**Summary Report**

**Peer-to-Peer Workshop to Advance Humanitarian, Development, Collaboration**

**Entebbe 28-29th November**

1. **INTRODUCTION:**
	1. Despite systemic, procedural and administrative challenges, the international aid community at the country level are working to find solutions to the obstacles that perpetuate the humanitarian and development silos, including different programme cycles, tools and procedures; lack of uniformity in support and flexibility in funding; and inconsistent membership of actors in different planning processes.
2. **BACKGROUND:**
	1. The Peer-to-peer support network meeting targeted 25 peer practitioners including representatives from the UN, NGO community and the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, possessing the mind-set, in-depth knowledge and hands-on experience in advancing a strengthened collaboration across sectors in the field. The primary aim of this workshop was to facilitate cross-learning, peer-to-peer knowledge exchange and pragmatic trouble-shooting advancing a strengthened collaboration across sectors in the field and included colleagues from FAO, IOM, UNHCR, WFP, WHO, OCHA, UNDP, UNDG (Great Lakes), RCOs, IFRC, ICRC, ICVA and CRS from 6 countries Uganda, Ethiopia, Chad, Mali, Cameroon and Sudan as well as regional representation and HQ colleagues from UNDP, OCHA, UNHCR, FAO, WFP and DOCO.
	2. The activity is undertaken in response to requests by field colleagues and is in support of the joint Plan of Action of the UNDG Sustainable Development and Sustaining Peace Results Group ‘Task Team A’ and the Inter Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Task Team on the Humanitarian Development Nexus in protracted crises (HDN TT).
	3. The agenda featured opportunities to deep-dive on thematic elements of the humanitarian development nexus; namely Analysis, Planning/Programming, Coordination/Leadership; and Collective Outcomes. In addition, participants also had the opportunity to present their country contexts where context-specific lessons, challenges, and opportunities were highlighted and discussed. The workshop included co-facilitation by TT members from WHO, WFP, FAO, UNHCR, ICVA, OCHA and UNDP as well as presentations by EOSG to provide global level policy perspectives as well as situate these discussions within broader UN-specific reform tracks.
	4. What follows is a summary of the major takeaways, key findings, and proposed recommendations and next steps from this group of field-level practitioners. The following key issues reflect both areas of broad agreement and in some cases also reflect an acknowledgment of divergent views.
3. **ISSUES DISCUSSED**
4. **Reducing the impact of protracted crises requires not only meeting immediate needs but also reducing vulnerabilities** and boosting resilience through coordinated efforts such as strengthening institutions and capacities, improving livelihoods, and increasing access to services that can enhance peoples’ abilities to withstand future shocks. To do so, in line with the 2030 Agenda 2030 and the promise to leave no one behind, the efforts to strengthen the Humanitarian Development Nexus should target in particular, vulnerable populations currently trapped in protracted crises.
5. **The strengthening of the humanitarian development nexus cannot succeed without an explicit attention to peace:** In some country contexts conflict dynamics and social cohesion dimensions cannot be disregarded as they are often the root cause of needs and vulnerabilities. In this regard, there was broad agreement to “scope the peace element” when discussing the Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus. For the structure, processes, and mechanisms that will be put in place to strengthen the nexus (joint analysis, joined up planning and programming) to have a concrete impact on affected populations caught in protracted crises, they will have to include the peace element to the extent possible through conflict sensitive programming, a comprehensive understanding of the root causes; and the role that government or local authorities play in these dynamics.
6. There is a need to have the right mix of accountabilities. In a new policy thrust that is aiming for convergence and coherence, mindsets and attitudes need to **shift towards a more flexible understanding of comparative strengths and advantages**. At the same time, strong collaboration and joint work should not lead to the dilution of accountabilities. Strengthening the nexus should not only be about all actors engaging at the same time, at the same place (even though in some contexts this will be the case). Instead the **Nexus is about gaining a collective and comprehensive understanding of what each actor can contribute in a strategically sequenced manner** spanning prevention, preparedness, response and recovery that in different manners can contribute towards or directly strengthen resilience to reduce vulnerabilities and need.
7. Currently there are different development and humanitarian plans, mechanisms, tools, and processes to implement humanitarian and development programmes. These need to be harmonized, joined-up or, at a minimum, synchronized. Across, analysis, planning, programming and coordination repetition, overlaps, and **duplications have proliferated, some of which are not fit to implement collective outcomes.** Depending on the context, there might be value in keeping separate planning tools, or at minimum, some core elements of the UNDAF and the HRP. This is particularly the case in sudden emergencies, where humanitarian partners are able to issue a joined-up plan and appeal in 48-96 hours. However, any new modalities that might come out of the need to strengthen the humanitarian development nexus should not contribute to this proliferation of processes and **tools. Rather, they should seek to harmonize and build complementary** by establishing the causal links from the identification of root causes of crises to articulation a theory of change that not only address these root causes but also help manage risks, as well as decrease needs and vulnerabilities,
8. **Shared assessments, joint analysis of these, and a common problem statement is at the heart of strengthening the humanitarian development nexus.** A multi-stakeholder approach was considered necessary to achieve the definition of a collective problem statement that can, in turn, inform planning and decision-making for programming.
9. **The notion of Collective Outcomes is also an integral part of better joined up planning and programming.** Collective Outcomes, once agreed, can serve to transcend long-standing silos, mindsets and structures. Endorsed whenever possible by the national government, they can provide a collective goal to which all actors can contribute to. In order to be impactful, Collective Outcomes will need to be ambitious and transformational yet achievable based on capacities. They will need to reflect a clear, specific, and time bound target that -- once achieved -- contributes substantially to fulfilment of national development plans aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals. This will require creating incentives for all sectors and actors to participate in the formulation of Collective Outcomes, including whole of government, multilateral and bilateral partners as well as civil society and relevant private sector.

**KEY MESSAGES**

**Changes required to make this approach work are institutionally and financially complex.** Establishing effective and efficient joined up programming between humanitarian and development action will require not only a shift in mindsets, but also strong and empowered leadership. These changes should be focused around four key issue areas:

1. **Strengthen leadership and coordination** through an empowered RC/HC who will work with in-country stakeholders including UN entities whole-of-government, the diplomatic corps, IFIs and MDBs, NGOs, and civil society actors. This can be done, by establishing a multi-stakeholder strategic (senior) coordination for a – for example and Executive committee of representatives of pre-existing coordination mechanisms (HCT, UNCT, DAG Clusters). There is also a need for inter-agency guidance from the global level, particularly on Collective Outcomes. It should be developed by a group representative of the breadth of sectors and endorsed by a majority of stakeholders as well as be genuinely inter-agency (including NGOs), otherwise agency specific planning instructions are unlikely to change.
2. **Focus on consistent and sound joint situation and context analysis.** To do so, in-country stakeholders should aim to establish means to generate genuine joint analysis that drives the identification of Collective Outcomes. The NWoW process should start with joint analysis which would define a common problem statement. This process should aim to be light and agile in process but inclusive in nature, by wherever possible a) leveraging, key elements of the CCA and HNO; and b) augmenting them with analysis of the root causes that are driving needs and vulnerabilities as well as aim to reflect the dynamics that impact social cohesion, protection, human rights, discrimination and marginalization.
3. **Improve joined-up planning and programing, by bringing coherence to the multiplicity of plans** that humanitarian and development sectors/actors among in-country stakeholders currently use. Solutions to generate the required coherence may take many shapes. Practitioners should perhaps explore, whether there is a need for “one plan”– a phasing out and deletion of existing plans. It may require integrating a resilience component in humanitarian plans. Alternatively, depending on context, coherent joined-up planning and programming may require one commonly agreed and joint analysis based on which multiple plans could be designed.
4. **Recalibrate financing modalities to support the identification and achievement of Collective Outcomes:** To do so, there will need to be donor and stakeholder buy-in and accountability on multi-year funding as well as financing support of multi- year plans. This approach would, in turn, facilitate more predictable and timely funding that can enhance a timely shift from emergency to recovery and development programming.

**NEXT STEPS**

1. Acknowledging that these efforts will need to be context specific and be field driven, there is agreement that advancing on the four focus areas highlighted above will require a concerted effort from stakeholders at national, regional, and global levels. Specifically:
	1. **Establish and grow a Community of Practice (HDN CoP).** While many country contexts have advanced in operationalizing the NWoW, others lag behind. Through the establishment of a Community of Practice, supported by the IASC HDN TT, the participants of the peer-to-peer workshop will endeavour to focus their efforts, energy, and expertise on these four issues areas. The Community of Practice will serve as a living resource where information, best practices, and new solutions can be shared to accelerate progress towards a strengthened humanitarian development nexus.
	2. **Promote a risk-tolerant culture:** The coherent integration of humanitarian and development action will require a mindset and attitudinal shift. Senior global leadership will need to create corporate environments that promote a culture of innovation and that provides the space for field practitioners to come up with new solutions that break through current administrative and institutional barriers and bottlenecks.
	3. **Establish a common language and vision:** Develop inter-agency guidance to ensure the buy-in of all relevant stakeholders. Guidance should be light and adaptable to context (it should not be one-size fits all); by providing critical elements that are essential to operationalizing the NWoW. In particular, while a few countries have begun the process of defining Collective Outcomes there remains a considerable lack of clarify around their specificity, timeframe, scope and level.
	4. **Establish linkages at global and regional level to support the field:** Promote linkages to regional level initiatives to leverage their capacity to address root causes that span across borders and multiple countries. In addition, there is a need to involve regional organization and bilateral donors from the onset of the planning processes.