

**Summary Report of Multi-Stakeholder Regional Workshop on the New Way of Working
for East/Southern Africa
Entebbe, Uganda, 30 November – 1 December 2017**

1. Introduction

Between 30 November and 1 December 2017, OCHA and UNDP co-organized a regional multi-stakeholder workshop on the New Way of Working with senior representation from country teams and partners in Eastern and Southern Africa. With thanks to the Government of Uganda and support from the UN Resident Coordinator, Rosa Malango, and her team, the workshop was hosted in Entebbe, Uganda. The objective of the workshop was to i) enhance awareness and ensure a common understanding of core NWOW elements among participants, including its operationalization in different types of contexts; ii) foster peer-to-peer exchange on implementation, operational solutions, tools and modus operandi, in support of best practices at country level; and iii) identify gaps and bottlenecks that hinder NWOW implementation, and identify additional tools and support needed.

More than 120 participants from the UN, NGOs, donors and IFIs attended the workshop. The attendance covered a total of 15 countries in Eastern and Southern Africa¹. Seven donors² participated, national and international NGOs, the Red Cross family, the World Bank, African Development Bank and OECD. From the UN-system the following entities participated from across country, regional and HQ level: UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, WHO, FAO, UNFPA, UNWOMEN, IOM, EOSG, MPTFO, OCHA and UNDP. Participation included a DSRSG/RC/HC, RC/HCs, OCHA Heads/Deputy Heads of Offices, Heads of Resident Coordinator's Offices, global and regional directors from several UN entities, as well as a Peace and Development Advisor and strategic planners from Peacekeeping Operations from CAR and Mali.

The workshop was preceded by a technical level peer-to-peer session where practitioners from some countries leading on NWOW implementation were brought together by the IASC Task Team on the Humanitarian-Development Nexus in Protracted Crises, to discuss best practices and operational challenges in strengthening collaboration across sectors, and establish a community of practice. The findings of the peer to peer session were fed into the discussion of the multi-stakeholder workshop.

The Entebbe Workshop followed a series of high level events on the New Way of Working at the global and regional levels in 2017, including a multi-stakeholder workshop for western Africa in Dakar in January, a high-level meeting hosted by the Danish Government, the World Bank, OCHA and UNDP in Copenhagen in March and the WHS Anniversary in Istanbul co-organized by OCHA, UNDP and the Government of Turkey, among others.

The workshop format included a mix of panel discussions and break-out groups. Discussions were clustered around the key elements of the New Way of Working: joint analysis; planning and programming; leadership and coordination; financing; and collective outcomes, with an overall focus on identifying and discussing the “barriers” and “enablers” for further advancing the NWOW. A number of recommendations were put forward to be addressed at country, regional and HQ-level.

¹ Angola, Cameroon, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zimbabwe

² Denmark, Norway, UK, France, Ireland, Japan, and Sweden

The New Way of Working

What is it?

The New Way of Working is a transformative commitment to transcend humanitarian and development divides focusing on what results are needed to be achieved on the ground collectively. The focus is not on agency-specific, mandate-bound outputs but a consolidated direct impact in changing people's lives and moving away from a situation of humanitarian vulnerability in crisis settings. At the core of the New Way of Working is the commitment to articulate and achieve concrete, measurable, time-bound **collective outcomes** that aim to reduce needs, vulnerability and risk, as installments towards achieving the SDGs particularly in protracted crisis contexts. Joint Analysis, **multi-year planning** and multi-stakeholder participation in the articulation and operationalization relies on the **comparative advantage** of a diverse group of actors are the other key elements of the New Way of Working.

What are collective outcomes?

Understanding what collective outcomes are (and what they are not) is fundamental for advancing the New Way of Working and provide clarity on how they relate to key global frameworks such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Agenda for Humanity stemming from the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS), the ongoing reform of the UN Development system as well as their interlinkages with peace and conflict, climate change, chronic vulnerability and a series of other global challenges.

Simply put, a collective outcome is "a commonly agreed result or impact in reducing people's needs, risks and vulnerabilities and increasing their resilience, requiring the combined effort of different actors".

At the workshop, some initial experience in articulating collective outcomes emerged from the discussions. For example, in Somalia, the proposed collective outcomes are:

- Food insecurity: The number of people in acute food insecurity decreases by 84 per cent, with Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rates reduced by 5 per cent and sustained below the emergency threshold.
- Durable solutions: Risk and vulnerability reduced and resilience of internally displaced persons, refugee returnees and host communities strengthened in order to reach durable solutions for 100,000 displaced households.
- Basic social services: Number of vulnerable people with equitable access to inclusive basic social services increases by 27 per cent.
- Climate-induced hazards: Proportion of population affected by climate-induced hazards (drought and flood) reduces by 25 per cent.

Where does it come from?

The New Way of Working to transcend humanitarian-development divides emerged as one of the main outcomes from the WHS in Istanbul in 2016. At the Summit, a diverse coalition of actors including Member States, NGOs, UN entities, regional organizations, international financial institutions, among others, made strong commitments to advance the UN Secretary-General's vision embedded in his Agenda for Humanity under core responsibility four "Changing Lives: Moving from Delivering aid to Ending need", where the core elements of the New Way of Working were outlined. Among these actors were the UN Secretary-General and representatives of 8 UN entities, who signed a commitment to action, also endorsed by the World Bank and the IOM, to take the New Way of Working forward operationally by advancing joint analysis and joined up planning, improving coordination and leadership as well as financing. Since then, the SG has recognized that the New Way of Working can be a key approach to ensuring coherence between humanitarian and development action as a way to ensure that we leave no one behind as we pursue the Sustainable Development Goals. To instill momentum in this, a new DSG-led Steering Committee was set up to foster synergies in humanitarian and development action and enable collective action on the ground.

Why is it important?

The New Way of Working aims to transcend the decades-long discussion on the humanitarian development nexus, shifting from delivering aid to ending need. In line with the ambition of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development, it calls to end humanitarian need and vulnerability over time, as installments towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals in protracted crisis contexts.

2. Key transformational areas: Barriers and Enablers revisited

A number of enablers but also barriers to progress on the New Way of Working were highlighted during the discussions at the workshop. Overall, these findings validated and further augmented the enablers and barriers identified over the past year through a series of NWOW events and policy dialogues, and also built directly on the findings of the peer-to-peer practitioners session which preceded the workshop. The below tables are excerpts and shortened versions of the challenges raised by participants, as well as solutions suggested to overcome them. These do not attempt to represent an exhaustive list of all challenges reported by operational actors, nor do they reflect institutional positions of single or a group of agencies.

A. Joint Analysis

Getting joint analysis right sets the motion for the ambitious New Way of Working roadmap. Often analysis is associated with the creation of new processes or tools or the perpetuation of existing ones, when in fact, given that each context is unique, joint analysis should build upon all existing relevant tools and sources of data as relevant to a specific context, aiming to develop a common narrative on root causes, vulnerabilities and needs in a crisis context. Participants noted that joint analysis is the foundation for the definition of collective outcomes and as such, must include all relevant actors from the start, including NGOs, financing partners and local actors.

Barriers	Enablers
Lack of sharing/ transparency of data and lack of reliability on analysis on root causes of crises	Create hard incentives for data sharing (e.g. donors can create incentives for data transparency and sharing, update accountability frameworks of leaders of operational partners to ensure individuals are rewarded for sharing rather than withholding information). Explore options for shared information management and analysis capacity (e.g. a joint information management hub) Ensure institutional commitment to joint analysis.
Analysis done in thematic and/or institutional silos (by cluster/agency, short/long term, humanitarian/development) instead of more multidimensional vertical and horizontal information sharing and flows.	Adapt and combine existing analysis tools/processes as part of a similar process, either by merging them when possible or by aligning them in terms of timeframes and complementary methodologies. Expand participation in analytical processes beyond traditional participants, including local actors.
No standard process to bring together data on 'needs' with risk and vulnerability analysis and national, structural indicators of development progress.	Start by agreeing on the overall purpose and scope of the joint analysis from the outset (e.g. through jointly defining "vulnerability" among different relevant communities and prioritizing which SDG targets are relevant to be measured in a given context as well as which targets are missing from the SDG framework).

	Ensure an inclusive process based on the notion that reaching a common understanding of the situation on the ground, including the root causes, is a precondition for agreeing collective outcomes. An inclusive process can also itself enable joint action.
In many contexts, principled humanitarian action is associated with separate humanitarian analysis or assessment tools.	If form follows function, and the function is determined as achieving better results for people through collective outcomes, analysis – as an enabler of collective outcomes – needs to be undertaken with producing a collective narrative as its goal. While in complex emergencies separate structures may need to be maintained, in other settings a clear ‘code of conduct’ or partnership framework to collect and analyse information could equally serve the function of protecting humanitarian space.

B. Joined-up Planning and Programming

Participants noted that improving the flexibility in the various planning and programming architectures would be critical to allow partners to work together to define collective outcomes and joint and joined up planning processes. Given the range of complexity and context-specificity of protracted crises, it was highlighted that different approaches might be needed for different typologies of settings. Additionally, participants noted that the New Way of Working is still perceived as UN-centric. It was also acknowledged that in some settings, for instance where the government is party to a conflict, building government capacity might not be a viable option. However, participants agreed that recognizing government leadership from the start whenever possible and avoid creating systems that may duplicate national structures would be a good starting point for ensuring that relief efforts can help build the ground for sustainable development programming. Finally, participants noted that joint analysis need to drive the planning process from the beginning, and that jointly defined collective outcomes can serve as a roadmap for how planning and programming should be designed and implemented.

Barriers	Enablers
Lack of clarity of the process/steps for defining collective outcomes. Experience of collective outcomes being retrofitted or super imposed on existing analyses, strategies and tools.	Wherever possible, undertake a truly joint analysis, and articulate collective outcomes at the beginning of the planning process as the drivers of how joined-up planning and programming need to be developed. Collective outcomes must drive subsequent planning and programming. Develop guidance on collective outcomes to help guide the process in country.

Multitude of plans with different timeframes (HRPs, UNDAFs, National Development Plans, etc.) Lack of alignment and complementarity towards an intermediate, common target between life-saving and long-term national development.	Where possible and applicable, explore options to align, merge or adapt frameworks to the specific context.
Agencies planning individually without accountability to deliver against commonly set objectives. Even where these are set, agencies implementing pre-determined and pre-funded activities, or retrofitting them for collective planning purposes.	Individual agency planning should only take place after the articulation of collective outcomes and be truly informed by them. Donors should encourage and provide incentives for agencies to plan and programme towards collective outcomes.
The process being too UN centric and missing the bigger picture	Engage all actors as relevant in each step of the process, including analysis and planning. Use the shared narrative stemming from joint analysis as enabler for joined-up planning between the UN, national actors, Governments, NGOs, bilateral actors, IFIs, private sector etc.

C. Empowered leadership and coordination for collective outcomes

Progress on the New Way of Working cannot only rely on the personality of individuals, it needs to be supported by the collective, wider Government, UN system, multilateral development banks, donors and operational partners. For this, the UN Development System reform proposals on an empowered RC were welcomed by participants, but they noted that it was important that the “delinking” of the RCs from UNDP is followed by an even more robust “relinking” of the RCs to the wider UN system and its entities, with greater accountability between the RC and operational agencies. In a context-specific manner, governments should lead the process of defining and coordinating the achievement of collective outcomes where possible, and coordination structures should be geared to supporting governments in this role. Leadership at the global and regional level are also fundamental and in this regard, it is important that the experience of RC/HCs and country teams in the operationalization of the New Way of Working can inform the newly established Steering Committee on humanitarian development cooperation, and that regional level structures are also advocating for advancing the New Way of Working in support of the field.

Barriers	Enablers
Rhetoric on empowered leadership is not supported by the existing institutional set up in protracted crises given current reporting lines.	Ensure that as part of the UNDS reforms and the broader UN reform agenda of the SG, issues related to reporting lines in support of an empowered new generation of UN coordinators are addressed.
Lack of cross-pillar capacity and coordination support, and structures that enable defining and achieving collective outcomes.	Empower field leaders to create and staff their coordination offices based on context-specific needs, with secondment arrangements from other entities, as needed.

Coordination fora and structures sometimes (depending on contexts) risk reinforcing existing silos.	Provide more flexibility to RC/HCs to adapt coordination structures as needed based on context, including by creating multi-stakeholder fora where appropriate in which e.g. the World Bank, the government and NGOs participate. At the country level, assess the coordination mechanisms that are required (i.e. HCT) based on 'form follow function'.
Lack of clear messaging from highest level.	Ensure clear messaging on the commitments, guidelines, and expectations from global level (including through newly established UN Steering Committee on humanitarian development cooperation)
Regional level not sufficiently connected to the implementation of NWOW in the field.	Connect regional level, including Regional UNDGs, by clarifying their role in supporting NWOW implementation including through advocacy.

D. Sequential and aligned financing behind collective outcomes

Financing is a key element of translating collective outcomes into a reality. Participants highlighted that funding streams can both be at the root of fragmentation and silo thinking as well as an opportunity to create the right incentives for working together. The manner in which collective outcomes are financed will be an important step in the operationalization of the New Way of Working on the ground. There is a need to engage with donors not only as providers of resources, but also in their bilateral capacity as development actors as well as “shareholders” of the multilateral system, in a position to create incentives and mandates to enforce or enable institutional change, including within the UN. It is also important not to limit the discussion on financing to the UN system and UN tools. The links with Multilateral Development Banks is key to advance the New Way of Working and it is therefore paramount to situate the New Way of Working in the context of a wider financing architecture, ensuring its connectivity with the financing for development and the wider 2030 Agenda umbrella on SDG financing in crisis contexts, which includes public and private resources, domestic and international.

Barriers	Enablers
Fragmented financial “ask” of donors, articulated by humanitarian and development partners in protracted crisis. There is no aid architecture behind collective outcomes which can bring together bilateral, International Financing Institutions, the UN Development System as well as humanitarian actors.	Need to reform the way humanitarian/development actors present needs, vulnerability and risk to create a shared narrative of the crisis and enable to present a business case on “investability” in collective outcomes.

Financing modalities are not conducive to the NWOW, including earmarking to specific projects or programmes, limitation in length of period for financing (mostly to annual) and restrictions on recipients for the financing (mostly UN and international NGOs).	Need for more aligned, flexible and sequential financing by donors over multi-year timeframes.
Donors not meaningfully involved in the HRP/UNDAF analysis, leading to donors funding their own priorities based on their own individual analysis, which influences their multi-year or short-term funding behaviour, and their demand for and incentivizing of better joint up planning and programming.	Donors need to align financing behind collective outcomes, not agency specific projects. It starts from having a strategic role in participating in the joint analysis from the onset and owning the collective analysis.
Scale up of new MDB financing opportunities (e.g. IDA 18) in crisis contexts can risk creating incentives for fragmentation	IFIs should be key partners in establishing financing compacts around collective outcomes to ensure that new financing tools are geared towards enabling and incentivizing joint efforts.
Lack of risk tolerance and flexibility in funding by development donors limits development funding to programmes in fragile and conflict-affected areas, even when it would be possible.	Need for commitment by development donors to find creative ways to fund programmes in fragile and conflict-affected areas.

3. Recommendations

Participants were asked to articulate recommendations to be addressed at HQ/Global level, regional level as well as country level to further advance the operationalization of the New Way of Working.

Global

HQs

- Provide clear communication on the commitments made at the global level, and articulate indicators of success of implementation of the NWOW.
- Provide more clarity and guidance on the NWOW, while still ensuring it is sufficiently flexible for different country settings/typologies.
- Create joined up policy support teams at the global level to support humanitarian-development collaboration to avoid institutional biases in implementation and operational support.
- Ensure clear messaging to the field that there is flexibility to experiment and innovate at country level to further advance the NWOW.
- Support a new generation of fully staffed RC Offices with adequate and dedicated resources, including coordination and information management staff.
- Further invest in developing staff capacity with the right skillset and mindset to be deployed to countries advancing the NWOW.

- Ensure that communication around the CRRF is done in a way that acknowledges its contribution to the NWOW and ensure lessons learned from that process inform other NWOW practices in non-refugee settings.
- Further clarify the link that can be done with Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (RPBAs) processes (which is an example of a not “UN-centric” process).
- Explore opportunities to initiate change with a complete rethink, rather than adjustment of existing systems (e.g. opportune times during the planning cycle or country events providing space for a rethink).

Donors

- Ensure alignment of global and country budgets with risk, need and vulnerability in an evidence-based manner.
- Create incentives for advancing the NWOW at country level, including through channeling bilateral financing behind collective outcomes, and by creating mandates/incentivize collaboration towards collective outcomes, including through the respective boards of UN entities.
- Accept consolidated reporting rather than separate reporting on respectively humanitarian and development efforts in cases where such efforts are joined-up.

UN Joint Steering Committee on Humanitarian and Development Collaboration

- Clarify its expectations of the role regional and country level entities should play in advancing on operationalizing the NWOW, and send clear messaging to field entities to cooperate with the process.
- Establish principles for NWOW implementation and ensure accountability for follow up.
- Use evidence of good practice and successful innovative processes to ensure learning and scaling up of enablers.
- Ensure that policies made at HQ are informed by field practice and tested for viability at country level.
- Share good practice for involvement of all relevant stakeholders in the process of identifying collective outcomes (starting with a thorough mapping of development actors per area/per sector)

Regional

- Clarify what is needed from the regional level, and for what purpose.
- Connect regional UNDGs with country team efforts to advance the NWOW.
- Provide clarification, consistency and best practice from similar experience in the region.
- Acknowledge that different entities relate to the regional level in different ways and thereby there is a need to adapt – or harmonize where possible – when engaging with regional levels.
- Champion the NWOW and encourage Country Offices not to put agency interest first.
- Encourage cross-border programmes as good practice to ensure synergies across countries and regions given that fragility drivers do not respect national borders.

Country level

- Ensure inclusive in-country dialogue with UN agencies, government, INGOs, NGOs, donors, IFIs, academia and private sector to discuss the NWOW in country from the onset.
- Develop joint conflict analysis with common understanding of likely trajectories and scenarios, and invest collectively in deeper and more detailed analysis of root causes.
- Bring UN Mission (when present) into analysis whenever possible and relevant.
- Do not retrofit existing processes into collective outcomes (collective outcomes should not be sum of all existing programmes).
- Wherever possible, collective outcomes should be framed within nationally owned plans and frameworks (and coordination structures).
- Ensure that collective outcomes relate to a Humanitarian-Development-Peace theory of change.
- For planning and programming, set common, realistic, quantitative and concrete targets that are relevant to both humanitarian and development actors, for instance on food security.
- Consider the establishment of area based coordination system.
- Adapt coordination mechanisms in country, either by merging or rationalizing existing platforms (e.g. joint UNCT/HCT meetings) or by creating a bridging structure/group.
- Establish funding mechanisms that blend resources (UN, government, donors, others)
- Have country investment plans and to enable a joint “investability” case to be presented to donors (investing in short term interventions will unleash progress across a complex problem tree of activities aligned with collective outcomes, i.e. short and long-term investments are interrelated).

The above recommendations were suggested by participants and do not necessarily reflect consensus, but will be communicated through relevant channels to the various constituencies for consideration and follow up as appropriate. Participants are also urged to proactively help ensure follow up on relevant recommendations within their sphere of influence.

4. Conclusion and next steps

There was wide agreement of the necessity to advance humanitarian-development collaboration along the NWOW in order to assist people in a more sustainable manner. From the discussions during the workshop, it however also became clear that institutional interests or biases at times trump common sense at the country level. Participants noted that the closer to affected people such discussions take place, the clearer solutions to bottlenecks are identified. It was emphasized that the further away from country operations, the more complicated it seemed for agencies and entities to overcome established ways of working and silo-thinking.

There was a strong call for more advocacy and stronger messaging and incentives to come from HQ to the field to push the New Way of Working agenda forward, to allow for taking risks and experimenting, and for using common sense and be pragmatic in the operationalization of the New Way of Working, driven by the given country context.

There was also a clear call for more support through further guidance, technical support, deployable capacities, peer-to-peer support and knowledge sharing, both at global, regional and country level and between as well as within institutions.

This all speak to the timeliness of ongoing workstreams to advance the New Way of Working, such as efforts around strengthening peer-to-peer networks, collecting evidence to share promising lessons and identifying and addressing bottlenecks, providing guidance and further clarity e.g. on collective outcomes, and looking to build a stronger cadre of professionals with the right skills to work across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus.

The findings and recommendations coming out of the Entebbe workshop and the peer-to-peer practitioners' session that preceded it, are directly feeding in to the ongoing workstreams and will further be channeled to relevant forums for consideration and follow up as appropriate, including to the UN Joint Steering Committee on Humanitarian and Development Collaboration.

Additional multi-stakeholder regional workshops are being planned for 2018 for West/Central Africa and for the Arab/MENA region, building on the discussions and recommendations coming out of Entebbe.