent work, including work to broaden and deepen its membership, with a focus on youth and gender, including partnerships with United Networks of Young Peacebuilders and Search for Common Ground. CSPPS also commissioned a report on civil society contributions to countering radicalisation. The CSPPS continues to work with country teams on appropriation of the New Deal.

• The World Bank provided an update on some of its latest work, including the upcoming launch of International Development Association (IDA) 18. It also encouraged the International Dialogue to ‘punch above its weight’, by focusing on issues of substance, tackling some of the problems in the world where it can bring added value. This encouragement to refocus on substance was welcomed by the co-Chairs.

• The 6th Global Meeting will be on 10 May 2017 in Bangui, Central African Republic. The next Steering Group and IWG meetings will be in April 2017, on the margins of the World Bank’s Spring Meetings, and the World Bank reiterated its willingness to host the meetings.