



Multi-stakeholder Regional Workshop on

THE NEW WAY OF WORKING

West and Central Africa

31 May and 1 June, Dakar

KEY MESSAGES

There is real progress on the New Way of Working (NWOW) in the region

Presentations from government participants, RC/HCs and other partners demonstrated that considerable advances have been made in operationalizing the NWOW at country level. Experience to date confirms that the NWOW is being adapted in different countries according to the specific country context.

Collaboration by design, not by choice

Participants further noted that the NWOW should not be dependent on choices by leadership or discrete initiatives calling for greater collaboration and inclusivity. It is not about more coordination between humanitarian and development actors, but rather it is about delivering results together in a shared operational space relying on the comparative advantage of a group of actors such as governments, civil society, affected populations, national and international NGOs, IFIs, UN agencies, RC/HCs, donors, and the private sector with the overall aim to reduce recurrent need, risk and vulnerability.

Aligning financing behind collective outcomes, donors are a fundamental part of the solution

Donors have a major responsibility of creating the right incentives through their allocations of Official Development Assistance. Lack of flexible funding can reinforce existing silos, but donors can also be major enablers of transformation by placing their resources behind the commitments they made at the World Humanitarian Summit to “invest in humanity”. Donors can act both in their capacity as donors of the multilateral system as well as in their bilateral development cooperation capacity, by aligning their finances behind the achievement of collective outcomes.

There is no peace without development nor development without peace

There was wide agreement among participants about the direct link between sustaining peace and ensuring sustainable development outcomes. The NWOW relates to the 2030 Agenda as a common framework for results, which clearly articulates the indivisibility between development and peace. While there remain concerns from humanitarian partners on the nexus with political and security (and military) dimensions, it was clear that “softer” elements of peacebuilding such as delivery of basic services, social cohesion and protection were an important aspect of the NWOW.

Collective outcomes as accelerators of SDG achievement in crisis contexts

The NWOW is about reducing need, vulnerability and risk in crisis contexts, by a wider variety of actors based on their comparative advantage, over multiple years. It stems from the realization at the World Humanitarian Summit that in order to achieve the SDGs and the 2030 Agenda’s call for “leaving no one behind” and “reaching the furthest behind first” in crisis contexts, we need greater alignment of purpose of all relevant actors to “move from delivering aid to ending need”. Collective outcomes can be milestones towards SDG achievement.

The NWOW is not a new framework, it is a mindset shift

The NWOW as a mindset shift needs to initiate behavioral change and lead to institutional change. The NWOW is not an additional strategy, plan or coordination mechanism. It is the way we work together to achieve results. Rather than creating new frameworks, the approach should aim to reduce bureaucratic layers.

Important role of government

The importance of government ownership and leadership was identified as an enabler to successfully implement and operationalize the NWOW. Governments have a critical role to play throughout the process - from the articulation of collective outcomes to ensuring accountability and monitoring results.

Connectivity as the rule rather than the exception

While there will always be contexts where rapid emergency response will be necessary through a distinct humanitarian modus operandi, it was clear that most contexts, in particular protracted crisis settings, allow and call for much greater connectivity between short term interventions and medium to long term solutions. As outlined in the SG’s Agendas for Humanity, working collectively to reduce need, vulnerability and risk sustainably is a shared responsibility.

Advance and “get on with the NWOW”

The direction of travel is clear. With the 2030 Agenda as a common framework for results, the commitment to moving from delivering aid to ending need was the main outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit. Two years after the Summit and one year after the first Dakar regional workshop on the NWOW, country leadership is moving ahead and asking HQs to flexibilize tools, processes and guidance building on country experiences. More needs to be done to support proactive field leaders and partners to make the New Way of Working their “Normal Way of Working”.

Introduction

Workshop

From 31 May to 1 June, OCHA and UNDP co-organized the second regional multi-stakeholder workshop on the New Way of Working (NWOW) in Dakar, Senegal, for West and Central Africa with participation from a broad range of stakeholders. The NWOW is grounded in the Secretary-General's Agenda for Humanity and the Commitment to Action, signed at the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016. The workshop further built on previous regional workshops in Dakar, Senegal, and Entebbe, Uganda, as well as events at the global level in Istanbul, Copenhagen and Washington which contributed to filling the concept with life¹.

More than 120 participants took part in the workshop, including government representatives, international and national NGOs, UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes from both regional and country level, UN mission representatives, donors and other key stakeholders including OECD, the World Bank and a number of regional organizations including ECOWAS. The attendance covered a total of 10 countries in West and Central Africa². Government representatives from seven countries and eight donors³ participated. From the UN system, the following entities participated from across country, regional and HQ level: UNOWAS, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, WHO, FAO, IOM, MPTFO, OCHA and UNDP. Participation included the Secretary-General's Special Advisor for the Sahel, several RC/HCs, OCHA Heads/Deputy Heads of Offices, global and regional directors from several UN entities, a Chief of Staff and Programme Management Officer from Peacekeeping Operations in CAR and Mali as well as a direct video link with the Executive Office of the Secretary-General (EOSG) in New York. The workshop format included a mix of panel discussions and break-out groups.

The workshop was preceded by a smaller practitioners' support network meeting, organized by the IASC. The findings of the practitioner's meeting which focused on country level experiences around the implementation of the Nexus were incorporated into the discussion of the multi-stakeholder workshop.

Feedback from participants on the relevance of the workshop was overwhelmingly positive. Sessions with a focus on country-level experiences as well as the panel discussion on financing the NWOW were ranked highest by participants. Several participants felt encouraged by the progress made by a number of countries in implementing the NWOW. Responders highlighted the need to focus on country-level implementation and to enhance shared understanding of key concepts underpinning the NWOW.

1 See Annex 1 for more details

2 Burkina Faso, Cameroon, CAR, Chad, DRC, Mali, Mauretania, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal

3 Denmark, European Commission (ECHO/DEVCO), Japan/JICA, Republic of Korea, Sweden/Sida, Switzerland, Turkey, USA/USAID

What is it?

The NWOW 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 NWOW 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 that relies on the **comparative advantage** of a diverse group of actors are the other key elements of the NWOW.

What are collective outcomes?

Understanding what collective outcomes are (and what they are not) is fundamental for advancing the NWOW 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. Examples include:

Burkina Faso: Food Security: By 2020, to reduce by 50% the number of people in phase 3 of food insecurity and reach 0% of people in phase 4 and 5 of food insecurity.

Chad: Basic Social Services: 90 per cent of people in need have access to functioning basic social services including water, sanitation and education by 2019.

Mauritania: e.g Outcome 1.3: Institutions and communities contribute to sustainable management of natural resources, and to anticipate/respond to crises and to the effects of climate change (outputs, indicators, and specific 5-year targets will be set in agreement among all partners).

Lessons from country-level implementation (best practices and challenges)

Diverse partnerships and multi-stakeholder focus based on comparative advantages.

Government: Throughout the discussions, participants highlighted the importance of government ownership and leadership of the process - from conducting a joint analysis and articulating collective outcomes to ensuring accountability and monitoring results, wherever possible, governments should be in the leading role. Government representatives emphasized the importance of aligning collective outcomes to national development plans. Alignment has for instance been achieved successfully in Burkina Faso and Mauritania. Government leadership is also critical for aligning bilateral agencies and financing to collective outcomes.

Multi-stakeholder approach: Participants reconfirmed that, in line with efforts towards achieving the SDGs, the NWOW is a multi-stakeholder approach which should encompass governments, civil society, affected populations, national and international NGOs, IFIs, UN agencies, RC/HCs, donors, and the private sector. Operationalizing the approach should not be UN-centric. Rather, the UN can take on a convening role supporting countries in bringing all relevant stakeholders to the table. It was considered crucial to strengthen partnerships with development partners (donors, bilateral agencies, IFIs) from the very beginning. Cooperation with regional partners (i.e. ECOWAS, G5 Sahel and CILLS) should also be reinforced around specific collective outcomes.

To identify all relevant actors to include in the process, participants put forth the idea of mapping the 4Ws (Who does What Where with Which funds/ When). In large, diverse countries such as Nigeria, a decentralized, sequenced approach could facilitate inclusion.

Affected populations: At country level, several countries have undertaken efforts to include affected populations in the NWOW discussions. In Nigeria, civil society was closely involved in consultations on the new Lake Chad Basin strategy. Involvement and capacitation of civil society and local actors are also key components of the NWOW process in Burkina Faso and CAR.

Moving beyond “sitting around the table” – collaboration by design, not by choice: Participants underscored that it was crucial to move beyond bringing different actors to the table but to ensure their joint commitment to concrete action on the ground. This requires willingness to change and adjust programmes in accordance with collective outcomes and readiness to subject budget, mandate and visibility concerns to their achievement rather than the other way around. In Burkina Faso, a key success factor in developing collective outcomes was a strong investment in building relationships between diverse actors and leaving space for dialogue on contentious issues.

Dissemination within organizations and need for more clarity: Participants highlighted that dissemination on the NWOW throughout organizations remained slow both between HQ, regional and country level, but also between different departments. There was also a lack of common

understanding of many of the key terms used in discussions around the NWOW, in particular at country-level. In addition to clarifying terms such as “collective outcomes”, “peace actors” etc., it was highlighted that humanitarian, development and peace communities used the same terms in different ways (e.g. “outcome”). Elaborating light guidance on key terms was considered useful.

Peace/Security interlinkages

There is no peace without development nor development without peace: Participants emphatically echoed the 2030 Agenda political declaration’s references to peace. Given that the NWOW relates to the 2030 Agenda as a common framework for results, peace is a key consideration for determining the success of the NWOW. In the Sahel and Lake Chad Basin region many of the humanitarian needs are rooted in the negative impacts of violent conflicts. The NWOW can contribute to advance the 2030 Agenda in such contexts as it is focussed on reducing needs, risks and vulnerabilities, which can in turn also contribute to peace.

Unpacking peace: Participants suggested to clearly distinguish between “softer” components of peace (delivery of basic services, community engagement, social cohesion) and “harder” components of peace (intelligence, security, peace-keeping etc). For instance, CAR explicitly included a peace component in the priorities identified in its RCPCA, which is aligned with the Humanitarian Response Plan. In Burkina Faso, there is a strong consensus that achieving collective outcomes will require a concerted effort on social cohesion and security including sustainable management of natural resources. There would be a need to strike a balance of engagement among actors from collaboration, coordination, to coexistence, depending on the context. Especially in ongoing conflict settings, serious consideration must be given to the preservation of humanitarian space and respect for humanitarian principles (see below).

Development actors: Participants expressed concern that development actors were getting involved too late in crisis contexts. Actors should

not wait to work together until a situation has become protracted, instead development actors should become involved at the outset of a crisis. In this context, participants put forth the question of how to enable development actors to actively engage in crisis situations or “to stay when things get hot”. Donors have a key role to play in creating the right incentives for risk-tolerant development engagement in fragile and crisis affected contexts. Given the importance of linking peace and development, representatives from CAR expressed the need for development partners to invest in affected areas. Given the government’s capacity constraints, rebuilding the social contract with its population would only be possible through support from partners.

Humanitarian principles

Participants fully recognized the importance of safeguarding humanitarian principles and ensuring humanitarian space. However, in many cases working together will not impede humanitarian principles but rather contribute to upholding them by alleviating human suffering and reducing needs in a sustainable manner. Humanitarian principles should not be used as an excuse for lack of sustainable programming or for not working with governments. In all contexts in the region, participants noted that humanitarian programming is done in close collaboration with governments anyways. In Mauritania, the new Partnership Framework provided an opportunity for government, NGOs and the UN to exchange on the importance of humanitarian principles and ensuring operational space for emergency response. The principles are clearly spelled out in the joint plan.

Joint analysis

Centrality of joint analysis: Participants re-emphasized the centrality of joint analysis as point of departure for embarking on the NWOW. Ideally led or co-led by the government, analysis should build on existing tools and capacities, and should address the drivers of risks, needs and vulnerabilities, including conflict analysis. Beyond government, UN and NGOs, it was considered key to include development partners, IFIs and civil society in this stage of the process.

Build on existing tools and data: Mapping existing tools at country, regional and global level was considered a useful first step. Consideration should further be given to national data collection mechanisms and capacities. Integrating political, security and human rights information into joint analysis from the outset of crises was considered as critical, through Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (RPBAs) for instance.

Country experiences: Different existing tools can be combined depending on the context. In Burkina Faso, joint analysis built on data which had informed the national social and economic development plan. It further combined vulnerability and poverty assessments which provided new insights for targeting. This led to the decision to focus collective outcomes on the region of Sahel which is not the poorest region but the most vulnerable and the most exposed to risks.

Regional level: In the Sahel, regional entities including UNOWAS and ECOWAS are excellent sources of analysis, with a challenge being the lack of available capacity to tap into and use the data. UNOWAS shared information about its recently published “Manuel de l’UNOWAS sur l’analyse des conflits” and a study on the links between pastoralism and security. Given the importance of joint analysis to the NWOW, it will be crucial to reconnect existing regional information management tools with national governments and other national authorities.

Capacities: Given the centrality of joint analysis, participants agreed on the need for dedicated (human) resources and the need to build local /

state capacities for analysis. It was also suggested that neutral or external facilitators such as universities or researchers could be beneficial in some circumstances.

Sensitive data: Questions remained on how to handle sensitive security-related data and ways to ensure data privacy protection.

Joint planning and programming for collective outcomes

Collective outcomes as contribution to SDG achievement: Throughout the workshop, participants highlighted that the NWOW is part of global efforts towards achieving the SDGs and the 2030 Agenda’s call for “leaving no one behind” and “reaching the furthest behind first”. It was suggested that collective outcomes can be milestones towards SDG achievement. In Burkina Faso, the NWOW is fully anchored in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and was identified by the government and the UN inter-agency MAPS mission as one of the SDG accelerators in Burkina Faso. To date, collective outcomes have been formulated in a variety of ways ranging from sector-specific outcomes (e.g. Burkina Faso, Mauritania and Chad) to broader approaches.

Flexibility in fragile contexts: In fragile and conflict affected settings collective outcomes need to be flexible enough to adapt to volatile situations and shifting needs. While the collective outcome should stay the same, activities need to be adaptable.

Collective Outcomes are not ALL the outcomes: Participants further highlighted that collective outcomes cannot address ALL humanitarian objectives or ALL development objectives, instead they should be limited to areas where collective action has a clear added value and there is potential for achieving results together. Sensitive issues, such as elections monitoring, governance support, political mediation around which actors may not find a wide consensus, should not be regarded as less of a priority overall, they are just not placed in the shared space of humanitarian and development action in crisis contexts.

No new frameworks: There was wide agreement that the NWOW and the articulation of collective outcomes should not necessarily create new frameworks. Instead, the process should aim to reduce bureaucratic layers, streamline coordination and ensure that systems are fit for purpose.

Joined-up planning: Participants highlighted the need for highly context-specific approaches to joined-up planning and programming. While participants deemed joined-up planning to be crucial, views diverged on the need for a single joint plan, as it will always be context specific. In Mauritania, chronic risks and prevention of potential emergencies were absorbed in the new Partnership Framework, while sudden-onset incidents and emergencies are catered for through an ad-hoc, time-bound response plan. An alternative approach, taken by Chad, is to house constituent parts of the collective outcomes in different plans (UNDAF, HRP, national development plans, Country Frameworks etc.).

New generation of UNDAFs as windows of opportunity: Country experiences from Mauritania and Burkina Faso show that a possible window of opportunity to align planning tools to the NWOW and collective outcomes is the renewal of existing plans. The new UNDAFs were mentioned as a good opportunity in this regard. In contrast to traditional UNDAFs, the new frameworks provide the flexibility to include a wider range of stakeholders (NGOs, bilateral agencies, IFIs). They are fully owned by the government and reposition the UN to support the government in its efforts to achieve the SDGs. Participants suggested integrating the NWOW into the process of developing a new generation of UNDAFs as mandated by the UNDS reform process.

Country spotlight: Mauritania

Operational challenges of implementing joint plan:

- Harmonization of timeframes of humanitarian vs. development action (1 year vs. 5 years)
- Flexibility for humanitarian action necessary (need for creation of ad-hoc response plan in first year)
- Terminology used in different ways by humanitarian and development actors (e.g. “outcomes”)
- Harmonization of information and monitoring systems
- Harmonization of cluster approach and less-standardized development architecture (WASH cluster vs. technical sanitation working group)
- Retrospective inclusion of omitted issues (displacement, humanitarian space)
- Financing not easily adaptable

Next steps:

- Consolidate partnerships at the local level (decentralize to regional, district, community level)
- Broaden partnerships to include IFIs, private sector, local NGOs

Reporting, monitoring and accountability

Reporting: Divergent reporting mechanisms were identified as a major obstacle to elaborating and implementing joint plans. Regarding the UN, much effort at HQ level will be necessary to overcome this barrier.

Monitoring: Participants highlighted the importance of monitoring actual implementation of agreed commitments. There was a perceived disconnect between agreements and actual changed behavior and results on the ground. A potential enabler in this regard could be the empowerment of RC/HCs to ensure implementation jointly with government.

Accountability: Participants expressed concern that in the articulation and implementation of collective outcomes the specificities and mandates of each agency could be diluted. The question was put forth who would be the “provider of last resort” in a system of mutual accountability.

Coordination for collective outcomes

Collective outcomes driving coordination: Participants agreed on the need to avoid creating additional coordination structures for collective outcomes, but rather to streamline existing ones, depending on context. For instance, Chad took an area-based approach to coordination which reflects the specific needs of priority regions.

Steering committee: During group discussions, participants put forth the idea of setting up a steering committee, building on a best practice from Uganda and its roll-out of the Comprehensive Refugee and Response Framework (CRRF). The steering committee would be comprised of representatives of the ‘Whole-of-Society’ with one representative per stakeholder including government (national-local), donors, private sector, INGO, NGO, UN (H-D), IFIs to organize and manage discussions. The objective of discussions would include a) joint analysis, b) agreement on a set of collective outcomes and c) decisions/proposals on coordination and establishing the right process for the country.

Principles vs. coordination structure: The group further suggested identifying principles to which all partners would subscribe rather than setting up a dedicated

coordination structure. Principles could include: Context specificity, national ownership, centrality of SDGs (“reaching the furthest behind first”), use of whole of society approach, principled action, decentralized (area-based) focus and people-centered approach.

Competition vs. Coordination: Participants raised concern about the unwillingness of many partners to give up a certain degree of power by subscribing to the achievement of collective outcomes. Competition for financing was regarded as a major challenge in this regard. Further work will be necessary to explore ways to incentivize a focus on results rather than funding needs.

Empowered Leadership for collective outcomes

Government leadership: While agreeing on the importance of government leadership, participants discussed cases in which governments were unable or unwilling to take on this role (including when government is party to conflict). In all other cases, even if challenging, efforts to ensure government leadership were seen as indispensable. Reasons for a government’s unwillingness to take on a lead role in the NWOW should be analyzed carefully. In some cases, government may not agree on the joint vision and priorities identified by partners. In such cases, collective outcomes should focus on areas of commonality.

Decentralization of authority: Participants further advocated for greater decentralization of authority. Elected officials at local level can be crucial partners for greater participation of affected communities. Referring to the UN, participants called for more delegation of authority to country teams. HQ and regional level can support country level dialogues, but country teams should be in the driving seat.

Empowered leadership (UN): The new generation of country teams should be led by senior leaders with a blended profile capable of responding in both humanitarian and development settings with expertise in engaging with peace and security actors. RCs should be supported by dedicated planning capacities within the RC offices (e.g. joint planning cell).



Aligning financing with collective outcomes¹

Widen scope of financing: As part of the NWOW, participants called for moving from an approach based on aid towards one which focuses on using the right kind of financing at the right time in the right place. This would entail applying the multi-stakeholder approach of the NWOW also to financing by widening the scope to include ODA, domestic resources, foreign direct investment (FDI), remittances, private investment and philanthropy. Each financing tool has specific comparative advantages that can be leveraged for specific objectives. For instance, in contrast to FDI, remittances are considered as risk tolerant and domestic resources such as taxes are highly predictable. Further, ODA can incentivize coherence and complementarity and induce behavior change. Financing can prompt behavioral change within partners as well as donors themselves.

ODA fixed amount: Broadening the scope of financing beyond ODA is furthermore necessary since ODA is a fixed amount of money for which no large increases can be expected. The priority for donors is not to provide more money to invest in the NWOW but to get the mix of funding for humanitarian, development and peace efforts right to support collective outcomes. Donors also hope for efficiency gains through subscribing to the NWOW.

Country-level financing strategy for collective outcomes: For the NWOW to be catalytic, it needs to be linked to a country-level financing strategy aligned behind collective outcomes, which is based on a shared understanding of risk and vulnerability and which maps existing financing flows and identifies opportunities and comparative advantages. A financing strategy should go beyond UN agencies which only account for around 10% of overall development financing. A broad multi-stakeholder approach is needed to ensure that larger shares of the remaining 90 percent of separately channeled multilateral and bilateral resource flows are leveraged

more strategically. Financing should encourage the principle of providing development funding wherever possible, and humanitarian funding only when necessary. Financing strategies should also consider financing flows at regional level.

Financing partners as part of the solution: While many participants expressed concern about the lacking action of donors to provide the right financing incentives, panelists highlighted that a number of changes were currently taking place within many donors with a growing number of flexible funding streams available. Examples include Denmark, France, Germany, the European Commission and the World Bank. It will be crucial to disseminate information about existing mechanisms and to bring them down to country-level, while also considering to close old mechanisms to avoid fragmentation. To ensure greater buy-in, donors, bilateral agencies and IFIs should be engaged in the early stages of embarking on the NWOW at country-level.

Debt distress: Participants warned that debt distress could potentially derail NWOW processes. Recalling the difficult circumstances many of their citizens faced in terms of food insecurity, limited access to education and employment and exposure to the effects of climate change, government representatives put into question macro-economic constraints placed on their economies by the IMF. In Chad and Niger, such constraints included requirements to reduce spending on social services which ran counter to the countries' efforts towards achieving the SDGs.

Capacities: Participants further identified a need for building the capacities of governments, especially in fragile contexts, to manage finances and to absorb resources. Government representatives further called for more structured and transformative financing instead of fragmented, project-based aid.

¹ Resources: OECD 2018: Financing for Stability in the post-2015 era, <https://bit.ly/2LI4jFT>; UNDAF guidance 2017: Funding to Financing, <https://bit.ly/2uyNsWk>

Tableau des devoirs

Exo

Calculons l'énergie formée

Noter en 100 km

1, 2 → 20 km

→ 100 km

$$\frac{100 \times 10}{20} = 5,5$$

1 → 36000 kg

5,5 →

$$5,5 \times 36000 \text{ kg} = 198000 \text{ kg}$$

$$= 2 \cdot 10^5 \text{ kg}$$

Calculons l'énergie mécanique

$$E = \frac{em}{eb} \quad E_m = P \times t$$

$$E_m = 0,2 \times 100000000$$

$$= 20000000 \text{ J}$$

la force de tra

$$100000$$

$$= 675 \text{ N}$$



Next steps and recommendations

Country-level

Participating countries provided concrete suggestion of specific next steps to further advance the NWOW in their given context, including through actions such as mapping exercises (of analysis and tools available, relevant actors present, existing frameworks, financing options and tools), organization of country-level NWOW workshops, steps to ensure stronger emphasis on localization and decentralization of the process, as well as stronger linkages with regional efforts. A summarizing table on next steps identified at country level is attached to this report.

Recommendations for Country-level

- Conduct mapping of all relevant actors (4W - Who does What Where with Which funds)
- Identify ways in which to include affected population at the local level, building on experiences from Burkina Faso, CAR and Nigeria
- Joint analysis: Conduct mapping of existing tools for data collection and existing capacities (including national statistical offices)
- Joint planning: Capitalize on renewal of existing plans (UNDAF, HRP, CF, national development plans etc.)
- Financing: Develop country-level financing strategy based on mapping of financial flows at country-level (including ODA, taxation, FDI, remittances, private investment and philanthropy)

At regional and HQ-level, opportunities, challenges and support requirements raised throughout the workshop will be brought to and sought addressed by relevant constituencies.

Regional-level

While the focus of NWOW operationalization lies at the country-level, regional actors (such as ECOWAS, CILLS, the Office of the SG's Special Advisor for the Sahel and UNOWAS) can play a critical role in enabling cross-fertilization of best practices across the region, with a strong focus on cross border issues. Country specific efforts should also ensure appropriate linkages with the regional efforts, requiring a much more deliberate effort to collaborate and coordinate by national governments, UNCTs and other actors within individual country contexts.

Participants voiced concern that, at the regional level, donors were willing to invest in the military component of the G5 Sahel strategy while funding for development and humanitarian action as well as softer components of peace was lacking. High Level conferences such as the upcoming Oslo II / Berlin meeting on the Lake Chad Basin should be opportunities to create the right incentives for more development financing in the sub-region in line with the NWOW. It was also suggested that ECOWAS could play a role in galvanizing political will and engaging in mediation and prevention.

Recommendations for regional level

- Mapping of analysis tools and capacities at regional level and dissemination of existing analysis
- Support compiling and sharing of best practices within and across regions
- Reinforce links between NWOW and regional initiatives including Resilience framework and UNISS Support Plan

- Hold more frequent consultations amongst UNRCs/HCs regionally and more bilateral discussions amongst UN country teams and UNRCs to find solutions for cross-border issues
- Mapping of humanitarian and development funding in the Sahel (with visual support showing geographic areas) and financing flows beyond ODA (remittances, FDI, regional philanthropy)
- Identify tools to capitalize on regional opportunities through mobility, remittances and financing
- Ensure greater connectivity between the NWOW and the upcoming OSLO II / Berlin Lake Chad meeting.
- Develop light guidance on scope, purpose and process of operationalizing and financing collective outcomes which is flexible enough to be adapted to context
- Support dissemination of NWOW efforts throughout relevant actors
- Explore options to reinforce links between NWOW and SDG framework (explore link to MAPs)
- Disseminate and regularly update information about flexible financing tools

HQ level

With the workshop confirming a strong country-driven focus of the NWOW process, the role of HQs will be to support and enable country-level implementation. A recurring theme from country table discussion was the need for a common understanding among all actors of the NWOW process. To this end, HQ can support with light guidance to use for in-country discussions.

Recommendations for global level

- Continue to provide support to country-driven efforts as needed
- Provide surge capacity to country-level processes, including expertise for mapping exercises (4W, analysis tools and data, financing flows), joint analysis, workshops, etc.
- Support compiling and sharing of early best practices from country-level implementation (progress reports, explore other light formats) to inform JSC, implementation of current UNDS reform and to be shared at country level
- Support efforts of harmonizing / simplifying reporting mechanisms to allow for joint reporting
- Reinforce links between NWOW and the operational aspects of the 2030 Agenda implementation in crisis contexts
- Ensure inclusion of a NWOW component in guidance for new generation of UNDAFs
- Advocate for empowered RCs to ensure implementation of the NWOW (priorities on building resilience)
- Advocate for harmonization of humanitarian and development information-monitoring systems
- Take a lead role in advocating for stronger dissemination of NWOW efforts throughout the UN system and other partners
- Assess the institutional barriers holding progress on the NWOW at country level

Joint Steering Committee

For the UN system, the JSC, chaired by the DSG and with the Principals of OCHA and UNDP as vice-chairs, has the mandate to foster greater synergies in humanitarian and development action, taking account of the linkages to peace, and to guide and support field efforts to implement collective outcomes, over multiple years, in support of the 2030 Agenda. It has the potential of effecting real change within the UN system.

Recommendations to Joint Steering Committee

Incentives:

- Strong government leadership
- Strong demonstration of collective leadership from JSC and DAC donors
- Greater involvement of development actors
- Successful first experiences

Disincentives:

- Insecurity and ongoing conflicts
- Lack of government capacity or willingness
- Lack of flexible financing at country-level
- Lack of understanding of NWOW / lack of vertical dissemination of information within each actor (government, UN, NGOs, donors).
- Lack of technical joint humanitarian and development support to RC/HCs at country level.
- Use of different terminology / lack of understanding of each other's terminology
- Lack of coherence between country and regional strategies
- Perceived disconnect between HQ and country level: some issues debated at HQ level not relevant for country-level implementation (e.g. the role of peace)



Annex 1:

The New Way of Working global and regional developments and operationalization at country level

Since the Secretary-General, nine United Nations Principals and the World Bank committed to the New Way of Working (NWOW)¹ and a number of NGOs, governments, international financing institutions (IFIs) and other actors made commitments to advance core responsibility four of the Agenda for Humanity “Changing People’s lives: moving from delivering aid to ending need”, during the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in 2016, much progress has been made in filling the concept with life. Regional NWOW workshops organized in Dakar, Senegal and Entebbe, Uganda in 2017, bringing together a wide range of stakeholders, helped to bring to fore examples and good practices, which can help learning from a regional perspective.² Global events in Copenhagen, Istanbul, New York, Geneva, Seoul and Washington, DC galvanized political support for the commitment.³ The establishment of the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) to advance Humanitarian and Development Collaboration, chaired by the UN Deputy Secretary-General, underlined the Secretary-General’s commitment to swift implementation of the NWOW. Building on the SG’s priorities, the JSC has instructed that the Sahel, Lake Chad Basin, DRC, Horn of Africa and Afghanistan be considered as priority for the implementation of the NWOW, in addition to other on-going contexts.⁴

Global efforts towards achieving the SDGs in crisis contexts are ongoing. The NWOW is grounded in the SDGs and its implementation aims at ensuring full complementarity with and adherence to the SDGs. The NWOW can make a significant contribution to the 2030 Agenda’s call for “leaving no one behind” and “reaching the furthest behind first”. Collective outcomes are therefore milestones towards SDG achievement.

The NWOW is also entrenched in the recently adopted reform of the United Nations Development System. The reform will entail a further strengthening of coherence at the country level through the empowering the Resident Coordinator (RC) and a configuring of the UN country presence, tailored to country priorities and needs.

At the regional level, the recalibration of UNISS and its Support Plan build on a change in narrative, which contrasts the many challenges the Sahel and Lake Chad Basin regions face, with the many opportunities and potential in areas such as agriculture and renewable energy. The Sahel is one of the SG’s top priorities and has also been identified by Member States as the litmus test for the implementation of ongoing reforms. Peace and security actors play an important role in regional responses. Initiatives like the Group of Five (G5) Sahel and the Multinational

1 Commitment to Action: Transcending humanitarian-development divides. Changing People’s Lives: From Delivering Aid to Ending Need.

2 Summary report of Multi-stakeholder Regional Workshop for East/Southern Africa, 30.11.–1.12.2017, Entebbe; Workshop summary report West and Central Africa Regional Policy Dialogue, 18-19.01.2017, Dakar.

3 High-Level Workshop on the New Way of Working – Advancing Implementation, 13-14 March 2017, Copenhagen; WHS Anniversary Event. Advancing the New Way of Working, 18-19.05.2017, Istanbul.

4 Further developments at HQ level include the “People Pipeline” initiative to support the operationalization of the NWOW through staff development and training, as well as on options for a deployment mechanism for advisory capacities to support NWOW implementation. CIC/NYU is conducting research on challenges and opportunities arising from the NWOW with an aim to provide concrete analysis and actionable recommendations applicable at the country level.

Joint Task Force to fight Boko Haram aim to link security-related responses to investments in development. In this sense, the Sahel and Lake Chad Basin are natural areas where the operationalization of the NWOW could make a marked difference.

The NWOW is a country-driven approach which ultimately aims at transcending the decades old divides between humanitarian and development streams where possible and appropriate, in a context specific manner. Over the course of 2017-18, several RC/HCs and Country Teams have embarked on a process of articulating 'collective outcomes' with a range of partners, and designed multi-year strategies

to systematically reduce need, risk and vulnerability. Experience to date shows that there are different context-specific approaches to operationalizing the NWOW. Every country is adapting the concept to their specific country context. The workshop provided an opportunity to exchange good practice, lessons learnt and reflect on enablers and barriers encountered in implementing the NWOW at country level, based on concrete field experience. The meeting also allowed for discussion on concrete next steps to further advance the NWOW at country, regional and global level, with a focus on the Sahel and Lake Chad Basin Regions.





Annex 2:

Next steps by country

Information contained in the table is based on notes taken during the workshop, in particular during country table discussions, and does not reflect agreed decisions by governments or country teams.

BURKINA FASO		
<p>Current situation (May 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint analysis carried out by UN, Government and NGOs, built on analysis conducted by government to formulate its National Economic and Social Development Plan Articulation of three collective outcomes in line with SDGs (food security, nutrition, climate induced hazards) Collective outcomes are reflected in the recently signed UN Partnership Framework for Sustainable Development (2018-2020) and require concerted effort on social cohesion and security including sustainable management of natural resources 	<p>Next steps</p> <p>Operational level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mapping of existing interventions (4W- Who does What Where with Which funds) to ensure synergies and identify gaps Ensure effective coordination for actors at the field level Put in place a monitoring and evaluation framework to measure results <p>Strategic level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure common understanding of NWOW process (national and local government, NGOs, civil society, donors, UN) Support government in assuming its leadership role Utilize existing dialogue frameworks to ensure better coordination 	<p>Barriers/Disincentives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competition for resource mobilization (can be overcome through strong leadership) Non-alignment of some government services and partners <p>Enablers/Incentives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government leadership NGO participation and involvement Engagement of donors (e.g. ECHO, USAID) Flexibility given to UN agencies to interact with all stakeholders (RCO leadership)
CAMEROON		
<p>Current situation (May 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDAF and HRP aligned (same region, timeframe 2018-2020, aligned with SDGs, UNDAF focuses on building resilience) Ongoing government-led mapping of existing data and analysis tools Ongoing analysis of financing flows 	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Articulation of collective outcomes Mapping of existing interventions (4W) Sensitize national actors and financial institutions about NWOW process Identify coordination mechanism (government-led) Possibly evaluate and review UNDAF (?) Creation of joint planning cell within RCO Capitalize on current revision of national development plan based on risk analysis 	<p>Support needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support mission from HQ for articulation of collective outcomes Surge of NWOW coordinator to support implementation
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC		
<p>Current situation (May 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment (RPBA) conducted in September 2016 informed the country's national peace building and recovery programme (RCPCA) covering the period of 2017-2021 Three pillars are (i) peace, stability and reconciliation, (ii) enhance a renewed social contract and better access to basic services, and (iii) advance economic recovery across the country HRP, UNDAF+ are aligned to RCPCA 	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination between humanitarian and development actors and sequencing of interventions needs to be reinforced 	<p>Barriers/Disincentives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volatile security situation Limited engagement of development actors <p>Enablers/Incentives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-stakeholder architecture was set up well at the beginning of emergency intervention Alignment of collective outcomes with RCPCA would ensure monitoring of progress

CHAD

Current situation (May 2018)

- Joint analysis of vulnerabilities and structural causes
- Strategic alignment of National Development Plan 2017-2021, UNDAF 2017-2021 and the HRP
- Articulation of six collective outcomes in the areas of food security, nutrition, health and basic social services
- Regular consultations between humanitarian and development actors

Next steps

- Develop a strategic financing plan
- Undertake a mapping of existing humanitarian and development interventions
- Strengthen government engagement
- Focus on a few “quick wins”, including July visit of the Scaling Up Nutrition Global Coordinator, working with the Governor of the Lake region to develop a regional development plan; and building on the ECHO-DEVCO pilot that CARE is undertaking

Barriers/Disincentives

- Lack of quality financing
- Lack of government capacity and appetite
- Lack of coherence between country and regional strategies
- IMF pressure to cut expenditures on basic services

Enablers/Incentives

- Create mapping of wide range of financial flows (Development Finance Assessment, MAPS mission or OECD Resilience Systems Analysis)
- Ensure links to CRRF roll-out in Chad
- Greater UNDP involvement as entry point for government engagement and capacity building
- More regular meetings of the Humanitarian-Development Forum

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO

Current situation (May 2018)

- Ongoing process of larger integration of the UN
- Two informal coordination groups set up: a strategic level group bringing together the secretariats of humanitarian, development, stabilization actors, chaired by the DSRSG/RC/HC; and an informal group of senior technical planners to ensure linkages between planning processes (UNDAF, peacekeeping mission concept revision, HRP, WB Country Partnership Framework and national development strategy)

Next steps

- Government to organize multi-stakeholder workshop to inform national and provincial representatives on NWOW and humanitarian principles, to ensure alignment of new programmes and to validate priority areas for collective outcomes
- Possibly establish high-level coordination structure to provide strategic guidance and help monitor progress on collective outcomes (based on existing working groups)
- Identify regional “political champion” to lead NWOW at provincial level
- Government to update 4W mapping (Who does What Where When)

Barriers/Disincentives

- Given context of active conflict and with a stabilization mandate for UN peacekeeping, ensure that integration does not infringe on humanitarian response
- Uneven understanding and use of terminology between humanitarian, development and peace actors

Enablers/Incentives

- Financing of pilot initiatives

Identified support needs

- Support 4W mapping

MALI

Current situation (May 2018)

- High-level committee has been set up to coordinate and strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus in-country (driving development of new UNDAF which will incorporate humanitarian objectives)
- A National Development and Social Plan is currently being finalized and validated, while the new development cycle of the UNDAF is in progress

Next steps

- Identify priority areas (e.g. center of Mali) where security conditions allow for joint approach
- Hold national workshop to sensitize government and partners (NGOs, UN, donors, private companies) about NWOW to ensure common understanding and to articulate collective outcomes (September 2018)
- Hold high-level strategic discussions on financing for development to help Government expand its public resources and create greater space for private sector financing
- Capitalize on formulation of new UNDAF and preceding CCA to better integrate humanitarian and development needs and objectives at the outset

Barriers/Disincentives

- Lack of understanding of NWOW and implementation discourages many actors from engaging
- Existing coordination mechanisms not conducive to discuss Nexus
- Lack of implication of national authorities (possibly linked to upcoming elections)
- Lack of clarity on financing of collective outcomes

Enablers/Incentives

- Strong involvement of several donors (Switzerland, Denmark, Norway)
- Local humanitarian coordination mechanisms are multi-sectorial oriented in their response
- Successful implementation could encourage donors to buy-in
- Greater visibility will increase understanding

Identified support needs

- HQ support for design and facilitation of workshop
- External resource to gather existing data and conduct joint analysis (if not covered through CCA)

MAURITANIA

Current situation (May 2018)

- UNDAF and HRP integrated in new Partnership Framework for Sustainable Development (CPDD 2018-2022)
- Collective outcomes have been defined in the two broad areas of focus on two broad areas of 1) food security and nutrition, reinforcing livelihoods, broadening inclusive access to economic opportunities, and 2) improving equitable access to quality basic services and social protection.
- Collective outcomes have been informed by a Resilience Systems Analysis led by OECD

Next steps

- Annual planning of CPDD to be finalized (quantify and specify at the product level, define targets)
- Establish "convergence zones", areas of concentration of collective and highly coordinated actions, in order to maximize synergies, impact and efficiency
- Mobilization of financing
- Pay specific attention to partnerships and financing at local level: localization of national development strategy, establishment of regional councils

Barriers/Disincentives

- Resistance to change, need to forge a common understanding of the NWOW by all stakeholders

Enablers/Incentives

- National development plan aligned to SDGs, zero hunger strategy (SDG2)
- Legislation related to regional councils

Identified support needs

- HQ: make efforts to harmonize humanitarian and development information-monitoring systems (RPM-OCHA/UN INFO-DOCO)

NIGER

Current situation (May 2018)

- High-level committee has been set up to coordinate and strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus in-country; committee is currently driving the development of new UNDAF which will incorporate humanitarian objectives
- Humanitarian Development Nexus Road Map has been developed and endorsed by multiple stakeholders

Next steps

- Joint Analysis with the participation of affected people (prioritization by communities)
- Identification of collective outcomes based on joint analysis
- Identify necessary activities both humanitarian and development in character
- Align HRP and UNDAF to common framework for collective outcomes
- Identify ways to get donors involved

Barriers/Disincentives

- Changing the mindset difficult to achieve; need for more specificity on how to implement NWOW
- HQ not aligned to discussion at local level (need to clarify and follow lines)

Identified support needs

- OCHA to recruit a focal point to support process
- UNDP to recruit an IMO to consolidate development data (government to host database)
- Need to reinforce capacity of government to gather development data

NIGERIA

Current situation (May 2018)

- Recent RPBA for North-East Nigeria conducted jointly by Government, UN, WB and EU
- Triple nexus seen as a given, establishment of national peace commission(s)

Next steps

- Hold workshop with all relevant stakeholders (July 2018)
- In preparation: mapping of all relevant actors, outreach to relevant ministries
- Mapping of existing joint analyses
- Ensure common understanding of context among all actors
- Mapping of existing planning frameworks
- Capitalize on planning process for the next multi-year HRP and accompany discussions on turning HRP into an NRP (Nigeria Response Plan)
- Link country-level discussions to regional initiatives (e.g. Oslo II)

Barriers/Disincentives

- Politicized/multi-layered structure of national actors (state/ federal/ districts)
- Need to avoid creating more coordination mechanisms

Enablers/Incentives

- Serious government commitment
- Capacity building at institutional and state level high priority for Government

Identified support needs

- HQ support for upcoming workshop



OCHA

