In July 2015, UNDP’s New Deal facility, together with UNDP’s Regional Service Centre for Africa, hosted the global workshop “UNDP Engagement with the New Deal: Taking Stock and Accelerating Implementation” in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The workshop brought together 55 participants, including colleagues from 18 UNDP Country Offices, UNDP technical colleagues from HQ and relevant Regional Bureaus, as well as representatives from the g7+, International Dialogue, Civil Society and Governments, and key UN and academic partners, to take stock of UNDP’s role in supporting the implementation of the New Deal.

The workshop took place in the context of a restructured UNDP and UNDP’s new Strategic Plan, as well as key global policy and review processes, the independent reviews of UN peace operations and the UN Peacebuilding architecture, the Post 2015 process and Financing for Development, as well as the independent review of the New Deal Framework itself. The workshop focused on exchanging best practices among UNDP Country Offices and partners on how to support national Government and Civil Society partners in implementing the New Deal, best utilize the donors funds available through the New Deal facility and concluded by identifying elements of UNDP’s strategic approach at the global and country-level to engage with this framework, especially in the context of Sustainable Development Goal 16.
Executive Summary

“The world is at a critical juncture. Development as we know it is undergoing a paradigm shift. The novelty is the unanimous acknowledgement of what has always being a reality—that development is not just about eradicating poverty or achieving economic growth. It is also about peace, responsive governance, and the guarantee of justice, rule of law and security. This recognition is symbolized in Goal 16 of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, which many of you in this room fought so hard to achieve,” Patrick Keuleers, Director for the Governance and Peacebuilding Cluster of the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support in UNDP told participants at a workshop on accelerating the implementation of the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States. The Director also reminded participants that “When the New Deal was agreed upon in Busan, it represented a renewed commitment by the International Community to engage in a true partnership with fragile states, to support their transition out of fragility towards resilience and long-term development.” Whether the new partnership is meeting expectations and what lessons we are learning from New Deal implementation are the subjects of this workshop, Mr. Keuleers noted.

The workshop was organized in the context of a restructured UNDP with a new Strategic Plan and ahead of the Independent Review of the New Deal Framework. It also drew on the many post-2015 development agenda setting processes: the SDGs framework, the independent reviews of the UN Peace operation, peacebuilding architecture, and UN Security Council Resolution 1325, as well as, the Sendai summit on disaster risk reduction and the World Humanitarian Summit. Participants exchanged notes on the growing understanding and appreciation for fragility in development contexts; took stock of progress so far on New Deal implementation; explored how to accelerate New Deal implementation both in pilot and non-pilot countries, and discussed how to align the New Deal framework and its Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals to the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda.

The following are among the key conclusions from the workshop:

- While recognizing the encouraging results from country-level implementation of the New Deal, participants observed that New Deal activities have been too ‘global heavy’ and thin at country level. They recommended increased investment in country dialogues on the New Deal to accelerate implementation;

- Management of New Deal implementation Facility in UNDP needs to extend beyond HQ to involve Regional Service and Global Policy Centers to accelerate implementation. Participants noted that it is not clear where management for New Deal implementation lies at the country level. In some country it is in the Aid Coordination unit or led by the Economists. In other countries it is with the Governance and Peacebuilding unit. Participants called on UNDP HQ to clarify the implementation structure for the New Deal;

- South-south cooperation, particularly the g7+ Fragile to Fragile (F2F) initiative is not only about strengthening solidarity among fragile and developing countries, but also about amplifying the voice of fragile states in global decision-making, as witnessed in the SDGs process. The g7+ is demonstrating what can be achieved through the ‘solidarity of the weak’. Participants called for increased investment in the F2F initiative including developing solid knowledge management system to capture learning from the effort;

- The New Deal Framework and current implementation, participants observed, seems gender blind. The role of gender inequality in deepening fragility and how the New Deal addresses this challenge has been unclear. UNDP and the g7+ were encouraged to invest more in the gender dimension of fragility in New Deal implementation.

The workshop was made possible with financial support from the Government of Australia. It also benefited from the participation of the African Development Bank, the World Bank, and the Secretariats of the International Dialogue, g7+, as well as, the UN Peacebuilding Support Office, and the Governments of Australia and Germany.
1.0 Reflection on the History of the New Deal

As part of setting the stage for the deliberations, Patrick Keuleers, Director for Governance and Peacebuilding at UNDP’s Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, Helder da Costa, General Secretary of the g7+ and Marcus Manuel of the Overseas Development Institute introduced discussions on the history, vision, and results of the New Deal framework in international development discourse.

- The world is at a critical juncture. Development as we know it is undergoing a paradigm shift. The novelty is the unanimous acknowledgement of what has always being a reality—that development is not just about eradicating poverty or achieving economic growth. It is also about peace, responsive governance, and the guarantee of justice, rule of law and security. This recognition is symbolized in Goal 16 of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, which many of you in this room fought so hard to achieve,” Patrick Keuleers, Director for the Governance and Peacebuilding Cluster of the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support in UNDP told participants at a workshop on accelerating the implementation of the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States. The Director also reminded participants that “When the New Deal was agreed upon in Busan it represented a renewed commitment by the International Community to engage in a true partnership with fragile states, to support their transition out of fragility towards resilience and long-term development.” Whether the new partnership is meeting expectations and what lessons we are learning from New Deal implementation are the subjects of this workshop, Mr. Keuleers noted.

- Patrick reminded participants that the vision of the New Deal was prompted by the realization that effective and responsive institutions are not just drivers of sustainable development, they are also manifestation of developed societies. He also noted that inclusive societies, with strong social compact anchored on trust, are more resilient to internal and external shocks and are more likely to achieve sustainable development results. The Director observed well-coordinated international development cooperation, guided by meaningful partnership with conflict-affected societies, is critical to achieving results, however up until now, international cooperation has been too fragmented and less inclined to follow the lead of developing societies.

- For his part, the General Secretary of the g7+, a group of self-identified fragile states, recounted the history of the New Deal Framework, noting that the idea began at the 3rd High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra, Ghana. At the Forum, some participants especially those from conflict affected countries, called for a new thinking on development cooperation that would put the

Box 1: Specific Objectives of the Workshop

- To broaden awareness and understanding of fragility and the New Deal framework in the context of development;
- To share cross-country experiences and good practices identified to promote institutional learning on New Deal implementation;
- Design nine to twelve month concrete New Deal country level implementation plans for five of the seven pilot countries agreed in Bussan; and
- Strengthen country and global level partnerships on New Deal implementation.
voices of developing countries at the centre of decision-making on aid effectiveness. The discussion culminated in the five Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals, which were agreed in Monrovia in 2010. In 2011 the fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan endorsed the five PSGs as a part of the New Deal Framework.

- On the justification for the New Deal, Marcus Manuel recalled that the fact that none of the fragile and conflict-affected states had achieved any of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) led to the formulation of the New Deal Framework. Despite the debilitating impact of violent conflicts and fragility on this group of countries, the international community was holding them to the same standards as more stable states in achieving the MDGs. The New Deal was therefore designed to focus attention on the unique conditions of states in situation of fragility, to strengthen their capacities and to achieve development results, he noted.

Plenary Discussion

- In the plenary discussion that followed, participants praised the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, highlighting the following:

- The New Deal was a wake-up call, signalling that aid had not been working effectively, primarily because it had turned a blind eye on the social, political, and institutional challenges that make states and societies fragile. The New Deal, participants noted, is the first coherent policy response to situation of fragility in conflict-affected societies. Its core TRUST and FOCUS principles provide clear roadmap for the type of leadership, partnership, and impact needed to transition states out of fragility into more resilient and peaceful states. The New Deal’s emphasis on national ownership, the use of country systems, transparency and accountability based on agreed mutual
accountability frameworks and single development plan is a fundamental shift in development practice, the participants highlighted.

- The New Deal, participants indicated, inspired the members of the International Dialogue for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, to advocate for the inclusion of goal 16 in the SDGs framework. The goal aims at promoting peaceful and inclusive societies, capable institutions and access to justice, as inherent outcomes of as well as pre-requisites for sustainable development.

- Concluding the session, participants praised the International Dialogue and its members for raising the profile of fragility in international development discourse and for pushing for New Deal implementation in a number of countries in the three-year pilot phase.

2.0 Civil society and New Deal Implementation

Peter Van Sluijs, Chair of the Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS), introduced discussion on the role of civil society in New Deal implementation. The CSPPS represents civil society interest in the International Dialogue for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS). It also supports civil society organizations in the New Deal pilot countries to contribute to New Deal implementation.

2.1 In his introductory remarks the CSPPS Chair highlighted the following:

- The state needs its citizens to organize as partners in the fight against fragility. Mr. Van Sluijs strengthens his argument by citing the recent fight against the Ebola Virus Disease in West Africa. The role of civil society in social mobilization, in burying the dead, in raising awareness, and in supporting those who have lost loved ones, “is another strong reminder that no society can overcome fragility by relying exclusively on state institutions,” he emphasized. It is therefore in the best interest of the state to promote civil society, to strengthen their organizing and engagement capacities, he maintained.

- The CSPPS Chair also informed the workshop about the outcomes of the global conference on Civil Society, Inclusivity, and the New Deal, which was held 16 to 18 June 2015 in Helsinki, Finland. The conference took stock on the extent of investment in CSO’s capacities to engage in New Deal implementation; the quality of partnership between CSOs and governments in fragile situation, between CSOs and development partners, and among CSOs themselves. The conference concluded with a roadmap to strengthen the role of CSO in New Deal implementation in Afghanistan, Togo, South Sudan, Guinea, and Somalia—ahead of the New Deal Independent Review.

Plenary Discussion

2.2 In the plenary discussion, participants highlighted the role of civil society in fragile situations, questioned whether it is civil society or citizens that should have pre-eminent role in New Deal implementation; and called for greater investment in civil society to overcome fragility and strengthen resilience. The following were the key highlights and conclusions from the discussion:

- While recognizing the good work done by the Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, a participant from Somalia called on the CSPPS and UNDP to pay attention to the unique role and challenges civil society face in fragile situations. “Civil society has been
the face of Somalia for 25 years. And yet it is not clear how New Deal implementation in Somalia is harnessing the strength of civil society”, she pointed out.

- Building on her remarks, another participant noted that when state authorities disappear in crisis situations, as has been the case in Somalia, organized civil society tends to assume the role of *de facto* authority. But when the authority of the state is restored, very little is done to ensure the smooth transition of authority from civil society to state. Instead of building upon the strength of civil society, Governments and international actors tend to shift from civil society to state authority, thereby undermining the gains made by civil society organizations in situation of crisis. This pendulum swing restores the seed of poor state-society relations and in so doing reinforces the drivers of fragility.

- On the quality of UNDP’s partnership with civil society, a participant noted that civil society have always thought UNDP was only a partner to state authority. The few NGOs that work with UNDP are service providers and not viewed as partners. The New Deal is about cultivating partnership between state and society. Participants called for renewed commitment to strengthen and engage civil society as partners in fragile situations.

- Other participants were however critical of civil society, warning against what they called the romanticization of civil society in situation of fragility. Just as the workshop is critical of state authority, there must also be a careful examination of the role of civil society in fragile situations, a participant challenged the workshop. Civil society in fragile states, the participant alleged, tend to position themselves as opposition, rather than partner of state authority. They criticize government without offering any positive support and sometimes become the eye of international organizations rather than the face of their fragile societies.

- The participant went further to challenge the claim that civil society tends to be strong in fragile states. “Fragility is not only a reflection of weak state institutions, it is also about weak social cohesion,” he argued. While civil society organizations may do well in providing basic services in their respective communities, civil society do not necessarily advance inclusion and institution building.

- Some also questioned whether the focus should not be on citizen engagement, instead of civil society engagement. They argued that civil society and citizens are two different things. The workshop however concluded that the distinction between civil society and citizen is a bit academic. The CSOs arena is broader than the commonly known civil society organizations. It includes all social institutions, which come in many forms. The New Deal process must learned from these and include them to ensure success. The support should focus on broadening civic space and strengthening civic organizing to advance state-society relations.

2.3 Concluding the session participants made the following recommendations:

- UNDP should accelerate support to civil society to strengthen their capacity and voice in New Deal implementation at the country level, beginning with supporting CSO country dialogue to discuss the roles and capacity building needs of civil society;

- UNDP and the CSPPS should build on the success of CSOs’ Ebola response by supporting their engagement in post-Ebola recovery in Liberia, Guinea, and Sierra Leone. Ensuring support to CSOs should not be limited to capital cities and with the most vocal CSOs. Community based civil society groups, particularly women’s associations must be supported;
- CSPPS should accelerate implementation of the Helsinki Roadmap in the target countries. Lead donors, UNDP, and state authorities must be brought on board to support CSO strengthening;

- CSPPS with UNDP support should explore the idea of developing a set of criteria on CSO performance in fragile states, starting with CSOs’ role in implementing the New Deal. Just as there are peer review and other accountability mechanisms for governments in fragile situations, there must also be standards by which civil society organizations and civic associations are evaluated.

3.0 The g7+ and New Deal Implementation: An Innovative South-South Cooperation Model

The g7+ is a group of self-identified fragile states, which is organized to advance the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-affected states. Helder da Costa, General Secretary of the g7+ shared with participants the work of the group since the launch of the New Deal in Busan.

3.1 In his introductory remarks he stressed the following:

- The g7+ members are those countries that are burdened by violent conflicts and instability; are home to the bottom 1.5 billion people; and are trapped in the vicious cycle of fragility, poverty and violent conflicts. They are also endowed with abundant natural resources and vast youth population—resources which if well managed could fast-track the countries’ transition out of fragility and poverty.

- The overriding perception held by many in the international community, Dr. da Costa supposed, is that these countries cannot help themselves and must be carried along through aid. The g7+, he noted, is seeking to change this prevailing characterization. No amount of aid can compensate for what the countries can learn and share with one another through their own experience, he stressed. The leaders of the g7+ countries organized themselves out of the realization that unless they acknowledged the problem of fragility and nurture their own
endogenous resources to lead their own transition, they will remain trapped in fragility no matter the size of aid, he underscored.

- The Fragile to Fragile (f2f) initiative, which the g7+ Secretariat launched in 2013, according to Dr. da Costa, is the means by which fragile states are supporting one another to transition out of fragility. He underlined that the f2f is a unique contribution to the global south-south cooperation agenda. Unlike the common understanding of south-south cooperation, which is about emerging economic powers from the South supporting weaker states in the South, the f2f is about weak and fragile states exchanging experiences. It is a ‘solidarity of the weak’, he noted. The g7+ f2f initiative currently focuses on five broad areas: natural resource management, public finance management, employment, elections support, and preventive diplomacy.

3.2 Concluding his opening remarks, the g7+ General Secretary outlined the initiatives which the group has successfully undertaken through the f2f initiative. These include support to Guinea-Bissau’s elections, preventive diplomacy in Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of Congo, and support to Ebola response in Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone. The g7+ has also been at the forefront of campaign to include goal 16 in the 2030 Development Agenda and to engage with international policies on employment generation.

Plenary Discussion

3.3 In the plenary discussion, participants praised the g7+ members for raising the bar on the impact of fragility on development and for their innovative f2f initiative. The following were the key issues deliberated:

- What has been achieved through the f2f, participants noted, is already expanding the notion of south-south cooperation. F2f is about shared problem-solving among countries in situation of fragility. Participants encouraged the g7+ to accompany the good work being done through the f2f with systematic knowledge tracking and documenting. They suggested to the g7+ to build a network of think-tanks from countries in fragile situations. Xiaojun Grace Wang, Lead Advisor on south-south and triangular cooperation in UNDP, offered to support the g7+ to strengthen the initiative and link it to the broader south-south cooperation network. She informed the meeting, as an example of s-s cooperation, that 199 civil servants have been deployed to peer-coach South Sudan civil servants. Jordan is also helping to manage gender-based violence in Syria. South-south cooperation is about going together for development, based on solidarity and shared experiences, she noted.

- On administering elections in fragile states, participants praised the work done by the g7+ in Guinea Bissau, where it helped the country to efficiently conduct free and fair elections. They also praised the group’s preventive diplomacy work in the Central African Republic and DRC. Participants encouraged the g7+ to strengthen its preventive diplomacy role as it is becoming increasingly easy for one fragile state to listen to another in time of crisis. Some participants suggested the design of a dedicated course and approach to preventive diplomacy for the g7+.

- While recognizing the g7+ efforts to position itself as a third way in international peacebuilding and statebuilding, participants discussed the following concerns, which they challenged the g7+ to address:
The engagement of g7+ in situations where there is agreed international sanctions regime in the name of f2f solidarity should be carefully considered, if the g7+ aims to secure and sustained international recognition and support. Participants cited Guinea Bissau where the government at the time did not enjoy international recognition during the support of the g7+. While the g7+ support turned out successfully without international backlash, this might not always be the case. Participants warned, the g7+ should be very careful in positioning itself as alternative to international decisions.

The f2f and the UNDP New Deal implementation have been weak on the gender dimension. An f2f on women’s role in addressing fragility should be thought through along with women’s civil society organizations. Women in public leadership across f2f should be supported to establish a network to strengthen one another in solidarity to advance women’s role in fragile situations. Participants also recommended the involvement of UN Women, and local women NGOs in strengthening the gender dimension of the g7+ f2f;

Participants challenged the g7+ to reflect on the raison d’etre for the network—a solidarity of a group of self-identified fragile states. While the courage to self-identify as fragile is widely praised, participants noted it is preventing many other countries that could benefit from the New Deal framework from engaging with the group. Cote d’Ivoire, Haiti and Togo were cited as original members of the New Deal who are no longer interested in being considered as fragile with many others having issues with the words ‘fragile’ and ‘fragility’. A participant informed the workshop that Cote d’Ivoire is currently working on its new development plan. The country is not drawing on the New Deal. As for Togo, while it does not want to be called fragile, it is open to engage specific aspects of the New Deal, like strengthening aid coordination and delivery capacity. The participant noted that Togo is more excited about the 2030 Development Agenda and asked how the New Deal will fit in the New Agenda.

Participants encouraged the g7+ to change the characterization of itself to make all countries interested in the New Deal more comfortable. Cote d’Ivoire stills needs to work on strengthening social cohesion across groups and to heal the wounds from the civil war, but the government is reluctant to engage the g7+ because it does not want to be called fragile. One suggestion put forward to address the challenge was the possible renaming of the group as ‘countries in very fragile situations’ rather than ‘a group of self-identified fragile states’.

In response, the g7+ General Secretary pointed out that the group’s self-identification is not because they want to remain fragile forever, to claim a privileged position with development partners. We see the g7+ embrace of fragile state identity as a temporary one. That is why we conduct fragility assessment and hold dialogues across our societies to discuss how we will work together to quickly get out of the condition. He informed the workshop that Timor-Leste as a case in point is working assiduously to address its remaining drivers of fragility and may soon announce that it is no longer fragile.
The series of sections on this topic was designed as a space for an honest reflection on New Deal implementation and the lessons emerging from it. It began with three case studies on Somalia, Timor-Leste, and Sierra Leone. The cases were then followed by reflections on the New Deal implementation and the future of development in fragile states from UNDP HQ and Country Office staff and key external partners including, Kathryn NWAJI AKU (Head of Secretariat, International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding), Henk-Jan Brinkman (Chief of Policy at the Peacebuilding Support Office), Frederik Teufel (African Development Bank) and Anne-Lise Klausen (Senior Partnerships and Operations Officer, Fragility, Conflict and Violence Unit of the World Bank).

All the speakers praised the International Dialogue for successfully entrenching fragility in the development discourse, at the global policy level. They also noted the considerable progress on New Deal implementation at the country level citing the following: i) eleven fragility assessments conducted in eight countries; ii) a national development plan based on the New Deal designed and a pledging conference held for Somalia; iii) a mutual accountability framework developed for Sierra Leone; and iv) a use of country system’ conducted in Liberia.

Despite the progress, there are challenges that need to be addressed to strengthen the implementation of the New Deal. Among these, participants highlighted, definitional, financing, and delivery challenges. The plenary discussions were organized around these three broad themes:

**The Challenge of Definition**

- Participants define fragile states as those that are not ‘inclusive enough’. “Inclusive enough” states, participants noted are those whose institutions and service delivery systems serve all people; there is a sense of fairness in access to justice and rule of law; and there is civic space for the broader society to participate in decision-making. The degree of ‘inclusive enough’ that is required to prevent a society from tipping into extreme fragility, participants indicated, varies from state to state. That is why fragility assessment is a critical component of the New Deal framework. Fragility assessment, a participant noted, is designed to identify, through inclusive dialogues, the unique drivers of fragility in a society and to determine how these could be addressed through development and political means.

- A participant from the African Development Bank (AfDB) informed the workshop that AfDB now focuses on fragile situations, rather than fragile states and this has broadened the space to engage a number of countries in Africa. The participant noted that AfDB has developed its own understanding of fragility, its own strategy, and has its own track for conducting fragility assessment. Its assessment exercises are tied to the Bank’s support to countries in fragile situations in Africa. The World Bank, whose characterisation of states as fragile inspired the New Deal and the g7+, according to a participant, has also moved away from the notion of fragile state and is conducting its own assessment of fragile situations. The World Bank’s approach is increasingly investing in the links between fragility and interpersonal and organized violence. The 2015 State of Fragility Report of the International Network for Conflict and Fragility (INCAF) also calls for emphasis on the universality of fragility.

- The two Banks are among the leading members of the International Dialogue. Participants noted, their shift in focus should be seen as an opportunity to rethink the ‘fragile state’ notion and to also review the New Deal fragility assessment framework to incorporate the change. Such an adjustment, participants pointed out, is necessary to avoid IDPS members, including
the Banks, from working outside the agreed Busan Framework. Having the two Bank’s fragility assessments and a New Deal fragility assessment frameworks in a single country defeats the whole purpose of ‘One Vision, One Plan” and shared understanding of fragility that is advanced in the New Deal, participants pointed out.

- On the New Deal Independent Review, participants asked what is expected out of the review. Will it clarify how to strengthen partnership at country level? Will it be forward looking to suggest the use of the New Deal as means of implementing the 2030-SDA in fragile states, particularly in implementing Goal 16? Kathryn acknowledged these were good questions and promised to share them with the Independent Reviewers of the New Deal. She emphasized that the ID Steering Group has also recommended for the review to be more forward looking. She therefore assured participants that the questions will be addressed in the review.

**The Challenge of Financing**

- The unspoken expectation of fragile states, participants observed, was that by enlisting as member of the g7+ and adopting the New Deal, it would attract donor funds. This expectation over the last three years, has not been delivered. It was only in Somalia where a development plan based on the New Deal led to a pledging conference. Other countries that have adopted the New Deal have not seen a change in donor support. A participant cited a study conducted by OECD which reported that many fragile states remain aid orphans and there are unnecessary barriers in the way of remittances, which is the second major source of development financing in countries affected by conflicts and fragility.

- Participants discussed among others the following reasons for the limited flow of ODA to fragile states:
  - The peacebuilding and statebuilding community still lacks compelling theory of change for peacebuilding in development and the real impact of peacebuilding is only observable years, if not decades, down the line;
  - Trust in the use of country systems in fragile states is low. Yuko Suzuki, UNDP Team Leader on Aid Effectiveness informed the meeting that in 2013 and 2014 less than half of ODA was assessed through country system. Some fragile states have made numerous efforts to reform their public finance management systems but this has not yet inspired confidence in the international development community. A participant reminded the workshop that the trust issue is on both sides—with donors and recipient countries. He noted that in the case of Somalia, Aid management system has been controlled by donors and getting reports from the donors has also been a challenge.
  - The pace and quality of delivery of development results by governments of fragile countries cannot cope with the sense of urgency and time-bound project orientation of development partners. Some governments take very long time to implement projects, as a result the financing pipeline tends to be clogged;
  - There is also problem accounting for development results. Data management systems are weak and the quality and timeliness of reports are poor. A colleague from Sierra Leone reported that Sierra Leone has a major challenge in ensuring their aid delivery and monitoring database is able to capture information in real-time and in a transparent manner;
Another concern raised was the perception held by a number of countries, that some donors particularly from OECD countries were diverting ODA to this group of countries, to the disadvantage of other LDCs who are not members of the g7+. While there is no evidence for this claim, participants noted, the perception is one factor that explains the cautious relationship between g7+ countries and the rest of G77 group of countries. The continued association of the New Deal to aid effectiveness is reinforcing this perception. Until fragility is viewed beyond aid, it would be difficult to do away with the perception, a participant stressed.

Participants observed that these misperceptions could have been addressed had there been more country outreach through country dialogues, which were part of the design of the New Deal framework. They also urged the g7+ to extend membership to other LDCs to ensure the universality of the fragility agenda.

Participants also recommended the use of pooled financing instruments that bring together funding from ODA, the Private Sector and other financing sources to complement domestic resource mobilization. Participants stressed the importance for countries in fragile situations to strengthen their own domestic resource mobilization capacities. Another suggested stronger partnership between the UN Peacebuilding Architecture to contribute to ongoing discussion around the use of Assessed funds, often limited to peacekeeping operations, for peacebuilding and statebuilding activities;

The Challenge of Delivery

While the New Deal is a compelling framework and that significant progress has been made in its implementation, the results are far below what was expected at the signing of the New Deal in Bussan. Participants outlined the following challenges and lessons learned, which must be addressed to accelerate implementation:

- New Deal implementation has been less inclusive, focusing too much on state authority. Parliaments, civil society, private sector, traditional and religious leaders, women’s and youth organizations have not been actively engaged. Henk-Jan Brinkman reminded participants that post-conflict peacebuilding and statebuilding depends to a large extent on inclusive and mature political settlement, in which all stakeholders in the society are invested. This sets the foundation for inclusive society. He observed that the international community do not go far enough to nurture the full implementation of political settlement between rival groups until more mature political space is created. A participant cited South Sudan to reinforce Mr. Brinkman’s point. He indicated that the international community downplayed the centrality of politics for a more technocratic approach to peacebuilding and statebuilding in South Sudan. The result was a relapse to conflict and an even more polarized political space.

- Participants also noted that the way international development cooperation is organized inadvertently contributes to fragmentation and exclusivity that perpetuate fragility. “We cannot deliver inclusivity when we are so fragmented ourselves,” a participant emphasized. Commitment to one plan and one mutual accountability framework, under the support leadership of a lead donor in fragile situation was meant to achieve coherent and coordinated response to advance inclusivity. Participants observed these principles are still not followed by donors in many fragile situations.
The New Deal fell into the trap of the international community’s traditional blueprint approach to development and peacebuilding. Countries are required to undertake fragility assessment, even where there exists a range of assessment reports; this is then followed by a development plan designed along the five PSGs; followed by a compact and in one case (Somalia) by a pledging conference. This rigid formulaic approach, participants observed, is counter-productive to the spirit of the New Deal, which calls for context-specificity, national ownership, and flexibility.

The quality of partnership between donors and countries in fragile and conflict-affected situations did not improve as envisioned in the New Deal. Partnership with donors was meant to change from the traditional top-down relationship to one of equal and meaningful partnership. In some countries donors and host governments continue to disagree on what constitutes national ownership and use of country systems. Some g7+ countries have been reluctant to forge partnership with civil society and the private sector.

**Delivering the 2030 Development Agenda in Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations**

- The New Deal, according to participants, provides a clear path for achieving Goal 16 and for implementing the 2030 Development Agenda in situations of conflict and fragility. The TRUST and FOCUS set of principles are strategic guidance for how to support development in countries affected by conflicts and fragility. The Participants encouraged UNDP, the g7+ and ID Secretariats to extend the f2f model to helping g7+ countries to localize the 2030 Development Agenda by: a) developing national and local indicators; b) mainstreaming the agenda in existing development plans, and c) strengthening national statistics offices and civil society capacities to undertake independent reporting on progress on the 2030-SDA.

- Participants also encouraged the ID members to actively engage the global SDGs indicator formulation process. In defining indicators for Goal 16, participants recommended that the ID should share the indicators developed for the PSGs as a useful place to begin the global indicators development process for Goal 16.

- Despite the recognition for the need to mainstream the 2030-SDA participants cautioned against diluting the universal aspiration of Goal 16 as targeting conflict-affected countries alone or subsuming the New Deal agenda under Goal 16.

- Participants also discussed how countries affected by conflicts and fragility will finance the new development agenda. Even with the New Deal and the commitment of OECD countries to focus aid on these countries, participants observed, too many fragile states are aid orphans. The second source of development financing in this group of countries is remittances. Participants however noted that there are still too many barriers in the way of remittances to conflict-affected countries. To avoid lip-service to development financing in these countries participants called for a robust strategy to keep them on the radar of the international development community.

**5 Follow-up Actions**

Moving forward, participants recommended the following as immediate actions that should be taken by UNDP, the g7+, CSPPS, and the International Dialogue Secretariat:
Ahead of the New Deal Independent Review UNDP and the g7+ should accelerate New Deal implementation. UNDP country office colleagues were encouraged to develop, along with their Government and civil society counterparts, an accelerated New Deal implementation plan that should be shared in the next few weeks with the New Deal Implementation Facility at HQ to launch implementation of the proposed action. The focal points at HQ were introduced and encouraged to hold separate meetings with UNDP Country colleagues on the margin of the workshop.

UNDP should clarify the ND implementation structure defining the role of the Regional Service Centers and country offices. We need to ensure New Deal implementation has a clear home in country offices. This agenda is not about aid coordination. It is about statebuilding and peacebuilding and this role is led by the Governance and Peacebuilding Cluster in UNDP. We need to ensure this is reflected at the country level.

CSPPS encouraged to accelerate the implementation of the Helsinki Roadmap including working closely with UNDP to support civil society organizations in the Ebola affected countries to engage the post-Ebola recovery agenda. Civil society platforms at the country level will develop their own implementation proposals and submit to the CSPPS and UNDP for support.

ID Secretariat and UNDP were requested to organize series of country dialogues on the New Deal and the 2030-Development Agenda. The new agenda presents an opportunity to facilitate whole of society dialogues on ending fragility. Participants recommended that the ID should come up with a concrete action plan on this agenda.

UNDP South-South Cooperation Lead Advisor was requested to work closely with the g7+ to strengthen the f2f initiative including supporting knowledge management and strengthening women’s f2f initiatives.

Part of the challenge in New Deal implementation has been the lack of effective communication and outreach strategy at the country level. Going forward, participants recommended to UNDP and the g7+ to focus more on developing communication and outreach strategy for each g7+ member country.

6 Conclusion

Concluding the workshop Patrick Keuleers, Ozonnia Ojielo, Helder da Costa, Peter and Marcus concluded the workshop thanking the organizers and re-echoing some key takeaways from their points of view:

Ozonnia reminded the participants that there is a broader range of countries including middle income countries where fragility is a real problem. The excellent New Deal framework is relevant for these countries as well. He called on the g7+ and the ID to take advantage of the new development agenda to broaden the space for these countries to embrace the ND agenda.

Helder da Costa thanked the organizers and indicated that the workshop exceeded his expectation. He indicated that he was happy to make the decision of attending amidst other competing activities. He said that the overwhelming positive feedback he got on the f2f initiative has reinvigorated him and he will follow-up on all the recommended actions.
Marcus Manuel observed that the gaping hole in the New Deal agenda over the years has been the absence of gender. With UNSCR 1325 under review and the continuing call for women’s participation in peacebuilding and statebuilding, the International Dialogue, UNDP, and g7+ need to do better at engaging the issues of women and gender in fragility.

Sam Doe congratulated his colleagues, Kristoffer Tangri and Mafalda Marchioro as well as colleagues of the Regional Service Centre for their contributions in the organization of the workshop. He noted that as we celebrate the launch of a new development agenda, fragility, poverty, and pandemics are in a tragic dance that is perpetuating human suffering in many parts of the world. Engaging fragility has got to be a multi-prong approach that include infrastructure, institutional, human capital development. We will not succeed if we do not help fragile states build the necessary human capital through their tertiary institutions.